

SAFETY CAMERA REVIEW – WORKSHOP REPORT

THEME 1 – PURPOSE AND REMIT

Question 1.1

Do you consider that the existing remit still reflects the fundamental requirement of the Safety Camera Programme or do you consider that it should be widened or given greater flexibility in its deployment?

Options you may wish to comment upon include:

- maintaining current arrangements as they are at present;
- the provision of current arrangements but with greater flexibility to address community concerns; or
- the removal of existing constraints and restrictions in their entirety.

Question 1.2

Changes in camera technology and other ongoing developments on the road network have created opportunities for the Safety Camera Partnerships to support enforcement activity in other areas such as Traffic Management Intelligent Transport System (ITS) schemes and at road works.

Given the varying demands for camera enforcement how do we ensure there is flexibility to support enforcement activity without compromising the casualty reduction strategy?

WORKSHOP 1

- Differing views offered on remit (e.g. the inclusion of roadworks, although it was noted that there is currently provision within the Handbook to enforce at roadworks)
- General support for ITS (expertise lies with SCPs, and Police Scotland/SCPs are only organisations empowered to issue Notices of Intended Prosecution) and a flexible approach, but that this must be separately funded, and additional to that currently provided for casualty reduction work
- Must retain an evidential element to the activity of the Programme to demonstrate impact.
- Involvement with roadworks and ITS schemes have the potential to undermine SCP effectiveness
- Handbook needs to be changed. It underpins everything and is fundamental to daily operations
- Maximise new technology

WORKSHOP 2

- Community concerns have to be addressed however we should not dilute work at core sites. More flexibility required to address community issues and the Police should play a part in tasking camera activity. Currently this is constrained.
- There must be a common process and partner-led approach to recording and assessing community concerns with the most relevant tactical option being deployed.
- Managed motorways should be considered but not at the expense of the key road casualty objectives. There should be separate funding streams. Although managed motorways are not directly linked to road casualty reductions, road traffic congestion also discourages the use of sustainable transport.
- There are diminishing Accident Improvement Plan budgets so effective use of enforcement resources essential therefore priority given to areas with a casualty history.
- Any alteration in remit has to be reflected in resource allocation

WORKSHOP 3

- There should be a way for local communities to raise concerns which can be monitored and resolved
- The Handbook is a shield to protect the safety camera programme from outside influence, and site selection criteria has 'hamstrung' activity – a review of legacy sites is overdue
- The Handbook is still relevant and the evidential requirements for activity should be retained or the Programme simply becomes a speed enforcement initiative.
- ITS should be separately funded so not to take resources away from casualty reduction
- Comms and resources should be better co-ordinated and used to achieve common goals and get things moving in the right direction. Benefits of local delivery and liaison with local media and community groups.

WORKSHOP 4

- current remit should remain as it stands but even now there are insufficient resources to cover existing requirements
- The programme is an important factor in policing the roads and contributing towards reducing fatalities
- Actions should be evidence-led, notwithstanding that some communities should wish local attention outwith this
- ITS – needs to be growth in SCPs to deal with this. Separate back office resource and a commitment from police to take this on as well. Concern that ITS and its operation is for a purpose other than casualty reduction.
- support for involvement of SCPs at roadworks as an opportunity for growth. However charging contractors for enforcement is a case of 'robbing Peter to

pay Paul' as the contractor will simply pass the costs for enforcement onto the local authority who are an SCP partner anyway

- Handbook is out of date but remit is not.

WORKSHOP 5

- Dangerous to dilute the remit. As soon as sub-objectives are added, the key purpose is diluted. Extending remit could confuse road users into believing it is a revenue raising scheme and undo all good work to date.
- A strong road safety brand has been established, and it would be a shame to dilute/ risk this
- Logical to extend remit if expertise is in SCPs. No issue with expanding remit but can't be done with existing resources and funding. Taking add-ons must be reflected in structure and funding. There has been no capital budget in the programme for several years.
- Criteria would be required for community concern sites, otherwise they would be unmanageable. Who would control multiple requests – without criteria it could be “he who shouts loudest”.
- Roadworks - no accident history but cameras needed.
- Assumption remains that cameras are there to make money – putting cameras on new roads without evidence undermines remit. If no history of accident/ collision then we shouldn't have camera.
- Police have a responsibility to enforce speed limits. Cameras should be focused on reducing casualties.
- Red light cameras don't appear to be having the same effect in reducing offences.
- Handbook is out of date and needs to catch up
- Helpful to get steer from central government as to priorities, and the direction that speed enforcement is taking e.g. cars with speed limiting devices, young people etc
- Impact on wider resources resulting from an expanding remit needs to be considered e.g. ability of PS to carry out enquiries when alleged offenders do not respond to NIPS, ability of court service to cope with a considerable increase in number of payments and in cases being reported for prosecution.

WORKSHOP 6

- ITS doesn't fit within existing remit as main purpose is to reduce journey times, but if it doesn't fit into SCPs where does it go? No issues for it to become arm of SCPs so long as adequate resourcing/ funding
- Query regarding use of cameras as prevention i.e. for community concern. Cameras already exist as a means of prevention - through analysing what is known to be fact, cameras are introduced as a prevention against further crashes occurring in the future.
- Additional criteria as well as resourcing would be required if community concern sites were to be widened in remit, otherwise SCPs would be inundated with demands. How would attendance at community concern sites be prioritised and how regularly would attendance be required – once

only/once a week/month? – and for how long? Who would control this? Would signage be installed to give deterrent effect?

