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London Principal Road Network

- **33** Separate local government districts
- **1,571km** of borough principal roads
- **585km** of additional TfL network (main through routes / Red Routes)
- **2,156km** in total addressed by the skid resistance policy
London Skid Policy

- 33 boroughs operate under varying political, financial, technical environments
- Therefore, any London-wide policy/guidance could not be prescriptive
- Policy needed to be sufficiently detailed to allow boroughs to apply own principles
- 2011 conference - “Implementing a skidding policy in London” reported
Principles of Policy

- Skid resistance surveyed annually using SCRIM®
- Principle roads sectioned into Site Categories (risk based)
- Investigatory Levels (evidence based, using Accident Rate vs SCRIM studies)
- Need to balance
  Risk (extent of deficiency) against
  Cost (affordability)
Policy Implementation

- Planning and undertaking investigations are key elements in policy implementation.

- Typically, boroughs have:
  - Lack of resources
  - Lack of skills to undertake investigations

- Need to prioritise investigations

- Need to prioritise treatments
Purpose of Training Guide

- To develop competency to undertake investigations, including prioritisation and record keeping
- To improve the level of expertise in boroughs, including knowledge of skid resistance
- To provide guidance on how to interpret accident records to check if linked to skid resistance
Two Methods Developed for Site Prioritising

- **Priority Category**
  - Priority 1 to 5
  - Level of SCRIM Deficiency
  - 3-year wet accidents

- **Priority Score**
  - Weighted score between 0 and 100
  - Level of SCRIM Deficiency
  - 3-year wet accidents
  - 3-year dry accidents
  - Accident severity
  - Traffic flow

- Both methods have own merits
- Choice up to authority
- Need to reflect authority’s AM Plan and Strategy
Example Prioritised Site Map
Preliminary Investigation (Desktop)

- It’s a desktop assessment
- Sites assessed individually
- Takes each site through a number of checks
- Each site - decision to be clearly documented
- Accidents at high priority sites checked for link to skid resistance
- Outcome – validated list of sites for a Secondary Field Investigation
Preliminary Investigation – Flow Chart Guides

Start
Site meets priority criteria for investigation and not been treated since the SCRM survey and not been programmed for treatment

Is the Site Category correct?
Yes
No

Review other data, maps, and network video

Revise Site Category with correct IL, and make necessary changes in the PMS database

Check SCRM on adjacent sites and confirm SCRM Deficiency of site

Could SCRM values be temporarily low?
Yes
No

No further action

Include on Site Inspection List

Does the site still have the same Priority/Score?

Check the validity of accidents on this site used in Developing the Primary Site

Is there evidence of contamination on site that may have affected SCRM values?

Address cause of contamination through routine maintenance

Still unsure?

Was at least one vehicle, (incl. cyclist) involved moving in the forward direction, and did it stop and come to a stop or collide with another object (another vehicle, pedestrian, kerb, roadside feature, etc.)

Did the accident happen because of failure to stop, slow down, or safely manoeuvre, regardless of the driver(s)/rider(s) reaction time or their behaviour?

Was the accident happen in wet/damp/dry/dipped conditions?

Did the accident happen in the carriageway?

Did the accident happen during the period considered in this exercise (usually 3 years)?

Did the accident happen in the carriageway?

Was the accident happen because of failure to stop, slow down, or safely manoeuvre, regardless of the driver(s)/rider(s) reaction time or their behaviour?

Was at least one vehicle, (incl. cyclist) involved moving in the forward direction, and did it stop and come to a stop or collide with another object (another vehicle, pedestrian, kerb, roadside feature, etc.)

Consider it a Valid Accident

Outcome
Validated list of sites for a Secondary Field Investigation
Secondary Investigation (Field)

- Guidance on planning the Secondary Investigation
- Field forms
- Information to take TO site
- Information to collect FROM site
- Making a recommendation
- Site Category change form
Post Secondary Investigation

- Treatment selection
- Budget considerations
- Treatment prioritisation
- Temporary warning signs
- Updating the databases
Key Messages

- A Site with high priority in the Prioritised Site Listing
  - does not mean it needs a treatment, a prompt to investigate
  - means a desktop investigation is necessary
  - may or may not require a secondary field investigation

- During investigations – important to validate accidents and reassess sites to ensure skidding issue really exists

- Very important to record network layout changes and to keep the digital network up-to-date

- Very difficult to investigate everything, important to lock-in to the policy

- One objective of a ‘London-wide’ policy is to ensure consistency

- The training guide and hands-on training provided to boroughs have helped achieve this objective
Acknowledgements

Work undertaken while I was employed at W.D.M. Limited

Assistance from individual London boroughs

LoTAG (London Technical Advisors Group)

LoTAMB (LoTAG’s Asset Management Board)
Thank you

Guidance for undertaking skid resistance site investigations in London

Dr Anuradha Premathilaka

anuradha.premathilaka@ch2m.com