Safety Camera Use for Speed Enforcement

MINSK, OCTOBER 16, 2018





Jan Sjorup I Eng MIET

Road Safety Analyst and Enforcement Strategist

40 years' engineering experience in electronics, telecommunications, data analysis and road safety strategy. Specialising in Data Analysis and Enforcement Strategies.







Emma Kelly MBA

Business Development and PR Manager

20 years experience of community safety, crime reduction and road safety. Specialising in Communications, Marketing, PR, Business Development and Road Safety Strategy.

Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Road Safety Support (RSS)

Formed in 2007, to provide a support mechanism to UK Police Forces, Police Forces and Governments in other counties.

Provides:

- Technical support and legal guidance.
- Data and communication support.
- Assistance in the Home Office type approval process.
- A central networking hub.
- UKAS 17025 accredited testing laboratory for speed meters anywhere in the world.





Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

RSS - Places we work





Road Safety Support (RSSi)









Duke of Kent Trevor Hall Meredydd Hughes

Lord Lieutenant of Essex Mrs Jennifer Tolhurst







Safety Camera Use for Speed Enforcement

09:30-10:15

Data-driven Speed Enforcement Strategies

- The principles of data driven enforcement and its effectiveness.
- How do we priorities enforcement locations?
- Monitoring & Evaluation strategies.

The Need for Enforcement

About 1.3 million people die each year on the world's roads and between 20 and 50 million sustain non-fatal injuries. Road traffic crashes are a major cause of death among all age groups and the leading cause of death among those aged 15–29 years.

Robust enforcement significantly reduces road casualties.



The Ripple Effect

The ripple effect highlights the far-reaching effects of road trauma.

Many people are affected by a collision not just the person or persons involved in the actual event.



The need to plan a long term enforcement strategy.

For successful road casualty reduction, an enforcement strategy needs to have a series of **step changes** in enforcement techniques that acts as a deterrence and further increases that deterrent effect over time, gaining public acceptance and widening its area of influence.



Understand the use of deterrence

The action of discouraging an action or event through instilling doubt or fear of the consequences.

- Specific Deals with the offender through a fine, de merit points or disqualification dependant on the severity of the offence.
- General The perceived perception of enforcement, the likelihood of detection.

Data-driven Speed Enforcement Strategies What is Enforcement?

Specific deterrence

Front

Notice of Intended Prosecution (NIP) is sent to owner/ Registered keeper of vehicle that has been detected committing an offence.

Ξ POLICE Police Address usuble to accept personal visits. All empiries must be it The name & address of registered keepe Anne emploities from Anne Man-Talle Traffic Ref. Dear Sirbladan NOTICE OF INTENDED PROSECUTION VEHICLE REGISTRATION NUMBER. Vehicle Reg Number here In accordance with Service 1 of the Road Traffic Offinders Act 1988, I headly give you notice that it is intended to take proceeding against the driver of motor vehicle Market of wehicle for the alleged offener of "Excess append and the speed the vehicle was alleged to be going a time on date anipland the location eg. A23, Coulsdon 584 RTRA 14 Set 2 RTO 4 M & Local Order (This allegation is supported by photographic and/or vides evidence) In scondarce with litera Protocice Logislation fail death-of the alkyod offerog will only to the boots to the power acknowledged to be the driver of the vehicle at the time of the altopod offence, on his her varitors applic IF VDE WIRE THE DRIVER of the vehicle at the time of the allogal affinite you are required to complete part 1 and put 5 or ging and many is to the Police. This may allow the materity be dealt with by the way of a Fixed Pennity and a wild the read to annual court. IF WELL WITHE NOT THE DRIVER of the which as the time of the allocal offence was are required to give any information in was r which may lead to the driver's identification by complexing the appropriate part of the Socia's 172 encourse to the police. For are required to provide the legismentian required within 24 \$1475 of the lower of this Notice, (\$117 food Traffic Act 1988) DO NOT PASS THIS DOCUMENT OVER TO THE PERSON VOU RAVE NOVEMATER. THEY WILL RECEIVE THEN OWN NOTICE AT A LATER DATE. On behalf of the Chief Constable Confidence of Service of the OVERCAE ASTE DOC TO etti) the flow this by speed the party susceptibles with this taking of which this is a two ways, by specing the solitation by if

