

S A F E T Y F O C U S

Published by The National Campaign to Stop Red Light Running



THE NATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO STOP RED LIGHT RUNNING ADVISORY BOARD

Barbara Harsha

Executive Director
Governors Highway Safety Association

Brian O'Neill

Former President
Insurance Institute for Highway Safety

Judith Lee Stone

President and Executive Director
Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety

Harry Teter

President, American Trauma Society

Anthony Kane, Ph.D.

Director of Engineering and Technical Services
Am. Assoc. of State Highway and
Transportation Officials (AASHTO)

Ann Sweet

Founder, Focus on Safety

Bill Wilkinson

Executive Director
National Center for Bicycling and Walking

Bryan Porter, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Psychology
Old Dominion University

Ricardo Martinez, M.D.

Clinical Professor of Emergency Medicine at
Emory University
Former Administrator of the
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Allen Fields

Retired Chief Justice
Republic of the Marshall Islands

John McGinness

Sheriff
Sacramento County, CA

Terry Gainer

Sergeant-At-Arms
U.S. Senate

Earl Sweeney

Assistant Commissioner
New Hampshire Dept. of Public Safety

Peter Harkness

Editor and Publisher
Governing Magazine

John Ulczycki

National Safety Council

Andy Clarke

Executive Director
League of American Bicyclists

Volume Eight, No.2

April 2009

This issue features a look at what engineers and researchers say about yellow light timing, changes at Arizona's Red Means Stop Coalition, a snapshot of Los Angeles County's light rail photo enforcement program, and pending red light camera and speed camera legislation across the country.

.....
A look at the position of the National Campaign and observations from engineers & leading researchers

What About Yellow Light Timing?

The National Campaign to Stop Red Light Running has always maintained that appropriate yellow light timing — as determined by traffic engineers — is critical for intersection safety.

But simply tacking on extra seconds without regard to individual intersection considerations and traffic patterns — as some jurisdictions are mandating — is irresponsible.

The National Campaign addresses the issue of yellow light timing in its 2007 publication *Focus on Safety: A practical guide to automated traffic enforcement* (available for download at www.stoppedlightrunning.com). As noted in the guide, lengthening the yellow light phase at intersections where the yellow phase is inappropriately short can bring into compliance some drivers who are inadvertent offenders.

However, extending the yellow phase will not reduce the incidence of deliberate red light running. Research backs this up.

In a 2007 study of Philadelphia intersections, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety found that lengthening the duration of yellow lights reduced red light running by 36 percent. The addition of red light camera enforcement further reduced red light violations by 96 percent beyond levels achieved by the longer yellow timing. "Adequate yellow signal timing reduces red light running, but longer yellow timing alone does not eliminate the need for better enforcement, which can be provided effectively by red light cameras." (*Reducing Red Light Running Through Longer Yellow Signal Timing and Red Light Camera Enforcement: Results of a Field Investigation*, Retting, Ferguson, Farmer).

(continued on page 2)

Yellow light timing

(continued from page 1)

Recently a number of jurisdictions and legislatures across the country have considered — or mandated — arbitrarily increasing the length of yellow light timing at all intersections with red light cameras, regardless of recommendations by traffic engineers. As part of a 2007 public document concerning the red light camera program in Dallas, Texas, researchers make it clear that they do not support across-the-board increases in yellow light timing as a way to reduce red light running.

In a memo to the Dallas public works department regarding a television news report questioning yellow light timing at intersections with red light cameras (which were operating under ITE suggested guidelines), Russ Rader from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety wrote:

“The Institute agrees with Dallas traffic engineer Beth Ramirez that ITE guidelines are appropriate for urban intersections. Once ITE guidelines are satisfied, there is no evidence additional yellow timing reduces crashes. In fact, excessive yellow timing may increase rear-end crashes because of the elongated decision period in which some drivers stop and others do not. And excessive yellow timing must be taken from other phases of the traffic signal. If taken from the green phase, capacity is reduced. If taken from the all-red phase, safety may be compromised.

