

October 2002

LTSA 2010 Initiatives: Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety

CAN response added to this document using the 'Track Changes' function – 11 November 2002

Purpose

1. The purpose of this paper is to update members of the Pedestrian and Cyclist Advisory Groups on:
 - ?? Progress to date with the development of a strategic framework for pedestrian and cyclist safety over the period to 2010; and
 - ?? Pedestrian and cyclist initiatives that are being undertaken by the LTSA as part of the first phase of implementation of the Road Safety Strategy 2010.
2. The strategic framework document will state how road safety for pedestrians and cyclists is to be managed over the period to 2010. It will be guided by the broad principles of the Road Safety Strategy 2010 and will develop alongside the National Walking and Cycling Strategy, both of which will in turn contribute to the high level objectives of the New Zealand Transport Strategy. The framework will also set the direction, context, implementation details and timeframes for specific pedestrian and cycle safety initiatives.
3. The LTSA expects to provide leadership, management, and support in the development of the strategic framework and the implementation of initiatives, and would welcome feedback from members of the Pedestrian and Cyclist advisory groups on the approach proposed in this paper.

Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety: Framework

4. A conceptual framework for Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety includes targets, details of interventions, and processes for monitoring and review.

What is "safety"? Many, including LTSA, seem to equate it with a crash or injury record, but if the roads are so dangerous that people won't cycle, then this doesn't measure the problem.

Cyclists and pedestrians are different from motor vehicle users in that they are deterred in serious numbers from exercising their choice. Ask people why they don't cycle: a common answer is "It's too dangerous".

Is it? Cyclists and pedestrians aren't the source of the danger - the motor vehicle is. Therefore, the main focus of action should be to curb the dangers motor vehicles pose to others, especially to those more vulnerable.

Traditionally, road safety strategies and actions focus on the victim - protecting the victim, or educating the victim in how they can protect themselves, or avoid the hazards altogether. Very little is directed at reducing the danger "at source".

Thus, for example, mention "cycle safety education" to many officials, and they will talk about child-centred programmes teaching cyclists how to "take care". Many "Safe Routes to School" programmes, in spite of their great potential, amount to little more than a repackaging of this old, traditional approach, with none of the education

directed at motor vehicle users, and no engineering (as in similar initiatives overseas) to reduce hazardous driving and speeds.

CAN supports the calls by many international experts for a re-focus of road safety onto "reducing danger". This is not the same as "reducing crashes". More important than reducing injuries is preventing the crashes that cause the injuries; but more important than reducing the crashes is reducing the danger that causes the crashes.

First and foremost road safety strategy needs to tackle a motoring culture, which still equate motor vehicle power and speed with status and prestige. Only after that do we slip in injury-reduction measures, like cycle helmet wearing. At present it tends to be the opposite way around.

CAN is concerned that major specialist cycle safety studies, such as Kerry Wood's "Bicycle Crashes in NZ" thesis and Roger Boulter's Cycling Strategy Foundation Project (both 2000) have received no response from LTSA other than "No comment", in spite of attempts to initiate dialogue. Meanwhile, LTSA and the Ministry of Transport have been preparing the "Road Safety Strategy to 2010" (RSS 2010). Also often ignored is that more cycling IN ITSELF results in greater safety, whatever else is done, for two reasons. Firstly, years added to a person's life through the health benefits of cycling have been conclusively shown to substantially outweigh the crash risk - one leading source estimates by a factor of 20:1. Secondly, both NZ and international studies show that the more cycling takes place, the lower the crash rate per usage. More cycling IN ITSELF brings down the crash rate!

Targets

5.5. There will be road safety targets for 2004 that will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists-, thereby helping to create an environment that will encourage people to bike or walk that are based on their use of the road network. Targets could include the percentage of urban roads with 30km/hr speed limits, % of journeys by bike or walking, % of school children receiving cycling instruction, % of schools with Safe Routes schemes in place. Targets for helmet wearing rates will explicitly not be included. In addition, road safety targets will be expressed based on exposure, i.e. crashes per km cycled or crashes per hour cycled. CAN also believes that more people taking up walking and cycling should in itself be seen a safety target.