- Community concern/ITS: How would effect of these interventions be measured?
- ITS is coming whether we like it or not. If scope is widened we need improved guidance to meet demands.
- Potential growth and implications of increased demand have not been scoped. Average speed cameras, speed awareness, ITS etc – we need to know what's coming in the future.
- No current capital budget to pay for new technology
- Handbook has been particularly valuable. Strength of partnerships has been through the Handbook, not allowing one partner to become stronger than the other. But we need to consider change carefully given what's on the horizon.
- England and Wales dispensed with their Handbook and stopped enforcing at many fixed camera sites. It would appear that as a result they have experienced an increase in speeds, and cameras are now being brought back into use
- Site selection criteria in Handbook based on 2002 - 2003 accident and casualty rates meaning SCPs struggling to find new locations as the number of accidents has reduced substantially since then. Current Handbook is holding us back.
- Don't dilute the programme. Strength in Scotland is public acceptance of cameras and mustn't risk this. Need to be cautious that the programme is not diluted to the point that it becomes ineffective
- Alternative data sources could be explored such as NHS.
- Need for clarity around definitions of ITS/ community concerns etc
- Recruitment restrictions creating challenges. Problem getting data from PS, affecting ability to intervene. There is potential to get data from other sources but issues with this (usefulness, charging etc)
- Baseline criteria for deployment absolutely essential.
- A broader remit is needed, along with more flexibility. Funding/resourcing is key – struggling at the moment, and can't do anything additional without funding and appropriate staffing levels.
- Funding should not come via payment of offences. Any action against crime should not depend on people committing crime to fund it.
- Robust evidence base policy before we move anywhere

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Evidence based casualty reduction should remain at the core of the safety camera programme as any move away from that could undermine public confidence and acceptance of cameras.
- ❖ There should be scope to use cameras more proactively to prevent accidents and address public concerns and success criteria developed.
- ❖ Use of cameras at roadworks and for any purpose other than casualty reduction/prevention such as managed motorways will need to be properly funded and resourced to mitigate or minimise any impact on casualty reduction objectives.
- ❖ Funding should not be linked to payment of fixed penalties or fines.
- ❖ The current Handbook is out of date and needs to be updated to ensure cameras are used to deliver their full potential in terms of the programme purpose.
- ❖ Site selection criteria should be updated to reflect current accident densities, trends and availability of new technology.

THEME 2 – STRUCTURE

Question 2.1

Which is your preferred safety camera partnership structure in order to deliver an effective and efficient Safety Camera Programme?

Question 2.2

Do you consider that there should continue to be a dedicated local communications resource for each Safety Camera Partnership or would a national communications team provide greater opportunities? If the resource is to remain within the programme what should the proposed structure look like?

Question 2.3

Do you consider that there are functions that could be delivered by alternative methods?

WORKSHOP 1

- Structure to reflect Police Scotland with one partnership which should have three areas each with an area manager
- Retain the status quo of 8 SCPs - if there's a problem then the manager is local to deal with it
- Consider the Trunk Road Patrol Group (TRPG) structure and the number of areas that they cover
- Single Communications resource suggested but this offers no resilience.
- Comms can be delivered nationally, and there should be consistent messages. What should the Comms staff role be given the changes in the Comms budget within the SCPs?
- A national structure may dilute the local interface. Some local authorities will see the loss of local input and accountability as a further step in relation to the growth of Police Scotland.
- Local authorities want to have a voice especially given their statutory road safety duty
- Need to keep local authorities involved in the process – but without duplicating the effort.
- There is a requirement to look at the higher level of the structure rather than the grass roots
- There are differing working practices being operated by the SCPs at present
- Issue regarding offence area and court attendance – this is a national issue for COPFS to consider
- Speed surveys should be provided externally and contracted out to a third party to complete. Depending upon local authority this can be a difficult task to complete for some.
- Academic input to the site selection criteria workshops should be considered.

WORKSHOP 2

- Command area structure would ensure parity in terms of specialist resources around Scotland.
- Benefits relating to any structure change must be made clear. Does the current setup/structure cause any problems? "If it ain't broke why fix it."
- Current setup constrains movement of resources, introduces variances and not every SCP has resource proportionate to risk.
- 14 SCPs would introduce duplication.
- Need to look at Christie Commission report of early intervention.
- Comms less effective due to diminished budget which is woefully unfit for purpose. In some SCP areas the overall revenue budget is significantly less than the communications budget of five years ago.
- Reporting to eight managers suppresses national Comms campaigns due to differing views.
- Local communications knowledge in conjunction with enforcement teams essential.
- NHS are a big player in terms of dealing with outcomes and potential for joint Comms activity with NHS and SFRS.

WORKSHOP 3

- Benefits of structural change need to be clearly articulated for the local authorities to understand.
- There would be a benefit for Comms with a smaller number of SCPs – it would improve communication messages across all of Scotland
- Could Comms be provided by another partner – possibly Road Safety Scotland (RSS) / Transport Scotland who already have the national expertise.
- SCP Comms should be working with RSS rather than working in parallel as at present
- Single manager for the SCP versus the Programme Office role. Should the Programme Office role not be increased instead?
- Desire for local authority involvement in the partnership to have a local focus. In a bigger area there is less local focus.
- Requirement for a strong local manager to provide buffer between staff and local authorities
- A single manager and operations manager for each back office would be required in shift to three.
- Issue highlighted regarding police enquiries being passed to the SCP for enquiry. Also enquiries not being carried out by Police Scotland and other UK forces.

WORKSHOP 4

- Locally based staff providing solutions – risk that bigger structures may lose out on the benefits of these
- Not sold on the driver for change - if it works why change, and no great effectiveness to be gained by changing the structure. Doesn't follow that Police Scotland change should predicate change to the SCP structure.
- Fewer managers would provide efficiencies but may provide a poorer service overall – lack of monitoring and supervision of staff, the reduced number would be too thin.
- When technicians need backup it should be close at hand. With fewer managers face to face support will not be possible. Managers should have local knowledge to know where each site is, particularly if a complaint was received. Important for Technicians that Manager can visualise the actual site concerned.
- strong leadership required within the SCP at a strategic, tactical and operational level. Current managers can perform all of these roles.
- Issue raised regarding the number of police officers involved across the differing partnerships.
- Court locations in relation to offences and requirements to attend as a witness are a disincentive to working within larger geographical areas.
- Reduced number of courts due to rationalisation within the courts service, so the issue of travelling further to attend court is likely to occur in any case.
- whilst some Comms messages are national, equally a number of other messages are specific to a more local area.
- National Comms messages should come via RSS. The local element of face-to-face contact with the public is a function that should come from the SCP.
- The Handbook should be compressed, as it is too lengthy at present.
- Speed surveys should not be sub-contracted to any third party and existing arrangements for the provision of these should continue. Is there a model for the provision of speed surveys in other areas that could be considered as best practice?
- There is an inconsistent application of the use of technology across Scotland

