

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your reply. Although you do not give your name, your position suggests that you are James Farr, to whom I spoke on the telephone recently.

I interleave below my responses to your various points, but must make this clear at the outset:

As a Senior Analyst asked to respond to the evidence I provided, that your fixed cameras **don't just fail to reduce injury and collision rates but cause them to increase, you have both a moral and a statutory duty** - the duty of care owed by all public servants - **to assess that evidence on its merits.**

Accordingly, your reply that "Some of the details of your analysis is not fully clear to me, and hence I cannot comment on your findings", apparently intending that to be the end of the matter - is completely unacceptable, and in my view a clear breach of your duty of care, all the more so given that this is all about injuries and deaths.

I attach in a Word file a step-by-step explanation of my clear and simple method of analysing your data, but for your convenience summarise my findings here in one sentence:

If you add up collision and injury data for each camera site, for each of the 8 years following installation you will see that they increase, in contrast to continuing reductions elsewhere.

One further general point - one of the worst aspects of public and corporate life in this country over the last 30 years, as millions of members of the public are becoming aware, has been the shameful and utterly despicable way in which senior people in authority, whether in South Yorkshire Police or other Forces, the NHS, the BBC, authorities responsible for children's homes and most recently the Grenfell Tower disaster, have **consistently buried their heads in the sand, ignored whistle-blowers (often paying them large sums of public money to go away and keep shut up) and failed to act to stop wrong-doing**, despite the duty of care they manifestly owe to those affected and the public at large.

Be in no doubt that, as an Appeal Court verdict upholding a prison sentence confirmed only a few years ago, that **failing to act when under a duty of care to do so - as of course we all are, at all times - is every bit as much a criminal offence as acting improperly.**

I have provided you with incontrovertible analysis that Hampshire's fixed cameras lead to increases in accident and injury rates. **This clearly has to stop.**

Please understand that I am deadly serious about this. I confirm that if you would like to see more details of my methods and results I would be happy to liaise with you.

My further comments are interleaved below.

Sincerely

Idris Francis

At 14:40 07/07/2017, you wrote:

Dear Mr Francis,

Your correspondence has been passed to me to respond to.

In response to the four points you would like to be considered:

1. Thank you for taking the time to send us your analysis. Over the years a lot of resources have been dedicated to understanding the collision trends at each of our fixed safety camera sites. We now publish all of our casualty data at www.tvphampshiretraffweb.co.uk.

Comment *Try as I might, I find it completely unusable - when I click on anything the revolving egg-timer icon appears and revolves and revolves and revolves and revolves evolves and revolves and revolves and revolves apparently without end. The only way I could stop it was to switch off my browser.*

*But even if the site did work as it was presumably intended to do - **what on earth is the point of it, other than as a make-work scheme for statisticians and IT people?** As above, individual accidents have no statistical significance whatever, so what any competent analyst needs is all the data in a readily accessible and analysable database or spreadsheet, not that nonsense!*

Similarly, if I could get the site to work, whose idea was it that data for each camera site should be extracted by clicking on its location on a map and then laboriously cutting and pasting whatever data it contains?

As you will know there are lots of different ways to analyse and interpret data, and some will give different results. Some of the details of your analysis is not fully clear to me, and hence I cannot comment on your findings. I am not prepared to enter into any discussion on the various methodologies that could be used. We do not have the resources available for this.

Comment. *Indeed there are many and various ways of analysing speed camera data, and almost all of them have one important point in common - they are unmitigated drivel, based on insufficient and seriously flawed data, and lacking any understanding whatever of how to deal with selection bias and regression to mean.*

*For that reason there is no need to enter into any discussion on the various methodologies, **all you need to do is to understand mine and accept that it is right.** For the record, I have spent well over 10,000 hours obtaining and analysing data and am about to publish my damning results for 23 police areas out of 33, showing conclusively that speed cameras are worse than useless not just in Hampshire but everywhere.*

This full analysis is, incidentally, not limited by annual totals or year of installation but uses a great deal more, monthly data to provide greater accuracy - i.e. to show more accurately how bad this farce really is.

2. We do not record the date when mobile speed enforcement commenced at a location simply as we have never seen a need to record this data. We do not have the resources to record everything about our work.

Comment. *Astonishing! I doubt that it would be possible to find any normal commercial organisation displaying such a cavalier attitude to establishing the effects of its work! The need is very simple and very obvious - **by failing to record the date of commencement at each site you make it literally impossible to analyse the effects of those cameras!***

*And in any case, compared to all the other work involved in selecting and agreeing sites for enforcement, how much effort would be needed for someone to note the start date? Ten seconds? Or for that matter, as we are talking weeks here not days or months, **would not the date of the first detected offence suffice?***

We do have limited access to data on historic mobile speed enforcement. This could be requested under Freedom of Information, but do be advised this may exceed the cost requirement.

Comment. *As it happened, I was a computer circuit design engineer from 1963 to 1965 and I used PC's and databases intensively to run my electronics company. How difficult could it possibly be to extract from your database the date of the first recorded penalty for each mobile site? **Please treat that, in principle, as the beginning of a Freedom of Information request for that data.***

Analysis of mobile camera enforcement and the effect on casualties would be very complex as some locations are only enforced a handful of times each year. There are also locations where there is a gap of many years between periods of enforcement.

