

# PUNECE Level Crossing Expert Group – Enforcement Sub-group

Informal Document No. 7 (Enforcement) -  
Update

Fourth meeting of the expert group

Geneva, January 29<sup>th</sup> 30<sup>th</sup> 2015

- At the 3<sup>rd</sup> Session GE.1 requested the sub-group to;
  - Undertake a specific survey within GE1 for further enforcement related information
  - Include the matter of private crossings, regulatory enforcement, and variations in the nature and levels of sanctions in punitive and corrective measures, in its further analysis, and
  - Prepare an informal or formal paper for the next session detailing the outcomes of the above actions and proposing next steps

To meet these actions;

- A more detailed questionnaire was produced in November/December
- Issued to respondents on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2014
- As of 26<sup>th</sup> January 2015, responses have been received from; UK, Republic of Ireland, France, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Germany, Romania
- Note: the timescale for responses has been extended to 20<sup>th</sup> February
- An Informal Document update has been submitted to GE.1
- Note: the Informal Document and this presentation is based only on the responses received to date

# Initial Findings – Legislation & Enforcement Agencies

- Regulations covering road vehicle drivers at level crossings appear to be in place for all countries
- For pedestrian users there is less consistency and punishments can be weak
- There is still more inconsistency with regard to private level crossings
- For public road crossings majority of countries appear to use police for enforcement
- For private crossings the railway infrastructure manager is used more although some countries also use the police

# Initial Findings – Technology

- Use and deployment of technology for enforcement purposes varies
- Cameras are the most common technology deployed, used to detect road vehicle violations
- Pedestrian violations only usually identified by a witness
- Gate misuse or other misuse at private crossings usually identified through train crew reports or rail staff witnesses

# Technology – Red Light Cameras

Country	Means of activating the camera when crossing sequence activates	Means of detecting a road vehicle is in the prohibited area
France (1 x fixed system approved)	Interlocked with level crossing signalling	Induction loops within the road
UK (3 x fixed systems currently being approved) (1 x mobile system approved – fleet of 15 vehicles)	Video analytics (x 3)  Not applicable – CCTV footage on recording loop	Video analytics using ANPR (x2) RADAR (x1)  Police officer witness

# Initial Findings – Technology Deployment

- In France - accident history, traffic moment and judgement (local authority)
- In the UK – (fixed cameras) based on modelled risk, accident history and foreseeability of future accidents
- In the UK – (mobile cameras) based on reaction to emerging or ongoing misuse
- Deployment of cameras at level crossings is quite new but some theft and vandalism is to be expected

# Initial Findings – Enforcement Options

- For red light offences at public road crossings some countries issue both fines and points against an offender's driving licence
- The approach to issuing penalties can differ;
  - Some countries issue a set penalty for anybody who fails to obey the red light regardless of how close they were to a collision with a train
  - In other countries the punishment can be linked to the severity of the offence
- For speeding offences the level of the fine or points received depends upon how fast the offender was going above the speed limit
- In some countries, such as Portugal and Sweden, the punishments for offences on private roads are the same as for those on public roads
- In other countries, the regulations and punishments differ for public and private roads level crossings.



# Initial Findings – Analysing The Effectiveness of Detection

- There appears to be very little analysis available to demonstrate how much enforcement effects user behaviour at level crossings
- More work is needed to analyse the effectiveness of enforcement on user behaviour benchmarking the rate of offences/accidents before and after camera installation.

# Initial Areas of Good Practice

- Awareness days at level crossings are effective way of reducing infractions
- Awareness days at driving schools facilitates the education of new drivers and improves behaviour positively
- Mobile Safety Vehicles are a flexible means of enforcement – rapid deployment, reactive, highly visible deterrent, but only have short term effect
- Rail infrastructure managers having direct access to, and influence over, a dedicated railway police force
- Specific red light safety driver training course
- Agreements/Contracts between the railway infrastructure manager and users of Private crossings

# Initial Areas of Enforcement To Improve

- UK;
  - Better legislation is needed to support enforcing pedestrian safety at public crossings
  - Need clearer legislation and means of detection to enforce safe use at private level crossings
- France;
  - Need more stringent punishment for pedestrians to deter unsafe behaviour
- Sweden;
  - Better visibility of level crossings
  - Skirts on barriers
  - Lowering road speed from 90 to 70 km/hr
  - Sighting of unprotected crossings

# Next Steps/Recommendations

- The working group will complete the analysis of all responses from the second questionnaire
- The complete findings and conclusions shall form part of a final report to GE.1
- It is recommended that a time-bound plan is developed to carry out analysis into the effectiveness of enforcement on user behaviour

- Any questions?

[darren.furness1@networkrail.co.uk](mailto:darren.furness1@networkrail.co.uk)