CAN's Rationale: Helmet wearing rates were previously the only target that LTSA's performance was measured against. Evidence suggests that forcing cyclists to wear helmets has little to do with their safety, though. For example, Government was quoting research in 2001, which claims a 20% reduction in cyclist head injuries since the introduction of the mandatory helmet wearing law six years earlier (i.e. a reduction in the number of head injuries). The latest household travel survey by LTSA shows a 34% reduction in cycling hours over 9 years, which equates to a drop of around 22% over 6 years. These two reductions are about the same and if cycling dropped, we would also expect head injury to drop by a similar amount. It appears that the mandatory helmet wearing law has failed to meet its objective of reducing cyclist head injury rates (as opposed to the number of head injuries).

CAN's concern with targets for helmet wearing rates is that it preoccupies Government agencies with a questionable task, and would rather like to see these agencies spending their time on targets that have real safety benefits for cyclists as a result (e.g. % of urban roads with a 30km/h speed limit).

Interventions

6.6. Interventions to improve the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, and thereby support increased use of these modes, need to be evidence based, cost effective and appropriate for New Zealand conditions.

7.7. We will be working, in consultation with other agencies and user groups, to rigorously assess the best ‘mix’ of safety interventions for New Zealand. Options could include:

Standards and Rules

- ?? Best practice guidelines or standards for pedestrian and cyclist facilities on the network (e.g. cycle lanes and walkways).
- ?? Rules to govern road user behaviour (e.g. covering the minimum age for independent use of the network or the use of traffic control devices).
- ?? Vehicle design standards (e.g. ‘forgiving’ car fronts and front, side and rear underrun guard rails on heavy vehicles, and non (or low level) tinted windows).

CAN is in agreement with LTSA about the first (best practice guidelines) and third (vehicle design standards) bullet point.

We have not heard about the proposal of covering the minimum age for independent use of the network before, and are thus not informed about any details on this. Our initial reaction is a rejection of such an approach. We believe that it is just to have a driving age limit, because drivers are in charge of a potentially lethal object, whereas pedestrians and cyclists are not. Due to the lack of detail that is available to us, we wonder where the line is drawn between being on the road network or not. Addressing a lack of experience by children by education might be a more sensible approach than an age limit. The main burden, though, should be carried by drivers, which could be most effectively achieved by lowering urban speeds and a higher duty of care around vulnerable road users. It appears reasonable to expect adults to be able to change their behaviour for the well-being of our children, rather than depriving our young ones of their childhood experiences.

Our concerns with the ‘Standards and Rules’ section lie with the extensive list that have a significant impact on cyclists, but appear to be missing above:

- ?? Setting of Speed Limits Rule (and in particular urban speed limits). CAN’s **Rationale:** To reduce the speed differential between cyclists and motorists in urban areas is one of the key principles in countries that have significantly better safety records for their cyclists (and pedestrians) than New Zealand. We have no reason to believe that the situation would be any different in this country, and thus ask LTSA to particularly focus on this intervention. The legislation is available, and what is needed is a promotion of a wide uptake by LTSA. One particular problem with that is “Speed Limits NZ”, the software equivalent of the Setting Speed Limits Guide RTS-17. Unfortunately, it doesn’t currently handle 30/40k limits very well, making it hard to implement them under the new Speed Limits Rule.
- ?? School Speed Zones. CAN’s **Rationale:** The Christchurch City Council trial of school speed zones has finished, and the results show that it was a success. There is every reason that LTSA should actively promote this tool for wider use in the country.