Back

S172		ALL MORE CALL	N 173 INT 6 INT 6 INT 6		THE DAY	RN 411		PER NOT					er vist	a1	ne AK	57	04	e.	P	iea ta	50	Re	tur	γL)0:
							l	FF			100		- in												
								Do	ch	đ:															
Part 1, Ale system poor	inter and The drive lettels at		the No.	figured in the figure in	e ev shops	esta duti	-	r 					••••			••			122	1./00 1.1.6 (400)	1	11	4.5	-	
Li Const Burg	ence les	und by	OW.	• [(7w)	nd		1		ion	С]		- 0	כ		1	4 (L.) Web (t Na piPy	è.	141	i.	iele i	he
	Π	Ť	ñ	Ĩ	Ť	Ĩ	Ē	Ē	ľ	Ĩ	ľ]		late DOR	2		Ĩ	1			-				
SCHITCH Petit For		0.04	-		*** 50	a 114	- 001	-	-		20		7	no.						1				_	_
	oer prov	**	ais a	N-9	in a	the s	ine-	0.44		-	- 010	008	-		-	N	ter	**	-	- Par	10				
<u> </u>	the bra	of the local	che	any a	a nor	the e	ano Tre i	****		i he	110	-	dan Mari		-			1	٣	f	ř	F	ř	r	Г
Cet 2 Per			- 8.0	cx c	APV1A	44.9	• •	e ne	. 14	-	-	-			-	-	***			whe					en.
d sambativ	g # 00m		,	100		Corre		-	•										Γ	L	Γ	Γ	L	Γ	Γ
Frik:			Т	Т]		84	-	•											Γ	Γ	Γ	Γ	Γ	Γ
formamen			Т	Т																			L	Γ	Γ
20.00				Т											ŀη	22	1		Γ	Γ	Γ	Γ	Г	Γ	Γ
License No.			Т	Т		Π	Τ													Г	Г	Γ	Γ	Γ	Г
Disease No Propert Neuron No.		_	T	T	П	Π	Т	Т											Г	Г	Г	Г	Г	Г	Г
Licence No Propert Neural No.	H	11		_	_	-	=	-											F	t	F	F	F	T	F
Licence No Propert Neuros Ko Minett Town:	Ħ	Н	t	T	П	П	- 1	- 1					_	_	_	_	_	_	<u> </u>	<u></u>	는	<u>. </u>	-	-	÷
Lizenze No Provel Innune Ko Movel Treet: Courty			Ì	T					-	Ē					•	400	8 -				L		Ē	L	1
Disease to Provel Insue Ke Street Toen: County Part 4, Nov		7/8		1			1		-						~	400	a :						Ĺ	_	
Dania to Front I Insue Ke Iner: Deuty Datis, 100 Facts, 00 Facts, 00		1000	part for	i add			1		*	100			-	5	Per contraction of the second	ALC:	64: 1.10								
Danie fo Priori Nevel Invest Invest Trees Courty Part 4, Nov Part								100	No.	100 Contraction		1	200			ALC:	E R	85	t d						





https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/06speed.pdf

Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

The most important requirement for enforcement is that it deters drivers from committing an offence.

General deterrence



Drink Driving



https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/06speed.pdf

Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Marketing Enforcement

The risk of apprehension of detection is increased if enforcement is supported by media campaigns, news stories and social media messages.





SYorks Spee... · 21/08/2018 ~ We'll be out and about in #Rotherham today supporting #syptweet during #OpDuxford



1

,↑,



Conclusion:

The probability of detection when violating a rule must be seen to be great, otherwise a detection may be associated with "**chance**" and not affect future driver behaviour.



Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Why is data so important and how do we prioritise enforcement locations?

The need for data.

Data brings order and breaks an incident down into component parts relevant to the environment, road conditions, vehicle and persons at the time of the accident. The data can be analysed by experts to determine the cause, common trends, verify performance and drive enforcement and marketing campaigns to aid in the reduction of future casualties.

Safety cameras have been shown to be an effective tool in reducing road casualties.

The use of data both locally and nationally provides us the information to develop a strategy for there use and a method of evaluation.



We use data to identify those areas of most concern, to prioritise camera deployment to maximise reduction in road casualties.

Types of data available or required to prioritise, monitor and evaluate effectiveness.

- Road collision and casualty data.
- Speed survey data.
- Offence data.
- Engineering data.

There are different types of ASE that we can deploy:-

- Fixed
- Mobile
- Average
- Red-Light





Guidelines to identify initial core sites for enforcement.

- Utilise a points system based on collision and casualty severity to identify worst locations for collisions.
- Confirm that speeding is an issue by measuring vehicle speeds (use a percentage over the speed limit as a threshold for enforcement).
- Ensure that no remedial engineering solution is planned for the locations identified.
- Is the location suitable of the proposed camera type.

