

TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD PAGE

1. Report No. FHWA/LA.13/510		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Automated Enforcement and Highway Safety Final Report		5. Report Date November 2013			
		6. Performing Organization Code LTRC Project Number: 10-3SS State Project Number: 30000203			
7. Author(s) Susan Herbel, Cambridge Systematics Richard Retting, Sam Schwartz Engineering Elizabeth Wemple, P.E., Cambridge Systematics		8. Performing Organization Report No. 8527-001			
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Cambridge Systematics 555 12 th Street, Suite 1600 Oakland, CA 94607		10. Work Unit No.			
		11. Contract or Grant No.			
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development P.O. Box 94245 Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9245		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Technical Report May 2011- May 2013			
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code			
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstract The objectives of the Automated Enforcement and Highway Safety Research study were to conduct a literature review of national research related to the effectiveness of Red Light Camera (RLC) programs in changing crash frequency, crash severity, crash costs, and violations; to identify red light running program noteworthy practices, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and barriers; establish a record of current RLC applications in Louisiana communities and the observed safety impact of the programs; conduct a survey to understand public perception of RLC programs in Louisiana; review the existing statewide RLC policy, compare it to noteworthy practices, and identify potential improvements; and develop a guidebook for implementing red light camera programs. The research led to recommendations to modify state policy to improve public support for RLC. Potential modifications include enhanced public education programs, additional signage and clarification on the determination of right turn on red violations at signalized intersections with red light cameras. The research also includes recommendations to maximize local agency involvement in site selection.					
17. Key Words Red Light Camera, traffic engineering, automated enforcement, crash reduction, Louisiana		18. Distribution Statement Unrestricted. This document is available through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 21161.			
19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (of this page)	21. No. of Pages		22. Price	

Project Review Committee

LTRC appreciates the dedication of the following Project Review Committee Members in guiding this research study to fruition.

LTRC Administrator/Manager

Kirk Zeringue, P.E.

Members

Peter Allain, P.E., PTOE, Louisiana Department of Transportation and
Development

Robert Canfield, P.E., Consultant

Dan Magri, P.E., Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

Tony Tramel, P.E., PTOE, Lafayette Consolidated Government

Marie Walsh, Ph.D., LTAP/LTRC

Directorate Implementation Sponsor

Richard Savoie, P.E.

DOTD Chief Engineer

LTRC Automated Enforcement and Highway Safety

by

Susan Herbel, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Richard Retting, Sam Schwartz Engineering
Elizabeth Wemple, P.E., Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
4800 Hampden Lane, Suite 800
Bethesda, MD 20814

LTRC Project No. 10-3SS
State Project No. 30000203

conducted for
Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
Louisiana Transportation Research Center

The contents of this report reflect the views of the author/principal investigator who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development or the Louisiana Transportation Research Center. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

November 2013

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the Automated Enforcement and Highway Safety Research study were to conduct a literature review of national research related to the effectiveness of Red Light Camera (RLC) programs in changing crash frequency, crash severity, crash costs, and violations; identify red light running program noteworthy practices, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and barriers; establish a record of current RLC applications in Louisiana communities and the observed safety impact of the programs; conduct a survey to understand public perception of RLC programs in Louisiana; review the existing statewide RLC policy, compare it to noteworthy practices, identify potential improvements; and develop a guidebook for implementing red light camera programs. The research led to recommendations to modify state policy to improve public support for red light cameras. Potential modifications include enhanced public education programs, additional signage, and clarification on right-turn-on-red violations at signalized intersections with red light cameras. The research also includes recommendations to maximize local agency involvement in site selection.

IMPLEMENTATION STATEMENT

This study was conducted to summarize currently understood research about the effectiveness of red light cameras at signalized intersections and to understand public perceptions about red light cameras at signalized intersections. The research led to recommendations to modify state policy to improve public support for red light cameras and development of a public education guidebook for communities considering implementing red light cameras.

The potential outcomes from implementing the results of this research project and distributing the project guidebook include improved public support for red light cameras in Louisiana, implementation of red light cameras in more communities in Louisiana, and reduced frequency and severity of angle crashes at signalized intersections in Louisiana.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
IMPLEMENTATION STATEMENT.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
OBJECTIVES.....	3
SCOPE.....	5
METHODOLOGY.....	7
Literature and Program Review.....	7
Survey Implementation and Evaluation.....	7
Tier 1 Survey.....	7
Tier 2 Survey Implementation Methodology.....	8
Survey Error Rate.....	8
Analysis of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Surveys.....	9
Alternative Development and Evaluation.....	9
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	11
Literature Review.....	11
Crash Type and Severity Associated with RLC Programs.....	11
Red Light Running Violations.....	12
Crash Costs.....	13
Effectiveness in Louisiana.....	13
Public Opinion Surveys.....	14
Red Light Camera Program Implementation.....	14
RLC Implementation in Louisiana.....	16
Data Collection and Analysis.....	16
Lafayette Parish Implementation.....	18
Results of Tier 1 Public Opinion Intercept Survey.....	22
Presence of RLC Program.....	22
Opinion on Whether RLR is a Problem.....	23
Opinion on the Use of RLCs.....	24
Reasons to Favor RLCs.....	24
Reasons to Oppose RLCs.....	25
Strategies to Change Opinion on RLCs.....	27
Opinion of Whether RLR is a Problem Compared to Opinion on	

RLC Program.....	288
Regions with RLC Programs versus Regions Without.....	28
Results of Tier 2 – Telephone Survey.....	30
Telephone Survey Results.....	30
Alternative Development and Evaluation.....	31
Development of Alternative Policies and Strategies	31
Public Information and Outreach Noteworthy Practices	32
Identifying Sites for RLCs Noteworthy Practices	35
Equipment Noteworthy Practices	39
Installation Procedures Noteworthy Practices	40
Enforcement Procedures Noteworthy Practices.....	41
Right-Turn-on-Red	42
Operations and Maintenance Noteworthy Practices	42
Effectiveness Evaluation Noteworthy Practices	44
Evaluation of Policies Recommendations	48
Comparison of Traditional Enforcement to Red Light Cameras	51
CONCLUSIONS.....	55
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	57
ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS	59
REFERENCES	61
APPENDIX A Tier 1 Survey	65
APPENDIX B Tier 2 Survey	67
APPENDIX C Current State Automated Enforcement Policy	71
APPENDIX D Data Assumptions and References used in Comparison of Traditional Enforcement versus Red Light Cameras.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Summary of the number of survey respondents and estimated error rates	9
Table 2 Red light camera programs data summary	13
Table 3 Tiered system of payment to Redflex	20
Table 4 Summary of traffic crashes at SafeLight locations within 100 ft	21
Table 5 Public opinion of RLCs before installation	21
Table 6 Public opinion of RLCs after installation	22
Table 7 Potential strategies to address RLR crashes	38
Table 8 Alternatives for RLC system acquisition, installation, operation, and maintenance ..	43
Table 9 Payment options for contractor-owned and -operated RLC systems	44
Table 10 Evaluation of recommended policy changes	50
Table 11 Comparison of traditional enforcement versus RLCs.....	52

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Percentage of respondents with a RLC Program by where they live/work.....	22
Figure 2 Percentage of respondents who believe red light running is a problem.....	23
Figure 3 Percentage of respondents who favor/oppose RLC programs	24
Figure 4 Reasons to support RLC programs (among those who favor)	25
Figure 5 Reasons to oppose RLC programs (among those who oppose)	26
Figure 6 Leading strategies to change the minds of those who oppose RLC programs.....	27
Figure 7 Percentage of statewide responses that favor/oppose RLC programs classified by opinion of whether red light running is a problem.....	28
Figure 8 Percentage of respondents who think red light running is a problem in RLC and non-RLC regions.....	29
Figure 9 Percentage of respondents who favor/oppose RLC programs in RLC and non-RLC regions.....	29
Figure 10 Intersection field inspection form.....	37

INTRODUCTION

In 2009, 7043 people were killed in intersection-related crashes in the United States (NHTSA, 2010) including 676 fatalities and nearly 113,000 injuries that involved red light running (RLR). According to the Insurance Institute of Highway Safety (IIHS), about half of the deaths in RLR crashes are pedestrians, bicyclists, and occupants in vehicles hit by the red light runners (IIHS, 2013).

Research shows the key contributing factors to RLR and/or crashes at signalized intersections are vehicle characteristics, intersection design and operation, and driver behavior (FHWA & NHTSA, 2003). For example, vehicles carrying heavy loads require additional time to stop. Failure to consider vehicle weight can result in RLR. Faulty braking and other defects may also contribute to RLR. Inadequate design and configuration of signalized intersections may contribute to RLR because it may be difficult for motorists to appropriately perceive and react to hazards. Finally, behavioral considerations, such as accelerating near an intersection to travel through during the yellow phase, in-vehicle driver distractions, and exceeding the posted speed limit also contribute to RLR.

Public opinion surveys indicate drivers who run red lights are perceived by 97 percent of survey respondents to be a major safety threat (NHTSA, 2004). A third of respondents claim they know someone who was injured or killed in an intersection crash because of RLR; however, public opinion on red light camera (RLC) programs is divided. Opponents of automated enforcement of RLR may perceive that the programs are designed to generate revenue rather than to improve road safety.

The Louisiana Transportation Research Center (LTRC) funded this project to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of automated enforcement at intersections, identify strategies to enhance public opinion related to automated enforcement, develop policy guidance for statewide implementation, and develop a guidebook for local jurisdictions considering implementing automated enforcement at signalized intersections. In the remainder of this document, the terms “automated enforcement at intersections” and “RLCs” are used interchangeably.

The project tasks included conducting a literature review of RLCs, surveying Louisiana residents to understand their perceptions of red light cameras, and developing recommendations and a guidebook for implementing RLCs in Louisiana.

OBJECTIVES

This report documents the results of research conducted to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of automated enforcement at intersections, identify strategies to enhance public opinion related to automated enforcement, develop policy guidance for statewide implementation of automated enforcement, and develop a guidebook for local jurisdictions considering implementing automated enforcement at signalized intersections. The guidebook for RLC implementation in Louisiana was provided separately to LTRC.

The following bullets show the five major project tasks and the objectives of each:

Literature review – study the national research related to the effectiveness of RLC programs in changing crash frequency, crash severity, crash costs, and violations; and identify red light running program noteworthy practices, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and barriers.

Data collection – establish a record of current RLC applications in Louisiana communities and the observed safety impact of the programs. The information collected for each community included: how the need for the RLC program was established; how the programs were implemented; information about public opinion of automated enforcement, if available; and crash and citation data before and after RLC installation.

Public opinion survey – understand public perception of RLC programs in Louisiana. The evaluation of perceptions provided information for developing the guidelines for implementing RLC programs in Louisiana communities.

Identify and evaluate potential implementation strategies – review the existing statewide RLC policy, compare it to noteworthy practices, and identify potential improvements to enhance the likelihood of successful RLC program implementation.

Integrate recommended strategies and policies into a guidebook – target local practitioners considering implementing and evaluating the effectiveness of RLC camera programs.

SCOPE

The literature review, public opinion survey, and alternatives development and evaluation conducted for this project focused on identifying opportunities to enhance the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) RLC program and providing guidance to jurisdictions considering a program.

The literature review provided national level information about the effectiveness and public perceptions of RLC programs. Noteworthy practices to improve or expand implementation of RLC programs in Louisiana were identified.

Existing RLC programs in Louisiana were evaluated by conducting interviews with representatives from the City of Baton Rouge/East Baton Rouge Parish (Baton Rouge) and Lafayette Consolidated Government (Lafayette). Jefferson Parish and Orleans Parish initiated programs, but at the time of this project both were currently under investigation and the programs were inactive. Automated *speed* enforcement programs have been implemented in other Louisiana communities. However this project was focused on red light running at intersections, so automated *speed* enforcement was not evaluated in this project.

The project public opinion survey focused on understanding the public perception of red light running cameras and identifying the measures that might enhance public approval of red light camera programs. Two types of surveys were conducted. A Tier 1 survey was an intercept survey conducted in three Louisiana communities – two with active RLC programs (Baton Rouge and Lafayette) and one without (Alexandria). The Tier 1 survey also included an internet-based survey released through the DOTD web site. A Tier 2 survey involved conducting follow-up interviews with respondents from the Tier 1 surveys who volunteered to participate in more detailed conversations.