- ?? Include 'Home Zones' in the Rules Process. CAN's Rationale: 'Home Zones', as they are known in Britain (equivalent to Dutch 'Woonerfs' or 'Spielzone' in Germany) are not covered in New Zealand legislation, and it is currently not proposed to incorporate these into the rules process (e.g. RUR and TCD Rule).
- ?? Review of the 'Mandatory Helmet Wearing Law'. CAN's Rationale: There is evidence that this law has failed to meet its objective of reducing cyclist head injury rates (see above). There is also evidence, both national and international, that mandatory helmet wearing legislation has resulted in a reduction of cycling, thus depriving many people from a healthy and non-polluting form of transport. Since it is now Government policy to 'promote cycling', the helmet legislation might well be considered a contradiction to that policy.
- ?? Definition of Right of Way. CAN's Rationale: The following text is mainly from our submission on the red draft of the Road User Rule.
Right of way is currently defined for the carriageway only and does not incorporate the whole road corridor. At intersections, the right of way is defined for the area achieved by the prolongation of the kerb lines. This has a direct bearing on the right of way for cycle paths (termed 'cycle tracks' in the draft document).
As cycle paths are by definition behind the kerb line, cyclists always have to give way to turning motorists at every side street. This is an important difference to European countries and North America, where right of way is defined for the road corridor. In those countries, turning motorists have to give way to cyclists (and pedestrians), unless a site is signposted otherwise.
As a consequence of the legal situation in New Zealand, a cycle path would often not be acceptable to commuter (and sport) cyclists, due to them having to give way at every side street. This in turn prevents TLAs providing cycle paths in the first place, as these tracks would potentially not offer an acceptable level of service for one of the main user groups (i.e. commuter cyclists). An example of this is Fendalton Road in Christchurch, where the main reason for not allowing for cycle paths (as asked for by the local bicycle user group) in the proposed widening was this give way situation at the side streets.
CAN acknowledges that bicycle paths do not necessarily result in safer facilities when compared to (on-street) cycle lanes. Scientific evidence for this is compiled on the following Internet site:
http://www.lesberries.co.uk/cycling/cy_pathr.htm
On the other hand, cycle lanes are often unsuitable in certain road environments. Then, only segregated cycle facilities (i.e. cycle paths) are suitable for the safe and convenient movement of cyclists. It is for this reason that the legislation in place needs to accommodate the option of providing cycle paths that are adequate to all groups of cyclists.
Cycle paths could also be justified as a means of promoting cycling. Arguably, a novice cyclist is not likely to take up cycling in a road environment that is likely to be perceived as hostile by them. Cycle paths, however, could provide an environment for these learner cyclists to gain some confidence and competence, before moving onto the road. Hence, the legislative environment should be created that allows and encourages TLAs to provide more cycle paths. With an extensive network of cycle paths in place, it would be a lot easier to put Government policy of 'promoting cycling' into effect.
Whereas the above considerations mainly relate to cycle paths running adjacent to roadways, there is also the issue of right of way of separate major

cycle paths over minor streets encountered (e.g. the railway cycleway in Christchurch, the Nelson Southern cycleway, the Christchurch Linwood Drain cycleway, Papamoa Main Drain cycleway, Tauranga and the North-western cycleway, Auckland). The Road User Rule needs to be written to enable road controlling authorities to give right of way to major cycleways over minor side streets.

?? Shared Lane Use. CAN's Rationale: We would like to highlight the issue of cyclists using left-turn lanes to go straight ahead, which is illegal under current legislation (or red draft road user rule). Where road space permits, this can be solved using bicycle lanes and advance stop boxes (at traffic signals), but provision needs to be made for situations where these are not feasible. Christchurch City Council has adopted a policy of leaving the kerbside lane unmarked if cyclists (have to) use this lane for a straight-ahead movement. Auckland City Council has similar issues regarding buses being able to go straight ahead from the left lane. A means of legally being able to sign/mark that certain classes of vehicle can use a lane for a different movement would be highly desirable.