Fixed Cameras



Data-driven Speed Enforcement Strategies Mobile Cameras



Speed and Traffic flow data provide details on the best time to enforce and can provide a bench mark to measure and **monitor effectiveness**.



Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Speed and Traffic flow data provide details on the speeds of vehicles to identify the scope of the problem and the critical times

TOD	speed 31mph	speed 32mph	speed 33mph	speed 34mph	speed 35m ph			
0000 to 0100	31	8	9	20	11	11	20	
0100 to 0200	17	2	1	10	2	4	11	1
0200 to 0300	9	0	2	14	2	4	5	2
0300 to 0400	11	6	4	13	3	4	7	1
0400 to 0500	16	5	3	20	1	2	15	0
0500 to 0600	69	17	13	54	17	16	35	14
0600 to 0700	180	46	55	130	50	39	104	30
0700 to 0800	271	117	89	113	43	34	61	29
0800 to 0900	113	69	60	43	24	25	16	13
0900 to 1000	211	90	84	101	27	30	30	15
1000 to 1100	308	121	110	155	58	35	61	21
1100 to 1200	519	194	168	290	102	65	88	22
1200 to 1300	661	267	227	363	128	81	140	54
1300 to 1400	666	268	234	368	142	94	112	39
1400 to 1500	619	247	187	31.	98	87	160	50
1500 to 1600	483	205	148	29.5	77	55	122	25
1600 to 1700	418	158	114	234	56	46	92	30
1700 to 1800	324	102	78	177	44	44	68	19
1800 to 1900	537	245	186	261	98	88	100	35
1900 to 2000	489	225	190	291	129	93	151	77
2000 to 2100	329	142	136	254	74	85	140	51
2100 to 2200	127	68	42	99	31	29	58	21
2200 to 2300	82	31	17	61	19	19	36	7
2300 to 2359	44	17	15	34	6	16	25	10
	6534	2650	2172	3719	1242	1006	1665	573

Speed threshold for enforcement (% of drivers offending over the speed limit.)

Annual surveys can be used to measure enforcement effectiveness over time

Average speed





Offence and postcode data can show the **effects** of enforcement over time and where offenders come from. (Example Average speed)



Offender post code location



Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Monitoring effectiveness Camera Site Analysis (Using six months of offence/postcode data)

LPC	Offences	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April
NN10 OYT	21	4	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	2
NN10 OYJ	18	0	2	0	5	3	4	1	3	0
NN10 8PL	15	2	6	2	2	1	0	0	1	1
NN16 OSE	15	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	4	0
NN10 0GA	14	1	3	0	5	4	0	1	0	0
NN10 OSY	11	1	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
NN10 9EP	11	3	1	0	1	3	2	0	1	0
NN10 OEA	10	2	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	0
NN10 ONB	10	0	3	0	1	1	3	2	0	0
NN10 8EU	10	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
NN14 4DF	10	1	1	3	0	1	1	1	2	0
NN10 0GT	9	1	0	1	3	1	2	0	1	0
NN10 OSN	9	2	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	0
NN10 0SW	9	2	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
NN10 6BD	9	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1
NN10 6EY	9	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
NN10 6XX	9	0	2	0	1	3	0	2	1	0
NN10 8EY	9	0	3	0	1	3	1	1	0	0
NN10 9LH	9	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	0
NN10 9LW	9	1	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	1
NN10 9TP	9	1	3	0	0	2	2	0	1	0
MK44 1JP	16	3	8	0	3	1	0	1	0	0
MK44 1JY	16	4	1	1	0	6	3	1	0	0
MK44 1DU	14	4	2	1	0	1	0	4	1	1
MK44 1EY	9	1	2	0	2	0	3	0	1	0
MK44 1JR	9	0	1	0	4	4	0	0	0	0
MK44 1AD	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MK44 1PE	7	2	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0
MK44 1QF	7	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
MK44 1HY	6	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
MK44 1PG	6	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
MK44 1PJ	6	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
MK44 1PN	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MK44 1EB	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0
MK44 1EJ	5	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0
MK44 1EX	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
MK44 1JU	5	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
MK44 1NN	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MK44 1NX	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
MK44 1PD	5	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0
MK44 1PQ	5	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
MK44 1PY	5	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
MK44 1QB	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MK44 2DX	5	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0



Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Camera Site Analysis

Postcode data can be utilised in communications that supports enforcement.



