

Proposals for Road Safety Investments and Interventions in South East Europe

Road Safety Workshop

Athens, 2 October 2014

George Yannis, Professor NTUA

Alexandra Laiou, Research Associate NTUA

South East Europe




- **Priority Axis:**
Improvement of the accessibility
- **Area of intervention:**
Improve co-ordination in promoting, planning and operation for primary & secondary transportation networks

Jointly for our common future

Main Problem addressed

South-East Europe regions are among the **worst road safety performers** in Europe.


Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, and to a less extent, Slovenia and Hungary, have a fatalities/population rate **by far above the EU average** (source: ETSC).



Reduction in road fatalities (2001-2013) ranging from 64% in Slovakia to 24% in Romania while the average EU reduction was 53%.

Jointly for our common future


Road fatalities per million population in SEE countries (2012) (*2011)



Sources: CARE, IRTAD, IRF

Jointly for our common future

Road fatalities per million population in ROSEE countries 2000-2012



Jointly for our common future

Project Objectives

Main objective:

improve coordination in promoting, planning and operation at national and regional road networks in terms of road safety.

Additional objectives :

- **Strengthen institutional capacity** to plan and operate the network from a road safety perspective and contribute to increased future funding for enhancing institutional capacity.
- **Contribute to safer roads and mobility** and increased future funding possibilities for safe infrastructure.
- **Increase capacity to deliver effective and multi-component road user behavior interventions** and **strengthen transnational cooperation** and dialogue on road safety.



Jointly for our common future

Project approach

On **Primary Networks** the project worked with relevant national stakeholders to develop or strengthen mechanisms for including road safety as a standard in the planning and operation of the network and to define road safety objectives for the primary network in each country.

On **Secondary Networks** the project worked with relevant national, regional and municipal stakeholders to design and test a model approach for strengthening road safety in the planning and operation of key segments of the secondary networks.



Jointly for our common future

Project Partners

Partner role	Official name in English	Country
LP	ALOT s.c.a.r.l., Agency of East Lombardy for Transport and Logistics	Italy
PP1	EUCon, Association EU CONCEPTS R&D	Romania
PP2	GRSP Hungary Association	Hungary
PP3	UniBS, DICATAM Department of Civil Engineering, Architecture, Land, Environment and Mathematics	Italy
PP4	KTI Institute for Transport Sciences Non Profit Ltd.	Hungary
PP5	NTUA, National Technical University of Athens / School of Civil Engineering / Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering	Greece
PP6	AMZS, Automobile and Motorcycle Association of Slovenia	Slovenia
PP7	AVP, Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency	Slovenia
PP8	UL FGG-PTI, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Civil and Geodetic Engineering	Slovenia
PP9	OY, Open Youth	Bulgaria

Jointly for our common future

Project Observers


Partner role	Official name in English	Country
OP1	ABS-RTSA, Road Traffic Safety Agency of the Republic of Serbia	Serbia
OP2	RSBSP , National Council for Road Traffic Safety	FYROM

Project Structure



Jointly for our common future

Core work-packages



Jointly for our common future

Project activities

- Establishment of **Advisory Groups** for road safety at national and transnational level
- **Assessment** of road safety **legislation, policy and institutional capacity** in the partner countries.
- Development of **National Reports** on road safety.
- Development of **Transnational Report** on road safety.
- Development of relevant **recommendations and investment proposals**.



Jointly for our common future

Project activities

- Development of material and delivery of **professional development courses** on:
 - speed management
 - enforcement
 - occupational road safety
 - road safety advocacy
 - road safety management
 - social marketing
 - vulnerable road users
- Proposal of appropriate **low cost measures**.
- Development of **speed management strategies**.
- **Surveys** on road user behaviour and attitudes.
- Development of relevant **recommendations** and **investment proposals**.



Jointly for our common future

Project activities

➤ Implementation of **13 pilot projects**:

- Safety of Pedestrian crossings on secondary roads
- Campaigning for better road traffic behaviour
- Protecting vulnerable road users
- Improved road safety for kids through education and safer road environments
- Understand the impact of newly built access road on traffic safety
- Safety of powered two-wheelers on secondary roads
- Road safety inspection based campaign in Pest County
- Assessment of the Peloponnese road network connectivity and safety
- Speed management. Piran Municipality
- Safety of the cyclists. Osrednjeslovenska and Podravska regions
- Traffic calming measures to improve road safety, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists in the municipalities Piran, Vrhnika, Škofja Loka, Litija and Izola
- Drive responsibly and courteously
- Pedestrian safety in Vidin



Jointly for our common future

Promote road safety and improve road network accessibility in South East Europe.