WORKSHOP 5

- Partnerships do reflect Police Scotland structures in terms of the 14 Police Divisions. Why does structure have to change now?
- Not the right time for wholesale change. PS in period of upheaval, and not allowed to recruit at the moment causing difficulties. Rationale for change weakened until PS have IT in place for reporting to PF (several years down the line necessitating the retention of eight back offices regardless of any other changes).
- If starting from scratch now and devising new structures, 8 back offices are still required because of IT issues
- One overarching partnership would be unwieldy, 32 partnerships too many/ inefficient. Moving to three would be unwieldy in terms of travel e.g. Dundee to Tain, and would require new layers of management. Moving to three SCPs does not necessarily mean three offices.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

- Alignment with Health Boards would be too many partnerships (around 14)
- Status quo at the moment is manageable geographically
- If we keep with 8 SCPs there must be a tacit understanding that we continue to work together, and more closely in future e.g. those partnerships with large geographical spread
- If 3 partnerships then there would have to be proper management structures/ layers to support this. If this was properly financed it would probably work.
- Communication between Court Services and SCPs is constant, issues with communication between SCPs and PS
- The good work that Comms currently do could be lost in a more centralised structure – local, targeted message could be lost. Important not to lose sight of internal communications among partners.
- Outsourcing admin could be an option but IT remains a big hurdle
- SCPs could procure more effectively and potentially collaboratively e.g. stationery, vans etc

WORKSHOP 6

- SCPs boundaries do match PS structure. Boundaries haven't changed (legacy force boundaries are new divisional boundaries, albeit some contain more than one division)
- Existing SCPs have well established links that must be recognised as we move forward. These could be lost if we move to a 3 or 32 world. One of the SCPs strengths has been their partnership working.
- There is nothing fundamentally wrong with the 8 SCPs. We've been working with PS for 9 months and nothing has been going wrong. Partnerships did not struggle (e.g. with recruitment) until PS imposed restrictions and are reluctant to fill vacant posts.
- 8 SCPs are operating well. Risk in change of disengaging from networks.
- If review promotes structure change there must be clear outcomes and improvements. There needs to be significant difference/ evidence of failure if taking the small risk of change. Potential therefore to move debate on to look at efficiencies and this can only be determined once the evidence has been considered
- PS IT platforms not ready to allow change, geographical limitations won't be resolved for years either.
- An SCP can have as many as 14 partners – it takes a lot of work and management to run these relationships
- Any savings made will be minimal as only managers/Comms/ analysts roles being considered. A potential financial saving could be that Sergeants are not required – Police Officer needs to be satisfied re conditional offer and could do this job. Police Officers also fulfil a range of necessary functions but that these were not dependent on holding the office of constable.
- Review provides opportunity to consider spend in most efficient and effective manner. Also to consider another layer of management – e.g. deputies in Strath/L&B
- Local knowledge very important in Comms. We already have a Comms managers group, engaging with large number of partner bodies

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

- Value of local knowledge and liaison with local media and community groups can't be underestimated
- Involvement in national Comms campaigns but with local delivery
- Potentially collecting too much speed data. Spending a lot of money on data that isn't telling us anything

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Partnership working arrangements are key to delivering successful outcomes.
- ❖ The current eight partnership structure is delivering programme objectives and although not replicating Road Policing delivery structures, boundaries align with new Police Scotland divisions
- ❖ Any proposals to change existing structure must have tangible benefits.
- ❖ Police Scotland IT constraints will mean that back office provision will continue to be needed in each of the legacy force areas for the foreseeable future so this is not the right time to consider change.
- ❖ Alternative structures could work, and could deliver greater consistency in working practices.
- ❖ Local authorities are concerned about the potential lack of local accountability that could result from the creation of fewer but bigger partnership structures.
- ❖ There is a need for good communications aimed at influencing driver behaviour, to develop and deliver consistent messages both internally within partner organisations and publicly.
- ❖ The benefit of good liaison with local media and community based groups should not be underestimated

Annex A –Scheduled attendees

Workshop 1 - Edinburgh 3/12/13 (AM)

| |
|-------------------------|
| Organisation |
| Central Scotland SCP |
| COPFS |
| Dumfries & Galloway SCP |
| East Lothian Council |
| Edinburgh City Council |
| Fife Council |
| Lothian & Borders SCP |
| RoSPA |
| Scottish Courts |
| West Lothian Council |

Workshop 2 - Edinburgh 3/12/13 (PM)

| |
|-----------------------|
| Organisation |
| Aberdeenshire Council |
| Borders Council |
| Fife SCP |
| Lothian & Borders SCP |
| Midlothian Council |
| North East SCP |
| Police Scotland |

Workshop 3 - Perth 4/12/13 (AM)

| |
|---------------------|
| Organisation |
| BEAR Scotland |
| Dundee City Council |
| North East SCP |
| Northern SCP |
| Police Scotland |
| Tayside SCP |

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

Workshop 4 - Perth 4/12/13 (PM)

| Organisation |
|--------------------------|
| Angus |
| Clackmannanshire Council |
| Dundee City Council |
| Police Scotland |
| Tayside SCP |

Workshop 5 - Glasgow 8/1/14 (AM)

| Organisation |
|-----------------------------|
| Dumfries & Galloway SCP |
| East Dunbartonshire Council |
| East Renfrewshire Council |
| North Lanarkshire Council |
| South Lanarkshire Council |
| Strathclyde SCP |
| Tayside SCP |
| West Dunbartonshire Council |

Workshop 6 - Glasgow 8/1/14 (PM)

| Organisation |
|---------------------------|
| Central Scotland SCP |
| CoSLA |
| Glasgow City Council |
| North Ayrshire Council |
| Perth & Kinross Council |
| Police Scotland |
| South Lanarkshire Council |
| Strathclyde SCP |

SAFETY CAMERA REVIEW – WORKSHOP REPORT

GOVERNANCE

Question 1

The Scottish Safety Camera Programme is currently a standing agenda item for discussion by the Strategic Road Safety Partnership Board, established under the Road Safety Framework to 2020. What, if any, role should the Board have in reviewing the performance of the Safety Camera Programme?