Conclusion:

To reduce road casualties quickly, **adopt a criteria** to identify and prioritise those locations and routes (core) where there are a high incident of road casualties, especially those of a high severity.

This is **the first step** of your enforcement strategy.



Safety Camera Use for Speed Enforcement

10:45-11:30

ASE Technology Brief

- How do speed cameras work?
- Presentation of different systems (fixed, mobile, average, red light).
- Emerging enforcement technologies (close following, distracting driving).
- Ensuring accuracy & integrity with type approval processes.

ASE Technology Brief

Emerging Enforcement Technologies

Emerging Enforcement Technologies

Anti-Safety Camera Technologies

A Laser Jammer

sometimes called a Diffuser is an electronic device fitted to a vehicle that prevents the measurement of that vehicle's speed when targeted by a speed measuring device operated by the police or safety camera operator.




•Laser jammers wait for a signal from a speed gun, either handheld or from a camera van.

•They emit a similar signal back at the police-operated device, confusing it.

•If your vehicle is fitted with one you could be charged with perverting the course of justice.





Emerging Enforcement Technologies Anti-Safety Camera Technologies



- Camera operators need to be aware that these devices exist and understand how to identify and defeat them.
- Introduce legislation regarding there use that is robust and a major deterrence.



Level crossing cameras in the UK

 Network Rail recognises that level crossings are a major concern with regard to collisions involving vehicles and railway stock.







Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Level crossing cameras in the UK

- Detect vehicles crossing the barrier lines triggered as the lights (WIGWAGS) commence to flash.
- Act as a deterrent to levelcrossing violations with an aim to affecting driver behaviour and reducing collision risk.



41



Emerging Enforcement Technologies Smart Motorways HADECS 3

Equipment can detect speed violations in all lanes. It is expected to dramatically improve driver compliance and journey times.

MIDAS sensors detect congestion and alter the speed limit accordingly. Lanes can be closed (Red X), and drivers moved to other lanes.



Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR)

- Technology is used to help detect, deter and disrupt criminality at a local, regional and national level. Including tackling travelling criminals, Organised Crime Groups and terrorists.
- ANPR provides lines of enquiry and evidence in the investigation of crime.





Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR)

The use of ANPR has proved to be important in the detection of many offences including:

- Locating stolen vehicles
- Tackling uninsured vehicle use.
- Solving cases of terrorism, major and organised crime.

Speed camera vans can have a dual purpose, enforcing both systems



CCTV Mobile Vehicles

Driver distractions have been identified as a major cause of road traffic collisions.



 Enforcement cars are fitted with a high quality camera on an extendable mast. The objective of increasing enforcement through use of these high profile vehicles is to increase driver awareness, act as a deterrent and improve public safety.



Emerging Enforcement Technologies Mobile Phone Camera

The world's first roadside camera that catches drivers using their mobile phone

The new technology is being trialled in New South Wales and safety campaigners want the UK to adopt the system for UK roads. The technology is known as the One Task system, and it's designed to catch drivers not only talking on the phone but texting or taking photos too.



http://www.onetask.com.au/

46



47

Using Video Footage on Social Media Channels as Evidence.

It is common now for drivers to post their antics on social media. Using forensic analysis, this can be used as evidence against them in court and on successful prosecution used in media campaigns to highlight their stupidity and act as a deterrence to others

- > Provided evidence on:
 - Speeding
 - Dangerous driving







Home Office Type Approval

Ensures the Accuracy and integrity of the enforcement equipment used in the UK



Home Office Type Approval (HOTA)

A testing and certification process by the Home Office that all speed cameras used for enforcement within the UK **must** pass, before evidence from them can be admissible in UK courts.

It is an ongoing process for the life of that product (known as a Section 20 certificate).



Type Approval Process

On behalf of the UK Home Office, **Road Safety Support** is responsible for testing the reliability and accuracy of new road traffic enforcement technologies in the Type Approval process.

Speed accuracy testing is performed within an ISO 17025 accredited process.







Devices undergoing HOTA must meet a stringent criteria before they are allowed to enforce in the UK.

Testing consists of:

- Scientific scrutiny.
- Track testing.
- Detailed analysis of test results.
- Operational testing.





- Enforcement cameras are tested using various measurement devices, with a variety of test vehicles, at various speeds and scenarios.
- Testing is conducted at speeds between 20 mph/32Kph – 186 mph/300Kph.
- In car speed measurements compared to the camera offence capture speed.

There can be no error!





53





Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018





Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018







Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018





Close following has been identified as a significant cause of collisions. Technology is currently under development that will detect close following offences and improve driver behaviour.