In the South East Europe area, injuries and road crashes are answerable for social and economic losses. South-East Europe regions are among the worst road safety performers in Europe: countries such as Greece, Bulgaria, Romania and, to a less extent Slovakia and Hungary, have a road deaths rate per population by far above the EU average of 62 deaths per million population in 2010 (source: CARE database and national data). In the South-East Europe (SEE) countries that are currently not members of the European Union crash and fatality rates are even higher: in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia and Croatia rates are above 100 deaths per million populations in 2009 (Source: OECD-ITF). This situation is holding down the development of the SEE region and requires urgent improvements. In order to reach the 2020 EU road safety target.



<http://www.rosee-project.eu/>

» About the project

ROSEE is a project that involves 6 countries: Italy, Romania, Hungary, Greece, Slovenia, Bulgaria. The project aims to improve road safety performances on primary and secondary networks in the South East Europe area and is financed by "South East Programme – Transnational Cooperation Programme".

- » Italy
- » Romania
- » Hungary
- » Greece
- » Slovenia
- » Bulgaria

The South East Europe programme is a unique instrument which, in the framework of the Regional Policy's Territorial Cooperation Objective, aims to improve integration and competitiveness in an area which is as complex as it is diverse. **Jointly for our common future** is the slogan chosen by the 16 participating countries in the programme.
<http://www.southeast-europe.net/en/>



Scope of proposals on investments and interventions

Exploitation of the ROSEE project results for the development of proposals on investments and interventions for the improvement of road safety in South-East European regions with regard to:

- **road safety legislation, policy and institutional capacity**
- **road infrastructure**
- **road user behaviour**

Proposals on investments and interventions drafted:

- **separately** for each of these three subjects
- using a **common methodology**



Jointly for our common future

Methodology

A **three step** methodology:

1. Use of measures and priorities identified within the ROSEE project
2. Exploitation of input from existing lists of proposals and recommendations
3. Assessment and ranking of road safety measures based on:
 - the estimated safety benefit
 - the implementation cost
 - the implementation timeby **more than 100** road safety stakeholders



Jointly for our common future

Legislation, Policy and Institutional Capacity proposals on investments and interventions matrix

Recommendations	Investment Proposals	Safety Benefit				Implementation Cost				Implementation Time (needed for benefit)				Implementation Barriers	
		4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	>5Y	1-5Y	6-12m	<6m		
Institutional	Development of road safety national Plan														
	Operation of national road safety agency														
	Setting up road safety targets														
	Setting up dedicated road safety budget														
Legislative	Legislation for infrastructure safety management														
	Legislation for new offences														
	Legislation for efficient enforcement														
	Legislation for training, licensing, education														
Infrastructure safety management	European Road Assessment Programme (EuroRAP)														
	Road Safety Audits (RSA)														
	Road safety inspection (RSI)														
	High risk site treatment program														
Monitoring	Accident data collection system														
	Monitoring road safety indicators														
	Monitoring implementation progress of measures														
	Evaluating measures effectiveness														
Communication	Road accident analyses														
	Campaigns supporting the national programme														
	Coordinate enforcement and promotion campaigns														
Post-Crash	Emergency Call system (eCall)														
	Emergency lanes in congestion														
	trauma management performance														
	Improved Emergency Medical Service														

Jointly for our common future

LPIC proposals – overall results

Investment Proposals	Partner countries recording high safety benefit	Partner countries recording low implementation cost	Partner countries recording short implementation time
Legislation for infrastructure safety management	6	4	0
Legislation for efficient enforcement	6	4	1
Evaluating measures effectiveness	6	2	0
Development of road safety national Plan	6	1	1
Road safety inspection (RSI)	6	1	0
Setting up dedicated road safety budget	6	0	1
High risk site treatment program	6	0	1
Road Safety Audits (RSA)	5	2	0
Monitoring implementation progress of measures	5	2	0
Improved Emergency Medical Service	5	0	2
Emergency Call system (eCall)	5	0	1
Legislation for training, licensing, education	4	4	0
Setting up road safety targets	4	3	1
Road accident analyses	4	0	1
Operation of national road safety agency	4	0	0
Accident data collection system	4	0	0
Monitoring road safety indicators	3	2	0
European Road Assessment Programme (EuroRAP)	3	1	0
trauma management performance	3	0	3
Legislation for new offences	2	5	0
Coordinate enforcement and promotion campaigns	2	1	3
Campaigns supporting the national programme	2	0	3
Emergency lanes in congestion	2	0	2

Jointly for our common future

Legislation, Policy and Institutional Capacity proposals

Overall results

- In many partner countries most Legislation, Policy and Institutional Capacity investments are related to **high safety benefit**.
- However, most such proposals are considered relatively **expensive** to implement and **effective on the long-term**.
- The proposals considered to provide **high safety benefit at low cost**, in most partner countries are:
 - legislation for infrastructure safety management
 - legislation for efficient enforcement
- However, both investments **need time** to show their effect on the improvement of road safety.



