

**Submission
No 67**

MOBILE SPEED CAMERA ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS IN NSW

Name: Mr Peter Galvin

Date Received: 30 May 2021

To the Committee,

It is positive to see that community feedback has initiated an Parliamentary enquiry, regardless of the matter under review.

Whilst being fully committed to road safety, I do not support the recent changes made to the camera enforcement programme and provide the following comments and opinions.

As reported extensively in the media, the changes appear to be motivated by increasing revenue. At the time of the announcement there was a desire from the Minister to suppress further discussion by arguing the changes are in the interests of road safety. However, no credible evidence was presented to the public to support the claims leaving many questioning his motivation. Further claims that revenue collected would go back to road safety initiatives is a matter of budget allocations and no basis for justifying rule changes.

The timing of the changes remains questionable as budgets are put under pressure due to COVID. Actual timelines for the various changes were not in line with the Minister initial statements, further highlighting a possible desire to increase revenues promptly.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that a publicly listed corporation is profiting from law enforcement activities which should remain the domain of Police and government agencies motivated by road safety, not profit.

The attached chart shows the price of Redflex shares spiking and more than doubling in January 2021. The share price increased from 0.42c to 88c almost overnight. It is understandable how a person might become cynical and question the Ministers motives when viewing this.

Road safety should be as much about engineering, education and training as it is about enforcement. In my opinion, the spokesman for the NRMA is correct in not supporting these changes. He makes a valid point when saying all the good work and education with the motorist has been dismantled and replaced with cynicism.

From a social perspective, I have had previous experience in my business with unfair penalties. Generally speaking, I have found it doesn't work. I have witnessed it send the less fortunate and minority groups (particularly indigenous) into a downward spiral. It does little to change behaviour and I have witnessed the behaviour get worse. I have had to write to government agencies pleading with them to give these people a chance to turn their lives around. Many of these employees have since been successful improving their lives and laws were amended to better reflect the needs and expectations of the community.

I hold the strong opinion that a high profile approach is more suitable in proportionate to the risk. In contrast, I hold the view that a lower profile approach to mobile phone handling is more suitable in relation to the extreme risks associated with driver distraction.

I believe these changes made by the Minister are out of steps with community expectations and a highly unlikely to achieve the claimed outcomes.

Peter Galvin