Areas you may wish to consider include:

- The Strategic Road Safety Partnership Board (the Board) meets twice a year and comprises members from a wide range of organisations with differing priorities and perspectives on enforcement policies.
- Should the Board have a discussion, advisory or consultation function?

Feedback

- An overview of the role of the Strategic Road Safety Partnership Board was provided (see attached).
- Consensus that the Board should continue to have a role in the Programme, and could be an appropriate scrutinising body. The Board could also provide the Programme with an additional profile.
- Recognition that sufficient time would need to be allocated to any Programme work. There would need to be a safety camera operational group sitting below the Board.
- The strategy for the Programme is set by the Handbook and the Board could have ownership of the Handbook. This would be a collective responsibility, and is linked to achieving our road safety targets.
- The Board could measure Partnership performance and influence levels of funding and finance.
- Programme Office currently has autonomy for the handbook, this needs to change.
- Only strategic changes should be discussed at the Board, it should not have a directive role.
- Achieving any level of agreement at the Board may prove difficult
- Handbook - terminology should be changed
- Discussion around a face/ ambassador for the Programme. No consensus reached.

Narrative

- ❖ The Strategic Road Safety Partnership Board should have an oversight of the Safety Camera programme.
- ❖ Strategic changes to the Handbook could be presented to the Board for discussion and agreement before being implemented.
- ❖ Consider the creation of a safety camera operational group.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

Question 2

Each partnership has a local stand-alone Management Board or Steering Group established as required for consideration of funding through the programme, and in terms of a local Service Level Agreement (SLA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). Is there a continuing need for local Management Boards or should it only be necessary to have local working groups to deal with practical issues such as site identification, site maintenance, etc.?

If there is a continuing need, what functions should local Management Boards have responsibility for?

Areas you may wish to consider include:

- Each partner organisation is responsible for paying any costs and expenditure in excess of that covered by grant funding. This is generally limited to excessive costs incurred by their own organisation or on a pre-determined proportion of total overspend as set out in the SLA or MoU.
- Should membership of local boards be confined to those who incur costs associated with delivering the programme, or expanded to include those bodies who benefit directly from programme outcomes?
- Should all board member organisations be required to deliver some part of the programme by for example providing a financial contribution, service, data or information quantifying benefits being derived from Programme activity?
- Local managers routinely provide performance information or financial control, deployment, offender rates and local communication activity to local boards but are seldom, if ever, subject to any direction from local boards.
- Decisions on camera deployment are not routinely co-ordinated with other enforcement activity undertaken by Police Scotland or linked to wider road safety initiatives organised by other partners.
- Proposals in the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill to strengthen Community Planning, so that public sector agencies work as one to deliver better outcomes for communities.

Feedback

- Consensus that there should continue to be a local management board and the chair provided by a local authority as there is a continuing need for local accountability.
- However there was recognition that if the local board was not in place then partnerships could continue to function.
- If structures change there could be difficulties in agreeing on an SLA as smaller local authorities may not want to pay out for overspends in larger local authority areas.
- Similar issues of terminology – management boards, steering groups and executive boards performing the same function.
- It would be helpful to have representation from NHS and SFRS as they could provide data on the effectiveness of the Programme, i.e. number of collisions attended, number of bed days for collision victims.
- Agreement that local boards have the power to influence however they tend not to at present.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

- Representation at local boards should be separated into two groups – contributing partners and beneficiary partners.
- SLA should only be signed by contributing partners.
- Partnerships currently coordinate work with Police Scotland for special events and will continue to do so, at sites which meet criteria.
- SCPs have been previously identified as an excellent example of partnership working

Narrative

- ❖ There should continue to be a local management board chaired by local authority and providing local accountability.
- ❖ Need to consider the impact that any change in structure would have on local boards.

Question 3

Who should be responsible for making deployment decisions – the police, local management boards or partnership managers?

Feedback

- Strategic deployment is a matter to be managed by Transport Scotland via the PO allowing for influence by partners.
- Operational deployment should be the responsibility of the partnership manager.
- The buck stops with the partnership manager who is locally accountable for deployment decisions.
- No one partner should have more influence than another.

Narrative

- ❖ Strategic deployment direction should be set out in the Handbook.
- ❖ Operational deployment decisions should be made by partnership managers with influence from the local management board.

Question 4

How might the functions of the Local Management Team be provided in the future?

Areas you may wish to consider include:

- Following recent changes to the Handbook, a number of partnerships have entered into resource sharing arrangements in terms of Communications Officers and Data Analysts.
- There is a published National Safety Camera Communications Strategy that is delivered in different ways across different partnership areas.
- Communications activity has been hampered by the lack of an identified budget for national communications in recent years.
- Recent independent research suggests that in contrast to other parts of the UK, support for safety cameras is diminishing in Scotland.
- Data analysis is not used consistently to influence deployment decisions and the role of analysts varies across partnerships.

Feedback

- Clarification that the Local Management Team, as outlined in the Handbook is the Partnership Manager, Communications Manager and Data Analyst. This has been expanded in some partnerships to include camera office and camera technician supervisors. The Local Management Team, as outlined above, is not recognised entity in some partnerships
- Discussion around whether they should sit on local police management teams to enable joined up working.
- Sharing of staff has the potential to work well however due to on-going recruitment issues there are increasing frustrations in this area.
- IT constraints prevent current sharing of staffing resources.
- Need to use evidence to better determine deployment.
- Need for new delivery method for communications. In light of budget reductions there may be an opportunity to consider face-to-face communication with the public.
- Need to increase the use of social media for delivering the road safety message.
- Engaging with people is proven to be far more effective than sticker back advertising.
- An opportunity to cluster partnerships into larger units and create a more robust management team, and share communications and data analysts roles. There is no need for 8 partnerships to each have a comms officer and data analyst.

