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Speeding in NSW

• Speed a leading factor in NSW crashes

• Addressed by a range of initiatives
  – Police and speed camera enforcement
  – Speed limit reviews
  – 50kmh general urban speed limit
  – 40kmh areas for school zones and high pedestrian activity
  – Public education

• Despite success in reducing speed-related trauma in NSW, drivers continue to speed
2009 Speed Research

• Ipsos-Eureka conducted comprehensive quantitative speed research
  – Representative sample of 1,500 NSW drivers (CATI)
  – Based on qualitative research conducted in 2008

• Intention of research:
  – Provide input into improved initiatives to reduce speeding in NSW
  – Create baseline measure for future changes

• Findings indicated:
  – Speed is understood to be main contributor to crashes
  – Speeding is common
  – Speeding not yet unacceptable except in extreme cases
  – High approval for speed enforcement
  – Understanding of how speed limits are set
2011 Speed Research

• Core questions from 2009 research, and new questions for emerging issues

• Current NSW licence holders aged 17+ years who drove at least 3 times/week

• Stratified according to NSW licensing data
  – Gender
  – Age (5 bands)
  – Location (metro v non-metro)

• 1,508 telephone interviews (17 March – 11 April 2011)
General Findings

• Sample structure consistent with 2009 sample
  – 65% from metro areas
  – 52% males
  – 41% aged 17-39 years, 37% aged 40-59 years, 22% aged 60+ years

• Speed most commonly mentioned factor in crashes (56%), as in 2009 (57%)

• Shift toward speeding more frequently
  – “Exceed the speed limit every time” (↑ from 12% to 14%)
  – “Mostly exceed the speed limit” (↑ from 12% to 15%)

• Shift toward speeding by smaller margin
  – More likely to report exceeding speed limit by 1-4 km/h
  – Less likely to report exceeding speed limit by 10-14 km/h or 15-19 km/h
Perceived Acceptability of Speeding

Exceeding the speed limit by up to 10 kilometres per hour in a 100 zone
- 2011: 4.7
- 2009: 4.8

Exceeding the speed limit by 11-20 kilometres per hour in a 100 zone
- 2011: 3.0
- 2009: 3.0

Exceeding the speed limit by up to 10kmph in a 60 zone
- 2011: 2.7
- 2009: 3.0

Exceeding the speed limit by more than 20 kilometres per hour in a 100 zone
- 2011: 1.7
- 2009: 1.9

Exceeding the speed limit by 11-20kmph in a 60 zone
- 2011: 1.3
- 2009: 1.6

Exceeding the speed limit by >20kmph in a 60 zone
- 2011: 0.7
- 2009: 1.0

Mean acceptability rating (on scale from 0 to 10)
Base: All participants less those saying 'don't know'

2011 (n=1,504-1,508)
2009 (n=1,500)
### Perceived Likelihood of Being Caught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police with a radar.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked mobile speed cameras</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed speed cameras.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** All participants; 2011 (n=1,508); 2009 (n=1,500).
Attitudes Toward Enforcement Measures

The primary focus of fixed speed cameras is increasing road safety.

The primary focus of marked mobile speed cameras is increasing road safety.

Safety cameras are mainly about revenue raising.

Marked, mobile speed cameras are mainly about revenue raising.

Fixed speed cameras are mainly about revenue raising.

Base: All participants; 2011 (n = 1,508); 2009 (n = 1,500)
Approval of Enforcement Measures

- Strongly approve
- Somewhat approve
- Neither approve nor disapprove
- Somewhat disapprove
- Strongly disapprove
- Don’t Know/Unsure

- 2011: All participants, n=1,507
- 2009: All participants, n=1,500

- Base: All participants; 2011 (n=1,507); 2009 (n=1,500)
Reasons for Extent of Speed Camera Approval

• Reasons for approval
  – Reduce speeding/provide safety benefits e.g. keeping kids safe
  – Placed in high-risk areas e.g. blackspots (fixed)
  – Anywhere, anytime approach effective in catching speeders (mobile)
  – Point-to-point described as ‘fair’ for extended periods

• Reasons for disapproval
  – Revenue raising
  – Not positioned in dangerous locations (fixed & mobile)
  – Positioned in ‘sneaky’ locations to catch drivers out (mobile)
  – Does not allow for low-level speed tolerance (point-to-point)

• What would increase approval?
  – Need to be put in clearly dangerous locations
  – Need better signposting
  – Nothing
Discussion

• Moving toward speeding as socially unacceptable
  – Small reductions in acceptability of speeding

• But still room for improvement
  – Reductions in acceptability only in lower speed zones
  – 44% did not identify speed as a factor in crashes
  – Still common

• Still strong community support for speed enforcement

• Fixed speed cameras not in school zones associated with revenue raising

• Perception that mobile speed cameras are placed in sneaky locations needs to be countered
Future Research & Policy

• NSW Speed Camera Strategy
  – Enhancements to current speed camera programs
  – Public education campaigns to support speed enforcement
  – Annual Speed Camera Performance Review
  – Website for speed enforcement info
  – Community nominated speed camera locations

• NSW Road Safety Strategy 2012-2021
  – Community Road Safety Fund
  – Social unacceptability of speeding

• Regular ongoing research into speeding
  – Similar research conducted this year
  – Consideration of key changes to speed policy and programs
  – Movement towards online sampling
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