The research team also reviewed the existing state automated enforcement policy. Findings from the literature review and the public opinion survey were considered to identify noteworthy practices and potential changes in the policy. The recommendations focus on enhancing public opinion and support for RLC programs. The policy changes were evaluated for ease of implementation, consistency with existing Louisiana practices, effectiveness, and potential impacts on public perception.

Finally, a guidebook targeted at local practitioners considering implementing a RLC for their jurisdictions was developed and provided separately to LTRC. The guidebook provides tools and strategies for implementing and enhancing public understanding support for RLC programs.

METHODOLOGY

Literature and Program Review

The literature review scanned domestic and international documentation related to the effectiveness of RLC programs and RLC implementation policies. It used the National Transportation Library online Transportation Research International Documentation and Research in Progress (RIP) databases. Google Scholar was also searched to identify additional documents and cross verify references. The project team also incorporated the expertise and resources of team member Richard Retting of Sam Schwartz Engineering to confirm critical concepts and resources had not been overlooked. The results of the literature review were organized according to the topics researched, and the references considered for each section are listed at the end of this document.

The review of existing RLC programs in Louisiana was conducted by identifying communities with RLC programs. Representatives from each community were contacted to understand the status of existing programs. Baton Rouge and Lafayette were selected based on this evaluation. Subsequently, detailed interviews were conducted with each RLC program manager to develop a detailed understanding of the program.

Survey Implementation and Evaluation

Two types of surveys were developed and implemented for this project. Two methods were used to implement the Tier 1 survey: in-person intercept interviews and a web-based survey. The Tier 1 survey included a question to solicit volunteers for a follow up interview (Tier 2). The Tier 2 survey was a telephone interview with the volunteers.

Tier 1 Survey

The objective of the Tier 1 survey was to understand public opinion of the RLC programs. Broadly, the questions related to whether a RLC program exists where participants live or work; the participants' opinion of whether RLR running is a problem; whether the participants favor or oppose RLCs and why; and if the participant opposes RLCs, what information or actions would change their opinions about RLC use. The Tier 1 survey can be found in Appendix A.

Team members conducted the Tier 1 intercept surveys at the Office of Motor Vehicles (OMV) branches in Baton Rouge (7701 Independence Boulevard; Monday, December 5, 2011), Lafayette (3241 N.W. Evangeline Thruway; Tuesday, December 6, 2011), and Alexandria (5602 Coliseum Boulevard; Wednesday, December 7, 2011) during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. At the Baton Rouge and Lafayette locations, the public was invited to

participate in a survey regarding the RLC program upon entering the OMV. Team members also approached persons seated and waiting for their turn. At the Alexandria location, all persons were approached while seated and waiting.

An internet version of the Tier 1 survey was also conducted to gather public opinion at the statewide level. DOTD posted the survey on the DOTD web site and distributed an e-mail statewide announcing the survey. The e-mail recipients had at sometime in the past signed up to receive notifications from the DOTD outreach program. Registrants on the DOTD site include the general public, legislators, local leaders, media, and businesses throughout the state. The internet-based survey was available December 14, 2011 to January 6, 2012. The results from the intercept and internet-based surveys were coded into a spreadsheet for analysis.

The Tier 1 survey (both intercept and internet-based) also asked participants if they would be willing to participate in an in-depth follow-up telephone interview. The names of the willing participants were compiled into a spreadsheet. Fifty people were randomly selected from this list for follow up interviews. This follow up interview is called the Tier 2 survey.

Tier 2 Survey Implementation Methodology

The Tier 2 follow-up survey is included in Appendix B. Broadly, this detailed telephone survey focused on participants' overall opinion of RLCs; perceived effectiveness of RLCs to improve intersection safety; opinion on the likelihood of getting caught running a red light; opinion on how RLC revenues should be used; and whether participants or someone they know have received a citation for running a red light.

The Tier 2 survey participants included respondents of both the intercept and internet-based surveys and were from communities throughout the state. The Tier 2 telephone interviews were conducted on weekdays between February 15, 2012 and February 26, 2012 between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. until a total of 50 respondents were interviewed. These results were also coded into a spreadsheet for analysis.

Survey Error Rate

The *intercept* survey produced 176 responses (46 in Baton Rouge, 91 in Lafayette, 39 in Alexandria) and 1,058 persons responded to the Tier 1 *Internet* survey. To increase the sample size and decrease the error rate of the Tier 1 intercept survey results, responses from the appropriate internet survey respondents were added to the intercept survey responses. In all, 312 responses from the Alexandria, Baton Rouge, and Lafayette regions were extracted from the Tier 1 *Internet* survey and added to the corresponding Tier 1 *intercept* survey responses. Respondents were added based on the location identified as the residential zip code. Adding the internet responses does not introduce bias because both the internet

response and people arriving at the OMV locations were random. Moreover, the same questionnaire was used in both efforts. The total number of responses analyzed for each community is called “combined respondents.” Table 1 summarizes the number of survey respondents and estimated error rate based on the entire population for each community and statewide for the internet survey. An error rate was not calculated for any subsets of the population evaluated in this report.

Table 1
Summary of the number of survey respondents and estimated error rates

Location	Original Number of Respondents	Number of Respondents Added From Internet Survey	Combined Respondents Analyzed	Estimated Error Rate (Plus or Minus)
Baton Rouge	46	243	289	6%
Lafayette	91	59	150	8%
Alexandria	39	10	49	14%
Statewide Internet Survey	1,058	Not applicable	1,058	3%
Overall Tier 1 Survey	1,234	Not applicable	--	3%

The volunteers were randomly contacted until 50 responses were collected for the Tier 2 survey. These results are being used anecdotally because an error rate could not be estimated.

Analysis of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Surveys

The Tier 1 intercept survey responses were analyzed in the following ways:

- Individually for each region (Baton Rouge, Lafayette, and Alexandria) using the combined results;
- At a statewide level using the internet survey only; and
- Comparing regions with RLC programs (Baton Rouge, Lafayette, and New Orleans) to regions without RLC programs (remainder of state).

The Tier 2 survey responses were analyzed in one group only.

Alternative Development and Evaluation

Finally, based on the literature review and the survey results, alternative policies and programs were identified for possible implementation in Louisiana. The research team developed and evaluated policy recommendations to the existing state-automated

enforcement policy and created a guidebook for local agencies considering RLCs. The current state policy is included in Appendix C.

Policy changes to the existing state-automated enforcement policy and guidance were evaluated according to the following qualitative criteria:

- **Implementation** – Who would be responsible to implement the change and is the recommendation likely to be relatively easy or relatively difficult to implement?
- **Consistency with Louisiana practices** – How consistent is the recommendation with existing Louisiana practices? Consistency with existing practices facilitates adaptation to change.
- **Effectiveness** – How effective is the recommendation likely to be in changing public opinion about RLCs? Is making the recommended change likely to yield a large or small change in public perception of RLCs?
- **Benefits to public perception** – Would making the recommended change have a positive or negative impact on public opinion about RLCs? At a qualitative level, what is the anticipated magnitude of the impact on public perception?

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Literature Review

The literature review addressed research results in terms of crash type, severity, and cost, behavior change due to RLCs, public opinion about RLCs, and RLC program implementation guidance.

Crash Type and Severity Associated with RLC Programs

Based on a summary of the research literature on RLC impacts, a synthesis report conducted for the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) concluded the preponderance of evidence indicates red light running camera systems improve the overall safety of intersections. Angle crashes are usually reduced and rear-end crashes increase, but to a lesser extent. Some “spillover” effect occurs at other signalized intersections. Automated enforcement of red light running can be an effective safety countermeasure. However, the report admits the findings are inconclusive because not enough empirical evidence based on a statistically rigorous experimental design are available to report the findings conclusively (NCHRP 310, 2003).

The peer-reviewed literature provides mixed findings on the type and severity of crashes affected with RLC programs. Installing RLC generally yields a reduction in right angle crashes and injury crashes. Many studies report increases in rear-end crashes although the findings are not universal. Many studies also show reductions in crash severity. Council, et al. (2005) found reductions in injury-related crashes. Examples from specific locations include:

- The city of Dallas (2009) reported a decline in RLR crashes and overall crashes within two years of implementation.
- After 10 years of implementation, Howard County, Maryland (2007), reported a decline of up to 57 percent in angle crashes and up to 18 percent in all crashes. Rear-end crashes in the same jurisdiction had a short-term incremental increase, but a long-term reduction.
- Evaluation of San Francisco RLC intersections (1992 - 2001) before and after crash data showed nearly a 50 percent decrease in fatal crashes and a nine percent decrease in injury crashes.

- Phoenix and Scottsdale (Washington and Shin, 2005) reported a systematic decline in angle and left-turn crashes. Overall crashes remained unchanged for Phoenix area sites, but decreased for Scottsdale. Rear-end crashes increased for both jurisdictions.

An analysis of 586 annualized crashes at 56 intersections across Texas showed a reduction in overall annualized crash frequency and angle crashes as well as a small increase in rear-end crashes (Walden, 2008). The researchers concluded RLC programs have a positive impact on crash frequency at intersections in Texas, although the results were not statistically significant.

Red Light Running Violations

Most studies show implementing RLC yields a decrease in the number of red light running violations at the treatment sites. Retting et al. (1999) reported approximately 40 percent reduction in violations in Fairfax, VA, and Oxnard, CA. The communities also witnessed a decline in red light running violations at *non-treatment* sites, indicating an overall change in driver behavior. Other specific findings include:

- Virginia Beach, VA, experienced 78 percent reduction violations (Martinez and Porter 2006).
- In Philadelphia, PA, yellow time extensions at two suspect intersections resulted in a 36 percent reduction in violations. After implementing RLCs, the violations decreased by an additional 62 percent (Retting et al., 2008).
- Howard County also reported a 67 percent decline in RLR citations (Frangos, undated).
- RLR violations decreased by 68 percent in San Francisco, following RLC program implementation.

Table 2 summarizes the observed changes in crashes, violations, and citations reported by jurisdictions across the country with RLC programs in place. An up arrow (↑) indicates an increase and a down arrow (↓) shows a decline of crashes or violations. Status quo is represented by “↔.”

Table 2
Red light camera programs data summary

Jurisdiction	Study Year	RLR Crashes	Total Crashes	Angle Crashes	Rear-End Crashes	Violations
Phoenix, AZ	2005		↔	↓	↑	
Scottsdale, AZ	2005		↓	↓	↑	
Calgary, CA	2009			↓	↓	
Oxnard, CA	1998		↓	↓	↑	↓
San Diego, CA	2002	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓
Baltimore County, MD	2003	↓	↓			
Howard County, MD	undated		↓	↓		↓
Charlotte, NC	2001		↔	↓	↑	↓
Raleigh, NC	2003	↓	↓	↓	↓	
Dallas, TX	2009		↓		↓	
Garland, TX	2009	↓	↓		↑	↓
Irving, TX	2009		↓	↓	↑	
Seattle, WA	2008		↓	↔		↓

Crash Costs

Council et al. (2005) report an aggregate crash cost benefit of RLC programs. The economic benefits due to reduction in angle crashes outweigh the additional cost incurred with the increase of rear-end crashes. They further suggest RLC programs should be considered at locations with a high ratio of angle crashes to rear-end crashes, high proportion of entering ADT at the major road, short cycle lengths, and one or more protected left-turn phases. Washington and Shin (2005) reported a net benefit of \$4,504 per approach per year for Phoenix and \$684,134 per approach per year for Scottsdale, which benefited more because of the greater decrease in fatal and injury crashes.

Effectiveness in Louisiana

RLCs were installed at six intersections in Lafayette between December 2007 and March 2008 (Schneider, 2010). The observational before after study by Schneider identified 127 crashes in the 12-month period before the installation and 111 crashes in the 12-month after period indicating a decline of 12.6 percent. Angle crashes decreased by 33.3 percent; whereas, rear-end and other types of crashes remained relatively unchanged. The research by Schneider indicated no statistically significant change in overall crashes per month. Only angle crashes registered a statistically significant decline. A cost benefit analysis estimates a net savings of \$693,926 per year.

