

## **ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE**

### **Inquiry into Pedestrian Safety**

Melbourne — 29 May 2006

#### Members

Mr B. W. Bishop

Mr J. H. Eren

Dr A. R. Harkness

Mr C. A. C. Langdon

Mr T. W. Mulder

Mr E. G. Stoney

Mr I. D. Trezise

Chair: Mr I. D. Trezise

Deputy Chair: Mr E. G. Stoney

#### Staff

Executive Officer: Mr R. Willis

Research Officer: Ms M. Johnson

#### Witnesses

Mr Rob Spence, Chief Executive Officer, Municipal Association of Victoria,

Mr John Hennessy, Municipal Association of Victoria, and

Ms Claire O'Neill, Municipal Association of Victoria..

**The CHAIR**—Thank you to you, Rob, and your team from the MAV for your time today. As you are aware, this committee presented to parliament in 1999 a pedestrian safety paper. We decided late last year as a committee to review that, to see exactly what has been implemented and what has not been implement from a government perspective. That is exactly what we are doing at present. According to my notes here, the MAV has made a submission this year, this time around, so we thank you for that. A couple of things: from an administrative point of view, we are taking transcript, as you are aware, and we will provide a copy of that to you; and we are acting under parliamentary privilege, so what you say cannot be held against you legally in the future.

I am not sure how you want to run this, whether you people have some opening comments or whether we can just ask a couple of questions straightaway.

**Mr SPENCE**—Just to give you a bit of context in what has been happening with us and the state, we have been fairly active with VicRoads on safety and transport issues, or road issues, over the last three or four years. We have a number of structures at work: the Safer Roads Committee, which has been active with LGPro, MAV and VicRoads, and we run what has probably been one of the more successful models in state-local interfaces: the MAV-VicRoads Liaison Group, which has on it no officers apart from MAV officers, counsellors and VicRoads executives from the senior management team. We meet every couple of months and it is, 'No holds barred; let's work through the issues,' in relation to road infrastructure, street lighting and road safety issues. Problems with the location of schools and a whole array of issues get put on the table. It is a really good environment to get the discussion going, and we have made pretty good progress over the last couple of years in advancing issues. There is still a lot outstanding, but in the context we are making progress. There still remain some issues outstanding, but the system is operating better than it has over the last few years.

**The CHAIR**—With regard to that body, what are some of the issues that it has tackled or recommended with regard to pedestrian safety?

**Mr SPENCE**—We are doing a piece of work at the moment on street lighting, and John will talk to you about some of the street lighting issues, about who has responsibility for what. A confusion in responsibilities that resulted out of the electricity reforms that occurred in the early nineties has meant that the jurisdictions are blurred, the funding is blurred, and the rules of engagement are really blurred in terms of what ends up where and what standards you have. That is one area.

We are doing some work on school crossings, school crossing supervisors and the funding of school crossing supervisors. We have been having discussions about streetscape - visibility, issues in relation to that matter. We are also having discussions about issues concerning the location of schools, the fact that schools always seem to end up on the last piece of the housing development site, on a piece of land that is not necessarily in the safest location for the security of pedestrians. So we now have a better interface, as a result of that work with the Education Department, to try to work through these issues. There is also an issue concerning traffic management around schools - drop-off zones and so on. Those are some of the issues that have come forward. Then there's a whole array of issues about general road infrastructure and speed limits.

**Mr STONEY**—Just on schools and school drop-offs - providing somewhere for parents to drop of kids - what part of that is the local council's responsibility and what part is the responsibility of the Education Department?

**Mr SPENCE**—Basically what the Education Department says is that they have responsibility for what occurs inside the school grounds, not outside, and the tension in this then becomes: how does the council actually manage the drop-off spots around the school? We hope that going forward we will get a much better arrangement where agreed positions are formed when you are establishing a school, to get that done properly, because the schools are very limited in the amount of space they can have inside the school ground for drop-off. We have seen some incidents in rural Victoria where the schools are located on the opposite side of the major highway to the main population. With siting and drop-off, there are massive issues about the location of schools where a better relationship between local government, Education and VicRoads would assist.

**Mr STONEY**—Are you finding the Education Department is receptive to those sorts of drop-off problems, or are they still saying it is not their pigeon?