60

Forensic Video Analysis

Ability to use the measurement technology to analyse video. This example shows a YouTube video posting of an Arial Atom Vehicle being driven at excessive speed through the country lanes of Cheshire(NW England).







Forensic video analysis



62

Forensic Video Analysis

Using HOTA type approved equipment conducted a benchmark drive through of the driven route.

This data was then used to analyse the YouTube video using distances and times between street furniture and distinctive landmarks.

This provided a comparison that was used to calculate the speed of the offending vehicle throughout the recorded sequence.















Driver sentenced after filming himself speeding along Cheshire and North Wales roads

Date published: 16th July 2015 2.01pm

Home / News and Appeals / Latest News / Driver sentenced after filming himself speeding along Cheshire and North Wales roads

A 49-year-old man from Chester admitted dangerous driving after filming himself driving at breakneck speeds around Cheshire and North Wales with a terrified passenger.

Frederick Randles, 49, from Heath Bank in Chester was sentenced to nine months in prison suspended for two years at Chester Crown Court on 16 July 2015. He was also ordered to carry out 250 hours of unpaid work, was disqualified from driving for 18 months and has to take an extended test. He was also ordered to pay £2,000 costs.

Most read

- Six men jailed following mass brawl in Neston
- Widnes man sentenced for robbery



Are You Ready For Automated Speed Enforcement?

11:30-12:30 Are you ready for Automated Speed Enforcement?

- Country profiles presented by participants.
- Role of Political Leadership.
- Institutional, Legislative & Administrative framework.
- Establishing National Guidelines.

Are You Ready For Automated Speed Enforcement?

Eastern european road fatalaty reduction progress 1998 - 2013



13:30-14:15

ASE Communications & Engagement

- Introducing Safety Partnerships: Rationale, Successes & Challenges.
- Identifying Stakeholder Groups.
- Effective road safety campaigns and education linked to enforcement.
- Media engagement: speaking to the media, key risk factor messages for the public.

Safety camera partnerships

In 2001:

The number of people killed in the UK was **3,450**,

The number of people seriously injured was **37,110**

Total casualties **313,309**.

This was not acceptable!!!



Safety Camera Partnerships

Local Government-based partnerships, set up in the United Kingdom from 1999 as part of the National Safety Camera Scheme, to enforce UK speed limits and improve road safety by reducing vehicle speeds at identified sites and over the wider area, in an effort to reduce road casualties.



Safety Camera Partnerships

Funding for the scheme between 2003 to 2007 was based on a system of hypothecation.

This is where fine revenue was used to pay for the operating costs of the partnerships.


The Safety Camera Partnership Model

Figure 1: National safety camera programme structure



The Safety Camera Partnership Model

Typical structure of a partnership



Safety Camera Partnerships (case study)

- This national programme was monitored and evaluated by the Department for Transport (DfT).
- To ensure standardisation amongst Police Force areas the DfT published the guidelines that were used for site selection nationally and running of the programme.

Handbook of Rules and Guidance for the National Safety Camera Programme for England and Wales for 2005/06

Provided a national standard for monitoring and evaluation of the Safety Camera programme

November 2004

Department for **Transport**

Safety Camera Partnerships

Site casualty data was provided monthly by Police Forces to the department of transport DfT.

A number of reports were published based on the number of partnership areas within the programme at the time.

- The two year.
- The three year.
- The four year evaluation.



Executive summary Three year Report

In 2000, a system was introduced that allowed eight pilot areas to recover the costs of operating speed and red-light cameras (safety cameras) from fines resulting from enforcement. In 2001, legislation was introduced that allowed the system to be extended to other areas. A national programme was then gradually introduced.

In February 2003, the Department for Transport (DIT) published a research report¹ that analysed the effectiveness of the system in the eight pilot areas over the first two years (April 2000 to March 2002). This report updates this analysis to the 24 areas that were operating within the programme over the first three years (April 2000 to the system) areas operating within the three years (April 2000 to the system).

are as follows: • Vehicle spe

the speed limit. At fixe

40% KSI Reduction

sites there was a 21% reduction. Overall, the proportion of vehicles speeding excessively (ie 15mph more than the speed limit) fell by 80% at fixed carnera sites, and 28% at mobile camera sites.