Public Opinion Surveys

Retting et al. (1999) conducted one of the first public opinion studies on RLCs in Fairfax, VA, and Oxnard, CA. In Oxnard, a majority of the residents were aware of the RLC program, and 79 percent supported it. Support for the program was lower among males and young respondents (16-29 years old). In Fairfax, VA, 84 percent of the respondents supported the program after one year of enforcement.

In another study, Retting and Williams (2000) surveyed respondents from 10 cities in the US, five with RLCs and five without. Overall, a majority of the respondents supported the programs. A notable finding is 80 percent of the respondents in cities with RLC programs supported the programs, and 76 percent of the respondents in the cities without RLCs supported RLR automated enforcement. RLC programs had a higher approval among respondents 35 years and older. Garber et al. (2005) indicated 66 percent of the respondents in Virginia communities with or without RLCs supported the program. A 2002 nationwide survey by the Gallop Organization reported 75 percent of drivers favor the RLCs.

Retting and Williams (2000) found respondents in cities with RLC programs perceive a greater risk of being cited. Sixty-one percent of the respondents in cities with RLC programs believe red light runners will receive a citation, compared with 46 percent in non-RLC cities.

The same document reported more than half of the respondents in Fresno, CA, mistakenly believed the city had implemented RLC programs. Media coverage about such programs and the actual implementation in other cities in California may have contributed to the misperception among Fresno residents.

Red Light Camera Program Implementation

In 2003, FHWA and NHTSA published “Guidance for Using Red Light Cameras.” The document demonstrates situations in which it is best to install RLCs and provides critical information for State and local agencies on consistent and proper implementation and operation of RLCs.

Initially, a systematic investigation of intersection crash data and red light running violations should be conducted to identify potential locations for RLC implementation. Potential sites are those with high incidence of red light running. However, caution should be exercised in using the number of violations as the only diagnostic tool because it does not always translate to a red light running crash problem.

In addition, a comprehensive review of crash data and field conditions should be undertaken. The crash data should be considered to understand crash location and type, time of day, speed, weather, direction of travel, and vehicle type. Further, field observations by traffic engineers and video surveillance may provide additional insight to driver behavior.

Intersection geometry, traffic volumes, and signal time data may provide clues to frequency of red light running crashes. Complaints from road users and the public should also be taken into account.

Following problem identification and a thorough engineering study, engineering, educational, and conventional enforcement countermeasures should be tried and proven unsuccessful before RLC programs are installed. RLCs should be installed only when authorized by law. Thirteen states and the District of Columbia have laws granting statewide authority for camera enforcement.

FHWA and NHTSA identify the following steps for a proper RLC program implementation:

- Early planning and set up;
- System planning;
- Engineering design consideration of RLC systems;
- RLC system installation;
- Operation and maintenance; and
- Public information and education.

Early planning includes establishing a stakeholder oversight committee responsible for clearly articulating program objectives. Typical program concerns vary but include privacy issues, distribution of RLC citations, and penalties. All of these should be thoroughly addressed and resolved before RLC system installation.

It is important to implement a comprehensive public awareness and information campaign before the RLC program. Outreach efforts can target schools, media, driver education programs, and local community programs. Quick response to telephone and email inquiries and correspondence should be a priority. In the early stages of the RLC program, warning citations could be issued to potential violators as an additional form of public education. Subsequently, the public should be advised of the end of warning citation period and the start of the actual enforcement.

Authorities are advised to explore all system procurement alternatives available to the state and local agencies. If agencies elect to outsource the functions and operations of the RLC programs to private contractors, they should establish necessary procedures for oversight and supervision. Responsible agencies should clearly establish procedures for site selection, violation processing, warning sign placement, system selection, technologies, vehicle

detection and communications apparatus, and methods for documenting yellow/clearance change interval signal timing according to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) guidelines.

RLC Implementation in Louisiana

Louisiana laws allow for local authorities to evaluate and make the decision to implement an automated enforcement program. Once an application is made to the state, DOTD will issue appropriate permits to local governments or designated agents for installing and operating photo enforcement equipment when such locations are proposed on state highways. The local authorities are required to provide documentation on the existence of a legal instrument authorizing the use of electronic enforcement in the jurisdiction. The permit application should include a public education plan with a 30-day warning period, issuance of a public information notice, an annual announcement of enforcement locations, and number of violations issued. The permit application must also include installation plans and appropriate signage for each site. Monitored intersection selection should be primarily based on vehicle/pedestrian crashes.

Data Collection and Analysis

The Baton Rouge and Lafayette programs were studied. The City of Baton Rouge/East Baton Rouge Parish Department of Public Works (DPW) in cooperation with the Police Department oversees the Red Light Safety Program in Baton Rouge. The program was developed in 2007 and initiated in early 2008. It is currently managed by Sarah Paul-Edel, P.E. (sedel@brgov.com, 225.389.2167) who was also responsible for the site selection methodology described below. The program was based on data from DOTD and was initiated by the Mayor's office as a possible solution to Baton Rouge's high crash problem.

Lafayette Parish's automated red light running program is called the SafeLight/SafeSpeed Program. It encompasses both RLC and automated speeding enforcement. The SafeLight red light program was studied for this data collection effort. The SafeLight/SafeSpeed program began in 1998 when Tony Tramel, P.E., became director of Lafayette's Department of Traffic and Transportation (DTT). At the time, increased emphasis on red light running crashes was occurring throughout the nation. In 2000, FHWA reported 106,000 RLR crashes nationwide, including 89,000 injuries and 1,036 fatalities. DTT staff perceived an increasing RLR trend and educated the members of the City Parish Council during a series of briefings and presentations, and provided information about alternative programs.

In 2004-05, Lafayette Consolidated Government (LCG) DTT received a safety grant from DOTD to study red light running enforcement issues and practices of other communities. This effort included validating all of the yellow/signal change intervals for all traffic signals,

identifying problem sites, reviewing technologies, and identifying challenges in other communities with RLR enforcement. A member of the City Council; members of local, parish, and state law enforcement officers; and the local prosecuting attorney conducted field visits to eight communities in North Carolina and Arizona and two companies who provide red light enforcement equipment and services. Staff also supervised a public opinion poll where the community identified red light running as a problem. Several members of the LCG Council were educated on this safety issue and were exposed to the automated enforcement in Charlotte, North Carolina, during a National League of City's Conference in 2006. The same year, the Council passed an ordinance allowing automated enforcement. The DTT director is identified in the Code of Ordinances as responsible for electronic enforcement provisions. Travis Smith, P.E. (tsmith@lafayette.la.gov, 337.291.8506) works with the director to manage the program.

The following summary provides specific information about the Baton Rouge and Lafayette Parish programs.

Baton Rouge Implementation

The Department of Public Works (DPW) chose a network approach to select RLC locations, using crash data from red light intersections and narrowing down the selection based on correctable crash locations (right angle) with relatively lower numbers of rear-end collisions. Selected locations were presented to a committee comprised of representatives of the Baton Rouge City Police, the Mayor's office, and the DPW Chief Traffic Engineer. The list was narrowed further based on recommendations from the committee, which factored in numbers of violations at intersections and the desire to distribute the locations throughout the city, in an effort to avoid concentration in one area. The list was then presented to the vendor, American Traffic Solutions (ATS), who videoed and reviewed the intersections and made additional recommendations based on the review and constructability at the locations. The DPW Traffic Engineering Department made the final site installation decisions.

Deployment. Baton Rouge installed 27 active, permanent, fixed location cameras at 18 signalized intersections. The first camera was installed in February 2008 as a test site by DOTD and ATS. The official locations were installed between March 2008 and March 2010.

Photos of red light running vehicles are taken with digital cameras when the violator is in front of the stop bar and again on the other side of the stop bar with the red light in view. In addition to the cameras, a video is taken and reviewed by police officers to determine if a traffic violation is valid. The video is available for the public to view online. More recent DOTD policy guidelines for installing RLCs at intersections have not changed the Baton Rouge methodology.

ATS installs, maintains, and processes all data from the RLCs. The violations are sent to the Baton Rouge City Police Department to determine if the incident captured is a violation of their Code of Ordinance, and if appropriate, a violation notice is mailed to the registered owner of the vehicle. ATS is paid 35 percent of the amount collected for each violation. The remaining 65 percent is deposited into the Baton Rouge general fund and is used for traffic-related safety improvements as determined by the Baton Rouge City Council.

Outreach. A formal public education plan was not adopted prior to initiating the Red Light Safety Program. The public was informed through press releases, occasional interviews, brochures, and the website. The program brochure and additional information can be found on the City/Parish website at <http://www.brgov.com/redlight/press.htm>.

According to the program manager, the number of calls to the DPW Traffic Engineering Department has decreased considerably since the inception of the Red Light Safety Program. The Department used to receive many calls questioning the length of yellow light times and requesting clarification of point of entry into the intersection. The calls received in the last year involve an occasional person wishing to contest a violation, in which case the caller is forwarded to ATS who processes requests for Adjudication Hearings.

Citations. From the first RLC installation on February 18, 2008, through August 2011, 122,767 red light running citations have been issued; 1,762 were contested, 1,134 were dismissed, and 628 were upheld. One adjudication officer and one attorney review the violation contentions. Violators who wish to appeal a violation may do so by noting it on the notice and remitting it by the due date on the notice.

Effectiveness. According to the DPW Data Reports to DOTD for the 2008 and 2009 calendar years, the Red Light Safety Program has not been operational long enough to form conclusions about the effectiveness of RLCs at intersections in relation to reduction or increase in crashes. The data for the 2010 calendar year are not yet available at the time of this research. While DPW has seen a reduction in total crashes and/or injury crashes at several locations, they are concerned about an increase in crashes at several other locations. When data becomes available, DPW will conduct a study to ascertain whether the red light cameras should be continued.

Lafayette Parish Implementation

The DTT implemented a network approach for identifying RLC installation sites in Lafayette. They evaluated every signalized intersection (190) for right angle crash frequency, and identified crash rates for right angle crashes to determine a rank order for RLC installation. The crash rate was determined by using year 2000 turning movement data and projecting 24 hour total entering traffic volumes and establishing a ratio of traffic crashes

per million entering vehicles per year. Both rank order rate and rank order frequency were summed to establish the candidate intersections for red light enforcement.

Deployment. Of the 190 total signalized intersections, 12 have active, permanent, and fixed RLCs and an additional 17 have been identified for implementation. Cameras capture the plate image, an image of the vehicle as it enters the intersection, and again when it is in the intersection. Incident videos are captured and reviewed by the DTT. Video is available to the public by request. Both a “plate” (rear end of the vehicle) and a “face” (front of the vehicle) imaged are captured. The “face” image may provide information about the vehicle driver (Baton Rouge only captures the rear of the vehicle).

Specific DOTD guidelines were lacking when the SafeLight Program first started; however, DOTD right of way permits were submitted and approved by the local District Office. LCG has not yet installed any RLCs under the new criteria. The guidelines for installation of the RLCs are outlined in the LCG ordinance, which was written by the DTT with the aid of attorneys. Lafayette currently defines point of entry as the prolongation of the curb line rather than at the stop bar, which is where DOTD prefers to regulate entry. The LCG decided designating the curb line is more consistent than the stop line, because the stop line location often changes or is pushed back for various reasons, such as crosswalks.

Additionally, state law at the time of equipment installation also defined the intersection in the same manner. Recent changes in state law and the MUTCD now include the area from the stop bars within the legal definition of the intersection.

Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc. (Redflex) is the vendor for the SafeLight/SafeSpeed Program and is responsible for installing, maintaining, and processing data from the RLCs. Redflex is compensated monthly based on the number of paid violations. Failure to pay the original violation within the time prescribed on the notice of violation (30 days) imposes a 50 percent additional penalty. A financial lock box agreement is used to audit and account for the number of paid violations in an invoicing process, which distributes the funds monthly to the vendor and to LCG. The funds LCG receives are deposited into a Traffic Safety Fund which is intended to fund traffic safety projects and programs subject to the provisions of LCG’s Home Rule Charter budget process. Table 3 explains the tiered system of payment to Redflex outlined in the vendor contract.