The yellow lights in Philadelphia were lengthened at the beginning of our study because the lights at the intersections did not meet ITE guidelines. Once lengthened, they met the guidelines and we did not recommend lengthening them further.”

James Bonneson, a researcher with the Texas Transportation Institute whose research is often misinterpreted by photo enforcement opponents, emailed Ms. Ramirez regarding the same news report:

“The research report FHWA/TX-05/0-4196-P1, ‘Red-Light-Running Handbook: An Engineer’s Guide to Reducing Red-Light-related Crashes’ published by the Texas Transportation Institute, recommends increasing the yellow time as a potential countermeasure only when it has been determined by an engineer that violations/crashes are related to drivers being incapable of stopping. This is illustrated on pages 45-46, Figure 16 and Table 11, under the countermeasures for ‘Incapable of Stop’. Increasing yellow time should not be used as a countermeasure to address violations/crashes due to: 1) inattentive drivers, 2) unnecessary delays, or 3) congestion/dense traffic.”



Yellow light timing

(continued from page 2)

Bonneson went on to say:

“Note that we do not suggest that the yellow interval should be increased on an area wide basis. If an agency were to do this (say, add 1.0 s to all yellow intervals in the city), then drivers will likely adapt and no benefit will be derived. As you know, countermeasures (e.g., increase yellow) are most effective when applied on an intersection-by-intersection, case-by-case basis and based on an engineering evaluation of the conditions present.”

Bill Stockton, associate agency director of the Texas Transportation Institute, was equally emphatic:

“Finally, the procedures recommended in our report clearly state that the decision on which countermeasures to employ — engineering or enforcement — can only be made on a case by case basis by the engineer. Once the engineer has determined that the existing yellow interval is appropriate for the relevant conditions, we did not recommend extending the yellow interval. Under those circumstances we did indicate that pursuit of enforcement countermeasures, including cameras, would be an appropriate first action.”



The National Cooperative Highway Research program (NCHRP) and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) are reviewing yellow light timing, but most engineers follow ITE’s published suggested guidelines. The yellow interval is normally three to six seconds and is based, in part, on approach speed. A longer duration is reserved for use on approaches with higher speeds.

The equation the ITE uses for recommended yellow light signal length allows time for the motorist to see the yellow signal and decide whether to stop or to enter the

intersection. It allows for motorists farther away from the signal to decelerate comfortably and motorists closer to the signal to continue through to the far side of the intersection. Factors such as the characteristics of the traffic and roadway environment are taken into account.

The purpose of the yellow phase is to warn drivers that the light is about to change from green to red. It is not meant to accommodate all ranges of driving behavior, including speeding and other forms of risk taking. Once the yellow warning appears, drivers are obligated to stop or to clear the intersection.

Yellow light timing

(continued from page 3)

Yellow and all-red phases that go beyond the timing recommended by the ITE formula make for longer red lights and shorter, or fewer, green phases. Excessively long yellows may incite more dangerous driving as drivers speed up to “beat the light.” Every second added to a yellow phase is effectively stolen from the green and puts a drag on free-flowing traffic. In point of fact, this penalizes all motorists, not just the ones failing to obey the law.

Researchers suggest that, at a minimum, an intersection review should include a determination that the sight distance of the signal is adequate and that the yellow phase is sufficient for drivers to stop or pass the stop bar before the red phase begins.

Critics of red light cameras often cite the 2004 study, *Effect of Yellow Interval Timing on Red-Light Violation Frequency at Urban Intersections*, by James Bonneson and Karl Zimmerman, Texas Transportation Institute, The Texas A&M University, 2004. That study found that lengthening the yellow interval by 0.5 to 1.5 seconds reduced red light running violations at selected intersections by 50 percent.

While violations did decline when the yellow-light interval was increased, drivers quickly began to adapt to the longer yellow. The study did not include an adequate “after” period to address this problem, and the researchers noted that enforcement countermeasures are likely to be the most effective means of curbing avoidable, intentional red light running.