Both casualties and deaths were down – after allowing for the long-term trend there was a 33% reduction in personal injury collisions (PICs) at sites where cameras were introduced. Overall, this meant that 40% fewer people were killed or seriously injured. At camera sites, there was also a reduction of over 100 fatalities per annum (40% fewer). There were 870 fewer people killed or seriously injured and 4,030 fewer personal injury collisions per annum. There was a clear correlation between reductions in speed and reductions in PICs

 There was a positive cost-benefit of around 4:1. In the third year, the benefits to society from the avoided injuries were in excess of £221million compared to enforcement costs of around £54million

Four year Report

In 2000, a system was introduced that allowed eight pilot areas to recover the costs of operating speed and red-light cameras (safety cameras) from fines resulting from enforcement. In 2001, legislation was introduced that allowed the system to be extended to other areas. A national programme was then gradually introduced.

n June 2004, the Department for Transport (DfT) published a research report 1 that analysed the effectiveness of the system in 24 areas over the inst three years. This report updates the analysis to the 38 areas that were operating within the programme over the four year period from April 2000 to March 2004. Only areas operating within the programme for at least a rear were included in the analysis. High level results are as follows:

 Vehicle speeds were down – surveys showed that vehicle speeds at speed camera sites had dropped by around 6% following the introduction of cameras. At new sites, there was a 31% reduction in vehicles breaking the speed limit. At fixed sites, there was a 70% reduction and at mobile

fell by 91% at fixed camera

42% KSI Reduction

the state of the s

77

ameras were introduced. Overall 42% fewer people were killed or seriously jured. At camera sites, there was also a reduction of over 100 fotalities per nnum (32% fewer). There were 1,745 fewer people killed or seriously injured ind 4,230 fewer personal injury collisions per annum in 2004. There was an ssociation between reductions in speed and reductions in PICs.

There was a positive cost-benefit of around 2.7:1. In the fourth year, the inenclits to society from the avoided injuries were in excess of £258million compared to enforcement costs of around £96million.

 The public supported the use of safety cameras for targeted enforcement. This was evidenced by public attitude surveys, both locally and at a national level.

Overall, this report concludes that safety cameras have continued to reduce collisions, casualities and deaths

Safety camera partnerships

Data collected under the programme provided the intelligence for .future planning, implementation and evaluation of enforcement strategies.

Benchmark internationally.

Other national independent studies concluded:

"That cameras are an effective tool at reducing road casualties."



The Safety Camera Programme

Achieved its aim with substantial savings in lives and costs to the economy and continues to maintain that reduction today!

DfT Annual Report 2010 (released Sept 2011)



- Stated:
- **48%** reduction in fatal's (1850)
- **49%** reduction in KSIs
- 64% reduction in child KSIs from the 1994-1998 average

The Safety Camera Partnership Model



Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Using a criteria to identify and prioritise major collision sites for enforcement is a very effective tool at reducing road casualties over a short period of time.

It can be considered **the first step** to an ongoing successful enforcement strategy.

It also builds public acceptance of the camera system.



A longer term enforcement strategy needs to be considered as casualty figures will eventually stabilise and flat line.

Further steps are required to drive down casualty numbers further.



On Site KSI Casualties

Year

On Site KSI Casualties

wider area enforcement strategy needs to be considered to increase detterence

Enforcement needs to be supported by a strong communications strategy.

- It helps to bring about a change in driver behaviour in order to help achieve a reduction in casualties on the roads, particularly in speed reduction and red light running.
- Education, training and information are essential for a comprehensive speed management policy.



Identifying Stakeholder Groups



Identifying Stakeholder Groups

Key Influencers- Ministers, Chief Officers in Government Departments, Police Local Government, Road Safety Teams, Highways and Transport, Education, Health, Environment. Road Safety Charites, Victims Charities', Lobby Groups.

- Offenders Those that have offended work to change driving behaviour Targeted marketing.
- General Public awareness campaigns to try and encourage compliance And raise profile of the issue.
- **Community –** Proactive Supporters community concern sites.

Media – working with those who can have a direct influence on target groups And who can sway public opinion.

We also need to consider communications between stakeholders within the road safety community to share ideas and best practice.







Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Why Engage with the Media?

Safety cameras UK example

- 2001: UK public opinion of cameras was poor
- 2012: Almost 80% of UK public now support safety cameras



Effective road safety campaigns and education

Seat belts:

- Third most frequent cause of road deaths following collisions in the EU
- Fatalities and serious injuries would be avoided if passengers wore seat belts.
- 1 in 5 drivers lives could be saved by wider use.
- Death is 7 times more likely for an unrestrained child.



88

Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

PSA Texting While Driving

This Gwent police clip of this public service announcement received worldwide attention costing only £10,000 to produce.