Table 3
Tiered system of payment to Redflex

Safelight Lafayette Program – Redflex Compensation		
Tier	Citations Paid	Fee Per Paid Citation
Tier 1	1-150 citations equivalent fully paid per calendar month	\$39.00
Tier 2	151 to 300 citations equivalent fully paid per calendar month	\$28.00
Tier 3	301 Plus citations equivalent fully paid per calendar month	\$15.50

Source: Final Contract Document, Exhibit D: Compensation and Pricing. Provided by LCG DTT

Outreach. No formal public education plan was adopted, but intense reporting occurred on this matter by print and electronic media during the adoption and implementation of the SafeLight Program. Additionally the vendor implemented an initial media campaign. The vendor program consisted of radio and television spots, a 30 day warning period before violations were issued for the first group of cameras installed, and a press release when subsequent intersections were outfitted with the cameras. The LCG Council appropriated \$50,000 in Fiscal Year 2010-2011 to begin a safety-oriented campaign, and a similar allocation has been appropriated for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 to continue the outreach.

Violations. LCG Council approved the RLC ordinance on September 21, 2006, and the contract with Redflex was signed in 2007. The DTT releases a monthly table of violations on its website. The total number of violations from the start of the program through March 2011 is 48,538.

An adjudication bureau of local attorneys hears appeals. If violators wish to take the matter further, they can appeal to the 15th Judicial District Court. Since the program's inception, no violator has proceeded to the 15th Judicial District Court, and no violations have been overturned other than those determined by the Adjudication Bureau during the initial appeal process. According to LCG, Redflex initially scheduled approximately 10 hearings every week, but currently holds between four and six hearings a year.

Effectiveness. According to the SafeLight/SafeSpeed Lafayette Program Status Report to LCG dated July 20, 2011, the program has not been operational long enough to perform a technically and statistically significant comparison of before and after crashes at intersections with RLCs. Lafayette has performed a trend analysis of traffic crash data, comparing data from the current operating time with the same amount of time prior to installation at an intersection. For instance, if a SafeLight intersection has been operating for 14 months, the data are compared with the data from 14 months prior to installation. A reduction in crashes

as well as improvement in driver behavior appears to be occurring. Table 4 summarizes this information.

Table 4
Summary of traffic crashes at SafeLight locations within 100 ft

Summary of Traffic Crashes at SafeLight Locations Within 100'				
	Before Period	After Period	Difference	Percent Change
Total Crashes	332	117	215	-65%
Right Angle Crashes	131	56	75	-57%
Rear-End Crashes	118	40	78	-66%

Source: Traffic Crash Statistics at SafeLight Locations, Program Status Report, July 20, 2011

Public Opinion. David Walker with Market Research and Analysis conducted two traffic safety public opinion surveys 2001 and 2005 in Louisiana: *Traffic and Public Safety in Lafayette Parish* (2001) and *Signal Light Cameras in Louisiana* (2005). The majority (65 percent) of those surveyed in the *Signal Light Cameras in Louisiana* survey support the placement of cameras at traffic signals, with 23 percent identifying red light running as a frequent traffic violation and 82 percent reporting red light running as either extremely or very dangerous. The results from the *Traffic and Public Safety in Lafayette Parish* survey were similar, with 65 percent indicating red light running as extremely dangerous and 25 percent indicating that it is very dangerous. The majority of respondents (64 percent) supported cameras at signal lights and 72 percent thought cameras would reduce the frequency of red light running. Table 5 shows public opinion regarding cameras at intersection prior to implementation.

Table 5
Public opinion of RLCs before installation

Do you support or oppose the use of cameras at traffic signals? (pre implementation)			
	Support	Oppose	Don't Know
Traffic & Public Safety, Lafayette, 2001	64%	30%	6%
Signal Light Cameras, Louisiana Voters, 2005	63%	16%	21%

Source: *Signal Light Cameras: State of Louisiana*, July 31-August 3, 2005, and *Traffic and Public Safety: Lafayette Parish*, October 11-13, 2001, Market Research and Analysis

Southern Media and Opinion conducted subsequent opinion polls and prepared a report after implementation of RLCs at intersections. These include two for Lafayette Parish in 2008 and 2009 and a statewide poll in 2009. A majority (71.2 percent in 2008 and 73 percent in 2009) of those surveyed in Lafayette believe the use of cameras will reduce the number of people who drive through red lights. Table 6 displays the survey responses related to support/opposition of RLCs.

Table 6
Public opinion of RLCs after installation

Do you support or oppose the use of cameras at intersections with red lights? (post implementation)						
	Strongly Support	Support	(Neutral)	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
Lafayette 2008	31.3%	34.7%	6.0%	11.2%	15.6%	1.2%
Lafayette 2009	27.0%	32.5%	8.8%	11.3%	17.3%	3.3%
Louisiana 2009	26.5%	33.0%	5.2%	16.3%	17.0%	2.0%

Source: Lafayette Parish Public Opinion Survey, April 2008 & August 2009; Louisiana Voters Public Opinion Survey, August 2009, Southern Media & Opinion Research, Inc.

Public opinion surveys have not been conducted prior to or since the implementation of RLC programs in Baton Rouge.

Results of Tier 1 Public Opinion Intercept Survey

This section provides a summary of the responses to the Tier 1 survey questions by region (Baton Rouge, Lafayette, Alexandria, and statewide).

Presence of RLC Program

Respondents were asked whether there is a RLC program where they live or work. As expected, a higher percentage of participants in Baton Rouge and Lafayette indicated a RLC program where they live (70.9 percent and 74 percent, respectively) and where they work (90 percent and 74.7 percent, respectively) compared to respondents in Alexandria or statewide. However, although Alexandria currently does not have a RLC program, 37.1 percent of Alexandria respondents indicated a RLC program where they live. Figure 1 summarizes the participant responses by region.




Figure 1
Percentage of respondents with a RLC Program by where they live/work

Opinion on Whether RLR is a Problem

Tier 1 respondents were asked whether red light running is a problem where they live. Of those who indicated yes or no, the results were nearly divided. In Baton Rouge, 43.6 percent of respondents believe red light running is a problem in the community in which they live, compared to 34.6 percent who do not believe it is a problem. Conversely in Lafayette, 32 percent believe it is a problem, while 41.3 percent do not. Nearly 39 percent of Alexandria respondents believe it is a problem, while 34.7 percent do not. Finally, 35.7 percent of the statewide respondents indicated red light running is a problem compared to 42.6 percent who indicated otherwise. Figure 2 summarizes these results. Accounting for the error rates, respondents are essentially evenly split in their opinion as to whether red light running is a problem.




Figure 2
Percentage of respondents who believe red light running is a problem

The results in Figure 2 differ slightly from the public opinion survey conducted by Market Research and Analysis for Lafayette in 2005. In that survey, respondents were asked, “How much of a problem do you believe red light running is in your community? Would you say it’s an extremely big problem, big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?” In the Lafayette survey, 58 percent of respondents felt red light running was either an extremely big problem or big problem with an additional 27 percent indicating they felt like it was somewhat of a problem. In this survey, only 9 percent of respondents did not believe red light running was a problem in their community as opposed to 41 percent in this survey. Five percent did not know or would not say.

Opinion on the Use of RLCs

Respondents also were asked to indicate whether they are in favor or opposed to the use of RLCs as a tool to reduce red light running at intersections. The responses in Baton Rouge and statewide were nearly evenly divided with 50.9 percent and 47.2 percent in favor and 48.4 percent and 49.2 percent opposed, respectively. In Lafayette, the percentage of respondents opposed to RLC programs was slightly higher with 54 percent opposed compared to 46 percent in favor. In Alexandria, the percentage of respondents opposed to RLC programs was slightly higher with 54 percent opposed compared to 46 percent in favor. In communities with RLCs, there is roughly an even split between favoring and opposing RLCs.

Conversely, in Alexandria (where there currently is no RLC Program), 67.3 percent of respondents are in favor of RLC programs, compared to 28.6 percent opposed. Figure 3 summarizes these results.




Figure 3
Percentage of respondents who favor/oppose RLC programs

The 2005 Market Research and Analysis survey for Lafayette posed a similar question. The 2005 survey asked respondents the following question: “Some local governments are considering placing cameras at certain traffic signals. The cameras would be activated only if a vehicle runs a red light, and the owner of the vehicle would be mailed a traffic citation. Do you support or oppose the use of cameras at traffic signals?” Sixty-three percent of the respondents supported the use of cameras, while 16 percent indicated opposition. Twenty-one percent of those surveyed said they did not know or would not say.

Reasons to Favor RLCs

Respondents who indicated they favor the use of red light cameras were asked to select reasons why they favor the use of RLCs. Respondents could pick more than one selection.

Their options included: “Reduces red light running,” “reduces crashes,” and “encourages drivers to obey traffic laws.” Respondents could also fill in their own responses. With the exception of Alexandria respondents, the most popular reason to favor RLCs is to encourage drivers to obey traffic laws. Reducing crashes elicited the highest response for Alexandria respondents. Figure 4 summarizes the percentage of respondents selecting each option by region.




Figure 4
Reasons to support RLC programs (among those who favor)

While the “other” responses varied, a common response was RLCs encourage drivers to pay more attention. Others responded RLCs encourage drivers to obey traffic laws and reduce angle crashes, making them feel safer.

Reasons to Oppose RLCs

Of the Tier 1 combined survey respondents, the 581 respondents who indicated they oppose the use of RLCs were asked to select reasons why they oppose RLC use. Respondents were asked to select from the following options: “It is just a program to increase revenue for local government and/or the police department,” “RLCs go against our system of justice since no police officer actually witnessed the driver committing the offense,” and “Do not think they are effective.” Respondents could select as many reasons as appropriate and also fill in their own response.

From the selections provided, the greatest percentage of respondents indicated RLC use goes against our system of justice and is a program to increase revenue. Fewer respondents indicated RLCs are not effective or selected the other category. These results are summarized in Figure 5.




Figure 5
Reasons to oppose RLC programs (among those who oppose)

This question also allowed respondents to provide an “other” response. While the responses varied, several underlying opposition themes were identified:

- Increases rear-end crashes and creates a more dangerous situation because people slam on their brakes to avoid getting a citation.
- Removes officer discretion (i.e., extenuating circumstances, weather conditions).
- Disagree with a private company having a financial interest in someone breaking the law.
- Believe adjusting signal timing is a better option (e.g., increasing the all red interval or adjusting the yellow time intervals).
- Violates privacy and is a government intrusion (Big Brother).
- Question reliability and accuracy of system.
- Eliminates due process (i.e., guilty until proven innocent).
- Discriminates against certain sociodemographic groups based on installation locations.
- Imposes responsibility on owner, even if not the driver of the vehicle cited.

Strategies to Change Opinion on RLCs

Respondents who indicated they oppose the use of RLCs were also asked to select strategies that their community could use to change their opinion on RLCs. Once again, respondents were asked to select from a series of options, including: use the revenue generated to improve safety in the community; better warning about when and where RLCs will be implemented; education about the effectiveness of RLCs; and education about how the revenue from RLCs is actually used. Respondents could select as many as appropriate and also fill in their own response. With the exception of Alexandria, the greatest percentage of respondents indicated education on the use of revenue may change their mind. In Alexandria, the greatest percentage of respondents indicated they may change their minds about RLCs if the revenue generated is used to improve safety in the community, followed by better warning about RLC implementation. Figure 6 summarizes these responses.




Figure 6
Leading strategies to change the minds of those who oppose RLC programs

Of the 311 respondents who selected “other,” 180 (30 percent of those opposed) indicated nothing could be done to change their mind. While the remaining responses varied significantly, several respondents suggested making improvements to the signal systems before considering a RLC program in a community. Some felt they might be more supportive of a RLC program if it were managed by the local government or law enforcement agency instead of a private vendor, or if the cameras functioned properly. Others felt a less burdensome appeals process might change their mind. Some expressed concern about using funds to implement RLC in lieu of maintaining roads, fighting crime, and eliminating law enforcement jobs.

