

Nothing heard yet, I would like to present my summary now in any case which I hope can be included in the documentation for Judge Farrer. Please could all parties acknowledge receipt.

After my summary I will copy an email which came in from Idris Francis today (another accomplished engineer trying to improve road safety), with yet more proper evidence to the same effect but from a slightly different perspective.

This might seem rather negative, even rather impossible to anyone who has not investigated road safety activities, but it is strange how well it all fits together which is why, unfortunately, I and many others believe it to be true. I will provide many references to news articles which back up the statements. Never have I seen anything from Dorset Police (DP) or indeed any of the Dorset authorities which even compares in terms of completeness or coherency.

The public have always been highly suspicious that speed cameras (and some other enforcements) have always been used to make money, not to improve safety. In more recent years, the far worse realization has materialised that speed cameras by their large numbers of negative effects (<http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/news/neg.aspx>) actually have no overall benefit and quite probably a negative overall effect. But the cash flows related to enforcements have resulted in the evolution of an industry (just as it does wherever there are resources / profit available) and that industry has perhaps inevitably become more interested in it's own future than anything else, including road safety.

The resulting inflated attention on speed as by far the most important factor leads to other problems, such as easily persuaded councillors, keen to be seen to be doing something, and also I'm sure tempted by financial return, spending precious money on traffic calming projects that don't work (<http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/news/sog100.aspx>) and speed limit reductions that have no credibility, are unenforceable (for example the 30 limit on Holes Bay, <http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/news/sog68.aspx>) and only lead to reducing respect for all road safety efforts. The mind-blowingly simplistic logic, which is that the slower you hit someone, the less you hurt them is all that remains, which is clearly a ridiculous way to determine speed limits as if this is all you have in the equation, it tells us we need limits of 0.

This does not result in an effective, efficient, balanced compromise and criminalizes normal, safe behaviour that is totally harmless to anyone. Vast amounts of evidence exists as to the negative effects of speed cameras (link as above), all of which Dorset Road Safe claims is "speculation", even after someone died in front of them as a direct result of the presence of one of their cameras (http://www.dailyecho.co.uk/news/9212760.Biker_s_fatal_crash_linked_to_speed_camera/). Disgraceful.

Fortunately for those in the industry, and unfortunately for the public, the "law" is on their side, no matter what the public do, they are met by brick walls when trying to get justification / explanation / communication from the police and other road safety organisations about them.

This is why, for example, a 7 year campaign, which started quite gently, receives NOTHING in response to questions and articles at any time. DP just carry on focussing more and more on the money, as driving standards deteriorate as proper road policing diminishes. Job security takes priority over saving life, a terrible situation. And when the inevitable happens, for example a death with a camera as an undeniable factor, we see the police wriggling out of responsibility simply by saying that it "holds no records" of the incident (<http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/news/107.aspx>), even though it was widely reported publicly, and even saying it will change nothing. Can you possibly imagine this happening in any kind of industrial accident in a public company?.

These are just some of a very large number of failings of DP I have commented on over the years. No wonder then that:

- they don't like it, and have refused to comment on ANY one of my revealing articles. If anyone is in doubt, I suggest taking a look: why would DP not want to engage in these articles

and deny them or explain their weaknesses if they could? Any safety professional welcomes ANY challenge from ANYONE. www.dorsetspeed.org.uk

- if there is no belief, no interest in communication, no answers, no explanation, then the numbers of concerns and questions will continue to grow. If a member of the public finds a problem with a local authority, how will it ever be corrected, if that authority can simply ignore complaints / questions until the point that it believes the complaints have been going on for long enough that it can try to claim they are vexatious? That is all that has happened here.
- they have struggled for more than a year to refuse to reveal where all the money goes that they take from the public by removing them from the proper legal process, **that money directly influencing their own job security (as has been suggested, perverting the course of justice** <http://www.abd.org.uk/pr/746.htm>).
- when Chief Superintendent Colin Searle shows some integrity, professionalism and balance and offers to have a meeting with me, and actually LISTENS, after one hour he offers for me to actually take part in a DSRSP meeting as he feels there is so much a “fresh” approach could offer
- that this is later refused and he is told to refuse to communicate or even respond to me. Colin showed considerable initiative and courage in talking to me and this was obviously sharply snuffed out by other members of DP. I think this is what DP refer to as “engaging positively”. The reason is obvious – now without government funding of “safety partnerships”, the DSRSP deciding on anything other than getting the maximum possible number of people on courses at maximum possible profit would be like turkeys voting for Christmas. How on earth have these unhealthy motivations been allowed to completely take over?. The last thing they want is someone with some good, efficient road safety ideas, that won’t make loads of money and keep them all in work. The simple fact is, teams of people in desk jobs sending out as many fines as they can to keep themselves in work will never result in good road safety. For that, you need proper traffic police on the road. They must do what is right and effective, even if just a small amount of it, not what is just cheap (actually hugely profitable) – and even then, if they do choose what is profitable, they must be HONEST about it, not just tell us it’s for our safety and refuse to say how they use the £millions.
- I get extremely irritated and feel that it is my duty to expose the disgraceful failings I have found which can only be resulting in more terrible suffering in road accidents than there would be if DP were actually concentrating on safety.
- DP try to continue to keep the movements of public money secret by claiming that the person who is investigating them is a nuisance! Of course I am a nuisance to them, just as a policeman is a nuisance to a burglar! If I am wrong, why have they still not answered ONE SINGLE ONE of my articles?