Compliance

Road User Education

?? Educative advertising campaigns designed to inform road users about changes to road rules or make them more aware of each other's needs. CAN is surprised that 'Share the Road Campaigns', for which we have been asking LTSA for years, and which have been successfully done in Australia and the US, are not specifically listed here.

?? 'Share the Road' campaigns can and should in our opinion extend to signage where and when appropriate. See Figure 1 for an example.



Figure 1: 'Share the Road' Promoted by Signage at Tunnel Entrance¹

¹ The sign reads: "Bikes in Tunnel when Lights Flash Speed 30"

- ?? Safety education for specific user groups, including pedestrian and cycling safety education and a pedestrian and cycling 'awareness' component in heavy vehicle driver licensing and motor vehicle learner/restricted license tests or courses.
- ?? CAN would like to see a guide for Road Safety Co-ordinators providing information on alternative cycle safety promotions that are possible, rather than repetitive helmet promotions.
- ?? CAN also supports a push for mandatory pedestrian and cycle training at various levels at primary and intermediate school. Adult training courses should also be offered, targeting people wanting to take up cycling (again), migrants, and overseas students.

Enforcement

- ?? Enforcement of relevant standards and rules such as urban and open road speed limits, give way rules, ~~cycle helmet wearing rules~~, and appropriate overtaking behaviour.
- ?? In light of local and international evidence enforcement of bicycle helmet wearing rules will be discouraged.
- ?? CAN is concerned about anecdotal evidence of lighter sentences for motor vehicle versus bike crashes.
- ?? Review police training on crashes involving pedestrians or cyclists, the level of investigation, and blame assigned. To promote walking and cycling, enforcement of the protection of these modes needs to have priority, not considered below motor vehicle cases.

Performance Assessment

- ?? Cycle and pedestrian 'Best Practice' guidelines will be incorporated into safety management systems for road controlling authorities.
- ?? Mandatory consideration of cycling (and pedestrian) issues in every roading project. CAN's Rationale: We believe that every project should by default provide for pedestrian and cyclists' requirements. Sadly, that is not the case at the moment. We encourage Government agencies to manifest this in their procedures. It may not be necessary to provide for pedestrians or cyclists in every project, but we would want this to be explicitly justified and documented in every single case. This initiative would require inter-agency co-operation by at least LTSA, Transit NZ, and Transfund.
- Cyclists' Right of Access. CAN's Rationale: Perceived and actual lack of safety in the current roading environment is compromising cyclists' basic right of access to much of the roading network. As well as being an issue of equity, this has created the 'Catch 22' situation where resources to improve the roading environment are allocated on basis of existing crash data but a cycle-unfriendly environment has contributed to a drop in cycling numbers² (and hence a drop in cycle crashes and a reduced likelihood of improvements being made). The NZRSS 2010 does not address this problem - it will effectively maintain the status quo as far as cyclists are concerned. This is the most fundamental flaw of

² *Travel Survey Report 1997-1998* Land Transport Safety Authority, Wellington, 2000 shows that the number of cycle trips has declined by 26% between 1989/90 and 1997/98.

the Strategy from CAN's perspective. Infrastructure is still being put in place that effectively excludes cyclists from that the roading network, e.g. fast flowing double-lane roundabouts. This is a violation of cyclists' right of access.

Monitoring and Review

8. A monitoring/review framework will be developed to determine annual progress against safety targets set for pedestrians and cyclists. More comprehensive and up to date data collection will ensure more robust monitoring on an ongoing basis. CAN understands that LTSA from time to time commissions manual classified counts throughout the country (i.e. staff counting traffic split into the different vehicle classes). We trust that in the desire of gaining an understanding of cycle activity, that cyclists will in future be explicitly included in these counts. We understand that in the past cyclists were excluded, which is surprising, as including them in the data collection would have meant only a marginal increase in data processing.
9. The review process will be aligned with reviews of the Road Safety Strategy 2010 and the National Walking and Cycling Strategy.

