

# TRANSCRIPT

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

### Inquiry into the Road Safety Road Rules 2009 (Overtaking Bicycles) Bill 2015

Melbourne — 31 May 2016

#### Members

Mr Joshua Morris — Chair

Ms Colleen Hartland

Mr Khalil Eideh — Deputy Chair

Mr Shaun Leane

Mr Nazih Elasmr

Mr Craig Ondarchie

Mr Bernie Finn

#### Participating Members

Ms Samantha Dunn

#### Staff

Secretary: Dr Christopher Gribbin

#### Witnesses

Mr Craig Richards, CEO, and

Ms Tess Allaway, General Manager, Behaviour Change and Government, Bicycle Network.

**The CHAIR** — I declare open the Standing Committee on the Economy and Infrastructure public hearing and extend my welcome to everybody who is present here this morning. The committee is today hearing evidence in relation to the Road Safety Road Rules 2009 (Overtaking Bicycles) Bill 2015, and the evidence is being recorded. All evidence taken today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Therefore you are protected for what you say in here today, but if you go outside and repeat the same things, those comments may not be protected by this same privilege. I would like to welcome our witnesses that we have present here this morning. I might ask you both to state your names and the capacity in which you are appearing before our committee today, and then move into any introductory comments and then we will follow those with some questions. Mr Richards, over to you.

**Mr RICHARDS** — I am Craig Richards, and I am the CEO of Bicycle Network.

**Ms ALLAWAY** — My name is Tess Allaway, and I am the general manager of behaviour change and government, Bicycle Network.

**Mr RICHARDS** — I just did want to say of course a little bit about our organisation and what we do. Our purpose at Bicycle Network is to get people physically active. We do that by making it easier for everyone to ride a bike every day. We have got a dream at Bicycle Network, and we are looking to establish Australia as a nation of bike riders and of course Victoria as a state of bike riders. We look after the 3 million Australians who ride a bike regularly, and we also look to look after the 10 million-plus Australians who want to ride a bike but are currently concerned. How we get that number is it is roughly 60 per cent — or 59 per cent — of people who are interested in riding a bike but they are concerned. Of course what they are concerned about is the risk associated with riding a bike.

There is an interesting relationship between risk and the number of bike riders. Of course the less risk there is, the more people will start riding. On the other hand of course the more people who are riding, the less the risk gets. The risk is not as great as a lot of people make out, but there are far too many bike riders that are hurt, and we need to take action to make sure that no bike rider gets hurt. That is something that we are really strong on making sure happens.

Of course today we are here to consider minimum passing distance laws. It has been introduced in a lot of places around the world and jurisdictions throughout Australia, and while the evidence has not been well maintained about its impact on injury, space given and more riders, the evidence has now come, largely through Australia, that just shows how strongly riders want a minimum distance passing law, and that they believe that as a result vehicles give them more room. We think it is a quick, inexpensive contribution to help overcome this problem of skimming bike riders, which of course is where vehicles pass too close to riders. As a result of that, our recommendation is a five-year trial for the minimum passing distance law in Victoria.

**The CHAIR** — Very good. Ms Allaway, are there any comments that you would like to add?

**Ms ALLAWAY** — Not at this point, no.

**The CHAIR** — We are happy to move to questions. Very good. I am interested with regard to some of the recommendations that you have made to the committee, and one specifically that the legislation should not apply to bikes in lanes in 50-kilometre-per-hour or less zones. I am interested to hear the rationale behind that particular recommendation.

**Mr RICHARDS** — Yes. Absolutely. We do appreciate that some members of the community expressed their concern and worry about that. It is an interesting area, because there are some worries for us about when minimum passing distance laws come in. The laws should come in of themselves, but what we have seen in a number of other jurisdictions is they have been accompanied with some fairly draconian measures. There have been blitzes on bike riders, there have been bike lanes have been ripped up — College Street is the big one in New South Wales. There have been other laws. We have seen in New South Wales the upping of fines. We have also seen a move that is not quite in yet to require bike riders to carry compulsory identification. This is a real victim-blaming situation. If you are bringing in a law that helps bike riders, why at that very time do you do things that make it seem as if it is the fault of the bike rider? What we have seen around the world — and the evidence on this is pretty clear — is that if there is a collision between a bike and a car, roughly three-quarters of the time it is the car's fault.