The Bonneson study concluded by saying that characteristics of *each* intersection must be considered before applying countermeasures:

“An increase in the yellow interval duration is one of several viable countermeasures to red-light running. However, countermeasure selection to address a problem location should be based on a comprehensive engineering analysis of traffic conditions, control device visibility, and intersection sight distance.”

Texas and Tennessee are among the states considering a blanket increase in yellow light timing; Georgia has already done so.

In an April 14, 2009, letter to Sen. John Carona, chair of the Texas Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security, Dallas Traffic Engineer Elizabeth Ramirez voiced her “strong opposition” to Senate Bill 2295, which amends the transportation code by requiring a minimum yellow light phase of six seconds on all traffic lights at intersections monitored by red light cameras.

“Traffic engineering practice should be based on engineering research studies and experience,” Ramirez wrote. She went on to say that none of the guidance from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), “suggests that six seconds (or any uniform interval) would be appropriate regardless of speeds and other conditions.”

At the least, Ramirez said, the Texas Legislature should delay any further action on yellow light timing until the ITE completes an engineering research study to determine recommendations for yellow change interval guidelines.

New affiliation, new name

Changes Afoot at Arizona's *Red Means Stop* Coalition



The Red Means Stop Coalition, a 501c3 non-profit organization based in Arizona, has aligned its self with Driving MBA. Both organizations are dedicated to keeping people safe on the roadways through education and training, and it is that common goal that brought about the transition, said Frank Hinds, a founder of the Red Means Stop Coalition.

The name has changed to the **Red Means Stop Traffic Safety Alliance** in order to encompass a broader safety message.

Hinds said Driving MBA provides comprehensive driver training programs for novice and experienced drivers. It also plays an active role as advocates for traffic safety legislation and provides community outreach programs to educate the public on teen driving and other issues.

A new board for Red Means Stop was elected in January with Maria Wojtczak, owner of Driving MBA, as president. Frank Hinds, John and Kathy Philippi, founding members of Red Means Stop, remain as board members.

Hinds, Marquis and Philippi came together in 1998 and dedicated the coalition to their children, Jennifer Hinds, Sam Marquis and Krystal Philippi. The three families, along with a host of dedicated volunteers, have worked diligently to educate the public about the serious consequences of red light running and have initiated key legislation increasing fines and penalties for red light violators.

On March 16, 1997, 17-year-old Jennifer Hinds died as a result of her injuries suffered in an automobile crash six days earlier. On April 25, 1998, Sam Marquis and Krystal Philippi were seriously injured in an automobile crash while on their way to Krystal's high school prom.

Red Light runners caused both incidents. Jennifer and Krystal both suffered traumatic brain injuries, common in these kinds of side impact crashes. While Jennifer did not survive, Krystal, who remained in a coma for nearly 10 weeks, has battled back and is recovering. Sam also recovered.

As a founder and executive director of Red Means Stop, Hinds was instrumental in getting the state legislature to pass and twice amend "Jennifer's Law," which now charges red-light runners who maim or kill as criminals in Arizona; levies fines of up to \$1,000; requires community service, suspension of driver's license, and sometimes jail time; and can require restitution to victims' families of up to \$10,000.

Hinds recently wrote to the National Campaign about Red Means Stop's new affiliation with Driving MBA: "We are excited about the possibilities of moving the organization to the next level and welcome anyone with a passion for safety to join us."

The Red Means Stop Traffic Safety Alliance can be reached at www.redmeansstop.org or info@redmeansstop.org.

Photo Enforcement Significantly Reduces Risky Behavior

Los Angeles County's Light Rail Photo Enforcement Program Saves Lives

Begun in 1995, Los Angeles County's light rail photo enforcement program has reduced yearly fatalities at gated and enforced crossings to zero along the Metro Blue Line and has decreased citations at enforced crossings by 67 percent.

"Nothing is more important than public safety," said Capt. Eric Hamilton of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. "And the statistics clearly show that this technology has dramatically improved our law enforcement efforts in saving lives."