Process: Development and Implementation of Framework

Research

10. Further data gathering and research will be undertaken that will build on current data analysis and develop a comprehensive picture of walking and cycling, and the specific safety issues (including perceived safety issues) that each mode faces. On-going surveys of travel patterns of New Zealanders will help provide much of this information. _____
LTSA to initiate and evaluate operational trials, i.e. take over the role from what is currently initiated on an ad hoc basis by RCAs.

Development

11. It is intended to take a collaborative and inclusive approach that will involve pedestrian and cyclist representatives in the development of the draft safety framework. CAN appreciates the announcement of LTSA being more collaborative and inclusive when developing (safety) strategy. We reiterate that we are available for consultation on issues affecting cyclists prior to the drafting of the consultation documents, rather than the issues being brought up by cyclists via the formal submissions. This would potentially result in more complete consultation documents, giving other stakeholders (e.g. RCAs, AA) a chance to comment on these aspects, too. This lack of consultation resulted in many issues that are fundamental to us being omitted from the red draft of the Road User Rule. In our opinion, more rules should have been discussed in previous consultation document, even if they ultimately remain unchanged. We hope that the above announcement will be followed through, and not just for safety strategy.
12. The framework will be finalised after consultation with members of pedestrian and cyclist advisory groups, local and central government road safety partners,

and other interested groups. CAN suggests that if LTSA really want to get a wide range of feedback, a series of regional workshops should be considered. While we believe that we provide pretty good advice "from the top", we are sure that a lot of local cyclists would also like to have an input into their perceived priorities.

Implementation

13. The framework will outline how ~~pedestrian and cyclist safety~~ interventions, which improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists, will be implemented and will set out a timeframe for implementation.— **CAN's Rationale:** It is principally risks imposed on pedestrians and cyclists by other modes which create an 'unsafe' environment for pedestrians and cyclists, so it is those other modes which should be targeted for safety interventions.

Pedestrian and Cyclist Initiatives

14. As part of the Road Safety Strategy 2010 work programme the LTSA has been preparing to undertake work on pedestrian and cyclist 'Best Practice' standards and guidelines, and a 'Safe Routes' programme. These initiatives will be integrated with the development of the safety framework.

Best Practice Standards and Guidelines

15. This initiative involves the development of the following:
 - ?? A pedestrian facilities and network planning guide. This will be a best-practice guideline for the planning and engineering of pedestrian facilities to ensure that the facilities provided for pedestrians are appropriate, safe, and consistent with current international design standards, and which encourage people to walk. CAN's Comment: We understand that this document will tie in with the Trafanz guidelines, which is fully supported.
 - ?? An update of the guidelines for installing pedestrian facilities for people with visual impairment. This would include a comprehensive extension and updating of the current guidelines for standardising pedestrian crossing facilities for visually impaired people.
 - ?? A cycle network planning guide. This will provide a best-practice guideline for the planning of cycle networks that will ensure the most appropriate type of cycle facility is selected and developed as part of an appropriately planned cycle network, which encourage people more people to cycle.
 - ?? A guide to urban speed management and traffic calming. CAN's Rationale: Apart from rural thresholds, there is no good, consistent information available on this specific to NZ.
Together with Transfund, Transit, and TLAs, assist in training seminars to disseminate these new standards.
16. The development of these documents will be overseen by stakeholders' advisory groups and will include reviews of international best practice, user surveys, preparation of and consultation on draft documents, and printing and promotion of the final documents. A programme for the development of other pedestrian and cycling associated guidelines would also be created in

consultation with stakeholders and as part of the development of the National Walking & Cycling Strategy.

17. An engineering guide for cycle facilities (The New Zealand Cycle Design Guideline) is currently being developed by a cycle standards advisory group under the project management of Transit New Zealand. CAN's Comment: We understand that the last sentence is factually incorrect and needs revising. As this guide includes the engineering detail for cycle facilities it will essentially be the companion document to the cycle network planning guide. There will need to be close liaison and cooperation in the development of both these documents. Both documents will be guided by the overall aim of promoting cycling and walking.