We are concerned about the infrastructure; the infrastructure is absolutely vital. I know the committee has heard a lot of things about infrastructure, and we have seen the impact infrastructure has. It is really significant. Of course we all aim for separated bike lanes — that is our preference — and that reduces your risk of a crash by about 90 per cent. The next best thing we could have on quiet streets is traffic-calmed quiet streets. That reduces your risk of a crash by about 70 per cent. Painted bike lanes reduce your risk of a crash by about 50 per cent.

We are there saying, ‘What will happen to the bike lanes?’. We want to make sure that they are maintained if this law comes in, as we have recommended, but what we do not also see is something happening to the vital infrastructure. We have put forward one recommendation here, and that is something for the committee to consider. They may have other suggestions, and I am sure you will hear them throughout the course, but at the very least we would really urge the committee, if it ends up recommending the law does get passed, that nothing is done that will denigrate the existing bike infrastructure or be seen as a substitute for improving and maintaining the current bike infrastructure.

We have still got a long way to go in Victoria with our bike infrastructure. We are probably a third to halfway down the journey of where we need to get to in terms of bike riding cities and states. Victoria is going okay, but not great. Other places around the world are taking off at a much greater rate. We have seen recently in London a new mayor elected. Following on the work from the previous mayor, he is committed to spending £35 a head on bike infrastructure. We think that that is a message that needs to be sent strongly.

**The CHAIR** — That is certainly something that the committee has heard loud and clear from many witnesses, that bike infrastructure has not kept pace with people who are choosing to cycle. I think that question is quite separate from the rule change, the possibility of not having the safer distance mandated for below 50 kilometres per hour. One of the concerns that we have heard from many witnesses is that a watering down of the proposed legislation or legislation that we see in the likes of Queensland could create confusion amongst motorists who are unsure of when it is that the safe passing distance applies and does not apply. Is that a concern of yours if this recommendation was to be adopted?

**Mr RICHARDS** — I am sorry. Are you asking is it a concern now?

**The CHAIR** — That confusion amongst motorists about when the 1-metre or 1.5-metre law applies. If we were to have 50 kilometres or below the safe distance does not apply, it does above 50 kilometres, that could create confusion amongst motorists in not understanding when it is that that distance applies and can be legally enforced. Do you see that as a concern?

**Mr RICHARDS** — As I say, we do have a concern about the bike infrastructure. That is a real concern for us, and we would want to make sure that that is maintained. When it comes to how motorists behave, while we do not profess to be the expert on all motorists, we do know that the bike infrastructure is important and that vehicles generally keep out of bike infrastructure. There are times when they go in, and with small improvements in bike infrastructure you can make a massive difference. For instance, something as simple as a rumble strip down a painted lane stops about 90 per cent of car incursions into the bike infrastructure. So there is a good law in place that stops vehicles going into bike lanes, and that law is in place to protect the bike riders, because we do know that lateral separation between a vehicle and a bike is very important. It is very important for the bike riders to make sure that they are well looked after, the current ones, and it is also very important for the future ones to encourage them to ride.

**The CHAIR** — Indeed. A five-year trial is something that you have also recommended. I am interested to hear why that length of five years, and what would your network expect to see that would see that translated into a permanent law?

**Mr RICHARDS** — Yes. The reason we recommend the five-year trial — and I know the committee has had some discussions, particularly around the evidence that has come out of Queensland as a result of their trial — is there is a significant period of time required to gather both the pre and post data, and that is why in our submission we have recommended that that be done. That would make sure that there is a sufficient period of time — five years to, say, two years. At the end of it you will probably come out with a report similar to Queensland, which says, ‘Yes, there is some good science, but we are unsure. We are not able to commit exactly’. That is why that length of time has been recommended.

**The CHAIR** — Fabulous.

**Mr LEANE** — I think you stole my question, Chair, but I will go to another one.

**The CHAIR** — I am glad you have got a backup.

**Mr LEANE** — I will wing it. I appreciate what you were saying. We had someone from New South Wales give us evidence yesterday, and they spoke about how they did a whole review, as you probably already know, as far as the shared use of the road by cyclists and motorists. The outcome formed was I think something like 30 recommendations, off the top of my head — it might have been around that area. Some of those recommendations recommended some changes to the fines that cyclists may attract for infringing on the current road rules. So their outcome was to try to encourage a change in behaviour of the small percentage of cyclists who do not do the right thing, and we accept that the large percentage of cyclists endeavour to follow all the laws and do the right thing. I think that is where they were coming from.