**Mr SPENCE**—They are better than they were. That is not to say that there do not remain significant issues.

**Dr HARKNESS**—But lots of decisions about sites have been made, in some cases in the sixties, seventies, eighties and nineties, and that sort of issue was not really taken into account. It was far more the price of land and the expected demographics of the township, not so much the transport issues.

**Mr STONEY**—The ideal situation obviously would be like an airport, where cars can pull into a one-way sort of thing and drop off or pick up inside the school grounds. But if the Education Department is not even thinking about that, the councils have a real problem, haven't they?

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes, and there has been a lot of discussion with the Education Department about trying to get the drop-offs inside the school grounds.

**Mr STONEY**—They are just not thinking about that?

**Mr SPENCE**—No, it has not been successful.

**The CHAIR**—They do not even recognise that on greenfield sites?

**Mr SPENCE**—Not in the discussions I have had with them. They are still looking at the drop-off being outside the school.

**Mr STONEY**—Do councils have any say over whether a school can go ahead on a site?

**Mr SPENCE**—No.

**Mr STONEY**—They have not, so you are really stuck. Otherwise they could say, 'You can't build a school—'

**Mr SPENCE**—It depends on the planning process, et cetera. Once they have the site, they go ahead as a school, and then the council has to plan around it. There is that bit about schools, then there is school crossings and managing the school crossings, which is—

**The CHAIR**—Because that is essentially a council responsibility?

**Mr SPENCE**—Council responsibility, part-funded by the state. We have had issues about getting enough school crossing supervisors.

**The CHAIR**—Getting enough with regard to—

**Mr SPENCE**—People willing to do it, and having enough funding from the states to deal with the demand. There is clearly a view amongst the parents and the school that these are an essential part of a school's safety. We have had issues about uniform. We also have some issues in eastern Melbourne about school crossing supervisors having to operate on roads like Springvale Road, where Monash Council particularly has expressed real concerns about safety - the safety of the school crossing supervisor, even with traffic lights working, having to venture out onto those roads with massive traffic flow - and we have been having discussions with VicRoads about how we might resolve those issues. So there is a lot that I think can be done in the schools to improve the process.

**The CHAIR**—How effective is the introduction of the 40-kilometre zones around schools in reducing risk?

**Mr SPENCE**—I basically take my feed off the advice I get from councils. If you went back 18 months, that was a real issue. It seems to have gone away as an issue. The clarification of the rules has helped. The main issue that was coming back to us was the confusion in the way they operated. There were also issues coming to us about people entering the 40-kilometre zone off a side street, maybe from a 60 into 40; the same in shopping centres, where the signage is not on the

side street, only on the main drag. We have taken those up with VicRoads, and VicRoads have been quite supportive in trying to get that resolved. There is still a lot of work required, particularly in strip shopping centres. That is where the main problem is.

**The CHAIR**—A lot of that confusion around schools, though, has been pretty much bedded down in the last 12 to 18 months?

**Mr SPENCE**—I think so, yes.

**Ms O'NEIL**—Could I add something, Rob. One of the things that we hear a lot from councils is just that they support the introduction of school zones but they do not feel that there are significant resources assisting compliance with the zones. They are asking for more police assistance but also saying to us they cannot afford to implement changes to the way the road is managed and put in treatments and things to change the natural speed that you might travel down it. That is something that we hear a bit.

**Mr LANGDON**—But schools will also be complaining, and have been complaining for years, that even policing of drop-off bays, or five minutes - all those things around schools that councils try to do to encourage parents to do the right things - have problems with the same sort of issue. It is not any different to any of that, I would imagine. It is just the overall package needs—

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes. The parking issue is something that councils can deal with. The speeding issue they cannot, and again there is a strong message coming to us, particularly from the inner Melbourne cluster of councils, about the failure of the state to deal with policing on local roads. We have been endeavouring to work through this issue with VicRoads and the police - we have not got very far with it - because we were trying to get an understanding about the amount of resources that were actually put into policing on suburban streets. We have yet to get that advice. But it is an ongoing issue: policing around the schools, policing on local roads, policing in shopping centres.

**Mr BISHOP**—Rob, can I take you to the other end of the sphere, aged people, pedestrians, crossing roads. What are the issues there from the MAV's point of view? They are less agile than the younger ones we have been talking about. They take longer to cross the road. Where does the MAV stand on that?