In addition to the overall decrease in citations, there has been a:

- 62% drop in left-turn violations since left-turn enforcement began in 2004; and
- a reduction in fatalities from an average of 2.4 per year in 1990 to zero since 2006 at gated and enforced crossings.

The Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Blue Line runs 22 miles between downtown Los Angeles and downtown Long Beach and includes 20 high-traffic crossings that are monitored by red light cameras. Initially cameras were used at gated crossings to discourage motorists from driving around the gates. It was expanded in 2004 to six non-gated crossings at signalized intersections.

The photo enforcement cameras capture the license plates of motorists who ignore lights and crossing arms, putting themselves and rail passengers at risk. The cameras monitor both left turn and straight through movements. Drivers are cited for running red left-turn arrows whether or not a train is approaching.

Photo evidence is reviewed — and citations issued — by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. When the program began in 1995, citations averaged more than 1,200 per month. Now the same intersections yield about 400 citations per month.

As noted in the 2009 *"Light Rail Vehicle Collisions with Vehicles at Signalized Intersections,"* published by the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), the placement of light rail transit in "the median, adjacent to an urban street, or within an urban street can lead to complex grade crossings incorporated into signalized highway intersections." Collisions are almost always a result of motorists making an illegal turn in front of an approaching train and/or running a red signal indication.

In noting the importance of public education and enforcement in reducing collisions between light rail and motor vehicles, the TCRP report points out that "Police and photo enforcement have been effective approaches to mitigating risky behaviors and collisions in Los Angeles."

News from across the U.S.

Alabama: Red-light cameras an important tool that saves lives


In an April 13, 2009, column in the *Opelika-Auburn (Alabama) News*, Jennifer Foster writes that she had never given much thought to red light running until 2003 when she was working for the Florida state House of Representatives and Mark Wandall of Bradenton was killed by a red light runner. The recent death of Los Angeles Angels pitcher Nick Adenhardt sparked her most recent column:

“Some legal analysts argue that the evidence collected by red-light cameras cannot be used to enforce criminal penalties. They cite the Sixth Amendment, which guarantees the accused the right “to be confronted with the witnesses against him.”

I don’t buy it. Red-light cameras function as an extension of law enforcement, as sworn officers would if we had the human and financial resources to put a cop on every corner. They are electronic witnesses — witnesses whose testimony can’t be twisted or swayed.

And evidence from unmanned surveillance cameras is readily used in criminal proceedings, sometimes as the only supplement to otherwise completely circumstantial cases. No apparent Sixth Amendment violations there.”

The entire column can be found at http://www.oanow.com/oan/news/opinion/jennifer_foster/article/jennifer_foster_red-light_cameras_an_important_tool_that_saves_lives/67961/.



Focus on Safety: A practical guide to automated traffic enforcement is a comprehensive resource to help state legislators and local policymakers, law enforcement officers, highway safety advocates and community groups design, operate, and support effective photo enforcement programs.

The guide is available from the Campaign for \$9 a copy, or it can be downloaded in PDF format from the Campaign website at www.stopredlightrunning.com.

ORDER YOUR FREE CAMPAIGN BUMPER STICKERS

I STOP ON RED

www.stopredlightrunning.com

To order, send your name, address and how many bumper stickers you want via email to: info@stopredlightrunning.com or call us at 202-828-9100. It’s free for 25 and under. Larger orders will be charged only for mailing expenses.

Legislative Update — April 2009

If there is legislation pending in your state that is not listed here, please contact the Campaign at (202)828-9100 or info@stopredlightrunning.com.

RED LIGHT RUNNING SAFETY CAMERAS

ALABAMA: HB 125 (Bentley, Gipson), cited as the “Red Light Safety Act,” allows municipalities to pass ordinances to install red light camera programs. The bill outlines how red light cameras can be used, sets up a system to contest the civil fine and, if the owner of the vehicle wasn’t the driver, establishes how to transfer responsibility to a person who was driving. Read a second time on 2.19.09 and referred to public safety committee.