If a law like this is introduced, as far as behavioural change from cyclists, something that has concerned me — the more we talk about it, mainly in the CBD of Melbourne; Geelong might be the same or whatever — is a standard road lane is 3.5 metres, a sedan is about 1.8 metres and then you have got the metre distance to pass and then you have got half a metre or a little bit more than half a metre for the cyclist to occupy the left side of the lane. So in passing, for a sedan to pass a cyclist in that instance, safely, with the metre distance, maybe even more, it means they do not even have to break into a solid line or a double line. They should not have to actually go over to the other side of the road. But when there are two cyclists next to each other, they have to because of the pure mathematics of it.

Have you considered that if there was a change whether cyclists would be prepared to accept that in certain areas? I am not talking anywhere other than where there are some tighter lanes and some roads where it is harder for a motorist to pass safely. Are you prepared to consider that there could be a change around the way cyclists behave in that instance?

**Mr RICHARDS** — It is an interesting point, and I hear this argument put where they are talking about expediency of traffic movement against people's lives. To me you cannot balance one against the other. Here we are going to risk lives for the expediency of traffic movement. When it comes to where you recommend riders ride, we certainly do not encourage riders — even if they are on their own — to hug the left-hand side of the gutter. That often puts them at risk. In many instances, particularly in those areas, you would encourage the rider to what is called 'take the lane' and as a result of that the vehicle has to go right around them.

There is a concern here around traffic congestion. Congestion costs this country \$15 billion a year. There is an easy solution to congestion and that comes from getting more people riding bikes, so the more you discourage it and the more you are encouraging car flow, then the less likely you are to get people riding bikes. So while we have heard those arguments that we should get rid of riding two abreast and encourage riders just to ride in the gutter, it is not safe for riders. It is not the best position for them, and we would never advocate putting traffic expediency ahead of people's lives.

**Mr LEANE** — I am not encouraging cyclists to ride in the gutter because the maths I just gave you is close to a metre, where it can be occupied from the curb. But what you are saying is that you would encourage cyclists to ride in the middle?

**Mr RICHARDS** — In certain circumstances absolutely, because in those instances we are saying to bike riders that they have to look after themselves and then, particularly in the mixed traffic situations where there is not separation, in those moments there is a situation when cars and bikes operate better together rather than it being a situation where cars are just trying to sneak past, skim the rider, get used to, 'Oh, I've skimmed a rider. No big deal'. It is a big deal to the bike rider because they are the ones whose lives are in jeopardy.

**Mr LEANE** — But what if a motorist has actually given that metre clearance? In the instance I just gave you, with the pure maths, if someone is driving a sedan, the motorist does not even break the line in the middle. It actually gives that person a metre and maybe even more.

**Mr RICHARDS** — I would just say, and I could not profess to be the complete traffic expert, but the mathematical issue is in that instance where you say they do not have to break the line, if the car is right on the line — you cannot drive the car right on the line with the next line of traffic, I would not have thought, because then you are so close to the next car, if you are a couple of centimetres from the next car, that is not going to

work either. So while the maths adds up if it is just one lane and there is nothing else, when there is another lane of traffic, either an oncoming lane or a lane next to it, you are going to get into mathematical difficulties.

**Mr LEANE** — No, but it is actually working now. In a lot of instances where people — motorists — are taking concern for their fellow traveller, as in a cyclist, a lot of motorists would at the moment unconsciously be giving that much space, unconsciously veering across to the right with their tyres if not touching the line very close to it, even if there are oncoming vehicles — —

**Mr RICHARDS** — Obviously if there is sufficient space to not put the rider's life in jeopardy, that is fine, but that is a matter for — —

**Mr LEANE** — But the point that I would like to understand is: you are saying you are not prepared to encourage any different behaviour of cyclists riding two abreast if this law came into place, particularly in the CBD?

**Mr RICHARDS** — Riding two abreast does, for the bike rider, reduce that risk. There is a reason they ride two abreast, because in effect in that moment it does make people take a sufficient distance to pass them. I have heard people suggest, 'We should outlaw riding two abreast so bike riders can only ride one abreast', but we certainly would not recommend that change.

**Mr LEANE** — So not even on certain roads?

**Mr RICHARDS** — I think it would be a very difficult thing to say, 'This road's a two abreast road, this is one abreast road'. I really do not know how you could do that, but maybe the committee has a way to formulate a position.