**Mr SPENCE**—We are obviously concerned about the elderly having accessibility within their local environment. We would hope that the structure of crossings and so on would assist. We do not get a lot of feedback from the aged sector that it is a problem, although I would suspect in some of the rural communities, where you have significant aged populations and not necessarily a lot of support, it would be an issue. Again, it is not something on which a lot of concern has come to us.

**Mr BISHOP**—It hasn't come up in that group that you spoke about?

**Mr SPENCE**—No.

**Mr BISHOP**—Just following that through, then, I know they are not pedestrians but they are close to it: the gophers that we see around the area. Do you have a view on gophers? I know they are not pedestrians, but they are close to it.

**Mr SPENCE**—The rural councils are starting to raise issues about the number of gophers and how they are going to manage the street flow with the growing use of them. It astounds me when I go to some of the country towns and I see them. It is just amazing, the number of them relative to what you see in metropolitan Melbourne. A very high proportion of the population seems to be using them. There are issues raised with us currently at a very low level but recognising that there is going to be a need to manage this going forward. There are issues about road crossings: how they cross the roads, people being thrown off them when they cross the roads, and the arrangements with the footpath as it crosses onto the road pavement.

**Dr HARKNESS**—One of the biggest problems for older people, either as pedestrians or on motorised wheelchairs, is that there are a lot of new subdivisions with either no footpaths or footpaths on only one side. I am not quite sure why these subdivisions are going in with no footpaths.

**Mr SPENCE**—It is an interesting scene. The advice I get is that in a lot of these housing developments the developers think of a model 10 years back: 'This model has been successful for us in the past.' If you look at the stuff that was around in the eighties and early nineties, as I saw out at Brimbank, we are guilty of allowing a lot of housing developments to occur there without any proper streetscape. A lot of cars there are parked on the roadways; there are no footpaths for people to walk along. Access is absolutely terrible. The state-of-the-art housing developments now are basically pedestrian driven. People need to be able to walk around and get free access.

One of the task forces I am on is looking at issues in outer Melbourne, and what we are seeing is a lot of developments that are based on a 10-year-old model, which is footpaths on one side of the road. We would certainly hope that the future will see us having proper pedestrian access.

**Dr HARKNESS**—Do councils now recognise that?

**Mr SPENCE**—Absolutely. They do. The developers do not, necessarily.

**Dr HARKNESS**—Can councils dictate to the developers?

**Mr SPENCE**—They can.

**Ms O'NEIL**—One of the things that the MAV has been pleased to see is the amendments to clause 56, which the government is finalising at the moment, which is a provision talking about a policy basis for rejecting applications which are not friendly to pedestrians. That will help local government get some teeth.

**Mr SPENCE**—It has moved a long way in the last five years, but we have a lot of housing stock out there now that has infrastructure that is not pedestrian-friendly.

**Dr HARKNESS**—I am lucky in Frankston and on the Mornington Peninsula that both councils have dedicated road safety officers, but I know from our previous travels around the state that not many do. Do you think there is a need for dedicated road safety officers at the municipal level?

**Mr SPENCE**—Certainly you need to have capacity within the councils to build their roads safely. What is required is a real focus on getting the streetscape right to deal with those issues. My general view is yes, you need it. The thing that worries me is that, even in inner Melbourne, such as where I live in Fitzroy, we have been really smart in fixing up the streetscape so it looks nice and trendy and it has lovely little plants and stuff growing there, but when a car comes out from a side street, that car cannot see if there is a bike or another car coming to the right of it. It is a standard problem with the overcreative nature of trying to get the streetscapes nice but not taking into consideration safety issues. The whole safer roads drive in councils over the last few years has been improving that. That is not to say it is perfect by any means.

**The CHAIR**—John, do you want to comment on street lighting?

**Mr HENNESSY**—Just as Rob said before, Mr Chair, there has been a sort of silo effect between the power companies which are supplying the installation, the councils - in terms of funding, who is responsible - and the state authorities with the introduction of the Road Management Act, perhaps understanding that this issue was too complex to be addressed. It is a bit of a sleeper issue that perhaps impacts on visibility and we need a far more systemic approach to the design, planning and maintenance of street lighting. At some stage we are going to have to bit the bullet and try to come up with some sort of a sustainable way forward, because at the present stage we are not really sure in some cases who is responsible for what problems.

