

**Thames Valley Safer Roads Partnership
Partnership Board Meeting
Wed 28th February 2007
@ Drayton Golf Club, Abingdon**

Attendees

Sue Brown (Bucks CC, Chair)
Malcolm Collis (TVP)
Cariad Eveson-Webb (CPS)
Maria Madeley (HMCS)
Richard Owen (TVSRP)
Ian Wilson (TVSRP)

Apologies

Brian Butler (Bucks CC)
Dan Campsall (TVSRP)
Neil Mathews (Bracknell Forest)

1. Introduction

All of the Board members were introduced and their reasons for attendance explained. The terms of reference (ToR) for the TVSRP Strategy Committee state who should attend and in what capacity, and this group also appoints the Partnership Board chair. These terms of reference also state that the chair should appoint a vice-chair. SB nominated Malcolm Collis for this position. This was seconded by CEW, and agreed by all.

2. Partnership Board Terms of Reference

RO briefly described the ToR for the Partnership Board highlighting issues of membership, frequency of meetings, voting arrangements, facilitation of meetings and the nine core responsibilities of this group.

MM volunteered to take minutes at future meetings if this was required. RO commented that this was the responsibility of the project team but would be happy to accept MM's offer. RO has committed to provide draft minutes within 48 hours of the meeting's finish for members approval. The minutes will then be published on the website after formal approval at the following meeting.

3. Discussion of Sub-Group structure

3.1 Sub-Group Structure

RO showed the entire Partnership structure highlighting where the Partnership Board, Strategy Committee and various sub-groups slotted in. RO then showed a list of all current Partnership sub-groups showing frequency of meetings and the current chair of each group.

The board then discussed each sub group in turn.

3.1.1 Operations Group

MC said that this group includes inputs and outputs from the Fixed Penalty team, enforcement stats, motorway enforcement discussion, and includes members of FPSU, TVSRP, TVP (MC

plus Glyn Hollinshead and the Road Safety Sergeant (RSS)). Future membership should include a representative of HMCS, and one of the Highways Authorities. The Partnership Board acknowledges time pressures on CPS and they will attend when specific matters pertinent to them are on the agenda.

New responsibilities for this group could include approving sites, Community Concern requests and new site criteria.

RO suggested that the work of the Road Safety Constables (RSC's) would be managed through this group. This work would include mobile phone and seat belt enforcement.

Area profiling would also be included in the Operations Group meetings. The chair of the Data Group would attend and could be asked for analysis, *etc.* The group would also bring in other areas of concern from road safety officers, *etc.*

ACTION: MC/RO to work on ToR for the group.

3.1.2 Highways Authorities Group

RO said that this group has not met formally for over a year but that there is a requirement for partnership issues affecting the Highways Authorities to be discussed on a regular basis. There was a discussion as to whether this group was required or whether its work could be covered by one of the other Partnership groups.

3.1.3 Road Safety Officers Group

This group will continue in its present form, meeting 3 times per year. There was discussion on the structure of the group currently chaired by MC. Dan Campsall sits on this group as the TVSRP representative, and it was recommended that DC should be proposed as chair of this group. This should be put to the group and voted on at the next RSO meeting. MC will no longer attend this meeting, and the police will be represented by the RSS.

Terms of reference for this group need to be decided to ensure that it's work does not overlap too greatly with the work of other groups.

ACTION: MC to lead how structure should change. MC will contact current members including fire and ambulance services.

It was agreed that this group should also involve the Highways Agency (as practitioners) probably from Area 3.

ACTION: SB/RO to contact Highways Agency to discuss.

3.1.4 Finance and Efficiencyes Group

The Finance Group has only met once to-date but is expected to meet on a regular basis to discuss subjects such as budget returns, budget submissions, etc. Neil Mathews of Bracknell Forest Council is now chairing.

Action: NM to put together ToR and decide the number and timings of meetings throughout the business year.

3.1.5 BOBSTAR/Data Management Group

IW outlined the structure of the BOBSTAR group and the type of work it covers. This group is also currently chaired by MC.

There will be a need in the new Partnership to include a data group which will include data analysts, *etc* from partners and will coordinate the data needs of the Partnership. It was agreed that the new Data Management Group should be expanded to incorporate the BOBSTAR meeting.

Terms of Reference will need to be discussed and decided at the next BOBSTAR meeting on 20th March. The Partnership Board members recommended that IW should be proposed as chair of this group.