Opinion of Whether RLR is a Problem Compared to Opinion on RLC Program

A more in-depth analysis was conducted on the Tier 1 statewide Internet survey responses to provide a greater understanding of participants' opinions. In the statewide Internet survey, among the 35.7 percent of respondents who think red light running is a problem in the city where they live (Figure 2) 76.2 percent support a RLC program, while 23.3 percent oppose it (Figure 7). This trend is reversed for those who think no red light running problem exists. Among the 42.6 percent who do not think red light running is a problem (Figure 2), the opposition to RLC program stands at 71 percent compared to 27.9 percent support. These results are illustrated in Figure 7.




Figure 7
Percentage of statewide responses that favor/oppose RLC programs classified by opinion of whether red light running is a problem

Regions with RLC Programs versus Regions Without

Respondents' perception about whether their city has a red light running problem is similar in RLC and non-RLC implemented regions. In regions with RLC, 36.7 percent of the participants think red light running is a problem, while 40.3 percent do not. In regions without RLC programs, 34.2 percent of the participants think red light running is a problem versus 44.1 percent who do not (Figure 8).




Figure 8
Percentage of respondents who think red light running is a problem in RLC and non-RLC regions

In regions with RLC programs, 46.8 percent of people support the RLC program, 52.7 percent oppose it, and less than 1 percent of the respondents have no opinion. In the regions without RLC programs, 46.6 percent support a program, 47.8 percent oppose it, and 5.6 percent have no opinion (Figure 9).




Figure 9
Percentage of respondents who favor/oppose RLC programs in RLC and non-RLC regions

Results of Tier 2 – Telephone Survey

The Tier 1 survey also asked for volunteers to share their name and telephone number to be contacted for an in-depth follow-up interview. Three hundred seventy participants provided their names and contact number for the Tier 2 survey. Fifty randomly selected volunteers were interviewed, with each interview lasting about 8 to 10 minutes.

Telephone Survey Results

The telephone survey results are summarized below.

- Perception of RLC effectiveness:
 - Fifty-six percent of the participants believe RLCs are effective to improve safety at intersections, compared to 30 percent who disagree.
 - Sixty percent of participants think warning signs and media attention about RLCs may stop people from running red lights.
- Received a red light violation from a RLC:
 - Ten respondents had received a red light running citation in the past two years, and nine of these citations were camera issued.
 - Twenty-four participants knew someone who had received a red light running citation, with 19 of those citations camera issued.
- Perception of enforcement:
 - Seventy percent of the participants think it is unlikely someone will be cited if they run a red light.
 - Thirty-four percent of participants think RLCs help law enforcement, and 30 percent think it is an effective way to give citations. However, 16 percent think it goes against our system of justice, and 12 percent think RLC programs are implemented to generate revenue.
 - Thirty percent of the respondents who received red light running citations think it is likely for someone to be caught if they run a red light. Twenty out of the 50 (40 percent) participants believe it is OK to enter an intersection during the yellow light. Sixteen respondents (32 percent) indicated they slow down immediately and prepare to stop when a traffic signal turns yellow.

- Opinions about implementation:
 - Two out of three people who think RLC programs are implemented to generate revenue feel more information about vendor payout would influence their opinion on RLCs.
 - Thirty-two percent of participants believe revenue generated from RLCs should go to road maintenance projects.

Alternative Development and Evaluation

Based on the results of the literature review, public opinion survey, and an evaluation of the state’s existing policy, strategies to enhance public opinion of RLC programs were identified. This section discusses the noteworthy practices and, where appropriate, recommends changes to the state’s automated enforcement policy. It includes an evaluation of the recommended policy changes and presents a qualitative comparative analysis of the cost and benefit of deploying a RLC program compared to a traditional enforcement program.

Development of Alternative Policies and Strategies

Alternative policies and strategies should incorporate lessons learned from previous RLC program implementation efforts and address many of the issues identified through public opinion surveys. Retting (2010) identified “lessons learned” based on two decades of automated enforcement experience:

- Focus on safety. Site selection should be well documented and based on violations, crash histories, and other safety factors. Private vendors should not be involved in the selection process, other than to perhaps collect and provide data as directed by government officials.
- Emphasize fairness in program design and operations. To help ensure the public perceives the RLC program as fair, the state or local agency should control all major aspects of camera enforcement, including site selection and the final decision on whether a citation will be issued to specific vehicles photographed. Utilize signing and public information campaigns to emphasize deterrence and avoid excessive penalties. Finally, include a variety of stakeholders in the planning and design of the program.
- Get the engineering right. Consider other engineering measures prior to implementing RLC enforcement and evaluate the yellow and all red intervals, posted speed limits, and site conditions.

- Avoid the appearance of revenue motive. Ensure the agency has adequate funding for operations and equipment to avoid reliance on revenue generated from citations. Establish vendor payment methods that are not based on the number of paid citations. Clearly alert drivers to the use of RLC enforcement through adequate signage. Finally, the agency should conduct financial audits of the program on a regular basis.
- Anticipate and avoid legal setbacks. The legal setbacks faced by existing programs are primarily related to program control, oversight, and preemption of ordinances by state laws. To anticipate and avoid legal setbacks, planning and implementation efforts should include state and local law enforcement officials, judges, and others with the appropriate legal expertise.
- Employ effective communication. Upfront and ongoing public information and education is a key component of a successful RLC program.
- Evaluate program performance and outcomes. Agencies should establish procedures to evaluate their programs and the effects on violations, crashes, and public attitudes on a regular basis.

These “lessons learned” were considered along with the results of the literature review and public opinion surveys to inform the development of the alternative policies and strategies. The resulting alternative policies and strategies are formatted in seven focus areas: public information and outreach, site identification, installation procedures, enforcement procedures, operations and maintenance, and effectiveness evaluation. A discussion of noteworthy practices and resulting policy recommendations accompanies each focus area.

Public Information and Outreach Noteworthy Practices

A public information and outreach campaign has been linked to the success of a RLC program and should be conducted prior to and throughout program implementation. Without an effective public information and outreach campaign, the public may be unaware of the existence of a new type of traffic enforcement program and may be confused if they receive a citation. A study conducted by FHWA in 1995 identified three objectives for an information campaign on RLC programs including:

- The campaign should make drivers more aware of their driving habits and the possible safety consequences of running a red light.
- A variety of media should be used to communicate the program objectives and program results to the public and elected officials.

- The campaign should provide advance warning to the community on RLC program implementation.

FHWA also identified the following elements to include in a public information and outreach campaign:

- Use clear and nontechnical language to describe how the RLC system operates;
- Clearly define program objectives;
- Describe the advantages of using RLC enforcement;
- Explain other measures being used to improve safety at intersections; and
- Describe how the program revenues are used.

Public information and outreach campaigns can employ a variety of different methods, which can help reach a greater proportion of the public. Some of the most common methods used by existing programs include posters, mailings, handouts, media, billboards, warning signs (including changeable message signs), press releases, websites, slogans, and bumper stickers.

Both Baton Rouge and Lafayette maintain web sites that provide public information on their RLC programs. For example, the Baton Rouge site provides press releases, camera locations, frequently asked questions, information on what to do if you receive a notice of violation, sample notice of violation, RLR facts, information on how RLCs affect driver behavior, and information on how a RLC works. Links to these sites are provided below:

- Baton Rouge: <http://brgov.com/redlight/>.
- Lafayette: <http://www.lafayettela.gov/traffic/safelight.asp>.

The FHWA Office of Safety web site provides a section on marketing/outreach materials for automated enforcement programs. While the focus is not directly on RLCs, these materials do provide information related to RLR. The site provides public service announcements in the form of video/television, radio, live read, and print ready. Printable materials include sample letters of invitation to participate in/support a program, sample press releases, presentations, and a sample biography to support a program. <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/redlight/outreach/marketing/>)

Following are links to example RLC public information web sites from other agencies around the country:

- City of Newark, New Jersey: http://www.ci.newark.nj.us/government/city_departments/engineering/red_light_cameras.php
- Pembroke Pines, Florida: <http://www.ppines.com/police/red-light/index.html>
- Suffolk County, New York: <http://suffolkcountyny.gov/redlight/index.html>
- Cary, North Carolina: http://www.townofcary.org/Departments/police/Red_Light_Signal_Cameras.htm
- Escondido, California: <http://police.escondido.org/red-light-cameras.aspx>

While the source may seem somewhat biased, RLC camera vendors may also provide public information and outreach materials. American Traffic Solutions provides promotional materials on their web site and posts a monthly newsletter with information on RLC media coverage:

- Web site: <http://www.atsol.com/solutions/red-light-safety/>.
- Newsletter: <http://roadsafetyink.com/>

Providing the public with outlets to address questions or concerns is a critical component of a successful public education and outreach program. One method is to hold public forums where city and law enforcement officials can explain how the technology works and answer questions. Another method is to provide the public with an outlet to ask questions or express concerns through telephone or web-based information centers. Agencies should establish a priority to respond to comments and questions received from the public. Outreach efforts may also utilize employers, schools, driver education classes, motorist associations, and local community groups to help spread the word on the program. It is also beneficial to address not only the public, but to educate elected officials, judges, and the jurisdiction's traffic engineer and attorney's office, and to keep them informed about the program.

Another option for educating the public is to issue warning citations to potential violators during the initial implementation phase. However, when the warning period ends and enforcement begins must be adequately communicated to the public.

Finally, a continuous public information and outreach campaign should be conducted to educate the public on the dangers of RLR and to provide information on RLC enforcement. The campaign should also be conducted using different media sources and specifically target audiences or situations identified as higher risk for RLR crashes.

Policy Recommendations. The current state RLC policy requires the implementing agency to deploy a public education program *prior to beginning* automated enforcement. The policy includes a warning period for citations and, at a minimum, annual disclosure of the location of RLCs. This policy should be enhanced to include a public education program *prior to beginning and throughout the duration of the program*. Information could include:

- Local effectiveness results – including change in violations and, if available, crash frequency and cost efficiencies of performing automated enforcement;
- Information about how and when citations are given at locations;
- Answers to common questions, such as what happens if someone other than the registered vehicle owner is driving the vehicle at the time of the offense;
- Program costs and use of program revenues;
- Comparative costs and benefits of traditional enforcement versus automated enforcement; and
- How the RLC program integrates with other safety programs in the community.

Identifying Sites for RLCs Noteworthy Practices

The first step in implementing a RLC program is to determine if a RLR safety problem exists. Not all intersections with a high violation rate have a high frequency of RLR-related crashes. Since RLCs are intended to improve safety, they should only be installed at locations with a RLR running related crashes (i.e., right angle crashes). This approach is more defensible to the public.

Agencies should conduct an engineering study and provide documentation of crash characteristics to identify candidate locations.

When investigating a potential RLR problem, it is necessary to collect the most recent information available on crash history (multiple years), traffic volumes, intersection geometry, pavement condition, and site surveys. Collision diagrams and crash summaries (i.e., crashes summarized by crash type and contributing crash factors) are useful tools for identifying crash trends and potential contributing factors.

If the crash history indicates the agency should conduct a field review to gather additional information and observe traffic patterns. At a minimum, the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) (2003) recommends collecting data and making assessments on the following:

- Turning movement counts (including truck volumes);
- Signal timing parameters;
- Sight distance to signal;
- Geometric configuration;
- Traffic signs and markings (including condition);
- Pavement condition; and
- Traffic speed.

ITE prepared an intersection field review form for inspecting signalized intersections to reduce RLR (provided in Figure 10). Ultimately, the field review should help identify potential deficiencies at the intersection that may be contributing to the crash problem and/or other potential contributing factors to aid in countermeasure selection.