**Ms HARTLAND** — I found it very interesting that you started to quote New South Wales, because what has happened in New South Wales with the multitude of law changes has nothing to do with this legislation. You have said that Bicycle Network supports policy that has good evidence base, so could you explain the evidence base in regard to your proposed exemption?

**Mr RICHARDS** — Yes, it is an interesting question. Our evidence about an exemption really comes down to — I spoke before about the impact of the infrastructure. So for us we have had concerns, and we have put forward a suggestion here, that our concern has always been what happens with the infrastructure, and the evidence of the impact of infrastructure is very clear. I spoke before about the risk reduction that comes from a bike lane. The risk production from a painted bike lane is roughly 50 per cent; that is what a lot of the studies have shown. A separated bike lane is 90 per cent and traffic calming around 70 per cent, so that is where our evidence comes from. What are we going to do in these circumstances? We want to make sure that if these laws are introduced, as we have recommended, they do not come with another slap for bike riders.

I know you said about New South Wales, but we have seen similar situations — not to the same extent in New South Wales; they have cranked it up to another level — but in South Australia the laws came in, blitz on bike riders; in Queensland the laws came in, blitz on bike riders and up in fines.

**Ms HARTLAND** — So you are saying that this legislation will automatically lead to that kind of blitz against bike riders when, as far as I understand it, this bill has nothing to do with that kind of regulation or review of rules.

**Mr RICHARDS** — In terms of the enforcement by police on things against bike riders, I do not think that was a legislative moment. It was probably a policy moment; I do not actually know, but it certainly was not a legislative change in those three states.

**Ms HARTLAND** — So it has no connection to the bill that we are talking about?

**Mr RICHARDS** — It has not got a connection to the bill, no, but I presume it does have a connection to the way policy has been informed. So I would have thought that it is a good opportunity for the committee to perhaps make that recommendation that it is not accompanied with those same sorts of things.

I would be very hopeful that it does not happen in Victoria. We work very closely with Vic Police on a number of things. In some of those instances, and Tess might want to speak about that, and Light Up is a classic

campaign which is coming in tomorrow — we start our first day of winter — on those occasions in Victoria we think we have got to a situation where instead of just going out and fining bike riders, figuring that is the way to change their behaviour, we have worked closely with them on some interventions. You might want to speak about those interventions and the effectiveness of those compared to just fining.

**Ms ALLAWAY** — Yes, so some of the things we have worked with the police on over 5 to 10 years are campaigns like Light Up!, so making sure riders understand during the darker months of the year that they need to be properly visible with the lights on the road. We have run the Respect the RED campaign, so educating riders on what the dangers are to them if they do run red lights. Another one we ran around three years ago was related to the Swanston Street redevelopment. When the super tram stops were installed in Swanston Street there was a lot of confusion amongst all the road users in that space — pedestrians, commuters and bike riders — on how to use that space and not put other people at risk.

**Ms HARTLAND** — All of that is really great, but it has actually got nothing to do with the question I asked or this bill. For me this is quite a personal example of the Footscray City Primary School, which is on Hyde Street, an incredibly busy street, and has a substantial bike path. But with the exemption that you are suggesting, what would happen because of school zones — and this will happen across the state with your exemption — is that cars will be able to go closer, especially to children riding to school. What is your evidence that you think it makes it safer for children in school zones, to exempt cars, especially for them going closer to them?

**Mr RICHARDS** — The children are riding on the footpath to school?

**Ms HARTLAND** — No, they are on the road. There is a bike path, and with your exemption, because in school zones it goes down to 40 and because you are saying there should be an exemption under 50, that means that in that 200 or so metres that cars will be exempted from having to keep that distance between themselves and the bikes. Have you considered the impact this is going to have on school zones?

**Mr RICHARDS** — Of course we have considered it. As I say, we put forward this as a suggestion because we do have concerns about the way things are going to go here. We always have concerns about infrastructure and what might happen. The bike lanes — when you ask for evidence, evidence as in how effective bike infrastructure is?

**Ms HARTLAND** — No, that is not the question I asked. I asked you specifically about school zones, and I gave you a specific example of Hyde Street. Have you considered the fact that in school zones, if we followed your advice and went for that exemption, cars would be able to be closer, especially to children using the bike lane going to school?

