Fourth meeting of the expert group
Geneva, January 29\textsuperscript{th} 30\textsuperscript{th} 2015
• At the 3rd 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\textsuperscript{th} December 2014
- As of 26\textsuperscript{th} 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\textsuperscript{th} 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

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