**SAFETY CAMERA REVIEW – FOCUS GROUP**
**SITE CRITERIA AND DATA**
**4 June 2014, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh**

<u>**Site Selection Criteria**</u>

**Points System**

- Points system could be used to identify potential systems but should not be used to distinguish between urban/rural or camera type.
- Site selection should be technology neutral. Camera type should be based on the best solution to the identified problem.
- If the objective of the programme remains to reduce casualties then sites must be selected based on those that could provide the greatest casualty reduction.
- Two stage process:
    o Stage one – criteria to identify long list of sites
    o Stage two – discussion with local partners to whittle down list
- A benefit of the points system is that it is fairly easy to understand.
- Need to reduce differential between points awarded for fatal/serious accidents (5) and slight injury accident (1).
- Discussion around whether there should be a 2:1 ratio instead of the existing 5:1.
- Points system makes sites quantifiable.
- Low accident numbers make it difficult to identify sites that are not just "noise".
- Would a weighting based on the costs associated by accident type be feasible?
- Discussion around the merits of using accident rate for site selection however concerns that site length could unduly influence this.
- Cost vs. Benefit analysis should be used to determine the best intervention type, i.e. fixed, mobile or average speed camera.

**Speed criteria**

- Current speed criteria is set too high and is out of date.
- Discussion around the use of the ACPO guidelines, i.e. 10% of posted speed limit plus 2 mph for site selection purposes.
- Concern that ACPO guidelines would not be applicable to rural roads were the national speed limit applies due to variations in speed limit for different categories of vehicles.
- There needs to be clear guidance and rules in the handbook outlining how and when speed surveys should be conducted.
- The use of the term 85th percentile is not understood by the public. Would it be more transparent to link speed criteria to mean speed or percentage exceeding the speed limit?
- Automatic traffic count surveys (ATCs) are cheap to carry out depending on the type of equipment being used.

**Review and Exit Strategy**

- Current handbook rules state that sites should be marked as dormant and monitored for a period of two years before being abandoned. Agreement that it would be better to extend this to a three year monitoring period before considering removal.
- The revised handbook should set out clear guidance on decommissioning of sites.
- The formalisation of site removal processes and the relaxation of site selection criteria could lead to greater conflict between partners, particularly if one partner is losing a number of sites while another gaining sites.
- The same data examined when identifying a new site should be examined when considering site removal.

**Exception/Community Concern Sites**

- Community concern sites should not divert resources from core activity.
- If casualty reduction is 85% of the Programme's objectives then this proportion should determine the amount of time devoted to exception sites.
- Discussion around the need for criteria for community concern sites – whether this be that it meets the accident criteria but not the speed, or vice-versa.
- Feeling that this should be a policy decision made by the Programme Office.
- Consideration needs to be given to the availability of resources to service such sites. Should these be funded by the requesting authority, i.e. Police Scotland when the request is made by them or LAs when the request is made by them?
- There needs to be a solid governance structure to ensure that this capability is not abused.
- There needs to be a measurable benefit to any intervention.

**Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)**
- KPIs should be separated into those which relate to the performance of the Programme and those that relate to the performance of the partnerships.
- Partnership performance should be monitored on matters such as deployment hours, staff absence, meeting data submission deadlines, etc.
- Programme performance should monitor the impact safety camera have had to accident levels.

**AOCB**

- Time did not allow for discussion of red-light camera site selection criteria. Agreement that this should be reviewed but that the details of this could be discussed at a later date.
- Emphasis that cost vs. benefit should form part of the site criteria.

**Narrative**

- ➢ If casualty reduction remains at Programme's core, criteria should align with this
- ➢ Revised points based system appears most appropriate methodology. Agreement that existing 5:1 ratio is not viable and should be lowered
- ➢ Selection process to be formalised. Two-stage process with criteria used to identify long list of sites before partners identify those where camera is appropriate intervention and with greatest casualty reduction potential. Identification to be camera-technology neutral and consideration of cost-benefit analysis.
- ➢ Remove Lord Advocate's guidelines from site selection process with suggestion that sites can be considered at a percentage above the posted speed limit
- ➢ Guidance in Handbook on minimum requirements for speed surveys
- ➢ Formalise review and exit strategy within Handbook. There should not be a separate decommissioning group.
- ➢ With limited resource, exit strategies to focus on greatest potential for accident reduction
- ➢ Clarity required in Handbook around nomenclature – community concern/exception sites
- ➢ Revisions to criteria will potentially reduce demand for community concern sites
- ➢ 15% community concern is an arbitrary figure
- ➢ *General* agreement that community concern sites require strong governance to ensure no dilution of Programme
- ➢ Acceptance of community concern sites rather than support for them, and acceptance that policy decision on this falls to SG, as Programme funder.
- ➢ Crucial that Programme remains evidence based
- ➢ Consideration of Richard Allsop methodology to account for regression to the mean (RTM), i.e. collecting data three years prior to the three year baseline. http://www.racfoundation.org/assets/rac_foundation/content/downloadables/speed_camera_data-allsop-may2013.pdf
- ➢ Clear guidance required on how speed surveys should be conducted.
- ➢ Cameras introduced for purposes other than casualty reduction, i.e. at road works or traffic management schemes, should be monitored and reported separately.
- ➢ Agreement on need to measure performance
- ➢ Divide performance indicators - SCP performance and Programme performance
- ➢ SCP performance to include measuring speeds, adhering to Handbook rules, timeous submission of information, deployment hours etc,
- ➢ Programme performance – casualty reductions and contribution to wider targets. Stats report

**Attendees**

| Organisation |
|---|
| Police Scotland |
| Strathclyde SCP |
| Fife SCP |
| Central Scotland SCP |
| Tayside SCP |
| Transport Scotland |
| SSCPO |
| University College London |
| South Lanarkshire Council/SCOTS |
| West Lothian Council |