INTERSECTION FIELD INSPECTION FORM

LOCATION INFORMATION			
Intersection Identification: _____ with _____			
Approach Name: _____		Direction Heading: _____	
PART 1. CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY			
Type of Signal Mounting: Span Wire Mast Arm Pole Structure		Sight Distance to the Signal: _____ feet	
Requires Advance Warning Sign? Y N		Advance Signal Warning Sign Present: Y N	
Is anything blocking the view of the signals? Y N If yes, describe _____			
Can signal faces on other approaches be seen? Y N If yes, do these signals have visors, shields, or programmable lenses? Y N			
PART 2. CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY			
Could visual clutter detract from the signal? Y N		Signal Lens Size Adequate?:	
Are the signal indications confusing? Y N		Red signal lens size: 8 inch 12 inch	
If yes, explain: _____		Distance from stop line to signal: _____ feet	
_____		Near side signal? Y N	
Are backplates present? Y N		Is existing size adequate? Y N	
Are backplates necessary? Y N		Number of Signal Heads Adequate?	
Are other glare-reducing steps needed? Y N		Total number of signal heads for major movement: _____	
Signal lens type: Incandescent LEDs		Total number of lanes for major movement: _____	
		Is existing number adequate? Y N	
		Signal Heads Placement Adequate? Y N	
PART 3. CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS			
Grade (as decimal) $g =$ _____ (uphill is positive)		Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using agency practice or the following equation:	
Approach speed $V =$ _____ mph		$CP = 1.0 + \frac{\text{Yellow}}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{\text{All-red}}{1.47 * V} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$	
Cross street width $W =$ _____ feet			
	Actual Value	Calculated Value	Is Existing Adequate?
Yellow Interval	_____	_____	Y N
All Red Interval	_____	_____	Y N
PART 4. CHECK OTHER FACTORS			
Is horizontal location adequate? Y N Pavement condition on approach: Adequate Polished Severely Rutted			
Should signal warranting study be conducted? Y N Other concerns: _____			
PART 5. IDENTIFY PROMISING COUNTERMEASURES			
Visibility Deficiency	Conspicuity Deficiency	Signal Timing Operation Deficiency	
_____ Install additional signals on near side	_____ Add signals to achieve one per lane	_____ Change yellow interval	
_____ Change signal mounting	_____ Replace with LED lens type	_____ Add/change all-red interval	
_____ Install SIGNAL AHEAD sign	_____ Replace with 12" signal head	Other Measures	
_____ Install Advance Warning Flashers	_____ Install double red signal	_____ Determine if signal is warranted	
_____ Remove/relocate sight obstruction	_____ Install/enhance backplates	_____ Consider roundabout or innovative design	
_____ Install programmable lenses	_____ Install rumble strips on approach	_____ Improve pavement condition	
_____ Install shields and visors	_____ Install near side signal	_____	
_____ Other _____			

Inspection By: _____

Date: _____

Source: ITE (2005).

Figure 10
Intersection field inspection form

Prior to considering implementation of a RLC, engineering, educational, and traditional enforcement strategies should be tried and proven insufficient. Table 7 identifies some strategies other than RLC to consider.

Table 7
Potential strategies to address RLR crashes

Type of Strategy	Strategy
Engineering Countermeasures	
Traffic Operation and Signal Control	Revise signal timing Add all-red interval Ensure appropriate yellow times Improve signal head visibility Install additional signal heads Install advance signalized intersection warning signs Install advance yellow flashing lights Adjust the approach speed Coordinate traffic signals Install advance vehicle detection Remove unwarranted traffic signals Remove on-street parking
Intersection Geometry	Improve geometric deficiencies, where possible.
Education	
Public Information and Education Campaign	Provide information and data that explains the RLR problem, why it is dangerous, and actions in place to reduce the number of violations. Design an ongoing educational program to address the interests, concerns, and needs of various target audiences using various media. Combine the education campaign with targeted enforcement.
Enforcement	
Random	Select random locations for officers to enforce.

Enforcement	
Targeted Enforcement	Identify problem locations and have officers enforce the location for a particular time period.

Source: ITE (2003)

Note: Effectiveness of potential countermeasures will be influenced by site-specific conditions; not all countermeasures identified in the ITE Guidebook will be effective in all situations.

Policy Recommendation. The existing state photo enforcement policy specifies intersections shall be identified for RLC programs based “primarily on vehicle/pedestrian” crashes. As written, this implies only crashes involving pedestrians should be considered as an indicator for red light camera enforcement. In fact, all crash types that could be prevented by a red light camera should be considered in the criteria for identifying locations. It is recommended the wording be modified to “intersections shall be selected based primarily on crashes that can be avoided with an automated enforcement countermeasure.”

The existing state photo enforcement policy specifies red light enforcement is justified at an intersection if five or more RLR related crashes occur at an intersection within a continuous 12-month period. An issue with this approach is that it does not account for the random variation in crash frequency and could identify sites without a long term RLR crash issue and overlook sites with sustained RLR crash issues. Optional methods exist for identifying sites experiencing significant RLR crash problems. These include identifying RLR average crash rates or crash frequencies for similar intersections and comparing sites to the average; using statistical tests from the AASHTO Highway Safety Manual (HSM); or using the predictive method and Empirical Bayes method from the HSM.

It is recommended the state photo enforcement policy be modified to use enhanced methods to identify sites with potential to respond to RLCs.

Equipment Noteworthy Practices

FHWA (2005) identifies six “on-the-street” components of a RLC system:

- Camera units;
- Intersection lighting;
- Camera housing and supporting structures;
- Vehicle detection;

- Communications; and
- Warning signs.

The key components related to public perception are the camera units selected for the RLC system and installation of warning signs. Today's RLC systems typically use digital cameras to collect still images of the violation and video cameras to capture a video sequence of the violation. The use of video in a RLC system provides two major advantages from the public perspective: it allows the public agency reviewers to "see the context" of the violation when deciding if a citation should be issued and allows the driver to view the violation. Enabling drivers to view the violation via video clips should help in refuting the argument against RLC inaccuracies. Likewise, video clips can provide supplemental information to support a valid claim that a citation should not have been issued (e.g., vehicle entering on red under police direction).

FHWA identifies the ability to detect vehicle speed as another potential advantage of using a RLC video system. Vehicle speed can be used to predict whether a RLR violation will occur. This provides an opportunity to prevent a collision by preempting the signal to create an all-red interval. While this does not prevent the violation, it minimizes the crash potential.

Policy Recommendation. Signs warning drivers about the RLC enforcement should be installed as part of the driver awareness and education process. An evaluation conducted by Council et al (2005) concluded the net economic benefits of a RLC program are greater when warning signs were installed both at the intersection and city limits compared to intersection only. Signs should be in compliance with the MUTCD standards. The existing state policy allows for optional placement of warning signs at jurisdiction limits. It is recommended the state policy be modified to require signs indicating electronic traffic enforcement be installed at the jurisdictional limits of the local governments, perhaps at major entry points.

Installation Procedures Noteworthy Practices

To ensure proper installation, RLC installation plans should be prepared by a licensed engineer and in accordance with the system manufacturer's standard plans and technical specifications. Plans should also be developed in accordance with the state and local agency standard plans and specifications and processed through the appropriate review and permitting procedures.

According to FHWA (2005), proper installation of RLC systems includes:

- Installation consistent with the equipment manufacturer's guidelines and state or local agency specifications;

- Inspection of all installation work by state and local agency officials and, where necessary, by the project engineer;
- Testing the RLC equipment prior to its cutover for unattended operation; and
- Preparation of as-built drawings that reflect the actual construction conditions.

The RLC system should be comprehensively tested prior to initiating unattended operation. The installation should be thoroughly inspected, and the system should be tested using simulated and actual traffic. Until the system is deemed accurate and reliable, no warnings or citations should be issued. Once in operation, the system should be regularly evaluated to ensure it is working properly.

Policy Recommendation. No recommended RLC installation changes are offered to the state photo enforcement policy.

Enforcement Procedures Noteworthy Practices

Law enforcement officers in the field typically use judgment to decide whether to issue a citation for an observed traffic violation. For example, they may choose not to issue a citation for RLR if the driver’s view of the traffic signal was obstructed by an oversized vehicle. To improve public perception of a RLC program, some degree of officer discretion also should be applied when issuing citations for through movement and possible right-turn-on-red violations recorded by a RLC. Officers reviewing violation photographs should consider whether any circumstances captured in the video or still images make a case for not issuing a citation. To provide program consistency and support the goal of providing fairness to motorists, agencies should establish a clear policy on how to determine if a citation will be issued and provide the appropriate training to officers. This includes identifying scenarios for which a citation would be issued, while allowing room for officer discretion to avoid issuing citations (with appropriate documentation) when mitigating circumstances are observed. Establishing a policy provides enforcement factors that can be explained to violators, promotes transparency in decision-making, improves the perception of fairness, and educates the citizens about traffic signal operations and safety. Ideally, the policy should be developed and applied consistently across the state.

Policy Recommendation. To limit public confusion and concern, RLC enforcement policies should be consistent within the state and with relevant national policies. A potential issue with Louisiana’s existing law defining RLR is its lack of consistency with the national MUTCD, which establishes national standards for all traffic control devices. According to Louisiana Law Revised Statute Title 32 Section 232 (RS 32:232), “vehicular traffic shall not enter or be crossing the intersection when the red signal is exhibited.” Louisiana law requires

vehicles to clear the intersection prior to the signal indication changing to red, but the MUTCD only indicates the vehicle shall not enter the intersection during a steady red indication. The state automated enforcement policy allows for a citation to be issued if the motorist is beyond the stop bar at the beginning of a red indication, which is permissible according to MUTCD procedures. This variation in Louisiana's law could cause confusion from out-of-state drivers and potential negative feedback from residents. Therefore, it is recommended the state further evaluate these issues and consider revising RS 32:232 to provide consistency with the MUTCD.

Right-Turn-on-Red

Prior to digital camera technologies, right-turn-on-red after stop violations were not enforced with RLCs due to limitations of cost and number of photos to be captured using wet film technology. However, with advances in camera technology, jurisdictions have started issuing citations for right-turn-on-red after stop violations, which has been met with significantly less public support.

McCartt and Eichelberger (2011) conducted a public opinion survey of drivers in 14 cities with existing RLC programs. They found nearly two-thirds of those surveyed favored the use of RLCs; however, only 41 percent favored using them for right-turn-on-red after stop violations. Drivers were primarily opposed because they did not believe these violations were a safety issue. Many of the survey responses suggested drivers were confused about when right-turn-on-red is permitted and when right turns can be made without stopping. Right-turn-on-red is defined in the existing state policy; however, agency applications of state policy may differ on whether a citation is issued for a rolling right turn on red, which was identified as a possible explanation for the confusion.

Policy Recommendation. The state automated enforcement policy permits motorists to enter the intersection to turn right on a red light after stopping and, as necessary, yielding to pedestrians and other motorists without receiving a red light running citation. Drivers who do not stop prior to turning right on red are in violation of the law and subject to enforcement. Agencies should operate their RLC programs consistent with this policy, and it should be deployed across the state. Imposing a reduced fine for right-turn-on-red violations may increase public support for enforcing these common violations, and it should be incorporated into state policy.

Operations and Maintenance Noteworthy Practices

A number of options exist for operating RLC programs. For example, system operations and citation processing may be fully carried out by the agency or some functions may be outsourced to a private vendor. FHWA (2005) identified four potential alternatives for

acquisition, installation, operation, and maintenance of a RLC system (see Table 8). Table 8 shows increasing degrees of state/local agency responsibility are associated with the typical activities required to develop and deploy RLC programs. To reduce public confusion about program implementation, a consistent model for deployment throughout Louisiana is recommended.

Table 8
Alternatives for RLC system acquisition, installation, operation, and maintenance

Responsibility	Option A		Option B		Option C		Option D	
	State/Local Agency	Private Contractor	State/Local Agency	Private Contractor	State/Local Agency	Private Contractor	State/Local Agency	Private Contractor
Project Planning and Management	■		■		■		■	
Equipment Ownership		■	■		■		■	
Design and Installation		■		■	■	■	■	
Plan Check and Installation Inspection	■		■		■		■	
Operation and Maintenance		■		■		■	■	
Citation Data Processing		■		■		■	■	
Decision to Issue Citation	■		■		■		■	
Violator Inquiries		■		■	■		■	
Public Information Program		■		■	■		■	

Source: Adapted from FHWA (2005).

Most RLCs installed in the U.S. are owned and operated by private contractors, which is one source of opposition. However, the cost associated with purchasing and maintaining the equipment provides benefits in minimizing or eliminating the costs to the state or local agency when contracting with a vendor to purchase and maintain the equipment. To decrease the public opposition and avoid a conflict of interest, the agency should make all decisions regarding site selection process and avoid a compensation structure based on the number of paid citations.

Agencies should provide complete oversight of the private contractors to avoid potential conflicts of interest that may arise as part of the development and operations of a RLC program.