Comment.

*One of the major problems with camera analysis is the widespread but mistaken belief that it is complex. Nonsense! **Given a great deal of data it is very simple.** And in any case I have been able to obtain that data for mobile cameras for 9 police areas that use mobile cameras, so if they record it why don't you?*

*We all know that mobile sites operate only occasionally but **what matters as far as enforcement is concerned is the knowledge that, next time, a site might be operating,** so the gaps are largely irrelevant.*

Many of the locations where we conduct speed enforcement are at the request of residents who are concerned about speed in their neighbourhoods. Here there may not be a history of casualties where mobile speed enforcement occurs. At these locations any analysis of road casualties here would be pointless. I should add we do not hold a single database relating to why we enforce at a given location.

Comment *A good friend and fellow campaigner, a senior aerospace safety engineer, told me some years ago that it is a "given" in professional safety circles that opinions based no knowledge of the subject should be ignored - I agree!*

*In any case, how could it be pointless to monitor sites where there had previously been few casualties -- **just in case that (as it seems) there are casualties following enforcement?** Are you aware that a not insignificant number of fatalities have been recorded by Coroners as having been due to the presence of cameras?*

3. Analysis of casualties at safety camera sites has been carried out by many other organisations which supports this area of Policing. For example the work carried out by Professor Richard Allsop, and also the work carried out by PA Consulting Group and UCL, both of which I am sure you are already aware of.

Comment. Indeed, I am well aware of them all, having spent so many thousands of hours on the subject. If you wish I could copy you several 8 to 14 page demolitions of most of them and their findings. For example - the four absurd PA/UCL analyses to which you refer are the worst analyses of any subject I have seen since I graduated as an electrical engineer in 1960.

I have been in frequent touch with Professor Allsop for about 5 years and if you read his papers 2014 papers for the RACF you will find corrections that I pointed out.

In a letter to Local Transport Today (7/3/16) Professor Allsop explained that he and other analysts use probability theory and an assumption of Poisson distribution of numbers of collisions due to the smallness of the numbers and limited extent of the data [the results] are therefore far from definitive, and by no means rule out the possibility of the effect being much smaller in other partnership areas.

By obtaining far more and more detailed data I have been able to avoid those problems and produce results which are definitive - and which consistently show no benefit or worse.

A further point to note is that while you do not agree with speed enforcement technology, there are many people who do welcome it. I receive regular requests from individuals wanting safety cameras in their neighbourhoods.

Comment. As above and as always "be careful what you wish for". In other words, those requests are invariably made by people who have no data or understanding of it, and who's opinions are therefore based almost entirely on (a) simplistic nostrums such as "It's obvious innit, you drive more slowly you have fewer accidents" (said to me by the first PR man for Hampshire's cameras, way back in 2004 or so and (b) 20 years of mindless propaganda by those who don't hold or understand the evidence either.

Idris Francis

4. We have noted your comments.

Kind regards

Senior Analyst 11437

Hampshire Constabulary & Thames Valley Police Joint Operations Unit

External: 02380478538 Internal: 4636201

e-mail: saferroads@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

website: www.hampshire.police.uk

website: www.tvphampshiretraffweb.co.uk

From: <saferroads@hampshire.pnn.police.uk>

To: idris.francis@btinternet.com

CC: saferroads@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

Subject: RE: att of Senior Analyst 11437 re: Collision increase at your fixed camera sites Please acknowledge

Dear Mr Francis,

I have assessed and responded to the evidence you have provided to us.

As you have made clear over many years you do not believe the use of speed enforcement technology is a effective casualty reduction measure. In contrast, many people believe speed enforcement technology should be used, and provide evidence to support this.

You are already aware of much of the evidence I am referring to. In addition The College of Policing has recently published a report on this subject

http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Systematic_Review_Series/Pages/Speed_cameras.aspx.

Furthermore, TRL also carried out an independent review of the roads policing strategies employed by the Hampshire Constabulary and Thames Valley Police Joint Operations Unit which concluded the used of fixed and mobile speed cameras should continue.

As a public body we need to follow the guidance of these authoritative sources.

In the organisation my role is to assess and interpret data and to make recommendations; I am not in a position to make strategic decisions. I have made Chief Inspector Parsons aware of your analysis and your recommendations. He agrees the data which supports speed enforcement technology as a road safety measure currently outweighs the data to the contrary, and hence speed enforcement technology will continue to be used in Hampshire and Thames Valley.

I have noted that you have made reference to submitting a further Freedom of Information relating to the first recorded penalty for each mobile camera site, however it is not clear precisely what your question is. Could you please submit a specific question to via <https://www.hampshire.police.uk/contact-us/forms/foi/>.

I am however not prepared to enter into any further correspondence about these matters. Fundamentally this is a subject where we need to agree to disagree and therefore I see no benefit in any further discussion.

Kind regards

Senior Analyst 11437

Hampshire Constabulary & Thames Valley Police Joint Operations Unit

External: 02380478538 Internal: 4636201

e-mail: saferrroads@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

website: www.hampshire.police.uk

website: www.tvphampshiretraffweb.co.uk