**Mr RICHARDS** — I do not know. You might have a comment about school zones.

**Ms ALLAWAY** — Yes, I guess we run a big Ride2School program, and our advice to parents who are allowing their children to ride to school is if they are at the right age, we actually recommend that they ride on the footpath to school. We are actually running campaigns to decrease the speed limits around schools to even lower than what they are at the moment, so — —

**Ms HARTLAND** — But that would mean, again, that the lower the speed limit, the more exemptions there would be so that cars would be coming closer to children. Along Hyde Street it is a really lumpy, bumpy footpath, and they are actually safer riding on the marked bike path. So what you are saying with your exemption is that it is perfectly acceptable for cars to come closer to children in school zones going to school.

**Mr RICHARDS** — As I said to the committee, we have put forward one possible solution. You may have others, and that is great. We do not say this is the be-all and end-all, but we did have to have a careful think about what could happen to bike infrastructure, because we do think it is vital. We think it is vital that bike riders are well looked after, and we are trying to find the best way to do that. You might come up with another exemption. You ask about our evidence. I know you say that is not evidence, but unfortunately we are looking at infrastructure — —

**Ms HARTLAND** — Would it be possible for you to send the committee some links to actual evidence from other places that shows that having these exemptions is a good idea, because your verbal evidence today has not actually given us that.

If I could just move on. We have had a lot of emails from members of Bicycle Network concerned about how the submission was formed. I am going to ask a number of questions because I want to know from you whether what we are getting from your members is correct. You actually had a process and you engaged with your membership and asked them for submissions, is that correct?

**Mr RICHARDS** — Yes, we did.

**Ms HARTLAND** — Am I right in saying that 76 per cent of your membership supported the Metre Matters proposal and never talked about there being exemptions?

**Mr RICHARDS** — I would have to check. I think that is in our submission, the percentage rate.

**Ms ALLAWAY** — Yes. It was 76 per cent.

**Mr RICHARDS** — It was thereabouts, but it is in our submission how many members supported it.

**Ms HARTLAND** — Considering those submissions from members, why is it that you have — who is the submission coming from? It does not feel like it is coming from your membership; it feels like it is coming from another body within the organisation. I just need to understand where the submission has come from and where the idea for the exemption has come from.

**Mr RICHARDS** — The submission comes from the organisation. We are an organisation of 51 000 or 52 000 members. We clearly cannot put in our submission what 51 000 or 52 000 members say, so what we of course did was we went to our members and we asked them about this. We thought it was an important enough issue to go to our members and say, ‘What do you think?’. We got back what their feedback was, and then of course we had to wrestle with the problem. So we wrestle with our problem — our policy people wrestle and think, ‘How can we come up with a position?’. We have come up with a position.

Similarly we have got our six, I think it is, things that we put at the back. Some of those members would have said something about some of them. Many of them would not have said things about others of them. Probably none of them mention the safe systems to road approach. I cannot remember; maybe one or two of the hundred and something submissions we got did. We do have to, as best we can, consolidate what our members tell us and look at the other evidence and as a result of that come to a policy position.

**Ms HARTLAND** — When you were doing the consultation process, did you put to the members that you were considering an exemption?

**Mr RICHARDS** — No, we did not.

**Ms HARTLAND** — Right, so it was only afterwards that members would have seen your submission. Clearly where we have got most of our emails and the petition from is when they realised you had put an exemption in your submission.

**Mr RICHARDS** — Correct.

**Ms HARTLAND** — Am I correct in understanding that that did not have general support from the membership and you knew that?

**Mr RICHARDS** — No, that is incorrect.

**Ms HARTLAND** — Because the members did not know that that is what your intention was?

**Mr RICHARDS** — Correct.

**Ms HARTLAND** — So why did you not tell your members that that was your intention?

**Mr RICHARDS** — Because when it came to us formulating our policy, the facts were that time was tight. We had the committee call for submissions. We had to have a very consolidated process as a result of that. To go to our members we had a small window of opportunity. We still decided to do that. We got their feedback, and we looked at that carefully. We also looked at the available evidence, and that is how we came up with our position.

**Ms HARTLAND** — The fact that 76 per cent of the submissions that you received showed clear support for Metre Matters did not influence you, and then you went for the exemption.

