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NTUA and the School of Civil Engineering have contributed unceasingly to the country's scientific, technical and economic development since their foundation in 1837.

In 2018, the School of Civil Engineering of NTUA was ranked 11th in Europe among all Civil Engineering Schools and 31st worldwide.
NTUA Road Safety Observatory – Centre of Research Excellence

20+ members Scientific Team:
• Internationally recognized Professors
• 8 Senior Transportation Engineers (4 PostDoc)
• 6 Transportation Engineers PhD Candidates
• 2 Information Systems Engineers

With experience in Greece and Internationally (since early 90s):
• 80 road safety research projects (Greek 30, International 50), mostly through highly competitive procedures and several international cooperations
• More than 600 scientific publications (> 200 in Journals), widely cited worldwide
• More than 60 scientific committees
• International collaborations: European Commission, UN/ECE, OECD/ITF, WHO, World Bank, EIB, CEDR, ERF, IRF, UITP, ETSC, WCTR, TRB, decades of Universities and road safety research centers
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An international reference road safety information system, with most updated data and knowledge, with:
• more than 3,000 visits per month,
• tens of items and social media posts/tweets annually

www.nrso.ntua.gr
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Urban road safety - Open questions

• Which are the current and future urban road safety problems?
• Are they the same across Europe?

• How critical are data and evidence based decision making?
• How much transferable are successful urban road safety solutions?

• How to integrate road safety into urban mobility plans?
• Can road safety compete environmental, energy and mobility concerns?

• Are Citizens and Authorities ready for the necessary choices?
• Which are the future challenges of urban road safety?
Objectives and Structure of the presentation

**Objective**
To provide a comprehensive picture on urban road safety today and of the future challenges, with focus on urban safety and mobility, specially of the vulnerable road users

**Structure**
- Basic facts on urban road safety
- The need for road safety knowledge
- Urban road safety priorities
- Fundamental urban road safety choices
Different urban road safety progress in different countries (1/2)

Road Fatalities change 2007-2016 (source: CARE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Western Countries</td>
<td>-33,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Countries</td>
<td>-34,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Countries</td>
<td>-46,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing urban road fatalities and share on total fatalities over years 2007 to 2016.]

![Graph showing urban road fatalities per million population for 2016.]
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### Different urban road safety patterns in different countries (2/2)

#### Road Fatalities 2016 (source: CARE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Two Wheelers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Western Countries</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Countries</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Countries</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyclists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Western Countries</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Countries</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Countries</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Western Countries</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Countries</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Countries</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Urban Road Safety Problems

- More road fatalities outside urban areas, more injuries inside urban areas.

- More PTWs in the North-Western EU countries and more cyclists in the Southern EU countries result in:
  - Power-two wheelers' safety problems migrating at North and West
  - Cyclists' safety problems of the North migrating at the South

- Recession has a direct impact to road fatalities decrease, but lately slow progress is observed.
From Problems to Measures

• The identification of the suitable measures for specific urban road safety problems is a key challenge, possible only through the application of scientific and impartial methodologies.

• The social and economic benefits from a rigorous application of measures efficiency assessment can be very high.

• Road safety research and international cooperation are the keys to support evidence based decision making.
Road safety is ideal for spending money without results

• Authorities and other stakeholders may fear that **ex-post evaluation of measures** may prove that important road safety investments had little or limited impact.

• **Comparisons of measures effectiveness** between different cities and between different regions may reveal high discrepancies not only in the unit cost of the measures, but also in the implementation effort and the safety output.

• Sometimes **measures assessment** invited by the authorities tend to use faster and less rigorous methodologies, favoring prevailing opinions and decisions already taken, creating thus a wide variety of non-converging efficiency results.
The need for evidence based decision making

• Positive and negative aspects of each solution in the short and long term should be demonstrated allowing all urban road safety actors (society, decision makers) to realize the positive and negative consequences of their choices.

• On that purpose there is a clear need for publicly available high quality and impartial data and knowledge, with focus on the effectiveness assessment of road safety alternative solutions.

• Good practices manuals are useful but each measure should be tailored to the particular needs of each urban environment and the overall network design and traffic operation.
Urban road safety priorities

- Road user behaviour
- Infrastructure
- Vehicle technology
- Road safety management
Road user behaviour

**Vulnerable road users**
- Young: still at highest risk
- Elderly: ageing population
- Pedestrians: still often overlooked
- Cyclists: still often overlooked
- PTWs: an emerging problem in several countries

**Fit to drive**
- Driving under the influence of substances
- Driver distraction
- Driver fatigue
- Definitions, measurement, causes and effects

**Changing road user behaviour**
- Enforcement - Campaigns - Education
- Focus to the five killers:
  - Speeding, Alcohol, Cell phone, Seat belt, Helmet
Infrastructure

- Smart infrastructure
- New road safety infrastructure management techniques
- Self-explaining roads, forgiving infrastructure, roadside treatment
- New road safety infrastructure measures and investments
- Integration of road safety into transport / traffic / urban plans
- New generation of pedestrian and cyclist arrangements
- Infrastructure and traffic arrangements for PTW
- Special design for the elderly, the vulnerable and for users with specific needs
Vehicle technology