I repeat, why on earth would DP try so hard and for so long to keep these finances secret if there wasn’t a problem with them? A bit like a drunk driver refusing to give a breath sample. Refusal has to be seen as an admission that if the detail is shown, it WILL demonstrate false accounting, misuse or worse.

And I am not at all alone, here are some other professional engineers, with safety responsibility, deeply concerned with the behaviour of authorities on the subject of road safety: <http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/other.aspx> Eric Bridgstock has also tried to get some answers out of Dorset Road Safe / Mike Glanville, and been refused with the vexatious excuse despite the solid evidence and reasoning he produced.

Just like me, these senior engineers and professionals have realised, initially on their own, how disastrously wrong road safety has gone, have no interests (financial, job security, etc) other than applying their expert safety and technical knowledge to an area that desperately needs it, have independently researched evidence and data, have approached the authorities responsible and been totally horrified at the ignorance, arrogance, disinterest, and simple total lack of appreciation of fundamental principles of safety and ethics they have found.

I can not believe that refusal to provide this financial detail has not yet been recognised IN ITSELF as reason enough to insist that it is provided, let alone all the other reasons I have listed in this appeal and on my website.

Police forces are meant to work for the public, not the other way round, and everything I have found suggests that DP are more interested in themselves than the public and that this is having a bad effect on those who live, visit or pass through Dorset, and their safety. Perhaps now, you can see why I am angry.

This is why the appeal must insist that the simple information I have asked for must be released, if the information is good, it will be good for everyone, not least of course DP themselves – WHAT ON EARTH are they doing refusing? If I lose this appeal, I will just get someone else to make the request, then, if it is bad, it's going to look even worse for them (and the IC) – this demonstrating perfectly the futility of refusal and the support of the IC. It is therefore DP and the IC who are wasting time, effort and resources on this, not me. Just tell us where the money goes, what do you have to hide? A lot by the looks of things.

If the detail looks bad, it might be bad short term for some individuals in DP, but that's what happens unfortunately if you work badly. Would the police choose not to investigate a thief because it might hurt their feelings or their career? I don't think so. So why should it be any different for the police? If there is wrong, publication of this information will bring improvements to DP which is in the public interest as efficiency and safety will improve, and that is why DP must detail where course money goes in enough detail to demonstrate that it is, or isn't, being used properly and efficiently.

Email today from Idris Francis:

I am starting to review the entire history of false claims, shameful incompetence and/or wilful misrepresentation that started with the 8 Area Trial of 1999-2000, continued with a succession of seriously misleading Reports and claims of benefit which could not conceivably be true, the 2005 Handbook issued to Partnerships instructing them on how to calculate camera effect as if no other factors influence accidents at camera sites, right up to the present day where Safer Roads Humber refuse to withdraw patently false claims of benefit achieved based on that ludicrous assumption.

The man who did most to expose this scam was of course the late Paul Smith of Safe Speed og www.safespeed.org.uk, and it is instructive to read again his assessment of these issues.

If you go to <http://safespeed.org.uk/index1.html> and enter "Heydecker" in the search box you will get a list of articles and correspondence relating to Professor Heydecker, who it seems was more responsible than any other individual, for ignoring much the largest reason that accidents fall at speed camera sites - regression to the mean.

For the record, I too wrote to Professor Heydecker and his colleagues around 2005, pointing out serious discrepancies in the 4th Year Report. Having received not even one acknowledgement to two emails to all concerned I wrote again, by Recorded Delivery letter and again received no reply - until after a year or more one recipient emailed me to tell me that although he felt that I deserved a reply, they had all agreed instead to ignore my complaints. In the 30 years I ran my own electronics company I took the precise opposite view - the one person who was assured of an immediate and detailed response was

anyone who complained. But of course my circumstances were very different - I depended on willing customers in a free market. In the road safety world however it seems that the standard response to any and every complaint is first to fail to reply at all, and then when cornered, refused to address the issues in question. And for the most part they get away with it - and it stinks.

In the twelve years or so since I started looking at these issues and the seriously flawed analysis which has skewed road safety policy in the wrong direction, I have seen more gross incompetence, more clearly deliberate intention to deceive, more reviews which simply repeat past errors - at least one based on a starting assumption that any work carried out by civil servants will be correct - and more flagrant refusal to face facts and admit error than I would ever have believed possible from my prior 40 years experience in engineering in the real world, of paying customers free to take their orders elsewhere and where being wrong leads to going bust.

None of those responsible for the lunacy of speed camera policy and the clearly false claims made for cameras would have survived a year in a real business (i.e. one not funded by the bottomless pit of taxpayers' money) where mistakes filter right through to the bottom line of profit or loss, survival or liquidation.

A great deal more information is available both on www.safespeed.org.uk and my own web site www.fightbackwithfacts.com

Idris Francis