While vendor compensation practices vary by agency, the compensation amount should be solely based on the value of the equipment and services provided by the vendor. Table 9 provides some different payment options for vendor owned and operated RLC systems.

Table 9
Payment options for contractor-owned and -operated RLC systems

Payment Option	Equipment	Equipment Installation	Equipment Maintenance	Citation Data Processing
Initial Fixed Price Payment	■	■		
Initial Fixed Price Payment and Fixed Monthly Payments	■	■	■	■
Fixed Monthly Payments	■	■	■	■
Initial Fixed Price Payment and Per Citation Payments				
Per Citation Payments				
Initial Fixed Price Payment and Fixed Monthly Payment Schedule, Depending on Predetermined Low/High Number of Citations Issued	■	■	■	■
Fixed Monthly Payment Schedule, Depending on Predetermined Low/High Number of Citations Issued	■	■	■	■
Time Worked and Materials Used			■	■

Source: FHWA (2005).

The current vendor payment structures in both Baton Rouge and Lafayette are based on the number of paid citations, which reflects some of the controversy with the existing RLC programs in Louisiana. New programs in Louisiana should consider other vendor payment options. The existing RLC programs may want to reconsider the vendor payment options when new contracts are negotiated. Overall, vendor contracts and payment structures should be consistent and transparent across the state.

Some opponents of RLC systems claim RLCs are inaccurate. Any system operations issues should be identified during the review process. Further, it is important to continue monitoring the systems to ensure proper operations. Agencies should develop and implement operations and maintenance procedures and conduct periodic checks of the system to verify it is functioning properly.

Policy Recommendation. To decrease the public opposition and avoid a potential conflict of interest, agencies should control the site selection process with vendor support limited to data collection under the direction of the local agency. Agencies should avoid a vendor compensation structure based on the number of paid citations.

Effectiveness Evaluation Noteworthy Practices

The safety effectiveness of RLCs has been evaluated in numerous studies throughout the United States and internationally. While the level of effectiveness varies, the results generally indicate a decline in right angle crashes and increase in rear-end crashes. Conducting effectiveness evaluations of RLC programs not only enables an agency to verify

the program is resulting in the intended outcome, i.e., a reduction in RLR crashes, the results can also be used to educate the public on the effectiveness of the cameras for improving safety. Many opponents of RLCs claim they are ineffective in reducing crashes, and effectiveness evaluations can provide documentation to refute this claim (assuming a decline in targeted crashes).

The type of study methodology used for evaluating effectiveness of the RLCs (site-specific or as a whole) is a significant factor in the reliability of the results. Simple observational before/after studies are commonly used by agencies to evaluate the effectiveness of safety treatments. While this methodology is simple, it lends itself to two significant flaws – the results may be biased due to the effects of regression-to-the mean and lack of control sites. Regression to the mean is a statistical phenomenon in which a period with a comparatively high observed crash frequency will likely be followed by a comparatively lower crash frequency. This also applies to the converse situation; a low crash frequency period will probably be followed by a high crash frequency period. Since RLCs are intended to be installed at high crash locations, it is likely the result of a simple before after study will overestimate the effectiveness of the RLCs in reducing crashes. Additionally, the simple before/after study does not account for changes in conditions at the camera site or in the broader community, such as traffic volumes, driver behavior, or weather, which can impact crash frequency.

Advanced statistical evaluation methods can provide a more accurate estimate of the effectiveness of RLCs by accounting for the potential effects of regression to the mean through the use of control sites. These methods include: observational before/after study using a comparison group, observational before/after study using the Empirical Bayes method, and cross-sectional studies. The HSM provides more information on evaluation study types.

An additional challenge with evaluating RLC effectiveness is the potential for spillover effects at intersections without RLCs. FHWA (2005) defined “spillover effect” as “the expected effect of RLCs on intersections other than the ones actually treated, resulting from jurisdiction-wide publicity and the general lack of knowledge of where RLCs are installed.” Spillover effects actually increase the effectiveness of RLCs by spreading the benefits to other intersections in the jurisdiction. However, due to spillover effects, the actual effectiveness of RLCs may be underestimated, particularly when the evaluation study method has a strong reliance on comparison sites.

Previous RLC evaluation efforts can also provide some insight into considerations for the evaluation study design. The 2005 FHWA report on *Safety Evaluations of Red Light*

Cameras identified a number of lessons learned based on previous studies for developing a defensible RLC evaluation. These include:

- **Number of treatment sites.** Evaluating a low number of sites provides results with a low level of significance.
- **RLC “spillover effects” in the same city.** The RLC may impact the crash experience at control or comparison sites located in the same city. Therefore it may be necessary to use control or comparison sites located in similar cities for the evaluation or a study design that does not rely on comparison sites.
- **Differences in crash investigations and reporting practices between jurisdictions.** This can make it difficult to aggregate results or to make comparisons between different jurisdictions.
- **Defining “red light-running crashes.”** Previous studies have lacked a precise definition of what constitutes a red light crash, making it difficult to compare results. Also, police crash report forms do not always clearly differentiate between angle and turning crashes, and it is difficult to determine whether a right turn on red crash was “legal.”
- **RLC effects on rear-end crashes.** Since many previous studies have indicated an increase in rear-end crashes with implementation of RLCs, it is imperative to consider this crash type in the analysis and to provide a tradeoff analysis for the reduction in right angle crashes. An economic analysis provides a quantitative result that can help the public understand these tradeoffs.
- **Exposure changes between before/after periods.** Many RLC evaluation studies have not accounted for changes in traffic volumes during the before and after periods. Exposure is a major determinant of intersection crashes and should be accounted for in the evaluation methodology.
- **Regression to the mean effects.** Since RLCs are targeted at intersections with a high RLR crash experience, evaluation studies are subject to the effects of regression to the mean. If not accounted for in the evaluation study methodology, this may cause an overestimation of the effectiveness of the RLCs in reducing crash frequency or crash severity.
- **Yellow interval improvements (and other intersection improvements) made at the time of RLC installation.** It can be difficult to distinguish between the effects of

RLCs and other intersection improvements. However, since some studies have shown that other intersection improvements can be just as effective in reducing RLR crashes, it is important to separate the effects of these other improvements from RLCs when evaluating effectiveness.

- **Disaggregate effects by signalization variables.** Little knowledge currently exists on the effects of signalization variables (i.e., cycle length and yellow and all-red interval combinations). However, these effects would be useful in planning RLC programs or explaining the different results across sites or jurisdictions.
- **Effect of signage.** Previous evaluations have provided varying results on the effects of signage at intersections with RLCs, as well as other intersections in the jurisdiction. These effects need to be further investigated.
- **Public education level.** The impacts of public education on the effectiveness of a RLC program needs to be further investigated.
- **Definition of red light violation.** Defining what constitutes a red light violation may affect public perception and citation practices. For example, the amount of time allotted as a “grace period” after the signal turns red prior to issuing a ticket could have different impacts on the number of citations issued.
- **Relationship between changes in violations and changes in crashes.** A relationship has not yet been established; however, such a relationship would make it much easier to evaluate RLC installations.

As previously mentioned in the discussion of the effects of RLCs on rear-end crashes, an economic analysis would help the public understand the tradeoffs between a potential increase in rear-end crashes and a decrease in angle crashes associated with the installation of a RLC. Relative crash frequency may not change significantly, but crash severity will likely decrease because rear-end crashes are usually less severe than angle crashes. Similar crash effects are associated with the installation of traffic signals. The economic benefits of reducing angle crashes would be greater than the disbenefit of an increase in rear-end crashes. An economic evaluation also provides a method to compare the cost effectiveness of RLCs to the cost effectiveness of other countermeasures aimed at reducing RLR crashes at intersections.

In addition to the economic burden and the potential lack of data/methodological expertise in smaller communities to produce valid statistical evaluations, a multitude of evaluation

findings (some based on limited data or weak study designs) inevitably produces mixed results and confuses the issue of camera effectiveness.

Policy Recommendation. The effectiveness of RLCs in reducing fatal and serious injury crashes has been demonstrated numerous times in the research; hence, local governments in Louisiana need not be required to document the crash effectiveness of individual programs. Conducting crash effectiveness evaluations using statistically reliable methods is likely to be beyond many local practitioners' skill levels. The policy should be modified to eliminate the annual reporting requirement of changes in crash frequency or severity at RLC deployments. To more reliably evaluate the effectiveness of RLCs in Louisiana, it would be appropriate for LTRC or DOTD to conduct a multi-jurisdictional crash analysis based on statistically valid methodology and robust crash data. As an alternative and for the purposes of transparency, agencies should include information about outputs of the project as part of public education activities. This could include information such as citations issued and use of funds.

Evaluation of Policies Recommendations

The following recommendations to the existing state policy are proposed:

1. Modify the photo enforcement policy to require public education programs be conducted prior to and throughout deployment of a RLC program.
2. Modify the policy to clarify the type of crashes under consideration in the automated enforcement portion from "vehicle/pedestrian" crashes to "crashes that can be avoided with an automated enforcement countermeasure."
3. Modify the photo enforcement policy to required enhanced methods for screening signalized intersections to identify sites with potential for safety improvement.
4. Modify the photo enforcement policy to require signs indicating electronic traffic enforcement be installed at the specific installation location and at jurisdictional limits of the local governments.
5. Modify the Law Revised Statute Title 32 Section 232 (RS 32:232) or the photo enforcement policy to achieve a consistent definition of a red light violation. Louisiana law requires vehicles to clear the intersection prior to the signal indication changing to red. The MUTCD indicates the vehicle shall not enter the intersection during a steady red indication. Either the policy or the statute should be modified for consistency.
6. The state automated enforcement policy permits motorists to enter the intersection to turn right on a red light after stopping and, as necessary, yielding to pedestrians and other motorists without receiving a red light running citation. Drivers that do not stop prior to turning right on red are in violation of the law and subject to enforcement. Agencies

should operate their RLC programs consistent with this policy, and it should be consistently deployed across the state. Imposing a reduced fine for right-turn-on-red violations, as compared to traditional red light violations, may increase public support for enforcing these common violations, and should be incorporated into state policy.

7. To decrease the public opposition and avoid a potential conflict of interest, agencies should control the site selection process with vendor support limited to data collection under the direction of the local agency. Agencies avoid a compensation structure based on the number of paid citations.
8. Eliminate the requirement for local agencies to report effectiveness of RLC deployments.

Finally, the policy recommendations identified to address the public's positive and negative opinions of RLC programs were evaluated according to the following qualitative criteria:

- **Implementation** – Who would be responsible for implementing the change and is the recommendation likely to be relatively easy or relatively difficult to implement?
- **Consistency with Louisiana practices** – How consistent is the recommendation with existing Louisiana practices? More consistency with existing practices will make it easier for practitioners and stakeholders to adapt to the recommended change.
- **Effectiveness** – How effective is the recommendation likely to be in changing public attitudes about RLCs? Is making the recommended change likely to yield a large or small change in public perception of RLCs?
- **Benefits to public perception** – Would making the recommended change have a positive or negative impact on public perception? At a qualitative level, what is the magnitude of the impact to public perception?

Table 10 shows the results of the qualitative evaluation of each of these recommended policy changes.