ACTION: ToR and new structure to be put to BOBSTAR / Data group at their next meeting and voted (IW).

3.1.6 Road Safety Strategy Group / Traffic Management

This group currently chaired by MD has existing terms of reference and is generally well attended. There will be a need for additional attendance by a higher level Highways Agency person. HA attendance at this group will need to be someone with a good overview of road safety in their authority.

It was decided that this group should merge with the Highways Authority group and it should consider all aspects of road safety including engineering, enforcement and education. This group should be renamed the **Traffic Management Group** and will be chaired by Sue Brown.

ACTION: MC will review and contact authorities, recirculate existing ToR for comment and discussion at the next meeting.

The next Traffic Management Group meeting will be on 4th April 2007 in Aylesbury.

ACTION: RO to amend the partnership structure to reflect these changes to the sub-groups

4. Review of Revised Strategy Documents

4.1 Partnership Standard document

RO introduced this item saying that at the last Strategy Committee meeting, an action was given to the Partnership Board members to consider any further revisions to the Partnership

Standard document which will be submitted for final approval at the next Strategy Committee meeting.

The document was discussed and minor changes were included or changed where appropriate. A discussion was then held to decide how performance targets should be set and measured.

4.1.1 Target/Performance Management

Target figures have been added.

Target 3: Levels of enforcement. The proposed figures by RO were agreed by the Board.

Target 4: Road Safety Constables. There will be 2,200 hours of enforcement carried out per annum by the 5 RSCs. This equates to 2 hr/day enforcing partnership and local areas. As this work has not yet started, it is difficult to estimate how much of this work will be required and therefore the 2,200 hr figure will be reviewed by the Partnership Board after 6 months to see if it is realistic.

There will be a strategy put together by the Operations Group for this type of work. This revised strategy will cover other areas too (mobile phones, fatigue, etc) and will feed into the Traffic Management Group and the work of the RSCs.

It was recommended that the RSCs keep the Highways Authorities aware of their areas of work in advance.

Target 5: ETP - 100,000 identified offenders to be offered & to complete the Diversionary Education course.

ACTION: RO to add that there will be several types of courses offered for different offences.

Target 6: Public awareness of TVSRP. There are no figures available for baseline public awareness. This is being worked on by the Partnership team at this moment. No target can be set until this information is known.

ACTION: DC target to establish baseline.

Target 7: Cashable savings of 10% per annum beyond the 4% reduction in funding from DfT.

RO provided actual figures for the 4% annual reduction and the 4% + 10% reduction that showed Partnership budgets shrinking to £4.15million and £3.03 million respectively. The group said that efficiency savings should be made without detriment to core business. It was agreed by the board that 10% beyond the existing 4% reduction was unrealistic. MC asked how this 10% figure was derived. It was agreed that reference to the 10% figure should be removed, but that the wording changed to state that significant cashable efficiency savings should be achieved beyond the 4% reduction. The Finance & Efficiencies Group should be tasked to decide what would be sufficient at their next mtg.

Target 8: MC said that the target should be 99%. RO pointed out that the current conversion rate is less than 90% and that the proposed target was realistic. The wording “to process all identified offenders through the appropriate disposal methods ensuring that 95% are satisfactorily concluded” means identifying the actual driver. It does not mean offences identified or vehicles identified.

Target 9: There is a proposal that TVSRP will provide accurate data to the partners within 6 weeks. However this is unrealistic as they do not have the data themselves after this period of time (IW). It was agreed that the partnership team should provide analysed data together with a newsletter to all partners on a quarterly basis, 3 months after the end of each time period. This target could be stretched if the data was made available to the project team quicker. Some data inputters get data to TVSRP within 2-3 weeks, whereas others require the full 6 weeks.

ACTION: F&E Group to look at data input methods and efficiency of it.

Target 10: Public net satisfaction. This will be very difficult to measure as no baseline figure exists. There are many aspects of the Partnership’s operation that could be measured including education, community concern sites as well as enforcement processing. We need to be able to ensure we are measuring the service provided, not outcomes. It was agreed that the target should be changed to “to establish the current level of public satisfaction and then to improve on it”. MM suggested that we measure the number of complaints and thanks received.

ACTION: RO to coordinate establish what data is already available with Janet Brydon and MM.

Target 11: Core partners net satisfaction. It was agreed that this was difficult to provide figures for.

ACTION: RO to discuss with Steve Howell for further clarification.

