

Appendix C Other Analysts' Fundamental Errors

- Failing to realise that **far more and better collision data are available from Stats19 records** than from camera partnerships. (App. D)
- Failing to realise that, whatever the limitations of their other data, partnerships surely must **know where and when their cameras operate**. (App. D)
- Using partnerships' **annual collision and installation data that reduce accuracy, instead of insisting on the monthly data that clearly was available**. (App. D)
- Using partnerships' **collision data for narrowly-defined sites, thereby ignoring adverse effects known to extend beyond those boundaries**. (App E)
- Providing results in the **simplistic form of single number % falls from *before* to *after* averages** that **provide no information whatever** about how effects vary over time.
- Failing to realise that **collisions that as they are inherently positioned in time relative to the installation dates of cameras installed over many years, camera effects may very easily be differentiated from all others on the basis of timing alone**. (App. G)
- Installing cameras where there had **recently been higher numbers of collisions than usual**, thus **ensuring subsequent reductions** even if nothing were done (App. F)
- **Ignoring or trivialising the *Regression to Mean* collision reductions** made inevitable by installing most cameras where numbers had recently been high. (App. F)
- When soundly-based objections made it impossible to continue to ignore Regression to Mean, **wrongly claiming to have quantified and corrected for it because they** failed to realise that it impossible to do so accurately. (App. F)
- **Believing that cameras can eliminate far more collisions than ever involve speeding** and making false and weasel-worded excuses for doing so. (App J)
- **Claiming speed reductions achieved by cameras cut collision rates despite finding no relationship between those reductions**. (RAC Foundation 2013 in Table 1)
- Failing to realise that **most of the DfT's estimates of the "value" of collisions supposedly prevented are notional figures not cash saved when accidents are avoided**. (App M)
- **Failing to realise that the DfT's very large figure for the "lost output" of road fatalities is at least cancelled out by what they no longer consume**. (App H)
- In all of the above ways, turning what **could and should have been simple and straightforward analysis, as set out here, into an over-complicated shambles** that not even they understand or agree about.
- **And as a result, sustaining one of the worst road safety policies this country has ever seen, at a cost to date not only of several billion pounds but worse, a substantial though unquantifiable number of deaths and injuries that would otherwise not have occurred - and an entire industry based on a statistical mirage! END**