**Ms O'NEIL**—As a consequence of that, street lighting is not being installed because no-one wants to pay for it.

**The CHAIR**—This manifests itself in the fact that street lighting is not being installed in new subdivisions, at the fringe typically?

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes.

**Mr STONEY**—But the developers have to put street lighting in a new estate, don't they?

**Mr SPENCE**—Inside the estate, but at the fringe of the estate it falls down the crack. Once you are inside the estate everything will be fine, because it will be a part of the development, but the entry points into the estates are not well done.

**Mr STONEY**—Surely that is a council responsibility, isn't it?

**Mr SPENCE**—It depends what the road is. If it is a state road, it is a state responsibility. If it is a local road, it is a local responsibility.

**Mr STONEY**—If it is a local road, do councils bite the bullet or do they say it will cost too much?

**Mr SPENCE**—No, they generally bite the bullet.

**Ms O'NEIL**—Yes. I think the key issue is on arterial roads, which are a state responsibility.

**Mr SPENCE**—We do have massive confusion.

**Mr LANGDON**—Does the state bite the bullet as well?

**Mr SPENCE**—The outskirts of towns is a bit of a grey area, where no-one is sure what stage the street lighting is supposed to extend to. It can be a bit of a variable issue.

**Mr LANGDON**—Literally a grey area!

**Mr SPENCE**—Literally a grey area, but the classic examples, when you look at the confusion in roads such as Springvale Road and Blackburn Road, are roads where you have side lanes or service lanes where the crossovers occur. In rural Victoria it is where the crossovers occur, so who has responsibility at what point? As a consequence you get pretty ratty outcomes.

We know we have councils paying for state roads; we do not know whether we have the state paying for councils' street lighting. We are not sure. We have variable standards.

**Mr STONEY**—What is the solution to all that?

**Mr SPENCE**—It worked well when we had a central sort of organising body that determined what went there and determined who had responsibility for what.

**Mr LANGDON**—Who was that? Who was the central organising body?

**Mr SPENCE**—It was when the SEC was around.

**Mr LANGDON**—I thought you might be going to say that.

**Mr SPENCE**—No, I do not want to recreate the SEC. What happened was, when you removed the SEC, it actually left a gap in the system to determine who did what. The SEC was a key player. Since then it has been a bit of a moving feast.

**Dr HARKNESS**—In the drafting of the Road Management Act there was some debate about what defines the edge of a township in the country, for example, whether it is the township sign, the—

**Mr SPENCE**—The 80-kilometre zone.

**Dr HARKNESS**—The 80-kilometre zone, the last house. It was all over the place.

**Mr LANGDON**—If a town was expanding, that would also be a challenge.

**Mr SPENCE**—That is right. Where is the bulk of the housing? It could be outside the 80-kilometre zone.

**Mr LANGDON**—Make a new estate and then move the 80 further out.

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes.

**The CHAIR**—That is an issue that is unresolved at present.

**Dr HARKNESS**—It is unresolved, and with the crashes that we have seen in the past four or five months, where cars have ploughed off the road just inside these township areas in the country, visibility could be a factor.

**Mr BISHOP**—Do you have a position on something that was raised at the North-West Municipal Association, chaired by our good friend Darryl Argall, where VicRoads reported that they have been putting in signs, 'You are now approaching a 60-kilometre zone'? There was animated discussion over that. Does MAV have a position on that?

**Mr SPENCE**—I had better ask what the member said! I cannot really comment, because that is something that has never been raised with me. I think it used in other states, and it seems for a driver to be quite successful, when it is actually pointing out to you that there is a speed change coming up. From a personal viewpoint, maybe less signage but more effective signage would be a good outcome.

**The CHAIR**—Hasn't the state government committing to introducing the system out of the review of the speed limits?

**Mr BISHOP**—This came up in the municipal association, where 10 or 12 councils got together, but apparently that has not been well publicised, because there was a bit of surprise around the municipalities in relation to that announcement by the VicRoads officer who was there on the day.

**Mr SPENCE**—This stuff is a great challenge because the more you drill, or the more you work on it, the more you have to do. It is a never-ending feast.

**The CHAIR**—Rob, in your submission you pointed out that the installation of bullbars is one issue of concern or interest to the MAV. Is that right?

**Mr SPENCE**—No, not us, I don't think.

**The CHAIR**—I was hoping to go there, because that is a very contentious issue.

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes. It is a bit outside our space.