FLORIDA:

HB 439 (Reagan, Hooper, Nelson) creates the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Program to be administered by the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV); provides for counties and municipalities to enforce traffic control signals using red light cameras; requires annual report from counties and municipalities to DHSMV on use of red light cameras; provides for allocation of portion of fine proceeds to trauma centers and public hospitals; requires summary report from DHSMV to Governor & Legislature. Filed 1.19.09. First Read 4.02.09 and sent to economic development & community affairs policy council. Sent to finance and tax council 4.14.09.

SB 2004 (Altman) preempts to the state the use of cameras to enforce traffic laws. Creates the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Program to be administered by the Department of Transportation; requires a county or municipality to enact an ordinance in order to use a traffic infraction detector to identify a motor vehicle that fails to stop at a traffic control signal steady red light. Provides for placement and installation of detectors on certain roads, etc. Filed 2.23.09; on criminal justice committee agenda 4.15.09.

SB 2688 (Peaden) Establishes a traffic control program using unmanned cameras to record vehicles that violate laws relating to traffic control signal devices. Provides program requirements. Introduced 3.19.09.

GEORGIA: HR 774 (Loudermilk, Burkhalter) creates the House Study Committee on Compliance by Local Governments with the Red Light Camera Law to examine why some local governments aren’t in compliance with a law, effective Jan. 1, 2009, requiring municipalities with red light camera programs to add one second to the yellow light phase at every intersection monitored by a camera. Resolution was read a second time 3.30.09.

HAWAII:

HB 145 (Souki, Awana, Chong et al.) establishes red light camera programs and authorizes counties to implement them. Photos and citations would be mailed to the registered owners of the photographed vehicles. Introduced 1.22.09, sent to the transportation committee, where it passed with amendments, referred to judiciary committee 2.06.09, transmitted to Senate 3.10.09, where it passed first reading 3.12.09.

SB 216 (Espero, Gabbard) Establishes a three-year pilot red light camera program. Introduced 1.23.09 and on 1.28.09 referred to committees on transportation, international and intergovernmental affairs; judiciary and government operations; and ways and means.

ILLINOIS:

SB0148 (Harmon, Althoff) provides that the Illinois Commerce Commission in cooperation with a local law enforcement agency, may establish in any county or municipality a system for automated enforcement of railroad crossing violations. Establishes requirements for the system and provides that local authorities must initiate the process by enacting a local ordinance requesting the creation of such a system. Introduced 1.30.09, assigned to transportation committee where it was amended 2.10.09; passed the Senate 4.02.09 and referred to House rules committee. Referred to railroad industry committee 4.14.09.

(continued on page 9)

Legislative Update — Red Light Running Safety Cameras *(continued from page 8)*

ILLINOIS (cont.): HB 442 (Jefferson) amends the Illinois Vehicle Code, providing that, in addition to the eight previously designated counties, the counties of DeKalb, Macon, McLean and Winnebago, and the municipalities within those counties, may establish red light camera programs, effective immediately. Introduced 2.04.09, referred to rules committee, where it was amended and sent to the Senate 3.19.09.

INDIANA:

HB 1586 (VanDenburgh, Candelaria, Reardon, Friend, Austin) allows municipalities to establish red light camera programs with a penalty not greater than \$100. After allowing for administration costs of the photo enforcement program, 50% of the net proceeds must be deposited in the local road and street fund, 25% deposited in the county or local law enforcement continuing education fund; and 25% deposited in the local police equipment fund. Introduced 1.22.09; passed the roads and transportation committee 9-1 and referred to ways and means committee 2.02.09.

SB 389 (Rogers, Mishler, Wyss), as introduced 1.08.09, was to establish a 10-city pilot red light camera program with local authorities first getting permission from the state Department of Transportation (DOT). The bill has been amended to make it identical to HB 1586. and referred to homeland security and transportation & veterans affairs committee, where it passed out of committee 2.10.09 by a 7-3 vote. Passed to the House 2.17.09 and referred to the committee on interstate and international cooperation 2.25.09.