Safe Routes

18. This initiative involves the development and establishment of a 'Safe Routes' programme that will build on and extend the scope of the 'Safe Routes to School' programme. CAN suggests the development of a guide for school access facilities (similar to previous & current NSW guidelines).
19. The programme will be designed for areas identified as having a high risk of pedestrian and cyclist injury. It will be an intensive, data driven programme, and will rely for its implementation on the involvement of a range of central and community agencies over an extended period of time. CAN would like to reiterate that we fundamentally disagree with a 'data driven' programme. In many locations, there won't be any cyclists or recorded cycle crashes simply because the existing road environment is so hostile for cyclists. In other cases, schools are discouraging or banning pupils from cycling to school. CAN believes that if people are to no longer to be put off cycling, road safety resources should be allocated on the basis of creating a safe roading environment rather than on the basis of an established crash record. The data that the programme uses should include data about children's and parents's preferred and actual modes of travel to school, and data about perceived risk.
20. The programme will be based on national and international 'best practice' and will be developed and piloted in consultation with stakeholder groups.

Timelines

21. It should be noted that the following timelines may be subject to revision.

Pedestrian and Cyclist Strategic Framework

Deliverable	Target Date
<i>Framework Developed</i>	29 Nov 03
?? Finalisation of framework	29 Nov 03
?? Consultation with interested groups	31 Oct 03
?? Development of draft framework	31 Jul 03

Pedestrian and Cyclist Best Practice Standards and Guidelines

Deliverable	Target Date
<i>Pedestrian Planning Guide</i>	
Pedestrian Network Planning and Facilities Guide	July 2004
<i>Cycle Planning Guide</i>	
Cycle Network and Route Planning Guide	January 2004
<i>Visually Impaired Pedestrian Facilities Guidelines</i>	
Guidelines for installing pedestrian facilities for people with visual impairment	July 2003
<i>NZ Cycle Design Guide</i>	
<i>New Zealand Cycle Design Guide (CSAG)⁽¹⁾</i>	July 2003
<i>Programme</i>	
Programme for ongoing pedestrian and cycling best practice development, review and research.	July 2003

⁽¹⁾ This project is being undertaken by the Cycling Standards Advisory Group.

Safe Routes

Deliverable	Target Date
<i>Safe Routes Programme</i>	June 2003
The establishment of a Safe Routes Programme including the recruitment and appointment of a co-ordinator.	
<i>Operational Policy</i>	April 2003
An initial statement of operational policy for “safe routes” activities undertaken under the programme for 2003/2004. A firm statement of operational policy for “safe routes” activities undertaken in 2004/2005 and outyears.	
<i>Business Plan</i>	March 2003
A business plan for the on-going operation of the programme through to 2004/05 including quantity, quality and timeliness measures along with evaluation criteria.	
<i>Research Report</i>	January 2003
A research report in the form of an environmental scan of best practice in safe routes type activities nationally and internationally.	
<i>Programme Options Report</i>	January 2003
A report analysing of the various options for delivery of a Safe Routes Programme.	

Deliverable	Target Date
<i>Evaluation</i>	
An annual evaluation of progress against established programme criteria.	

Timeline for:

?? Rules / Standards Process

?? Helmet Law Review

?? Education / Enforcement

Contact Details

22. For further information on these initiatives please contact:

?? Pedestrian and Cyclist Strategic Framework: Matt Grant, DDI: (04) 494 8741, email: matt.grant@ltsa.govt.nz

?? Pedestrian and Cyclist 'Best Practice' Standards and Guidelines: Lyndon Hammond, DDI: (04) 494 8796, email: lbh@ltsa.govt.nz

?? Safe Routes: Michael Cummins, DDI: 494 8693, email: mjc@ltsa.govt.nz

23. Please direct any feedback on this document to Matt Grant.