LRRSC the IRG was sent an XL spreadsheet apparently showing the last five years of crash data used by VicRoads/VicPol/TAC.

It appears inadequate to us. We have complained about road data before.

***************************************************************

If you look at columns AY through BB you will see the Vehicle type as one of,
- HEAVYVEHICLE
- PASSENGERVEHICLE
- MOTORCYCLE
- PUBLICVEHICLE

If the accident involved 2 bikes, one truck and a car you would see
- HEAVYVEHICLE 1
- PASSENGERVEHICLE 1
- MOTORCYCLE 2
- PUBLICVEHICLE 0

Then looking at

Column J you can see if an animal was involved,
- L shows if the accident was caused by a U turn, T intersection, double parked, rear ended etc
- N shows light conditions
- O police attendance
- R speed zone
- S road run off
- AB-AG shows how many people were injured or killed, and if they were drivers, passengers, pillions, pedestrians
  - there's also data for male/female, age, bicyclist, pillion, passenger,
  - location, type of road, alcohol

Probably more data than we have ever had.

While VicRoads clearly state they do not release this type of data to the public. They certainly do have it for road planning bodies. Their site has an application form for councils, police etc to access their full database. The interesting thing is they provide this snapshot to the bureau of stats, who then release it to the public for educational purposes.
Which is where I picked it up.

Let me know if you want some help making sense of this data. (I used to do this sort of stuff for a living)

cheers

ANONYMOUS

********************************************************************************

With the computing power and expertise available in 2018, Victorian crash data is still less than adequate.

That VicRoads is unwilling to release the data they have is very wrong. This is road safety not national security. I was not aware any of this data (a spread sheet of serious injury and fatal crashes over the last 5 years) was available through ABS.

There are skilled, qualified people, who VicRoads have virtually banned, who would contribute to road safety if they had access to more information.

People on VicRoads committees have to sign a confidentiality agreement. I’ve seen it. It states that members can’t talk/communicate committee business outside the committee. If a member is aware another member is talking outside committee they must report the other member to VicPol!

OK. Back to the data. Columns ay to bb still do not give us vehicle brand or model. This would be particularly useful in motorcycle & scooter crashes. Public vehicle? Correct me if I’m wrong but a bus crash on a city street might be a very different crash to a country train coming off its’ tracks. The information on brand and model is simply not collected at the crash site or after. This data would be very easy to record.

If an animal was involved is not enough information. Rabbit or roo. Big difference. And the if is huge. That an animal was involved in a crash is entirely down to the officer attending the crash site. He/she may not be specially trained for crash investigation and usually is not so trained. Sometimes the officer will take 4 or 5 hours to get to the crash site as in the Coryong motorcycle fatal in 2012(?). Sometimes the site has been “cleaned up” and opened to traffic as in the Cann River road motorcycle fatal in 2014(?). By the time VicPol attended from Bairnsdale the victim and her bike had been moved and the road open to traffic. That she was torn apart by the wire rope barrier was not recorded.

O shows that sometimes VicPol does not attend. The data from these crashes is after-the-fact and includes assumptions and opinions from people who may never have been to the crash site but the data is not identified as such.

The further the crash is from the capital city the less likely the crash site is to have a competent, comprehensive investigation. Urban crashes get more attention than rural crashes. Fatal crashes get more attention than serious injury crashes. Multiple fatals get more attention than single fatals.

S “road run off” I assume indicates a vehicle left the carriageway. It does not indicate there was a safe run-off area. Safe run-off areas are a major safety feature.

There does not seem to be any information on crashes involving roadside objects. Barriers and barrier type information is critically important in understanding a large percentage of crashes. VicRoads/VicPol know it. It is easy, even for an untrained officer, to collect this data but they do not. Why? The excuse I’ve been given on barriers is that if bush data was made public it might give advantage to the manufacturers competition. That excuse makes me very angry. Road safety is about people not profit. Ask a grieving wife or husband or kid.

I’m not an expert in any of this but it seems to me (and to Parliamentary Inquiries) that Victorian Crash data is unnecessarily inadequate. In my opinion, where vehicle brands & models and barrier types are concerned, data collecting is selective. I think that is irresponsible and indirectly it contributes to road trauma.
Finally, there is no way to check what injuries resulted from a crash. In a motorcycle crash where a rider drops a bike because of an animal on the road then slides into a WRB and is found with a broken leg tangled in the cables (Calder Highway 2017) the information on what he hit won’t make it into the data and a medical report into the injuries that killed him will be nearly impossible to get even for qualified people who signed VicRoads secrecy agreement.

Sorry to seem negative but bureaucratic inertia is retarding improvements to crash information which would reduce road trauma. That’s not just my opinion. See attached. Bureaucrats write most of the very badly named “whole of government response” to Parliamentary inquiry recommendations. Of the 64 recommendations in the 2012 inquiry report, probably 60 will not be allowed by bureaucrats to effect the status quo. Our elected representatives may start wanting to make a difference but VicRoads/TAC/VicPol soon house trains them. YES MINISTER.

I do appreciate your sending me this material and explanation.

If I remove your ID can I share this with selected people?

Damien
IRG
Hansard Extract: South-West Coast electorate

Members Statement - South-West Coast electorate roads

Ms BRITNELL (South-West Coast) - I once again direct these comments at the Minister for Roads and Road Safety, and once again it is in relation to the state of the roads in South-West Coast.

Over the last few weeks I have been speaking with transport companies in my electorate that are the backbone of the local economy and state economy — the people who take goods to market. They are all reporting to me huge increases in repairs and maintenance on their vehicles, all due to the shocking state of our roads. One company has reported product being broken and damaged during transport. We are not talking glasses or something fragile here — we are actually talking about bluestone.

Another company, Kelly Logistics, does the run from the port of Portland to the woodchip mill and back again. Their repairs and maintenance bill normally sits at around $28 000 to $30 000 a month, but over the past 12 months that figure has increased by about $45 000 per month, and is now sitting at around $70 000. The company’s owner, Tony Noske, has been involved in the transport industry since 1956 and told me he has not seen roads in this bad a condition — ever.

He also said the main problem is drainage — water sitting there, not draining away and in turn soaking the road sub-base. When crews come to fix a surface failure they do it well, but because they do not fix the underlying problem with the wet sub-base the surface fails again within a matter of weeks. Mr Noske says the simplest way to stop the cycle happening is to fix the road sub-base and then fix the drains and culverts and keep them maintained.