WEBINAR WILL BEGIN AT 14:00

ROADS POLICING: EVIDENCING THE NEED FOR ENFORCEMENT

RICHARD OWEN AND FRANK NORBURY (PACTS)



WEBINAR SUPPORT

- Please use the Q&A Section to ask questions – We will answer as many as we can
- This is being recorded and will be available to review shortly
- The PDF slides are also available

STANDING TOGETHER WEBINARS

- Wednesday 15th July COVID-19 Pandemic: How is road safety delivery being impacted?
- Thursday 16th July Active Streets Assessment Tool

<u>https://agilysis.co.uk/online-training-resources/</u>



ag

- •The role of technology and roads policing
- Performance frameworks

Recommendations and the future



ROADS POLICING AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO ROAD SAFETY

Frank Norbury Policy and Research Officer, PACTS



Firstly, we looked at this from an overall perspective, and sought to find out whether evidence supports the general theoretical relationship between levels of enforcement and collisions.



This relationship is 'S-shaped', implying that offence rates (and by association, collision rates) are likely to be unaffected by small levels of police enforcement, but increasing enforcement will eventually result in a reduction in offence/collision rates (tipping point).

Collision rates continue to fall linearly with increasing levels of police enforcement, until the 'saturation point' is reached, at which further reductions in collision rates are unlikely.



Elvik attempted to establish the shape of the relationship between enforcement and its effect on accidents, using a small selection of real studies.

Concluded that the more enforcement there is, the greater the reduction in collision rates. Additionally, he found that beyond a certain point, there were diminishing marginal returns, which broadly supports the theory as laid out.



Additionally, and on a more general level, we reviewed several other meta-analyses, comprising of over 100 studies and conclude that **an increase in enforcement will lead to a reduction in both fatal and serious injury collisions.**

Some of the literature reported that the average effect of police interventions can be between a **23 and a 31 percent reduction in the number of collisions that cause injuries.**





Speeding

Strong evidence base that most tech-led and officer-led methods of speed law enforcement can achieve significant reductions in fatal injury collisions, with varying degrees of effectiveness.



Drink and drug driving

Large evidence base showing that drink drive law enforcement methods, such as random and selective breath testing, especially when used at 'checkpoints', can have a significant effect on reducing fatal and serious injury collisions.

Less research into the effectiveness of drug driving law enforcement.

Seat belt non-use



Substantial body of evidence suggests that enforcement of seat belt laws can improve wearing rates.

Significant additional casualty reductions can be achieved for every extra percent of road users who can be persuaded to wear their seat belts.

Mobile phone use

Strong evidence of increased collision and casualty risks as a result of mobile phone use while driving, but research is needed to explore countermeasures and compare their effectiveness. This information is not currently available.



We also analysed enforcement, compliance and contributory factors in relation to the fatal four to provide an insight into the relationship between enforcement and road casualties.

We looked at: FPN data Compliance data Self-reported survey data Contributory factors/casualty data

> Where there has been an increase in enforcement since 2011, the anticipated effect on casualties appears to have materialised. However where there have been considerable reductions in levels of enforcement, compliance and casualties appear to have worsened.

Speed



FPNs for speeding have been increasing (implying an increase in enforcement)

In terms of compliance, observational data and self-reported survey data suggests people are speeding less, and attitudes towards speeding are changing.

For fatal casualties in collisions where 'exceeding the speed limit' a contributory factor, the successive decline in the numbers of fatalities in each year following 2014 may indicate that a significant downward trend may be establishing itself.





What does the evidence tell us Seat belts



An area we know has seen significant reductions in enforcement

In terms of compliance, observational data implies there has not been a great deal of change in wearing rates in front and rear passenger seats.

A PACTS report, using police forensic collision investigators' data, found that in 2018 31% of those who died in vehicles were unbelted. This was higher than in previous years, based on the same data source.







1 in 5 adults are still not belting up in the rear passenger seat.