**Ms O'NEIL**—The truth is local governments do express concern about it and councils express concern about it, but it is not exactly our jurisdiction.

**The CHAIR**—No, that is fine.

**Mr LANGDON**—A question on that issue: which councils are doing it? Are the inner city councils complaining, the outer regional councils, or the country councils?

**Ms O'NEIL**—It is pretty well across the board, but it probably reflects people's personal views about bullbars rather than anything to with any municipalities.

**Mr SPENCE**—The installation of bullbars has never come up as a motion to the state council, but a lot of other things have. You would assume from that that there is not a strongly-held view that the MAV is the right organisation to run that through.

**Mr STONEY**—A lot of councils have road safety officers who are involved in community road safety programs. What is the feedback on how effective they are? Do VicRoads and government generally listen to what people on the ground are saying, or is going to all these meetings just wasting time? Is there anything in there we could identify and draw attention to?

**Mr SPENCE**—I think VicRoads do listen. We do not always get the result we want, but communication is very open. The feed up from the councils into VicRoads is generally pretty good.

**Mr STONEY**—Can you actually get things done?

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes, we do. That's why I say the VicRoads liaison groups - I'm on plenty of liaison groups with government departments and so on - would be one of the most successful in resolving issues, because it is very practical, and there is rarely an issue that comes forward on which we cannot find a way forward. The Safer Roads partnership seems to work particularly well. It is upskilling the councils so they are becoming better, instead of focusing on putting pavement down, at thinking about how to create a safe environment.

**Mr HENNESSY**—Rob, that program where the councils get \$5,000 to develop road safety strategies, is that the Safer Roads program?

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes.

**Mr HENNESSY**—There has been some very positive feedback from councils about that. It is perhaps assisting councils to get some awareness of what they needed to start to do in a proactive sense about road safety.

**Mr SPENCE**—You will always get poor outcomes, in my view, when you have a confusion in responsibility. To me the tidying up the boundary issues and interfaces is a really critical thing in moving forward.

**Mr STONEY**—Who should drive that process? If councils drive it, they have a vested interest; if VicRoads drives it, they have a vested interest. It seems to me to be a major issue. You have identified those accidents, and who is to say that was not a lighting problem and so forth? There are plenty of such cases. This committee has to make recommendations. Give us a lead on how we might approach it to make a recommendation that that occur.

**Mr SPENCE**—You are exactly right in what you say, Graeme, but you should look at it from the council's viewpoint, in other words, the responsibility to minimise their cost, and VicRoads will do the same. No-one will deal with the issue of what happened after 1992 through to 2006. It needs some sort of independent process, I think, to have a look at it and come forward with a satisfactory recommendation.

**Mr STONEY**—So you see it from a safety point of view as a major issue?

**Mr SPENCE**—I do, yes. You are always going to get ratty outcomes, in my view, if you have unclear responsibilities, but nobody will get on with it if that is the case.

**Mr STONEY**—What would those players accept to come in? Would it be an independent person? Who would it be?

**Mr SPENCE**—An appropriately skilled independent review of where is at and come up with recommendations to government would be one way to go forward.

**Mr STONEY**—But it would have to have a formula, so that as the town grew the formula changed, so all of a sudden you have another 100 metres of—

**Mr SPENCE**—That is right.

**Mr HENNESSY**—This whole issue was supposed to be addressed by the Road Management Act. This question of street lighting, et cetera, was agreed to be too hard, so it was kept outside the Road Management Act to a large extent. As part of the Road Management Act we have made some quite major advances in terms of the establishment of the utilities infrastructure. There is a panel which was formed by the minister called the Utilities Infrastructure Reference Panel, where the utilities, councils and VicRoads sit around the table. It has perhaps an independent chair, and they have addressed some quite major and contentious issues about things like road openings, who is responsible for road openings and whether they need consents or not. Things which have been major issues for perhaps half a century across local government and the utilities have now been resolved because we have had the people sit around the table with an independent chair reporting to the minister. I think that sort of approach over six or 12 months could come up with some successful outcomes.

**Mr SPENCE**—There is nothing more contentious than this issue, I can tell you, in relation to who has responsibility for what.

**Ms O'NEIL**—Can I just add by way of background to this that the MAV and VicRoads have both developed position papers, which are of course completely diverse. That is the point we are at now. It sits on the agenda at our liaison group and overtures are made about to how to resolve the issue, but it is at a bit of an impasse at the moment.