ACTION: RO will send changes to the document to Partnership Board members for approval and submission to the Strategy Committee meeting next month.

4.2 Enforcement Strategy Document

This document has already been reported to the Strategy Committee. In turn, they have asked that the Partnership Board recommend changes to the document.

RO presented a number of proposed changes to the documents as submitted by Ian Duncan (Bucks CC). These were agreed with the exception of:

- Using offences as a mechanism for calculating priorities: This should be kept in as part of the calculation as it is broadly similar to the speed survey data, but gives a more accurate reflection of motorist behaviour when conspicuous enforcement is present.

- It was agreed that we do not put a figure on the ratio of cameras to housings, rather, saying that not all our cameras are loaded all of the time.
- Concerns were raised that publishing the site ranking list would encourage drivers to 'take a chance' at sites that are identified as operating less frequently. It was therefore decided that this should not be included on the Partnership's website.

ACTION: RO will make the changes to this document for circulation as soon as possible to Board members for approval no less than 2 weeks before the next Strategy Committee meeting.

4.3 Communications Strategy Document

ACTION: RO to circulate amended Communication Strategy document to Board members for approval, 2 weeks prior to next Strategy Committee meeting.

4.4 Strategy Committee Meeting

The Strategy Committee has indicated that at least one meeting will be in public each year, where the following will be discussed: budget for next year, accounts for last year, summary of the activities undertaken, summary of achievements. The Partnership Board suggested that this meeting could take the form of an extraordinary meeting of the Strategy Committee to ensure that two other full meetings still take place.

5. Partnership Launch

SB informed the Board that the Partnership launch will take place at 8-10am, 13 March 2007 on Wendover Road, Aylesbury. The press release is being prepared by DC, and the main thrust is driver education. Malcolm Messenger is coordinating the police. Fire & Rescue will also be there, as well as regional press and TV.

Partners will have an opportunity to add comments for the press/TV releases. It is to be a "stop and advise" event. There will then be a press release and after-event activities.

ACTION: DC to circulate proposals to all Partnership Board members as soon as possible before issuing to all partners.

6. Review of Partnership team's responsibilities

RO explained that this work has not yet been completed but that Trevor Dove is working on it as a matter of urgency. NM has offered to help in this matter.

Once tasks have been re-aligned, Trevor Dove will re-write the job responsibilities for the operations manager, data manager and communications manager. He will then send this out for approval by the Partnership Board.

ACTION: This needs to be completed by 1st April 2007.

7. Partnership Team updates

7.1 National Speed Awareness Scheme model

RO recounted brief details of a recent meeting in Manchester to review proposals for the new national model. ANDISP is recommending that we move from a 2½ hour model to a full day one. There is considerable disagreement with this proposal nationally and many providers believe that a 2½ hour version is beneficial. There are not enough driving instructors available to offer a practical element and take up rates are likely to be lower for the longer course reducing the number of people being educated.

ACTION: RO / MC to continue to consult nationally to see what support there is for retaining the existing model.

7.2 National Road Safety Support Office

RO described details of the proposed NRSS Office. This involves a request for further funding. For Thames Valley, this would presently be £50,000, but we have asked for changes including revised proposals and revised lower payments.

ACTION: RO to keep the Board advised of any updates

7.3 Asset disposal

RO informed the board that following the recent office move, TVSRP has a certain amount of surplus furniture and hardware. As agreed by Bucks County Council rules, we will record and list all of this equipment, putting a price against every item. This list will be given to the Partnership Board for approval at the next meeting. The list will then be circulated to partners for interest in purchasing. If not, then individuals may be able to purchase, and if the items are still remaining they will be given to charity or disposed of.

ACTION: RO to provide an asset register at the next Board meeting

8. AOB

MC mentioned the possibility of TVSRP processing some of London's offences as they are having capacity issues. RO said this could help improve efficiencies within the office if it could be done without increasing staff.

ACTION: RO/MC to investigate further.

SB requested if she could attend the next BOBSTAR and Operations Group meetings. CEW will be added to the circulation list for Operations Group minutes.

The Operations Group meeting date needs to be changed as it clashes with the Partnership launch date.

9. Date/Venue of next meeting, and future meeting dates

25th April 2007: @FPS U, Crouch Street, Banbury, 10am – 1pm.

ACTION: RO to provide directions

Then future dates are:

27 June 2007 – date might need to be moved as SB unable to attend

5 September 2007

31 October 2007

12 December 2007

27 February 2008

IW/RO 1st March 2007