Narrative

- ❖ Consider opportunities for further sharing of staff.
- ❖ Consider alternative ways in which the road safety message could be delivered, i.e. face-to-face contact, social media, etc.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

Annex A – Workshop attendees

Edinburgh 22 May 2014

| |
|--|
| Organisation |
| Central Scotland SCP |
| D&G SCP |
| Fife SCP and Board |
| L&B SCP Board |
| NESCAMP |
| Northern SCP and Board |
| Strathclyde SCP |
| Tayside SCP |
| Scottish Government – Transport Policy |

SAFETY CAMERA REVIEW – WORKSHOP REPORT

SITE CRITERIA AND DATA

Question 1. Existing Site Criteria

Do you consider that the existing site selection criteria for accident reduction purposes continue to be an appropriate means of identifying potential new camera sites, or should the criteria be modified to take account of alternative or additional factors?

Areas you may wish to consider could include:

- Is a points based system appropriate?
- What methodology other than points could be used to reflect road risk and most appropriate type of camera?
- Should criteria exist for average speed camera systems?
- How should 'regression to the mean' be taken account of in site selection?
- Should the minimum speed requirements continue to be based on Lord Advocate's guidelines?
- Other than when an alternative intervention is introduced, how regularly should sites undergo a formal review?
- Should an assessment criteria be used to review the effectiveness of existing sites?

WORKSHOP - EDINBURGH

- Debate around distinction between urban and rural sites - an argument posed that a fatality is a fatality regardless of location.
- Camera type should not be determined by points, rather the "best fit" should be chosen i.e. if fatal accidents occur at 0300 then a fixed camera would be the best solution. Deployment times should be directly linked with collision times.
- No consensus on a points based system: i) rather than a points system there should be full site assessment taking into account road surface etc; points based system is too inflexible and defensive – no cognisance of weather etc; or ii) a points system is appropriate. There must be some form of measurement, but need to look wider than only casualties e.g. time of year etc. Support for points based system as an early identifier with subsequent further examination.
- Agreement that ratio and points used is out of date. There has been a huge reduction in number of casualties.
- Expert opinion required to determine how and whether regression to the mean could be accounted for in site selection. RTM not taken account of in other road safety measures such as the introduction of traffic signals, mini roundabouts or speed bumps.
- Suggestion for separate weighting for killed and seriously injured. The only difference between seriously injured and slight injury could be chance.
- As average speed camera systems are becoming more affordable they should be considered alongside fixed and mobile cameras and should not have separate criteria.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

- Speed criteria should not be linked to Lord Advocate's guidelines as they are neither publicly known nor transparent. LA guidelines would still have to be adhered to when detecting offences.
- 95th percentile suggested for consideration
- Sites should be reviewed every three years, however a camera's exit strategy is more important than its review.
- It would be useful to have a VAS in front of each speed camera to improve speed compliance.

WORKSHOP - GLASGOW

- A points based system seems appropriate, and there's no viable alternative.
- Criteria must be revised, otherwise cameras will remain in the same sites they've been in for years.
- Site selection should focus very closely on speed. Lord Advocate's guidelines should not apply to site selection. Thresholds should be used to identify initial problems, followed by a multi-agency process. This will impact on the number of sites meeting the criteria – current criteria making the creation of new sites very difficult.
- Alternatives to current system include: separation of killed and seriously injured with differing points; a points system where every collision has the same points; or a three tier weighting per severity.
- Any points system should reflect increase in slight collisions.
- Discussion around selecting the correct technology i.e. mobile cameras are a more suitable route strategy intervention.
- Reducing the number of fixed camera sites as a result of legacy site evaluation will increase the number of mobile sites. Fixed camera infrastructure should be easily removed as required.
- There must be an exit strategy, which could include VAS.
- There should be a five year from baseline evaluation rather than the current three year requirement.
- Criteria should exist for average speed cameras - agreed that it is difficult to adjust the existing criteria to suit.
- There should be no points distinction between urban and rural sites.

WORKSHOP 3 - PERTH

- Current site selection process feels arbitrary. The current Handbook criteria are too rigid and proving increasingly difficult to find new sites that meet the criteria
- A site selection criteria must remain, and a points based system seems appropriate.
- An alternative to the current system is a two stage process where sites are identified in a long list. Data is then drilled down further into a shorter list from which those sites of highest risk should be considered. Potential for points-based system for the long list, and risk-based for the short list.
- In ranking new and existing sites, capacity can be fulfilled and those at bottom of list fall away. Ensures focus on sites with greatest need.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

- The current 5:1 points ratio is outdated. If points based system is to remain, killed and serious collisions could be separated and a new weighting developed.
- Damage only data collision data should be considered.
- Site selection should be technology neutral with the most appropriate intervention selected including engineering and enforcement.
- Speed data with time of day and class of vehicle will improve intelligence led deployments. Criteria should identify accident times (this has a particular impact on rural roads).
- Utilising the average speed data can make it difficult to identify routes or sites with a prevalence of excess speeds within a certain timeframe.
- Agreement that Lord Advocate guidelines are inappropriate for site selection purposes
- Regarding an exit strategy and dormant fixed cameras, housings and flash units could remain as a continuing deterrent. Alternatively, dormant camera housings could be moved around the network to ensure that areas of risk are covered.
- Australian/ New Zealand model centres on risk based assessments (rather than collisions).
- Regression to the mean could be based on five years data.
- Should consider the introduction of speed enforcement areas, i.e. Perth town centre could be an area strategy allow for deployment anywhere in the town.
- Existing 5:1 ratio inappropriate. Could be revised to reflect aspirations for 2020 Framework.
- A points based system appears appropriate.
- If the Programme is to be appreciated, it needs to be more responsive to perception. Programme also needs to be more flexible.
- Alternative view that this isn't the job of the partnership. Community Police role etc, and how do you prioritise the aspirations of a community
- Using LA guidelines for site selection is wholly inappropriate, and not transparent. Mean speed could be used as an alternative

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Current site selection criteria is inappropriate and out of date
- ❖ General agreement on a points based system, revised as appropriate. Alternatives could include a two stage process for site identification (long list then short list), consideration of accident times, and a different separation of collision types
- ❖ Criteria should exist for average speed camera schemes
- ❖ Lord Advocate guidelines introduce a lack of transparency and should not apply to site selection
- ❖ No concrete alternatives to existing exit strategy, however agreement of their importance and that improved strategies required. VAS an option.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

Question 2. Exception Sites

Do you think that the Programme should have the ability to deploy cameras on roads which do not meet accident/speeding criteria? E.g. to respond quickly to community concerns or complaints regarding speeding; creating 'route strategies'; road works; or traffic management.

