

# “ PPP ”

## People for Proper Policing in North Wales

### "Safety performance of traffic management at major motorway road works".

**Safe Speed** issued a Freedom of Information request to the DfT on **July 5th 2005** regarding motorway road works safety. When the results were **published on 4th August** we were alerted to TRL report 595 "Safety performance of traffic management at major motorway road works".

#### Safe speed Links:

[DfT Freedom of Information response page](#)

[TRL595 executive summary](#)

[Safe Speed Press Release 228](#)

[Safe Speed Press Release 229](#)

[Safe Speed Press Release 233](#) - latest, with full details

And so they purchased the full report. (£40) Upon careful study some 'interesting' data was discovered. **It hinges on Table 3.18.** They were first alerted to the problem by the footnote, then we looked very closely.

Some definitions are required to make good sense of this table.

**Digital Speed Camera**; "Digital cameras described in this study measure the average speed of vehicles over a distance using number plate recognition software." P42 (i.e. SPECS type cameras)

**Analogue Speed Camera**; "The analogue speed cameras present during this study are those that measure spot speeds of vehicles at a single location." P42 (i.e. Gatso type cameras, and possibly mobile camera vans although these are not mentioned in the report.)

**'Other'** "... the remaining two sites used patrol cars and speed traps" P42

The figures in the third section **'PIAs'** are the **personal injury accident rate** figures expressed in **PIAs per million vehicle kilometres (mvkm)**. A low figure means lower risk of crashing. What does it mean?

**The 'without speed cameras' figure (the same for road works and open motorway) of 0.089 PIAs per mvkm is a very good general safety performance.**

There are six cases where we can see the effects of two sorts of speed cameras and police patrols for both road works and open motorway. As follows:

#### The effect on PIAs .....Road works ....open motorway

Analogue speed cameras ...55% increase .....31% increase

Digital speed cameras .....4.5% increase.... 6.7% increase

**Police patrols .....27% reduction.....10% reduction**

These percentages are a simple calculation from the TRL data - for example the Analogue speed cameras at road works is:

$0.138 / 0.089 = 1.5506 = 55\%$  increase.

How might they try to explain it away?

There are limited opportunities to deny the results recorded here, however, we're expecting **the camera proponents** to try to carry out 'damage limitation' and expect the following claims:

**We** only placed fixed speed cameras where the danger were greatest, so we should not be surprised that there were high accident rates:

A fairly desperate claim when one considers the three alternatives apparently were better (digital speed cameras, **police patrols** and no speed cameras!) It's interesting to see them try and use selection bias as an excuse when they have been attempting to benefit from it (via RTTM) for the duration of the speed camera programme.

**How has the truth been hidden away?**

**We have identified no less than 5 different attempts to keep this information under wraps.**

1) Report not announced to the public - With the summary report **mislinked on TRL web site** (here) (at time of writing **TRL595 summary link produces TRL594 summary** instead!)

2) **Report (paid for with public money by the Highways Agency) not available for public download (we had to pay £40 for it).**

3) **The report's conclusions lump together the benefit of Police patrols (called 'other') with the disbenefit of the cameras to yield a neutral result - as reported in the executive summary.**

4) **The disbenefit of cameras has not been calculated out, highlighted or made clear - although the source figures are there.**

5) **The executive summary comparison groups are not "road works with camera vs road works without camera" instead they are "road works with camera vs open motorway without camera" this is how they get to claim the 1% and 2% benefits in the executive summary. In fact serious injuries are down in all road works sections irrespective of camera use.**

.....

**The PPP comments. The TRL was a world class and totally respected research organisation. They appear to have done the research to scientific standards. BUT we see again the insidious corrupting influence of the current government and their lackeys, like Brunstrom and Co with their ill thought out sound bite objectives and crazy control freak policies.**

**We would expect serious injuries to be down on nearly grid-locked Motorways & trunk roads under maintenance for months on end.**

**The PPP campaign for, community style policing of all our roads by professionally manned and clearly identifiable Patrol Cars.**

**We much prefer PREVENTION to DETECTION it saves lives and minimises paperwork.**