MISSOURI:

HB 241 (Yates) referred to as the Missouri Universal Red Light Enforcement Act, places severe restrictions on any red light camera program and prohibits speed camera programs. Combined fine and court costs cannot exceed \$25 and any fines collected must go to the local school district where the infraction occurred. Any issued notice of violation must be mailed no later than three business days after the violation was recorded. Introduced 1.12.09 and referred to public safety committee 1.22.09. Public hearing completed 3.03.09; as of 4.16.09 bill not on a calendar.

SB 211 (Lembke) prohibits red light camera programs anywhere in the state. Introduced 1.20.09, referred to transportation committee 1.27.09, hearing held 2.18.09, failed to pass the transportation committee 2.25.09.

SB 58 (Stoufer) modifies several provisions of law relating to transportation, including a requirement that red light camera citations clearly identify the driver of the vehicle. Passed by Senate 3.26.09; referred 4.02.09 to House transportation committee, which held a hearing 4.07.09.

MISSISSIPPI: HB 1568 (Blackmon, DuVall) bans photo enforcement by prohibiting the governing authority of any county or municipality from enacting or enforcing ordinances authorizing the use of automated recording equipment or systems to enforce compliance with or impose or collect any fine, fee or penalty for violation of any traffic laws, rules or regulations on any public street, road or highway within the state. Passed by the House and the Senate and approved by the Governor 3.20.09. *Also listed under speed safety cameras.*

MONTANA: HB 531 (Nooney) prohibits red light cameras; providing exceptions; Introduced 2.10.09, passed the House and sent to Senate 2.25.09 where it was referred to highways and transportation committee; returned to House with amendments allowing the continuation of existing red light programs and allowing photo enforcement at railroad grade crossings. The House did not agree to the amendments, and conference committees were appointed 4.15.09 and 4.16.09.

NEBRASKA: LB 496 (Fulton) authorizes local governments to operate red light camera programs. Violators would be notified within 15 days of violation; \$100 maximum citation fee. Introduced 1.20.09, referred to judiciary committee, hearing was scheduled for 3.11.09.

(continued on page 10)

Legislative Update — Red Light Running Safety Cameras *(continued from page 9)*

NEW HAMPSHIRE: SB 113 (Roberge, Hawkins, Graham) authorizes red light camera programs with fines not to exceed \$100 plus penalty assessment. Introduced 1.08.09 and referred to the judiciary committee, where it died by a 4-1 vote 4.08.09.

NEW MEXICO: SB 519 (Sanchez) caps maximum fines at \$100 maximum for a red light camera citation; requires 50 percent of collected fines be retained by the municipality for municipal traffic safety programs and to offset the municipality's reasonable costs directly related to administering a program; the other 50 percent of the fees to be returned to the state for the Court Automation Fund, the Traffic Safety and Education and Enforcement Fund and the Judicial Education Fund. Requires appeals to be heard by a hearing officer appointed by the presiding judge of the district court. Signed by the governor 4.06.09.

NEW YORK: The New York Legislature passed a package of bills that would expand the current program in New York City (**A 7328**, Silver; **S 3750**, Dilan) and authorize local laws for the installation of up to 50 cameras in Rochester (**A 7332**, Gantt; **S 3746**, Thompson), Buffalo (**A 7331**, Hoyt; **S 3747**, Thompson), Yonkers (**A 7330**, Spano; **S 3745**, Stewart-Cousins), Nassau County (**A 7329**, Lavine; **S 374**, Johnson) and Suffolk County (**A 7333**, Eddington; **S 3748**, Foley). Under the package, municipalities would be authorized to institute a five-year trial program to enforce the red light law with cameras. Additionally, each bill requires participating municipalities to issue an annual report to the governor and legislative leaders detailing the effectiveness of this technology. The Assembly passed the package of bills 4.06.09, and the Senate passed similar legislation 4.07.09. The measures have been forwarded to Gov. David A. Paterson.