**Ms ALLAWAY** — I guess just to bring it back, our submission is encouraging a trial of minimum distance passing law. We are encouraging a five-year trial, and that is what we are recommending the committee — —

**Ms HARTLAND** — But with an exemption.

**Ms ALLAWAY** — With six qualifications, yes. That is one of six.

**Ms HARTLAND** — Okay. Can I also ask, have you read all the submissions that have come to us from your members?

**Mr RICHARDS** — The submissions being the submissions to the committee?

**Ms HARTLAND** — The submissions that have come to the committee that have actually come from your members.

**Mr RICHARDS** — I am not sure which ones. Are you referring to the ones that are published on your website?

**Ms HARTLAND** — That is right.

**Mr RICHARDS** — I do not think they identify who is a member and who is not. There are 170-something submissions?

**Ms HARTLAND** — Yes, quite a few of them do actually, so I am wondering whether — there are particular ones that I would suggest you have a look at. That is from Stephen Williams. I have to declare I know Stephen; we live in not quite the same part of the western suburbs but we know each other through a number of things. I think his submission sums up a lot of what we have seen from other members, and also he has had a very tragic incident within his family. I think it is really worth having a read.

The other thing is that evidence we have received from Queensland, one of the things we heard about is that there has actually been a dramatic decrease in claims to the Motor Accident Insurance Commission. In fact there were one-third — or 100 — fewer claims. That to me says that what is happening in Queensland, even though they quite acknowledge that they had a somewhat flawed process — they did not have good base data to start with et cetera — is it would appear that there are substantial benefits. The thing that I found really interesting was that they talked about how it had made drivers think about the distance they needed to keep. Even drivers who really dislike cyclists were actually complying with the law because it was now a requirement. Do you think that that is evidence as to why we should do this?

**Mr RICHARDS** — The Queensland study are you asking about that?

**Ms HARTLAND** — Yes.

**Mr RICHARDS** — Yes. So when we wrote our submission the Queensland study had not been released. It has been done in the meantime, so there is obviously a timing issue there. One of the difficulties has been throughout the world that the evidence is pretty thin. But that is one of the more comprehensive ones, which is terrific, and that has been a good step forward. As a result of that it certainly strengthens our position in saying that we recommend that this law come in.

**Ms HARTLAND** — You will not have seen this, but we have had other evidence from Rutgers University in relation to what has happened in New Jersey. Also in New South Wales, putting aside all the other things that have happened, clearly there is evidence that this is working. As I understand it, none of those are looking at speed exemptions. The thing that really concerns me about that, and I see this living in the inner city, is that we have 40 zones, we have 50 zones, we have 60 zones and people get confused. So if there was an exemption for under a certain speed, do you think drivers are then going to get confused about what they are expected to do?

**Mr RICHARDS** — When it comes to what drivers are expected to do, I know part of the terms of reference here speak about education. So in terms of how we change driver behaviour we think that is an important thing



as well, because the end outcome we are all looking for here, and this has been suggested through a change in the law, is that drivers do give riders more space. We know that is so important because we do not want riders to be hurt. So there is also a job to be done around behaviour change. I might ask our behaviour change person to speak about behaviour change.

**Ms ALLAWAY** — So if the concern is that motorists are going to be confused about where the law applies, the job to be done is to make sure that — in the terms of the inquiry an education campaign was mentioned. One of our six recommendations in relation to our submission is to actually supplement the introduction of this law with a behaviour change campaign rather than an education campaign. The reason for that is there is a lot of evidence that an education campaign or an awareness campaign can be effective at increasing public knowledge on an issue and changing attitudes towards an issue, but actually having an impact on behavioural change, there is very little data to suggest that education campaigns are effective.

So what we are advocating for, if this law is introduced, is to run a proper behaviour change campaign, make sure that it is designed with measures that we can assess whether behaviour change is happening and look at the different road user groups. So talk to the taxidriviers, talk to truck drivers, talk to motorists in regional areas and inner-urban areas, because they will all have different drivers for why they are not complying with the desired behaviour. So a broadbrush one slogan is not going to resonate with all of those different types of road users. That is something we have put across really strongly in our submission.

**The CHAIR** — Thank you very much for your testimony this morning. I will remind you that you will receive a copy of the transcript of today's evidence for proofreading. That transcript will ultimately be posted on the committee's website. Thank you, Mr Richards and Ms Allaway, for your presentation this morning.

**Mr RICHARDS** — Thank you.

**Ms ALLAWAY** — Thank you.

**Witnesses withdrew.**