

**Submission
No 1455**

MOBILE SPEED CAMERA ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS IN NSW

Name: Name suppressed
Date Received: 29 May 2021

Partially
Confidential

Dear Sir/Madam,

Assumption

I understand the review is into "recent changes to the mobile speed camera program in NSW". I assume this means the phasing out of mobile speed camera warning signs and the operation & use of mobile speed cameras (MSC's) generally.

My View

Please continue with the current practice of not displaying warning signage which indicates the location of MSC's and dispense with the painting/identification of those vehicles themselves. Also, increase the size of the unmarked MSC fleet.

I welcome and strongly support the government's decision to phase out the use of warning signs for MSC's and consideration should be given to extending that to include fixed speed cameras.

Reducing Fatalities

As far as reviewing the effect of MSC's insofar as reducing fatalities and serious injury, if speed is the primary cause of most 'fatalities and serious injury' and the objective of MSC's is to stop or at least deter speeding drivers, then in the medium to long term it must have a positive effect on reducing the road toll and serious accidents. When drivers become more aware that they could be anywhere at any time (note public education opportunity), greater speed compliance must follow.

Warning Signs – Advertise and Educate Not?

The NSW Police Force has already 'hedged its bets' when it comes to education/exposure vs more covert and probably more successful policing. For example, the current practice of making highway patrol vehicles highly visible only their sides and rear but having absolutely no signage on the front.

Even the roof mounted lights have been somewhat 'camouflaged' so oncoming traffic can no longer readily detect their presence. Covert policing? So why is this? My only conclusion is that someone somewhere in their planning has opted to provide the hi-viz / exposure from angles that are not usually involved in catching speeding motorists. All in all, a good decision by someone in my view.

Simply, if people don't know where the cameras are located and continue to receive infringements then hopefully, they will eventually adopt a practice of adhering to the speed limit or lose their license. Or should I say, the privilege to drive.

Anecdotal evidence I am aware of suggests that the large percentage of drivers that get booked once, maybe twice, do alter their driving habits particularly in terms of speed because they know it is going to take 3 years to get those points back and with double demerits featuring so often, they cannot afford to take any more chances. On the contrary, they realise they need drive like their parents. Again, there is an education opportunity here.

About education, in my view it would be prudent to embark on an education program and that could include the provision of permanent signs around NSW that state something along the lines of 'Unmarked & Un-signposted speed vehicles are used in NSW'. The extension of the program will

certainly cover the costs of this public information exercise and even the saving achieved by not having to paint and restore MSC vehicles (before sale) and not having to provide MSC drivers with temporary roadside signs.

On the point of temporary roadside warning signs, it could be argued that it would be safer for operators of MSC vehicles not to have to place and later retrieve, temporary signs on roads that have been identified as potentially having speeding issues.

Education and the effect of delayed advice of infringement notices.

Probably one of the best deterrents to speeding is being pulled over by a highway patrol officer. This seems to have an immediate and lasting affect on driver behaviour. At least for most people. However, like fixed speed cameras, infringement notices from mobile speed vehicles can take some time to arrive at the registered owner's address. This is a missed opportunity that could be taken to 'educate' speeding drivers by a timely notification of the offence.

A possible solution could be to have the MSC's database marry up the registration number of the vehicle and automatically generate an Email or SMS to the registered owner(s) advising *'that the speed of vehicle registered (registration number) was checked at (location) on (date) at (time) and the registered owner may receive further correspondence'*. Yes, that may invite some premature enquiries but it will have a much more immediate and positive affect on driver behaviour than finding out about the infringement weeks later.

Revenue Raising or Not?

Any person or organization that suggests 'it is only revenue raising' is in my view, completely missing the point by throwing in that red herring and this invariably leads to more unnecessary debate. It has been suggested that such statements are often used for political purposes. That's a shame.

As a long-time member of the NRMA, I am extremely disappointed in their position on this issue.

How can people legitimately accuse the government of 'simply revenue raising' when all that is happening is law enforcement. No revenue would be raised if drivers did not speed.

Impact on Rural/Regional Drivers, those from Low Socio-Economic backgrounds, Indigenous people and P Plate Drivers.

There is no difference between the licence of a person from one of these groups and that of a driver outside those groups. Further, drivers in those groups are subject to the same laws and conditions as drivers that are not in those groups and there is only one set of NSW Road Rules for licensed drivers in NSW.

Both rural roads and P plate drivers are feature in terms of road fatalities and serious accidents statistics. Therefore, any measure to reduce those figures would be a positive move which again brings us back to the point of increasing measures to curb the incidence of speeding i.e. unmarked MSC's and un-advertised locations.

Insofar as the possibility of people from these groups being disadvantaged either financially or by loss of licence, any driver issued with a speeding fine has the right to have the matter heard in the court system and many people in the groups mentioned have access to legal assistance at little or no cost. The court will hear cases and make judgments and those judgments could include special dispensation based on the merits and circumstances of each case. Of course, this includes the specific circumstances of drivers in the groups mentioned. If it is felt the current law does not fully provide for concerns that may arise from this review, then change the law.

Finally, the only impact on revenue will be that of an increase and that will continue as long as drivers are caught exceeding the speed limit. The government does not need to justify the issuing of speeding fines to drivers who break the law. Quite the reverse, we did all agree to abide by the road rulers when we were permitted to hold a licence.

The fact that the revenue will almost definitely increase as a result of building the MSC fleet and/or dispensing with signage, is simply a by-product of this aspect of the governments road safety strategy and something that would not occur if drivers adhered to the law.

The vast majority are doing the right thing, but something does need to change in order to address the minority.

Yours sincerely