Drink driving

The total number of annual breath tests carried out by the police has almost halved since 2010.



Mixed view of drink-driving compliance, but generally implies little change over time.

The provisional estimate for the number of people killed in collisions where at least one driver or rider was over the drink drive limit in 2018 was 240, identical to the final estimate for 2010



Drug driving There are no official statistics, but since police use of saliva-based drug tests started, numbers have been increasing.

Mixed view of drug-driving compliance and not much data.

There has been an increase in the use of drug driving as a contributory factor, but it is likely that the increase in numbers reflects an increase in reporting.



Mobile phone use

Substantial reduction in the annual number of FPNs issued for mobile phone use since 2010.

Compliance data from observational surveys seem positive, but self-reported surveys report ¼ of motorists at least occasionally use their mobile phone to make or receive calls while driving, and around 17% say they check texts and social media while driving, and that these figures have changed little over time.

Data suggests there has been no systematic change in the annual number of deaths related to mobile phone use, but potentially an increase since 2011 in the number of seriously injured casualties for which 'driver using mobile phone' was listed as a contributory factor.

The 2019 RAC Report on Motoring reported that use of handheld mobile phones by other drivers at the wheel was the single biggest concern of motorists overall, exceeding concern over fuel costs and the condition of local roads.





POLL: IN WHICH AREAS ARE THE POLICE DELIVERING EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT

WHAT DOES THE EVIDENCE TELL US?



Role of technology and roads policing Speed enforcement



Lots of evidence on the effectiveness of camera enforcement

In the case of speed cameras, they appear more effective than officer-led forms of enforcement. 97% of offences are detected by cameras in England and Wales.

Average speed cameras in particular are shown to be effective at reducing collisions, and more broadly supported by drivers.

Overall, there are important halo effects to be considered. For most speed cameras, their effective on behaviour is usually constrained to their immediate surroundings.

arch suggests that whilst officer-led speed enforce

Research suggests that whilst officer-led speed enforcement is less effective, said to have a halo effect around five times larger than automated static forms.

Role of technology and roads policing

Officer led enforcement in more detail:

There is evidence that enforcement using stationary marked vehicles is slightly more effective at reducing collisions than stationary unmarked vehicles.

There is no evidence on the impact of using mobile marked/unmarked vehicles on collisions, but there is evidence on the effect on speed compliance.

Use of mobile enforcement in unmarked vehicles is not seen as effective at reducing speeds as the more visible method of using marked vehicles.







Role of technology and roads policing

PACTS PARLIAMENTARY Advisory Council For Transport Safety

Distinction in methods within the literature refers to effectiveness of random breath testing (RBT) vs selective breath testing (SBT) either patrolling or at a checkpoint.

The conclusions are:

RBT enforcement is more effective at reducing collisions than SBT, but seemingly only slightly.

The impact on collisions is much greater for enforcement carried out at checkpoints (regardless of technique, RBT or SBT) than mobile enforcement (patrolling).



Role of technology and roads policing Other enforcement

For enforcement of mobile phone use and seat belt non-use, the literature/research into the effectiveness of enforcement does not distinguish between the effectiveness of different methods.

Deployment of officers

Body of research on the impact of different types of deployment on accidents is mixed in terms of ideal factors such as intensity and time scale. Overall, what is clear though is that patrol routes matter, and have an effect on accident rate. There are also conclusions that stationary units have a more substantial impact on accidents rates than units that are continually mobile.

Media campaigns/publicity

Research generally suggests that, although media campaigns are not always necessary, they are strongly associated with successful programmes. Most of the most effective studies included within meta-analyses note that they were accompanied by a publicity campaign that raised awareness of the enforcement.





Role of technology and roads policing Other offences



Beyond the fatal four, use of cameras, such as ANPR cameras have become increasingly involved in the enforcement process.