Areas you may wish to consider could include:

- Should there be basic levels of criteria?
- The impact such activity may have on the ability to service accident reduction sites
- Should there be a limit in terms of time/resources allotted to this activity? (currently 15% of mobile deployment time can be spent at "exception sites" – excludes road works and route strategies)
- What guidance may ensure the best allocation of resources to the areas of greatest need? i.e. balancing requests, which could be considerable, with available resources.

WORKSHOP - EDINBURGH

- Polarised views on community concern sites: preference for the flexibility offered by these sites against perception that they're a dilution of effort in achieving 2020 targets (How can money spent on a community concern site be demonstrated as value for money to the taxpayer?)
- Suggestion that this is the role of community policing, rather than SCPs.
- Some level of criteria for exception sites should be introduced.
- Deployment at exception sites should be a short term solution (also benefits in camera van visibility in the community).
- Decisions to deploy at areas of community concern should be multi-agency. All partners should be consulted and in agreement before enforcement is carried out.
- For enforcement at roadworks, suggestion that convoy systems are a more appropriate means of reducing speed than enforcement.
- Agreement that ITS should be funded separately from core SCP funding, and costs of enforcement at roadworks (including the associated back office costs) should be met in their entirety by the contractor.
- The purpose of ITS was discussed (traffic management, safety, emissions reduction etc), along with the potential for separate funding streams for ITS and road work enforcement.
- Discussion around potential separate funding stream for enforcement at community concern sites i.e. costs should be met by PS/LA if enforcement at their request.
- Time to be spent at exception sites – ranges from 15% to 0%. Agreement that if a time percentage is provided, this must be stipulated in the Handbook.
- VAS trailer could be used to record speed data.
- Agreement that a camera should remain the last resort.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

WORKSHOP - GLASGOW

- Debate around the capabilities of current resource and ability to address community concerns.
- Community concern is fundamentally about encouraging behaviour, and therefore may not require a camera. Behaviour can be influenced in a number of ways.
- Disagreement on percentage: i) current 15% limit is appropriate at the moment, however if criteria change this will not be the case; or ii) community concern sites should not be a prescribed percentage as this could impact on resources.
- Safeguards required to manage political intervention and PS should outline their current resources
- All deployments must be evidence led, with a proportion of control, and proportionate to risk. If there is an ability to deploy cameras in areas without history of accidents, there must be basic level of criteria.
- A granular solution is required that could include urban 20 mph zones being enforced by Local Authorities under a decriminalised scheme
- Funding for ITS needs to be separate from core SCP funding

WORKSHOP - PERTH

- Community and public reassurance should primarily be the role of Police Scotland rather than the SCP, whose goal is casualty reduction.
- Any commitment to addressing community concerns must be managed to ensure that it does not dilute the casualty reduction objective.
- There should be a multi-agency approach to community concern or some partners may withdraw.
- In whatever form they take, community concern sites require a criteria.
- Exception sites should fall just short of the core site criteria to facilitate them being graduated to core sites as required.
- Roadworks enforcement should be funded separately.
- ITS should also be funded and managed separately as it is about traffic management rather than casualty reduction. Acceptance that the SCP back office should be utilised to this end.
- If the core site selection criteria is developed and applied correctly there will be a reduction in the need/number of community concern sites.
- Adoption of the long/short list approach would take care of the majority of community concern sites.
- Community concern sites offer community assurance and in turn promotes increased public support for cameras. An increase in sites and offences may have a detrimental impact on public perception.
- A camera van can only address speeding whereas a police officer can address and provide assurance around a magnitude of issues. Only c50 camera operators but c17,000 police officers.
- There must be evidence for sites as finite resources should not be deployed to address perception. Changing perceptions could be achieved by police, not deploying a camera.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

- More flexibility required to address poor driver behaviour as some will speed regardless of location or environment.
- Need to do more to engender speed compliance.
- Speed awareness courses would add transparency.
- There is no set criteria in the Handbook for route strategies. These were not included in the Stats Bulletin and some sort of reporting mechanism should be included.
- There should be a criteria for community concern sites but not at the detriment of core sites. 15% feels an appropriate balance.
- Additional budgetary contributions from alternative bodies would be welcomed.

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Lack of agreement on the use of community concern sites, or otherwise, the need for criteria, and the levels at which they're adopted. If adopted there should be a basic level of criteria.
- ❖ Community concern deployment should not be at the detriment of core sites and risk diluting the Programme.
- ❖ Multi-agency agreement and approach to community concern sites.
- ❖ If cameras deployed for traffic management/ road works/ ITS, funding should be allocated separately and not from core SCP budget.
- ❖ Role for community policing in community concern sites, rather than the SCP.
- ❖ Casualty reduction objective should not be perceived to be diluted.
- ❖ Cameras should remain the last resort.

Question 3. Evidence base and Data

Do you think the Programme should continue to be an evidence-based initiative? If the remit of the Programme expands, what data should be collected to measure the effectiveness of cameras in different scenarios?

Areas you may wish to consider could include:

- How the performance of the Programme could be measured without an evidence base, and how partnerships would respond to enquiries.
- How the effectiveness of cameras could be measured when utilised for community concern, traffic management or any other purposes.
- Should cameras be divided into groups depending on their purpose, and should evidential reporting then reflect the different categories?

WORKSHOP - EDINBURGH

- Broad agreement that Programme should continue to be evidence-based.
- Rationale behind creation of an exception site should be data that is monitored e.g. if a validated speeding complaint is the reason for camera deployment, speeds should be monitored before, during and after enforcement.
- Rather than enforcement at roadworks, more use should be made of road closures for maintenance work.
- Different types of enforcement should be reported separately i.e. core sites, community concern sites, traffic management, and roadworks should all be monitored and reported separately. Measuring the effectiveness of cameras for traffic management purposes depends on the purpose of the traffic management – emissions, traffic flow, noise etc.
- Unpaid COPFS should not be measured – rather the number of these resulting in a report being made to the PF.
- Agreement on the need for commonality in data collection i.e. provenance, validation etc.
- The only true measure of a camera's impact is change in speed.
- Suggestion that a level of public perception should be recorded, and that qualitative, as well as quantitative, data should be recorded.
- Data sharing protocols should be in place.