Jointly for our common future

Legislation, Policy and Institutional Capacity proposals on investments and interventions

- **Institutional issues, legislative issues and infrastructure safety** management concentrate most of the highly effective investment proposals.
- **Legislative issues** are considered the **easiest to implement** in most partner countries.
- Almost **half** of the examined **proposals** were related to **high implementation cost**.
- Almost **all** of the examined proposals are considered **effective in the long-term** in all partner countries.
- In half countries, **communication and trauma management performance** proposals are the only ones considered to need a **short implementation time** to provide benefit.



Jointly for our common future

Road Infrastructure proposals on investments and interventions matrix

Recommendations	Investment Proposals	Safety Benefit				Implementation Cost				Implementation Time			Implementation Barriers	
		4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	>5y	1-5y	6-12m		<6m
Pedestrian crossings	New pedestrian crossing													
Lighting treatment	Upgrade of existing pedestrian crossing													
	Implementation of new street lighting													
Speed limits	Improving of existing lighting													
	Changing from unrestricted speed to speed limit													
Traffic control and operational elements	Lowering existing speed limit													
	Creation of speed transition zones													
	Traffic signs (regulatory)													
	Traffic signs (warning)													
Traffic calming-Speed management measures	Traffic signs (guide)													
	Delineators and horizontal road markings													
	Raised road markers													
	Chevrons													
Vertical curvature treatment	Post-mounted delineators													
	Rumble strips													
	Speed humps													
	Raised pedestrian crossings													
Cross-section treatment	Raised Intersections													
	Central islands													
	Lateral shifts													
	Reducing gradient													
Roadside treatment	Improvement of sight distances													
	Increasing lane width													
	Introduction of shoulder													
	Increasing shoulder width													
Crossings treatment	Introduction of median													
	Increasing median width													
	Development of bicycle lanes													
	Development of pedestrian sidewalk													
Intersections layout	Implementation of safety barriers													
	Implementation of motorcyclist safety barriers													
Traffic control at intersections	Introduction of new pedestrian crossings													
	Upgrading of existing pedestrian crossings													
Parking Facilities	Introduction of rail/road grade crossings													
	Protection of rail/road level crossings													
	Development of roundabouts													
	Intersection channelization													
	Implementation of yield signs at intersections													
	Implementation of stop signs at intersections													
	Implementation of traffic lights at intersections													
	Improvement of existing traffic lights													
	On street parking facilities introduction													

Jointly for our common future

Road Infrastructure proposals – overall results

Investment Proposals	Partner countries recording high safety benefit	Partner countries recording low implementation cost	Partner countries recording short implementation time
Implementation of safety barriers	6	0	2
Development of roundabouts	4	0	0
Implementation of motorcyclist safety barriers	4	0	2
Speed humps	3	2	4
Raised pedestrian crossings	3	1	4
Creation of speed transition zones	3	1	3
Implementation of traffic lights at intersections	3	0	4
Improvement of sight distances	3	0	2
Delineators and horizontal road markings	2	4	3
Upgrade of existing pedestrian crossing	2	2	3
Traffic signs (regulatory)	1	4	5
Chevrons	1	4	4
Changing from unrestricted speed to speed limit	1	4	4
Raised road markers	1	3	3
Improvement of existing traffic lights	1	1	4
Rumble strips	1	1	3
Traffic signs (warning)	0	5	6
Traffic signs (guide)	0	4	4
Implementation of stop signs at intersections	0	4	5
Lowering existing speed limit	0	4	3
Post-mounted delineators	0	3	4
Implementation of yield signs at intersections	0	3	3

Road Infrastructure proposals – overall results

ROSEE countries differ widely in regard to:

- road network conditions
- road maintenance and managing
- road user behavior
- vehicle fleet and ownership
- general social and economic background
- legislation
- enforcement



Thus, **different measures act differently between countries.**

Generally, measures with the highest safety benefit are neither the fastest nor the cheapest to implement.

Jointly for our common future

Road Infrastructure proposals on investments and interventions

The **highest safety benefit** is related to:

- the implementation of safety barriers
- the development of roundabouts
- the implementation of motorcyclist safety barriers

Installation of traffic signs, such as stop signs at intersections, yield signs at intersections, warning and guide signs is related to the **lowest cost** and **implementation time**.

Cross-analysis of all criteria showed that **speed humps** are the most effective measure, related to high safety benefit, low cost and short time to take effect.



