



“The Write Way to Tell Them They’re Wrong?”

Tim Askew

Kier Services | Highways



Highways England Review

ATKINS AECOM

Highways England Framework for Transport Related Incidents and Engineering Advice and Responses

Task Ref: 478/05/17/674
Task Title: Maintain and Update the Road Safety Audit Database
Project Sponsor: Nicholas Bondall

GUIDANCE NOTES AND QUARTERLY REPORT July 2015 to September 2015

Author: Askew Timbar

Road Safety Audit Database

Quarterly Performance for July 2015 to 30th September 2015 (Slide 3)

Category	Project Frequency	Overall Total	Overall %	Overall %
12	100	100	100	100



Highways England Review – THE GOOD



Requirement	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec
2.97d - Identification of the Road Safety Audit Team membership as well as the names of others contributing such as the Police, Maintaining Agent and Specialist Advisors.	0%	0%
2.97f - The specific road safety problems identified, supported with the background reasoning. (also 2.98)	0%	0%
2.97g - Recommendations for action to mitigate or remove the road safety problems. (also 2.99)	0%	0%
2.104. The Road Safety Audit Team Leader must not include in the Road Safety Audit Report, technical matters that have no implications on road safety or any other matters not covered by the Road Safety Audit Brief, such as maintenance defects observed during site visits and health & safety issues.	1%	0%
2.97j - A list of documents and drawings reviewed for the Road Safety Audit.	4%	0%
2.97b - A brief description of the proposed Highway Improvement Scheme including details of its location and its objectives.	6%	0%



Highways England Review – THE BAD



Requirement	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec
2.100. Items such as correspondence with the Overseeing Organisation or copies of marked up checklists must not be included in the Road Safety Audit Report.	12%	0%
2.97h - A location map based on the scheme plan(s), marked up and referenced to problems and if available, photographs of the problems identified.	8%	6%
2.97a - Identification of the Road Safety Audit stage including a unique document reference number and the status of the Road Safety Audit Report.	28%	3%



Highways England Review – THE UGLY



Requirement	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec
2.97i - A statement, signed by both the Road Safety Audit Team Leader and the Road Safety Audit Team Member(s) in the format given in Annex D.	29%	11%
2.97c - Details of who supplied the Road Safety Audit Brief, who approved the Road Safety Audit Brief and who approved the Road Safety Audit Team.	45%	49%
2.97e - Details of who was present at the site visit, the date and time period(s) when it was undertaken and what the site conditions were on the day of the visit (weather, traffic congestion, etc.).	62%	50%



Assumptions and Omissions



- *“For the Audit it is taken that all of the subject roads will remain at their existing speed limits.”*
- *“No details relating to GD 04/12 and surface water drainage were issued to the Audit Team.”*
- *“Accurate [AADT] data was not available closer to either scheme”*
- *“No details were submitted to the audit that clarified footway option”*



Location, Location, Location



- Junction Warning Sign
- Sign reference 13, a new diagram 505 sign on the A99 eastbound approach to its junction with the B9999, situated in the nearside verge approximately 150m from the junction at chainage 423.7

A number of the location plans included in RSA reports are of poor quality and at a very low resolution which may make it difficult for designers and other readers to identify specific problem locations.



The Problems with Problems



The Summary

- Don't make life difficult by combining problems!
- The summary doesn't have to be just one line:

Summary: The road layout on the approach to the junction does not discourage overtaking on this straight downhill section of the bypass therefore this could increase the potential for collisions involving overtaking vehicles.



The Problems with Problems



HD19/15 Paragraph 2.98:

The Road Safety Audit Report must contain a separate statement for each identified problem describing the location and nature of the problem and the type of collisions or incident considered likely to occur as a result of the problem.

When deciding whether to include a potential problem, a Road Safety Auditor must consider who may be involved in a collision and how it might happen.

If a collision type cannot be associated with the problem being considered, then it may not be appropriate to include the problem in the Road Safety Audit Report.



The Problems with Problems



- A problem = 1 problem
- Clear & Concise is best – don't waffle!
- Don't include recommendations within the problem:

*The junction on the western side of the road is not clearly visible to southbound drivers **and should be signed to prevent** late braking or turning conflicts.*

- What type of collisions or incidents could result?



Recommendations for Recommendations



- It is recommended that ... ✓
- Provide ...
- Remove ...
- Optimise ...
- Relocate ...
- Review(!) ...



Recommendations for Recommendations



- A: Provide appropriate crossing facilities west of the junction to enable NMUs to cross the A999
- B: Crossing facilities should be provided west of the junction to enable NMUs to cross the A999



Recommendations for Recommendations



Personally I like the use of “should” as it is not a requirement whereas “provide” seems more of an order ... I would suggest an amalgamation of the two such as “appropriate crossing facilities should be provided to enable...”

*The trouble with semantics is that it is all pretty subjective and people often get very distracted by wording when **the key to me is that the recommendation is clear and easily understood by the recipient.***



Recommendations for Recommendations



- A: Provide appropriate crossing facilities west of the junction to enable NMUs to cross the A999
- B: Crossing facilities should be provided west of the junction to enable NMUs to cross the A999
- C: It is recommended that crossing facilities are provided west of the junction to enable NMUs to cross the A999



Recommendations for Recommendations



- Don't re-design the scheme
- Avoid being prescriptive – there may be better solutions than yours!
- Make sure your recommendation clearly relates to the problem
- Multiple recommendations relating to a single problem are Ok
- Beware of either / or recommendations
- Don't raise new problems in your recommendation



Recommendations for Recommendations



*Provide a sign warning drivers of the junction ahead. **The low PSV of the proposed road surface here may also present a risk of skidding so provide skid resistant surfacing as appropriate.***



A Recipe for Success?



- Follow the Requirements and Examples in HD19
- Make everything Clear and Easily Understood
- Problems / Recommendations should be Real and Proportionate
- Recommendations should Never be Prescriptive