OREGON: HB 2701 (Barton) prohibits cities that use photo red light cameras from providing compensation to manufacturers and vendors of photo red light cameras based on number of citations issued or percentage of moneys collected from payment of fines. Prohibits cities that use photo red light cameras and photo radar from collecting more than five percent of annual budget from citations issued using photo red light cameras and photo radar. First read 2.17.09 and referred to transportation committee 2.24.09.

TENNESSEE: HB541(Litz) and **SB 768** (Southerland) requires traffic signals in intersections using red light cameras to use a minimum exposure time of five seconds for yellow light while maintaining three second minimum yellow light for other traffic signals. HB541 was assigned to transportation committee's public safety subcommittee 2.20.09 and deferred 3.31.09 to last calendar. SB 768 was placed on transportation committee calendar for 3.31.09 and since deferred to 4.21.09.

TEXAS:

HB 2639 (Isett) prohibits local authorities from using red light and speed cameras. First read 3.16.09; referred to urban affairs committee, where it was left pending 4.02.09.

HB 3275 (Ortiz) requires local authorities obtain permission from the Texas transportation department before installing red light cameras on a state highway. The transportation department must hold a public hearing before granting approval for any red light camera installation. Read 3.18.09 and referred to transportation committee.

SB 374 (Carona) forbids municipalities and counties from using speed cameras on any street or highway within their jurisdiction. Passed the Senate 3.19.09 and referred to House public safety committee 3.31.09.

(continued on page 11)

Legislative Update — Red Light Running Safety Cameras *(continued from page 10)*

TEXAS (cont.): SB 2295 (Lucio) and identical companion **HB 4643** (Lucio III), amends the transportation code by requiring a minimum yellow light phase of six seconds on all traffic lights at intersections monitored by red light cameras, effective 9.01.09. Six seconds is the maximum allowable yellow change interval duration allowed under the Texas Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. HB 4643 was left pending in transportation committee 4.14.09. SB 2295 first read 3.31.09, referred to transportation and homeland security committee, where a posting rule was suspended and the bill was to be discussed 4.15.09.

SPEEDING SAFETY CAMERAS

ARIZONA: The Arizona legislature is swamped with pending bills aimed at ending or curtailing speed camera programs, including:

HB 2106 (Crump, Ableser, Campbell, et al.), as introduced 1.20.09, would immediately prohibit photo enforcement systems in the state. It has been rewritten so the state's program deploying speed cameras on highways statewide wouldn't be eliminated until July 2010. It also includes numerous provisions imposing new requirements and restrictions on signs, enforcement practices and other aspects of the program before it expires. Under the bill photo enforced citations can only be issued to vehicles traveling at least 11 mph faster than the posted speed limit and the local authority with jurisdiction over a photo enforcement system on a state highway will be held fully responsible for the ownership, operation and maintenance of that portion of the state highway. Beginning September 30, 2010, no photo enforcement system may be used to identify speed violators on any state highway in Arizona. Approved by appropriations committee 3.26.09; approved by rules committee 3.30.09.

HB 2131 (Weiers, Gowan, Stevens) requires photo enforcement warning signs to having flashing strobe lights attached. Introduced 1.20.09 and referred to the rules committee and the transportation and infrastructure committee.

HB 2168 (Biggs) requires the state to conduct a study to determine the need for photo radar before any contracts can be entered into or renewed. In addition to studying alternatives to photo enforcement and numerous other requirements, the study would determine if "a photo enforcement system that is capable of safely covering at least five lanes of traffic in one direction and that meets or exceeds federal roadside crash safety standards is available for state procurement." Introduced 1.20.09 and referred to the rules committee, where it was approved 3.30.09, and the transportation and infrastructure committee, where it was approved 3.05.09.

HB 2342 (Mason) restricts photo enforcement to local roads only and allows higher speed limits on controlled access highways. Introduced 1.26.09 and referred to the rules committee where it passed a second reading 1.27.09.

HB 2494 (Weiers) states that a person must be driving at least 11 miles-per-hour over the speed limit to be issued a citation by a speed camera system. Introduced 2.5.09 and assigned to the rules committee where it passed a second reading 2.09.09.