By 25 August 2009. The film earned honours in the Advertsing weekly Creativity Top 5 video becoming an overnight worldwide internet hit after being shown in the US The Today Show on Television.



PSA Texting and Driving, U.K., August 2009,	(HQ) Ma	ster	Origi	nal '	Video		
5,515,990 views	ı fir	7K	ap i	430	-	SHARE	≡+	

5,515,590 views

Embrace for life

A short British public Information film made for the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) about the importance of wearing seat belts.

- Released on 20 January 2010 and initially only shown in the local Sussex area.
- Became an international phenomenon after it was distributed on the internet, through social networking sites and YouTube, gaining over a million views in its first two weeks.



By 13 February 2010 it had reached 129 different countries, was the 5th top rated video that month on YouTube and was the most top rated YouTube film of all time in the education category.

 The film achieved the highest rating of No. 8 Top Rated (All Time) film on YouTube, and as of 27 March 2013 it has had over 20,046,440 views





20,046,440 views

Don't be a Space invader

Tailgating causes accidents – and you don't get an extra life in the real world Driving too close to the vehicle in front is dangerous and can make it impossible to avoid a collision in an emergency.

Tailgating was the third most common contributory factor in deaths and serious injuries on UK motorways in 2016.

Nearly nine out of ten (87%) drivers say they've experienced or witnessed it.

"Tailgating is a factor in 1 in 8 casualties on the strategic road network." Copyright Road Sa





What type of driver are you?

Country roads: If You Could See

The campaign warns drivers of the dangers of driving on country roads, and encourages them to slow down by <u>braking before the</u> <u>bend, not on it</u>.



primarily targets drivers aged 25-34 years and evaluation showed that this age group did reduce speed into bends following the 2015 campaign.

59% of all road fatalities occur on country roads.

In 2015 some 10,307 people were killed or seriously injured on country roads in Great Britain.

The number of people killed on country roads is 10 times higher than on motorways. The 'If you could see' film ran in cinema's and online, using 3D scanning technology to allow viewers to see through the bends on a country road and spot the hazards ahead.







Campaigns and the role of social media



💵 02-UK 🗢 😤

1 66%

Home

20:21

 Essex Roads Policing Retweeted
 SaferEssexRoads @S... ·1h ∨
 Not too many speeders reported from #Harwich today

We met a very positive response from the local community that stopped to chat too. #RoadSafety #NoExcuse



Q1 1⊒2 ♡3 ₫

North West Motorway Police liked

 \square



Engaging with the Media Project Edward

- ► Working in collaboration.
- High visibility policing mixed with enforcement technology works.
- ▶ Step change is needed.
- The results speak for themselves











Road Safety Support @road_ss · 5h

ROAD SAFETY You worked hard for your driving licence.

Having a crash might be the last thing on

your mind. But recognising that it could

career. What will you do for road safety today? Please share and help make Europe's roads safer #ProjectEDWARD

happen is a key step in a safe driving



Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018



Prince Michael International Road Safety Awards



Media Engagement

Using communications to gain public Support

Safety cameras

- Over the last decade all UK enforcement backed up by strong communications
- All communications activities based on casualty data
 and research into drivers' attitudes
- Two main messages:
 - Safety cameras are necessary and effective
 - Speeding is dangerous and unacceptable



Engaging with the Media

Using communications to gain public Support

Safety cameras

- ▶ PR Highly successful and low cost
- Honest and open approach
- Evidence in news stories:
 - Decreasing casualty reduction figures
 - Independent research -RAC Foundation found cameras save 800 lives each year





Engaging with the Media – Getting your message across

The media is not your adversary.

It can be a very powerful ally.

Used correctly it can help you to get your message to who you want to talk to.




Engaging with the Media – What is your 'news'? What do you want to say?

- What we think is interesting might not be to a journalist our news has to be appealing.
- ▶ It has to be relevant and current.
- Provide a local angle if you can to national news stories e.g. number of people caught speeding.
- The media likes stories with humour, conflict, human interest or something new and innovative.



Engaging with the Media – Who will you contact?

- You need to make sure your information is getting to the right people in the right places.
- Make up a comprehensive list of media outlets e.g. radio stations, television, newspapers, on-line media etc.
- Contact each outlet to find out who covers road safety / transport.
- Ask about deadlines, audience demographics etc.
- Ask what is the best way to contact them? (phone, email, fax).