Jointly for our common future

Road User Behaviour proposals on investments and interventions matrix

Recommendations	Investment Proposals	Safety Benefit				Implementation Cost				Implementation Time				Implementation Barriers
		4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	>5y	1-5y	6-12m	<6m	
Speeding	Installation of speed cameras													
	Lowering of speed limits													
Alcohol	Introduction of speed limits													
	Intensive police enforcement of drink-driving													
	Penalties for drunk driving													
Enforcement	Increased random breath testing													
	Intensive police enforcement of seat belt use													
	Intensive police enforcement of child restraint use													
	Intensive police enforcement of helmet use													
	Mandatory wearing of helmets for moped and motorcycle riders													
Licensing	Intensive police enforcement of mobile use while driving													
	Selective traffic enforcement programs at high-risk times and locations													
	Gradual driver license													
	Voluntary training for bus and truck drivers													
Pedestrians/ Cyclists visibility	Licensing for mopeds													
	Mandatory eyesight test for car drivers													
Education	Use of reflective devices by pedestrians													
	Improving bicycle conspicuity													
Campaigns	Mobility and safety education at all school levels													
	Periodically repeated first aid education and training at school, for drivers													
	Education, training for young drivers													
	Road safety campaign against drinking and driving													
Campaigns	Road safety campaign addressing young road users													
	Road safety television advertising supporting increased police enforcement													
	Campaign against dangerous and risky driving													
	Campaigns for seat belt and helmet use													
	Campaigns for speeding													
	Campaigns for the use of mobiles while driving													
	Using health professionals as advocate for road safety													
	Promoting walking and cycling													

Jointly for our common future

Road User Behaviour proposals – overall results

Investment Proposals	Partner countries recording high safety benefit	Partner countries recording low implementation cost	Partner countries recording short implementation time
Intensive police enforcement of child restraint use	6	4	4
Intensive police enforcement of helmet use	6	4	3
Traffic enforcement programs at high-risk times and locations	6	2	3
Improving bicycle visibility	5	5	3
Penalties for drunk driving	5	4	5
Mandatory wearing of helmets for moped and motorcycle riders	5	4	4
Intensive police enforcement of mobile use while driving	5	3	4
Intensive police enforcement of seat belt use	5	3	3
Education, training for young drivers	5	2	1
Intensive police enforcement of drink-driving	5	1	4
Increased random breath testing	5	1	2
Installation of speed cameras	5	1	2
Mobility and safety education at all school levels	5	0	0
Use of reflective devices by pedestrians	3	6	3
Road safety campaign against drinking and driving	3	2	1
Road safety campaign addressing young road users	3	2	1
Campaigns for the use of mobiles while driving	3	2	1
Using health professionals as advocate for road safety	3	2	1
Promoting walking and cycling	3	1	2
Campaigns for seat belt and helmet use	3	1	2
Campaigns for speeding	3	1	2
Campaign against dangerous and risky driving	3	1	2
Road safety television advertising supporting police enforcement	3	0	2
Lowering of speed limits	2	6	5
Introduction of speed limits	2	6	3
Licensing for mopeds	2	4	1
Periodically first aid education and training at school, for drivers	2	2	1
Gradual driver license	1	2	1
Voluntary training for bus and truck drivers	0	3	1

Jointly for our common future

Road User Behaviour proposals – overall results

- The **highest safety benefit** was related to measures focusing on **speed, enforcement and visibility** while the **lowest, to voluntary training** for bus and truck drivers, **first aid training and campaigns**.
- Measures of **enforcement, legislation, penalties and reflective devices for pedestrians and cyclists** are considered to be of **low cost** for achieving the desired safety benefits.
- **Campaigns and education** are related to **high cost** and **long implementation time** in most countries.
- **Lowering speed limits and strengthening penalties for drinking and driving** are measures fast to implement and will have the **quickest positive safety benefit**.



Jointly for our common future

Road User Behaviour proposals on investments and interventions

- **Not all measures** considered to have the largest safety benefits are the fastest to implement or are of low cost.
- **Legislative measures** such as enforcing traffic laws and increasing penalties for drinking and driving **scored high** overall.
- Most measures with **low overall scores** focus on **education** and **campaigns**.
- These measures were ranked as having **low safety benefit, high costs** and taking generally a **long time to show impact**.



Jointly for our common future

ROSEE - Overall proposals for road safety improvement in South-East Europe

- Focus on **road safety management** and **administrative structure** at national, regional and local level
- Emphasis on systematic **reporting** and **monitoring** of road safety data, measures and results
- **Infrastructure safety management**
 - integrated approach (RSA/RSI, road safety impact assessment, high risk sites' treatment)
 - systematic implementation of low cost measures
- **Focus on the five killers:**
 - speed
 - drink-driving
 - non use of seat belts
 - non use of helmets
 - use of mobile phone while drivingthrough **enforcement, training, campaigns**



Jointly for our common future

ROSEE - Future challenges for road safety in South-East Europe



Jointly for our common future

Proposals for Road Safety Investments and Interventions in South East Europe

Road Safety Workshop

Athens, 2 October 2014

George Yannis, Professor NTUA

Alexandra Laiou, Research Associate NTUA