SB 1291 (Nelson), introduced 1.29.09, **deletes** the following section of the statutes relating to photo enforcement: "Notwithstanding any other law, if a person is found responsible for a civil traffic violation or a notice of violation pursuant to a citation issued pursuant to this section, the department of transportation shall not consider the violation for the purpose of determining whether the person's driver license should be suspended or revoked. A court shall not transmit abstracts of records of these violations to the department of transportation."

SCR 1033 (Gould) requires a state referendum on a proposal to prohibit speed cameras on state highways. Introduced 2.02.09.

(continued on page 12)

Legislative Update — Speeding Safety Cameras *(continued from page 11)*

ARIZONA *(cont.):*

SCR 1039 (Gould) states that, if approved by a voter referendum and proclamation by the governor, a driver would only be cited by a photo enforcement speed program if the vehicle was traveling at least 11 mph faster than 85 percent of the vehicles on the highway. Introduced 2.02.09.

SB 1347 (Gould) requires extra signage for speed camera programs. Current law requires two signs with one placed at least 300 in advance of the photo enforcement system. This bill requires an additional sign to be located 1,320 feet before a photo enforcement system. All signs must include the posted speed limit and a notice that drivers will not be issued citations unless they are driving at least 11 mph over the speed limit. A standard size speed limit sign must be placed within six feet of each sign. Introduced 2.02.09.

SB 1355 (Gould) would prohibit speed camera programs on state highways. Introduced 2.02.09.

SB 1364 (Gould) identical to SCR 1039 but would not require a voter referendum and proclamation by the governor. Introduced 2.02.09.

SB 1391 (Huppenthal) requires the state or local authority to conduct an engineering review to determine a safe and reasonable speed limit for that portion of the street or highway; the minimum speed limit that results in a citation must be six mph more than the speed of 85 percent of vehicles on that street traveling during nonpeak daylight hours under good weather conditions. Any photo taken must be altered so that the interior of the vehicle is darkened and not visible and only the driver is visible. Introduced 2.03.09.

SB 1460 (Gorman), titled “2009 Photo Enforcement Accused Bill of Rights,” is a wide-ranging bill including requirements for extra signage, limitations on camera locations and amount of revenue jurisdictions can receive from photo enforcement, wording of citations, and signed statements from law enforcement officers verifying the required signs were in place at the time of the violation. Introduced 2.03.09.

COLORADO: SB 143 (Bacon) expands the types of locations speed cameras can be used to include school zones, work zones, streets that border municipal parks, and roadways with speed limits of less than 50 mph that are considered a speed or accident prone area; revenue must be used for traffic regulation or traffic safety. Passed by the Senate but killed by voice vote in the House 4.02.09.

HAWAII: HB 388 (Souki, Awana, et al.) establishes photo enforcement speed programs and authorizes counties to administer them. Introduced 1.26.09 and referred to transportation, finance and judiciary committees. Heard and deferred by the transportation committee 2.02.09.

MARYLAND:

SB 277 (Senate President, by request of administration) and **HB 313** (House Speaker, by request of administration), authorizes speed camera programs statewide in work zones and school zones; permits fines of \$40 for people caught on camera driving at least 12 miles above the speed limit. Passed both the House and the Senate and forwarded to the governor.

HB 396 (Anderson – by request of Baltimore City administration – McIntosh, Kirk et al.) authorizes speed camera programs on specified highways in Baltimore City. Introduced 2.10.09 and assigned to environmental matters; passed 3.28.09 and referred to the Senate rules committee 3.30.09.

OHIO: HB 2 (Ujvagi), the transportation budget for fiscal years 2010-2011, had included, when introduced, a pilot speed camera program for construction zones. That provision was removed from the final bill, which was passed by the House and Senate and signed by the governor 4.1.09.

TEXAS: SB 374 (Carona) forbids counties & municipalities from operating speed camera programs. Filed 12.16.08. It was referred to the transportation & homeland security committee 2.17.09 and passed by Senate 3.19.09. Sent to House, where it was referred to the public safety committee 3.31.09.