**Mr SPENCE**—We are quite happy to show you the papers.

**Mr MULDER**—Do we know what councils are spending across the state?

**Mr SPENCE**—I could get it for you. It is a lot of money, but it is an important field. The community do not realise the councils provide it. They would never know.

**The CHAIR**—No further questions?

**Mr LANGDON**—As I walked in - and I apologise for being late - you were discussing the issue of pedestrian safety around schools. The biggest bone of contention I have always heard about from my local community is who pays for it. Local government tends to think, 'We wouldn't have a problem with these local roads if the school wasn't there. The Education Department should pay for everything.' The Education Department tends to work on the theory, 'We're here to provide an education, not roads,' and therefore they do not want to. VicRoads do not want to be involved, because the schools are usually on local roads. So who do you think should pay for any works around schools to improve pedestrian safety?

**Mr SPENCE**—I think the point John was making earlier on is that what happens is that the land is set aside. When a housing development occurs, the land is set aside but the school is not built for years after the housing development starts. The contribution from the people that have

created the housing estate actually does not occur. The Education Department deals with what is inside their property, and they will not normally put parking or drop-off points for kids in there. They expect that to occur on the council space.

**Mr LANGDON**—So you would be suggesting, if a bit housing development is going to occur and a school area is being allocated, that while the developer is building the roads the infrastructure should be built in conjunction with that?

**Mr SPENCE**—In an ideal world you would site the school in the most appropriate location for it rather than the least appropriate location, which is generally where they end up now, in my opinion. What our members tell us is that it ends up on a piece of land that nobody else wants and, as a consequence, that ensures generally that it does not have reasonable access and traffic flow.

**Mr LANGDON**—That is the new development. The other problem you have, unfortunately, all around Melbourne, is the number of cars dropping kids off at school. I suspect it increases on a yearly basis. Who is responsible or who should pay for fixing those problems?

**Mr SPENCE**—At the moment it sits basically with the council, and the council has to try to work that through with the school community. What we were saying before is that we have made some headway with the Education Department in trying to develop those issues, so we will now have a more open process in trying to work it through. But it still remains a problem, and it goes back to how well it is planned to deal with the traffic flow that occurs for very short periods on relatively narrow roads with very low access capability. Council can only do so much. You are getting a lot of drop-offs in some pretty tight spaces, and that is dangerous, as you know.

**Mr LANGDON**—I imagine in places like Fitzroy it is even tighter.

**Mr SPENCE**—Fitzroy is pretty good. If you look at the street access around Fitzroy, you will see the problem is you have too much access, so everything becomes a one-way street to stop rat running. I have two little tackers - an old bloke like me - and I drop my kids off at the local primary school. It is not an issue because the streets have free access and are pretty open. But what you see in new developments is very narrow roads basically on a square around the school, and the access into that will not be as free-flowing as it is in some of the other, better planned, inner Melbourne areas.

**The CHAIR**—Statistically school crossings are pretty safe.

**Mr SPENCE**—They are, but kids getting out of cars and opening doors and double parking and so on is dynamite.

**Mr BISHOP**—Where schools have school buses coming in and dumping kids off, it is chaotic, and I do not know how we get away with it as well as we do. At suburban schools where you do not have that complication it would probably be different, but that is the biggest problem we have in country areas. Most of the teachers who manage the school bus - they call them coordinators - probably retire at 42 and look like they are 70. It is a problem.

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes. We have the contradiction in our policies at the moment where we try to ensure that the kids are healthy, yet we create a model where the basically the only way they can get to school is by car, in comparison with the pedestrian and cycle access to schools when I was a kid.

**The CHAIR**—That is why walking bus programs and things like that are good programs.

**Mr SPENCE**—Yes, the walking bus program is a great program. The only problem is that again it is one of things that are sort of half-funded, and it is hard to maintain. I think more resources into that would be a good outcome.

**The CHAIR**—Yes. There are no further questions. Thank you to the MAV. Thank you, Rob, John and Clare. Thank you for your time. We will be tabling this report in about August. We will provide you with a copy of our report. Thanks again.

**Mr SPENCE**—I look forward to hearing what you have to say.

**The CHAIR**—So do we.

**Witnesses withdrew.**

**Committee adjourned.**