Contact Manager My Contacts Glenn Block Howard Dierking Yavor Georgiev leff Handley Acrosoft Way, Redmond, WA 98052 Chandley/Draictosoft.com Janiel Roth farothill ris reacht re-Q

Engaging with the Media How will you contact the Media?

- Establish a working relationship with the media before you need to contact them about a story.
- Email or write to journalists' who cover road safety and provide them with an information pack on your organisation.
- ▶ Give them contact details.
- When you have news to promote send out a press release containing the most important information and follow it up with a phone call.



Engaging the Media Negative Media Coverage

- The chances of you experiencing negative media coverage is high.
- See it as a positive, if people are complaining they are being caught speeding it means your enforcement strategy is working.
- ► Never apologise for your efforts.
- ► Always stand firm with your message.









UK CASH COW: Speed cameras are NOT for safety but make LOTS of money, admit police



SPEED cameras on the Britain's motorways may be permanently switched-on in an

Home 🗏 My Feed 📃 Saved

One in three British motorists fined every year, as experts say automation has created a 'cash cow'

f share

Save 143



Engaging with the Media Speaking with the Media

- When the media contact you do not panic!
- The person who is talking to the media needs to know about the subject, be comfortable talking to the media and have the authority to talk to the media on behalf of the organisation.
- Be honest, if you do not know the answer to a question, say so.
- Speak in plan language, do not talk in jargon or use acronyms, repeat your main message in different ways.



Engaging with the Media How will you know if you have been effective?

- Each year review your strategy. Monitoring and evaluation are really important.
- Did you achieve your goals and objectives?
- You can track the number of media hits, Shares, Likes, column inches you get etc. Look at the statistics.
- Conduct a before-and-after survey to evaluate your campaign.
- ▶ For best results use tracking research.



Engaging with the Media How will you know if you have been effective?

Changing attitudes and behaviour is one of the hardest things to do and it takes time BUT it is achievable.



Why Engage with the Media?

To Recap:

- 2001: UK public opinion of cameras was poor.
- 2012: Almost 80% of UK public now support safety cameras.



14:30-15:00

Enforcement & The Prosecution Chain

- Back office functions and the prosecution process.
- Right-sizing the Back Office.
- Alternatives to prosecution.

ASE digital systems will generate many offences, typical Central Ticket Offices (CTO) in the UK process in excess of 100,000 penalties per year (3.8 million nationally).

Consideration has to be given to the legislation regarding ASE and the administration of those tickets and the processes required.

Enforcement can either be owner based or offender based. The UK uses an **offender based** system.

- Legislation needs to be in place to allow for Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE).
- Give police powers to require information about the identity of a driver.
- Give Local Authority's powers to install and maintain roadside speed camera equipment.

 Provision for evidence generated by speed and traffic light cameras to serve as the sole evidence against an offender (without corroborative evidence from police officers) providing that the technology used is a Type Approved by the Home Secretary (secondary check.)

 Allowance for a conditional offer of a fixed penalty, which could be sent through the post, thus allowing increased volumes of recorded offences to be dealt with.

Overview of the UK Prosecution Process

Offence detected

Notice of Intended prosecution sent to registered owner of the vehicle. (NIP)

Driver at time of offence identified (May take a number of iterations through the back office process)

Low end offenders have **option** of educational intervention in lieu of Fixed Penalty (£100) if criteria met.

Low end offenders Fixed Penalty £100 including 3 demerit points.

High end offenders dealt with through court process.

Central Ticket Office

The Enforcement Office and Central Ticket Office is key to the successful operation of an Automated Speed Enforcement system.

40,000 to 200,000 detections per year dependant on size

Identification of driver

AdministrationPostageFile preparation

Enquiries

Court process



Copyright Road Safety Support October 2018

Section 172

Duty to give information as to identity of the driver etc. in certain circumstances.

A person who fails to comply with a requirement under \$172 will be guilty of an offence; this offence is punishable by 6 penalty points and a large fine of 150% of the person's weekly income



Overview of the UK Prosecution Process "Alternatives to prosecution"

In the UK Low end speed offenders can be offered an alternative to a fine, and de-merit points, in the form of an educational intervention.

National Driver Offender Retraining Scheme (NDORS)

This scheme is unique to the UK and was developed as an alternative to points and fines.

The scheme allows motorists who have committed a minor offence, at the discretion of the local Chief Constable, to have education with the aim of improving the driver or rider's knowledge and behaviour whilst on the road.

A motorist has no automatic right to a course irrespective of how minor the offence is.



Safety Camera Use for Speed Enforcement

ANY QUESTIONS