Though there are no research pieces on the effect of using ANPR cameras on collisions, there are many accounts of forces using ANPR cameras and intelligence to target the most dangerous road users that present the most potential harm to others.

They are shown to be an effective tool which enables force to conduct highly targeted enforcement.







POLL: WHICH ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES ARE THE MOST EFFECTIVE FOR INCREASING COMPLIANCE AND / OR REDUCING CASUALTIES?

THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY AND ROADS POLICING





agilysis.co.uk

Performance framework



The safe system approach to road safety is now seen as international best practice. In the UK, it was endorsed by the DfT in its 2015 Road Safety Statement and by the NPCC in its 2018 Roads Policing Strategy.

A key aspect of this approach is the focus on the monitoring not only of casualties but also of the safety of the system.

However, at present, forces appear to focus on casualty data as the key performance indicator.

It is unclear what framework, if any, exists to monitor the performance of roads policing functions. They are not specifically measured by HMICFRS as part of the PEEL assessments, as such, the obligation to monitor performance (and how to do it) in this area is not clear.

In force management statements, KSIs appear to be the primary measure of roads policing performance, in addition to capacity to respond to RTCs.



Performance framework



We know that fatality and serious injury statistics do not offer sufficient insight into the factors that may underlie the casualties. Casualties are the 'worst case' scenario of unsafe operational conditions.

They do not give an adequate indication of the level of safety. Nor do they necessarily indicate which factors require intervention.

Equally, the value of measuring offences detected, prosecutions resulting, or road users pursued as indicators of success is limited, and not necessarily useful in measuring impact on levels of road safety.

Road safety indicators can highlight risks, such as high levels of excessive speed. They can also assist in assessing the impact of interventions.

Performance framework



PACTS has published recommendations for a set of national road safety performance indicators. It includes the following which relate to roads policing:

- Percentage of traffic complying with speed limits on national and local roads
- Percentage of drivers who do not drive after consuming alcohol or drugs
- Proportion of drivers not using an in-car phone (hand held or hands free)
- Percentage of drivers wearing a seat belt.

These indicators are consistent with the 2018 NPCC roads policing strategy which highlighted the importance of tackling the fatal four offences.

Interviews

We asked whether senior police officers believed performance indicators should be adopted by forces. Respondents were reluctant to adopt casualty reduction targets as casualties were not sufficiently within their control. However, there was more support, at least in principle, for monitoring indicators which focus on the fatal four.



POLL: WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO MEASURE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ROAD POLICING

PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORKS





agilysis.co.uk

The future



Recommendations

1. Roads policing should be included in the Strategic Policing Requirement.

2. Police and Crime Commissioners should prioritise roads policing and road safety within Police and Crime Plans

3. The number of roads policing officers should be increased.

4. NPCC roads policing strategy should be revised.

5. HMICFRS should include roads policing in its annual assessment.

6. Collaboration and partnerships should be widened.

7. Intelligence should be enhanced and more widely shared.

8. Greater use should be made of technology.

9. The support and participation of the public should be encouraged.

10. Safe system indicators should be used to monitor road safety

11. Research and evaluation should be enhanced

The future

Public support for road traffic law enforcement

Authorities have different interpretations of the public's attitudes and of the degree of their consent to enforcement.

However, support for more roads policing officers and road traffic enforcement is growing, as are concerns over levels of offending and lack of enforcement.

Makes a strong case for more support for roads policing from politicians.



RAC Report on Motoring

28% of drivers do not believe they will be caught if they break most motoring laws - **a 4% increase since 2011**

68% of motorists think there are not enough dedicated roads policing officers to enforce traffic laws - **an 8% increase since 2010**

PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORKS





agilysis.co.uk

Thank you



Frank Norbury, Policy and Research Officer, PACTS: frank.norbury@pacts.org.uk

View the full version at: <u>http://www.pacts.org.uk/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/sites/2/Roads-Policing-Report-FinalV1-merged.pdf</u>

