

I would ask that you please send your responses via email to secretariat of the APPG: contact@csrrr.org. Please be sure to include your name and contact details, as well as a brief description of the organisation you represent and your role within that organisation. Please do not feel you have to answer every question. Please answer in as much or as little detail as you feel able to.

Reflecting on the views of those you represent:

Organisation Name; ERRI
Contact; Chairman – Derek Firminger,
(Mobile) 07900-134500
(Email) derekfirminger@aol.com

ERRI European Rescue & Recovery Initiative is a consultative body whose aim is to represent the interests of the Rescue & Recovery Industry. It currently has a stakeholder list of over 40 members. Its aims are achieved through a combination of Stakeholder meetings and working groups. ERRI requires the support of all the main industry stakeholders and welcomes the input of the few from each sector that are not members. A big part of the groups representation is safety related and affects industry wide operational staff working directly at the roadside.

1. *Have casualties, 'near misses' and wider safety concerns affected the businesses and groups you represent? If so, how?*
 - a. Casualties, near misses as you refer, better described as 'near hits' sometimes resulting in death. Over a 3-month period last year our industry suffered the loss of 3 of its recovery technicians, killed whilst at work and not returning home that evening. If the same numbers were reported in any other industry, then action would have been taken immediately and safety measures implemented.
 - b. Staff retention, with staff understanding the everyday safety risk results in it being harder to employ new staff and retain existing staff.
 - c. Business that have had drivers killed or injured while at work have endured devastating financial effects and loss, often with drivers refusing to attend roadside incidents on dual carriageways and motorways.
2. *What is the scale of safety incidents and near misses within the industry?*
 - a. 1997-98 the recovery industry had 6 recovery technicians killed in a 12-month period whilst at work, as a result the industry formed a roadside safety group called SURVIVE (Safe Use of Roadside Verges In Vehicular Emergencies) this group implemented a **voluntary** operational safety standard PAS 43 (Public Available Standard 43).
 - b. Although PAS 43 has increased compliance and aided safety within the industry evidenced with fatality numbers reduced, we still have not addressed all the issues.
 - c. Near miss reporting is encouraged, but no official statistics exist.

- d. To aid accurate near miss reporting a clear industry definition is required.
 - e. In a survey conducted in 2013 by Professional Recovery it was reported there to be in excess of 2,500 recovery businesses within the UK, this does not include the garages with a recovery truck parked to use when they see fit, yet there are less than 600 PAS 43 certificates issued each year!
3. *What safety measures, if any, would you recommend to address safety concerns and why?*
- a. Education – there is a distinct lack of education towards the general public. The recovery industry is aware of the safety issues it faces daily and still struggles to educate its staff. There should be an education and awareness campaign on the radio and TV in the safe use of smart motorways and the ‘Slowdown or Move Over’ campaign.
 - b. Enforcement – there should be rigorous enforcement against offenders of the Red ‘X’.
 - c. Changes to the Highway Code – work closer with the DfT and include within the Highway Code best practice actions including the ‘Slowdown or Move Over Campaign’.
 - d. Red Lights – apply for legislative changes to allow registered recovery operators to use of Red warning Lights. Despite our efforts , the Recovery Industry is unlicensed and therefore has no formal structure to control the correct use of a Red Warning Beacon an issue that requires consideration.
4. *What effect, if any, has the Government’s roll-out of All Lane Running ‘Smart’ motorways had on the safety on the groups you represent?*
- a. Negative effect;
 - i. The obvious hazard of stopping within a live lane.
 - ii. Poorly located refuse areas, ‘brow of a hill’, ‘blind side’, ‘around the corner’ extremely dangerous when exiting a refuse area.
 - iii. Refuse areas too small, insufficient room to locate the disabled articulated truck and heavy recovery vehicle.
 - iv. Refuse areas too far apart
 - v. Distinct lack of HE staff & vehicles (not patrolling or visual) to support the growing network
 - b. Positive effect;
 - i. Safer working area ‘within the refuse area’ for recovery staff when loading being wider and further away from the live lane.
5. *What measures could be taken to address any safety concerns with All Lane Running motorways?*
- a. No recovery operator should be expected to work on a dual carriageway, motorway all lane running or otherwise without suitable protection, Impact

Protection or at the very least HE Traffic Officer/ lane closure additional protection.

- b. When there is an incident 'breakdown' reported apply lane closure signals and reduce speed to 50mph max.
- c. Implement Slowdown or Move Over within Highway Code without delay.
- d. Better use of signs & signals and when an incident is clear ensure signals are kept updated with the correct information.
- e. Better two-way communication between the control rooms of the recovery operator and the HE.