- Advanced driver assistance systems with focus on safety (ADAS)
- Safe design of Human Machine/Vehicle Interface (HMI/HVI)
- V2V and V2I communication and co-operative systems
- New active and passive safety equipment

- Better understanding and support of the pre-crash phase
- Improved pedestrian and 2-wheeler detection systems for accident avoidance
- Systems for the protection of (motor)cyclists

- Safety of new vehicles (hybrid, electric)
Road safety management

- Developing the Road Safety Culture
- Targeted strategies and integrated policies at city level
- Efficient programmes and measures

- Linking road safety management with road safety performance
- Monitoring implementation and effectiveness
- Efficiency assessment and cost-benefit (crash modification factors, standardization and transferability)
The high complexity of the urban environment makes road safety choices a very difficult task, attempting to balance conflicting social needs and economical restraints, especially during the economic crisis.

- Traffic Efficiency (Speed) Versus Traffic Safety
- Vehicles Versus Vulnerable Road Users
- Expensive but safe Versus Cheap but unsafe (vehicle, infrastructure, management)
- Priorities in policies, measures, research, etc.
The urban road safety choices (1/2)

• First comes safety then speed and traffic efficiency.

• Alternatives for achieving faster transport:
  - channeling of faster traffic to peripheral ring roads outside or near cities
  - development and support of more and better public transport

• Priority should be given to calmer transport means.

• First comes public transport then cycling and walking and last car traffic.
• Vulnerable users must be taken into account as fundamental design requirements during the development of road infrastructure and traffic management.

• Maximum separation of vehicle traffic from pedestrian and cycling traffic (pedestrian paths, bicycle routes, bus lanes etc.).

• Maximum separation of passenger traffic from urban freight transport.

• In complex locations (junctions, etc.):
  - optimum readability of directions,
  - road design consistency (no surprises)
  - a forgiving road environment.
Fundamental directions for urban road safety choices

• Safety should be integrated not only into the development of Urban Mobility Plans but also into proposed Urban Mobility Audits and Guidelines and be reflected in common targets.

• Plans should adopt a clear hierarchy of transport users, with public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians at the top of the hierarchy.

• The core public transport modes (bus and rail) are the safest modes of transport.

• Real and perceived safety can have a profound effect on modal choice especially in terms of the most sustainable modes of travel - walking and cycling and ability to access public transport.
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Some good practices for urban road safety

- Draft guidelines for promoting best practice in traffic calming measures (roundabouts, road narrowing, chicanes, road humps, space-sharing).

- Promotion (including legislation) of passive and active vehicle safety technologies for the unprotected road users (Intelligent Speed Assistance, car windshield airbags, pedestrian friendly bumpers, etc.).

- Introduction of minimum requirements for cycle lighting and reflective elements.

- Support the assessment of the safety impact of new traffic rules, e.g. contra-flow cycling, cycles in bus lanes.
Parking and urban road safety

- Vehicle parking has non-negligible implications for road safety mainly concerning **potential conflicts between vehicle traffic and the vulnerable road users** (VRUs): pedestrians - cyclists - motorcyclists.

- Special attention should be paid at parking provisions at the **vicinity of the junctions**, with emphasis on VRUs visibility.

- Special provisions are also necessary for minimizing vehicle conflicts at the **entrances and exits of parking stations**, with emphasis on avoiding surprises and forgiving road user errors.

- Need for **respecting pedestrian movements** within off street parking areas.
Clear road safety targets

- Urban road safety targets should be **clear and not be confused** with other - legitimate but less important – targets of traffic management or ecological driving (traffic police at junctions, cameras on bus lanes etc.).

- **Safety and speed** within urban areas are two opposite targets and local communities along with their authorities should choose between them.
The role of Authorities (1/2)

- Set clear **targets** for drastic decrease of speed.
- Implement an efficient **enforcement** program concerning basic traffic violations.
- Re-define **speed limits** for all roads within urban areas, and zones with limits 30km/h and 40km/h.
- Review horizontal and vertical **signs** after dedicated studies.
- Implement a systematic program of inspection and **maintenance** of roads, pavements and roadside elements.
The role of Authorities (2/2)

• Examine the necessary **interventions** on road infrastructure, integrate them into the urban design plans and implement them properly.

• Integrate **guidelines** and "good practice" design of other countries into new city plans, with emphasis on protection of mild circulation.

• Mobilize all local forces in order to change drastically drivers’ and pedestrians’ **behavior**.

• **Monitor** and publish systematically road accident data and results of the implementation and effectiveness of the respective actions.
Conclusions

• Urban road safety should be integrated into the urban mobility plans, equally with environment, energy and mobility concerns, within a long term and sustainable vision.

• Both authorities and citizens should realise the choices to be made (with focus on car traffic restriction) and work together and sincerely to implement them.

• Continuous research is needed to acquire the necessary knowledge for the support of decision making.
The future urban road safety challenges

Brave Road Safety Choices

Vehicle Technology
Smart Infrastructure
Efficient Enforcement

Driver Behaviour
Safety Culture

Power Two Wheelers
Pedestrians

Efficient Measures
Available Data & Knowledge

International Cooperation
Scientific Research

Evidence Based Policy Making
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