WORKSHOP - GLASGOW

- Broad agreement that the Programme should continue to be evidence-based, with importance of “before” as well as “after” picture emphasised.
- Effectiveness should always be measured if possible. Partners must share information to evidence their respective organisations effectiveness.
- Migration of traffic should be considered when analysing speed data.
- Comparisons should be drawn between reductions in collisions and speeds at core and community concern sites.
- KSI data must be drilled down to determine causations.
- There must be commonality in terms of data collation and collection.
- Data could be measured by technology type and road type.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

- There are benefits from undertaking qualitative research and the Programme Team should undertake this. Need for as much public perception information as possible. In Scotland we are at an advantage in this regard because we have one safety camera programme.

WORKSHOP - PERTH

- Broad agreement that the programme should continue to be evidence based.
- Consideration of wording of question - "if" remit of programme expands.
- Data is required to evidence casualty reduction benefits to the public.
- Data gathering should be consistent with a national model developed.
- We must ensure that we are utilising all of the data correctly and are aware of the interventions that are most effective, and locations where there are improvements in terms of casualty reduction.
- Opportunities to undertake more in-depth analysis of sites.
- We need to evidence if any reduction in casualties is attributable to cameras.
- Additional resource if using mobile units for traffic management purposes. Any expansion into traffic management should be managed as a separate entity however the existing back office resource should be utilised.
- Analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Public opinion surveys can be a good measure of public support.
- Programme must be evidence based. Existing data collection is managed well and works well.
- Issue around qualitative measure of effectiveness. Agreement required from community beforehand as to what would satisfy concerns, and then measure it after. It's easier to engage with people than defend entrenched positions.
- Deployment time and speed surveys are the only way to measure effectiveness.
- Consider what's required and then identify correct camera.
- Contractors should pay for enforcement at roadworks.
- ITS should be embraced.
- Most local authorities have representative panels that could be used to capture public opinion.

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Broad agreement that Programme should continue to be evidence-based.
- ❖ Need to consider qualitative as well as quantitative data as one of our objectives focuses on influencing driver behaviour.
- ❖ Cameras introduced for purposes other than casualty reduction should be monitored and reported separately.

Question 4. Key Performance Indicators

Should consideration be given to reviewing the existing KPIs and, if deemed necessary, introducing new ones to drive the Programme towards its aims and objectives?

Areas you may wish to consider could include:

- Are the existing KPIs measurable against specific targets?
- Can the Partnerships influence changes within the areas being measured?
- What new KPIs should be considered to measure the effectiveness of any areas of expansion within the Programme e.g. traffic management, community concern?
- Should the KPIs be linked to associated funding?

WORKSHOP - EDINBURGH

- Existing KPIs more akin to management indicators than performance indicators. KPIs should be about management – and subtlety in what they are for.
- Operational deployment hours are key measurement of activity. Management of resources, operational staff etc depends on structures.
- Offender data is a good measure of activity in the area, but should be removed as a performance indicator.
- Deployment hours vs. FTE camera technicians a suggested KPI.
- Deployment hours a good measure of performance, although need for consistency in recording.
- A need to look at how speed is recorded. Are fixed loops/mobile traffic counters the most cost effective solution?
- Agreement that performance should not be linked to funding. Underperformance should be addressed through governance.

WORKSHOP - GLASGOW

- Existing KPIs do not measure performance but difficult to measure if objectives are being fulfilled. Difficult also to ensure that KPIs are correct and not detrimental to individuals they effect.
- Operational deployment hours are a key measure of performance and can be dictated and influenced by SCPs. Cost per offence is not an effective measure due to a large number of variables.
- Meaningful statistics are more valuable than KPIs.
- Consider national % change in collisions as a KPI, maintaining a percentage would be an equally good measure.
- Cameras only prevent speed and red-light running related collisions and the KPIs and stats should reflect this.
- Performance should not be linked to funding. A reduction in budget would have a further detrimental reduction on performance.

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.

WORKSHOP - PERTH

- Programme does not have sole control of road casualty objectives therefore any KPI must relate to what cameras can directly influence.
- Offence related data should not be utilised as a KPI.
- Measuring and reporting percentile speed and casualty reduction does not give full picture. Any information must be contextual.
- Operational deployment hours are a key measurement of performance and can be dictated and influenced by SCPs.
- Performance indicators relating to management indicators should be separated from public facing indicators.
- A KPI relating to engendering speed limit compliance should be developed. This can be facilitated by measuring speeds on controlled and non-controlled roads and comparing them (essentially we currently do this by measuring sites average and 85th).
- Performance should not be linked to funding.
- Performance should be measured through the Stats Bulletin. Data would be taken from EROS.
- With a c£4m budget, there is a need for better evaluation and performance management.
- KPIs should not be linked to funding.

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Existing KPIs don't measure performance and should be revised. Deployment hours are the key measure and can be influenced.
- ❖ Greater consideration given to use of statistics rather than KPIs.
- ❖ Performance should not be linked to funding.

Annex A – Organisation Scheduled to attend workshops

Edinburgh 28 April 2014 (AM)

| Organisation |
|-------------------------|
| Borders Council |
| Bear Scotland |
| Central Scotland SCP |
| Dumfries & Galloway SCP |
| Edinburgh City Council |
| Falkirk Council |
| Fife Council |
| Fife SCP |
| Police Scotland |
| RoSPA |
| West Lothian |

Glasgow 1 May 2014 (AM)

| Organisation |
|---------------------------|
| Central Scotland SCP |
| CoSLA |
| Dumfries & Galloway SCP |
| East Ayrshire |
| East Dunbartonshire |
| East Renfrewshire |
| Glasgow City Council |
| Inverclyde |
| North Lanarkshire Council |
| Police Scotland |
| South Ayrshire |
| South Lanarkshire Council |
| Strathclyde SCP |

Perth 7 May 2014 (AM)

| |
|--------------------------|
| Organisation |
| Aberdeen City Council |
| Clackmannanshire Council |
| Dundee City Council |
| Edinburgh City Council |
| Lothian & Borders SCP |
| Midlothian Council |
| Moray Council |
| Perth & Kinross Council |
| Stirling Council |
| Tayside SCP |
| Transport Scotland |

Perth 7 May 2014 (PM)

| |
|---------------------|
| Organisation |
| Angus Council |
| Dundee City Council |
| Highland Council |
| NESCAMP |
| Northern SCP |

SAFETY CAMERA REVIEW – WORKSHOP REPORT

THEME – FINANCE

Question 1.

Is there a desire for local authorities to continue as treasurer for the safety camera partnership or should alternative arrangements be considered?

Areas you may wish to consider could include:

- Could the current process be improved upon?
- Should one partner become the expending partner for the safety camera partnership?
- If structures were to change what impact would this have on the role of a partnership treasurer?
- VAT implications with the creation of a single police service for Scotland?

DISCUSSION

- General consensus that local authorities should continue to provide a treasury service as SCPs are not legal entities.
- It was suggested that Police Scotland should only administer staff costs and the revenue budget should be administered by local authorities. There were however concerns that there may be procurement implications if all revenue costs are transferred to local authorities.
- If a structural change is recommended and agreed then this may result in a reduction in the number of treasurers and an increase in workload from a larger number of partners. In addition there could be a potential increase in the range of tasks undertaken if procurement were to become an element of the Treasurers' role.
- It was agreed that national standardised processes should be established that will reduce variations in practices and define the treasurers' role.

VAT

- There requires to be a single point of liaison to ensure definitive clarity regarding VAT. It was agreed that variances are as a result of a lack of guidance.
- TS are currently subject to an HMRC inspection therefore this may present an opportunity to seek clarification.
- There was a discussion regarding a number of current processes however it was agreed that any national process must be tax efficient whilst demonstrating compliance with VAT legislation.
- It was suggested that as the programme-wide irrecoverable VAT liability is minimal it would be more cost effective to pay this rather than introduce processes that are resource intensive. It was suggested that additional funds would be available for this purpose since it is clear that it is solely for the purpose of properly accounting for VAT.

- Police Scotland no longer have the protection of section 33 of the VAT Act 1994, however local authorities are still empowered to recover VAT therefore a national process where a local authority invoices TS for a statutory service should be considered.

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Local Authorities should continue to provide the role of treasurer.
- ❖ Clarity required as to whether it is permissible for local authorities to pay for goods used by SCP (Police) staff, i.e. fuel, stationery, etc.
- ❖ Processes need to be standardised across Scotland.
- ❖ Guidance required from HMRC in relation to Police Scotland VAT implications.
- ❖ Potential for funding to cover VAT.

Question 2.

How does the role of a partnership treasurer vary across Scotland?

Areas you may wish to consider in your response could include:

- Relationship with expending partners?
- Invoicing procedures?

DISCUSSION

- It was the consensus that there are a number of role variables due to varying procurement/ invoicing processes. It was agreed that formal standardised procurement and invoicing process would promote parity.
- Police Scotland finance also have a number of variables resulting from legacy processes, i.e. a single police service with eight legacy invoicing procedures.
- Treasurers support further meetings to standardise processes.
- A formal process requires to be linked to the funding terms and conditions.
- SCP's with fixed camera infrastructure generate a higher number of invoices and this impacts on the treasurer's role.

NARRATIVE

- ❖ There is a requirement for standardisation of procurement and invoicing procedures.
- ❖ Consider the introduction of an annual SCP treasurer's meeting.

Question 3.

There are vast variations in the costs associated with the work of the safety camera partnership treasurer. Can you suggest a suitable process for equitable payment of partnership treasurer's time?

Areas you may wish to consider in your response should include:

- The number of partners in each safety camera partnership?
- The number of invoices generated?

DISCUSSION

- Nationally treasurer costs currently vary from zero to in excess of £7,000 per annum.
- Many of the charging regimes are legacy and include audit costs.
- A cost per invoice charging regime could be considered.
- A standardised costing regime based on time expended with a national hourly rate and time ceiling would be more equitable.

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Introduction of standardised charging for SCP treasurer's time

Question 4.

There are variations in the costs associated with annual safety camera partnership audits, with some partnerships charging thousands of pounds whilst others charge nothing. Can you suggest a standard charging procedure for audit costs?

Areas that you may wish to consider in your response could include:

- With partnership budgets almost half of what they were initially, is there still a need for individual safety camera partnership audits?
- Why are there variations in charging policy for audit?
- What impact might a change in structure have on the auditing process?

DISCUSSION

- Not all Scottish Government grants are externally audited, one example is safer routes to school.
- The current audit process is too in-depth with the minutia of detail such as a £3.00 invoice being examined.
- Given that the grant letter prescribes the audit process, a treasurer or head of finance sign off should suffice.
- In the absence of an external audit, returns to the programme office may have to be more detailed however this information is routinely collated and should not lead to an increase in workload.
- Providing a monitor direct to the programme office would negate the need for a formal audit.
- The audit cost is historical and essentially a portion of the overall LA audit cost.

NARRATIVE

- ❖ Given that budgets have diminished greatly since the creation of the SCPs, the requirement for separate external audit should be clarified.

Annex A –Scheduled attendees

Perth – 15/05/14 (AM)

| Organisation |
|---------------------------|
| Central Scotland SCP |
| Dumfries & Galloway SCP |
| Fife SCP |
| Lothian & Borders SCP |
| NESCAMP |
| Northern SCP |
| Strathclyde SCP |
| Tayside SCP |
| Transport Scotland |
| Stirling Council |
| Fife Council |
| Edinburgh City Council |
| Aberdeenshire Council |
| Highland Council |
| Dundee City Council |
| Police Scotland (Finance) |

Views expressed in this document are those expressed by workshop attendees, and may not represent the views of partner organisations.