Table 10
Evaluation of recommended policy changes

Policy	Implementation	Consistency with Other Practices	Effectiveness	Benefits to Public Perception
1. Public education throughout RLC Deployment.	DOTD to change policy. Cities only have to conduct public education prior to installation now. Instead this would be a continuous program and thus would require additional revenues to implement.	Extending public education program is consistent with local practices.	Perhaps the most effective and valuable policy change.	A well developed public education program could have significant positive impacts on public reactions to RLC programs.
2. Type of crashes for site selection should potentially respond to automated enforcement.	DOTD to change policy. Clarifies the type of crashes to evaluate. No major change in type of site analysis or data needs. Not difficult to implement.	Clarifies types of crashes for evaluation. Crash evaluation already required. Consistent with other practices.	Automated enforcement will be more effective in reducing crashes if appropriate crash types are targeted. This clarifies crash types for consideration.	Public perception of effectiveness will be enhanced with appropriate crash types targeted.
3. Modify the photo enforcement policy to require enhanced methods for screening signalized intersections to identify sites with potential for safety improvement.	DOTD to change policy, DOTD may have to provide staff support to identify appropriate network screening method and support data needs.	Enhanced methods would be new to practitioners. Would require training and possibly additional crash summary information from DOTD.	Would improve the likelihood of identifying sites with meaningful potential to respond to automated enforcement.	As sites positively respond to automated enforcement, public perception of value will improve.
4. Photo enforcement signs at installation and jurisdictional boundary.	Cities are required to install signs at sites with RLC. This change would require cities to install additional signs. Marginal additional expense.	Signs are already a requirement so this is consistent with existing practices.	Consistent with expense, this would have an incremental additional effect of providing information to the public about automated enforcement in a community.	Incremental benefit of public having early information that photo enforcement is implemented in the community.
5. Consistency between MUTCD and automated enforcement definition of violation.	May be the most difficult policy recommendation to implement as one option is to revise the Louisiana Statutes.	Would be a new definition of a red light violation so would be a change to the public and would require education.	Having consistent definitions would reduce one argument for opposing RLC programs.	Consistency would have a small benefit to public perception. Each increment will add value.

Policy	Implementation	Consistency with Other Practices	Effectiveness	Benefits to Public Perception
6. Ensure consistent implementation of state policy regarding permitting right-turn-on-red after stop without a citation. ^a Consider a reduced fine for right-turn-on-red violations	No policy change is required.	Consistent with other practice in state.	No impact on effectiveness of a program.	Consistent enforcement may improve public perception of RLC program.
7. The implementing agency should not involve the vendor in the site selection process; avoid a compensation structure based on the number of paid citations.	Limited challenges to implementation for new programs. Would not be possible for agencies to modify existing contracts.	Depending on contracting periods, there may be differences between current contract practices and new practices. Cities with existing contracts could renegotiate address issue.	Would be beneficial to public opinion about revenue neutrality.	Would be beneficial to public opinion about revenue neutrality.
8. Eliminate before/after evaluation requirements.	DOTD would implement policy change.	Would require practitioner and public education to accept effectiveness research from other locations and not spend additional funding to research effectiveness.	Would reduce unnecessary public spending on data collection and studies.	Without appropriate public and practitioner education, the public may react negatively if local effectiveness evaluations are not conducted.

*Providing the motorist appropriately enters the intersection after stopping to confirm no pedestrians or vehicle conflicts.

Comparison of Traditional Enforcement to Red Light Cameras

A high-level comparative analysis was conducted to compare the costs and benefits of automated red light enforcement versus traditional traffic enforcement. Law enforcement colleagues and partners both inside Louisiana and in other states were contacted to gather information used in the comparative analysis to determine the approximate costs associated with traditional RLR enforcement. The literature review, community interviews, technology vendors, and sources in other states were used to identify and compare cost elements of automated enforcement.

A key objective of this comparative analysis was to match, as closely as possible, the costs and benefits of 24-hours-a-day, 7-days-a-week (24/7) coverage of automated red light enforcement with traditional police traffic enforcement. It is unlikely municipal agencies in Louisiana are able to assign police officers to enforce RLR at specific intersections on a 24/7

basis, but the comparative analysis made this assumption to match the costs and benefits of 24/7 coverage provided by RLCs.

Table 11 provides a summary of costs, benefits, and potential negative effects associated with traditional police traffic enforcement and RLCs. RLCs could also be compared to other engineering improvements such as roundabouts or grade changes; however, the analysis was beyond the scope of this project. The costs associated with traditional enforcement considered officer salary, use of a patrol car, additional time required to attend traffic court, and a fraction of a supervisor’s salary. Training costs incurred when a new officer is hired were excluded. RLC costs considered include the costs to lease, install, maintain, and service camera equipment, as well the costs associated with installation and maintenance of warning signs and police officer oversight.

In terms of benefits, monetary values were not estimated; it was assumed the same reductions in angle crashes reported for RLCs would apply to traditional enforcement. Some additional benefits were assumed for traditional enforcement (i.e., other violations detected such as DUI, unlicensed drivers, and crime deterrence). If legally authorized, RLC technology can also be used to enforce speeding laws. Data were not available; therefore, the comparative analysis did not account for the respective numbers of RLR citations (and associated fine revenue) issued by RLCs versus traditional traffic enforcement.

As for potential negative effects, an increase in rear-end crashes (as reported in some studies) was assumed for both automated red light enforcement and traditional traffic enforcement. Some additional potential negative effects were assumed (see Table 2). Additional assumptions and references used in the analysis are provided in Appendix D.

Table 11
Comparison of traditional enforcement versus RLCs

Cost	Traditional Enforcement		Red Light Cameras	
	Officer salary - Two (24/7)	\$240,000	Vendor payments	\$42,000
Patrol car - Two	\$284,700	Installation (amortized over 10 years)	\$4,400	
Court time	\$16,000	Maintenance	\$15,000	
Fraction of Sgt. Salary	\$15,000	Install warning signs (amortized over 10 years)	\$70	
Total	\$555,700	Maintain signs	\$50	
		Officer oversight	\$30,000	
		Total	\$91,520	

Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in angle crashes (assumed to be the same for traditional enforcement and red light cameras) - Other violations detected (e.g., DUI, unlicensed) - Crime deterrent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in angle crashes (assumed to be the same for traditional enforcement and red light cameras) - If legally authorized, red light camera technology can be used to enforce speeding laws
Potential Negative Effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in rear-end crashes - Driver distraction - Traffic congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in rear-end crashes - Public controversy

This basic comparative analysis suggests automated red light enforcement is more cost effective than traditional enforcement, primarily because of its ability to function 24/7 without the need to be accompanied by either police officers or patrol vehicles. The added value of using police officers is the ability to detect violations other than RLR and to apprehend criminals. Public controversy associated with automated enforcement is a potential negative effect that must be considered when comparing red light cameras with traditional enforcement. Including comparative costs analyses in the ongoing public education campaign could help enhance public perception of automated enforcement.

CONCLUSIONS

RLC programs have been used in over 500 cities (IIHS) in the U.S. to augment efforts by law enforcement to curb intersection crashes in general and red light running crashes in particular. RLC program implementation has reduced angle crashes and injury crashes in a majority of the cities; however, rear-end crashes increased in many jurisdictions. A majority of the studies also show a decline in the number of RLR violations at intersections following RLC program implementation.

Jurisdictions with RLC programs in operation generally have higher support among residents than jurisdictions without RLC programs. Approximately two-thirds of the drivers perceive an increased likelihood of receiving a ticket if they commit a RLR violation at an intersection with automated enforcement. Critics view RLC programs as a means to generate revenue rather than improve safety.

Comprehensive crash data analysis is recommended by federal and state guidance documents for investigating intersections with an unusually high number of RLR violations and crashes. Violation data may not be the only basis of analysis, as violations may not necessarily directly translate to a RLR crash problem. Vehicle characteristics, intersection design and operations, and driver behavior are central to RLR phenomenon. Engineering and education countermeasures should be the first line of action adopted by traffic engineers to mitigate RLR violations and crashes. Intersections that continue to exhibit abnormal levels of RLR violations even after engineering and educational countermeasures have been in operation are typical candidates for RLCs.

The Red Light Safety Program in Baton Rouge and the SafeLight Program in Lafayette were implemented in response to high crash frequency. They underwent similar implementation methods using a network approach. Deployment is similar with permanent, fixed cameras at intersections taking multiple digital images and outreach primarily through press releases to the media. The vendors in Baton Rouge and Lafayette are contracted to manage installation, maintenance, and citations. They are compensated when fines are paid.

Lafayette Consolidated Government maintains a record of crash data available for public review online, and the SafeLight citation information per intersection is updated regularly. Baton Rouge DPW has had difficulty collecting data both before and after implementation due to insufficient access to and inaccuracies in crash reports. Traffic engineers typically use crash data three years before and after active implementation to make scientific comparisons. Baton Rouge's program has not been operating long enough to undergo traffic study comparisons until this year, and data for the 2010 calendar year is not yet available from DOTD. Therefore safety effectiveness evaluations have not yet been conducted.

The public opinion survey conducted in this project showed an even split between respondents who perceive RLR to be a problem and those who do not. Similarly, respondents were evenly split between being in favor of and opposed to RLC programs. Opposition was slightly higher in the regions with RLC programs compared to regions without. Whether or not an individual feels RLR is a problem may influence whether they support or oppose a RLC program. For example, those who believe RLR is a problem are more likely to support a RLC program than those who do not believe RLR is a problem.

Among those who favor RLC programs, the leading reasons to support the program (in order of response) are it encourages drivers to obey traffic laws, reduces crashes, and reduces RLR. Conversely, the leading reasons respondents oppose RLC programs is because respondents believe it is just a program to increase revenue and RLCs go against our system of justice. A smaller proportion feels RLCs are ineffective. Respondents also provided several other reasons to oppose RLC programs, such as RLCs increase rear-end crashes, removes officer discretion, disagree with a private company having a financial interest in the system, violates privacy, discriminates against certain sociodemographic groups, and imposes responsibility on vehicle owner, even if they were not driving the vehicle.

While almost half of the respondents are opposed to RLC programs, they did identify strategies that could be used in their community to help change their mind. The most popular strategy was to provide more information about how the revenue from the RLCs is actually used. Other strategies that might change their mind include using the revenue to improve safety in the community, providing better warning about when and where RLC programs are going to be implemented, and educating the public on the effectiveness of RLCs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The project recommendations are:

1. Modify the photo enforcement policy to require public education programs be conducted prior to and *throughout* deployment of a RLC program.
2. Modify the policy to clarify the type of crashes under consideration in the automated enforcement portion from “vehicle/pedestrian” crashes to “crashes that can be avoided with an automated enforcement countermeasure.”
3. Modify the photo enforcement policy to require enhanced methods for screening signalized intersections to identify sites with potential for safety improvement.
4. Modify the photo enforcement policy to require signs indicating electronic traffic enforcement be installed at the specific installation location *and* at jurisdictional limits of the local governments.
5. Modify the Law Revised Statute Title 32 Section 232 (RS 32:232) or the photo enforcement policy to achieve a consistent definition of a red light violation. Louisiana law requires vehicles to clear the intersection prior to the signal indication changing to red. The MUTCD indicates the vehicle shall not enter the intersection during a steady red indication. The State automated enforcement policy allows for a citation to be issued if the motorist is beyond the stop bar at the beginning of a red indication, which is permissible according to MUTCD procedures. It is recommended the state further evaluate these issues and consider revising RS 32:232 to provide consistency with the MUTCD.
6. Develop and maintain a consistent approach applying the state automated enforcement policy related to right turns on red. Existing policy permits motorists to enter the intersection to turn right on a red light after stopping and, as necessary, yielding to pedestrians and other motorists without receiving a red light running citation. Drivers that do not stop prior to turning right on red are in violation of the law and subject to enforcement. Imposing a reduced fine for right-turn-on-red violations may increase public support for enforcing these common violations, and should be incorporated into state policy.
7. Control the site selection process with vendor support limited to data collection or other activities at the discretion of the agency to decrease the public opposition and avoid a potential conflict of interest. Agencies should avoid a vendor compensation structure based on the number of paid citations.
8. Eliminate the requirement for agencies to report effectiveness of RLC deployments.

ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS

AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ATS	American Traffic Solutions
DOTD	Department of Transportation and Development
DPW	Department of Public Works
DTT	Department of Traffic and Transportation
DUI	Driving Under the Influence
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
HSM	Highway Safety Manual
IIHS	Insurance Institute of Highway Safety
ITE	The Institute of Transportation Engineers
LCG	Lafayette Consolidated Government
LTRC	Louisiana Transportation Research Center
MUTCD	Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Device
NCHRP	National Cooperative Highway Research Program
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
OMV	Office of Motor Vehicles
RIP	Research In Progress
RLC	Red Light Camera
RLR	Red Light Running
RS	Revised Statute

REFERENCES

1. Bochner, B. and Walden, T. (2010). *Effectiveness of Red Light Cameras*, Texas Transportation Institute, http://tti.tamu.edu/group/stsc/files/2011/03/Red_light-camera-effectiveness-070610-w-Garland-correction.pdf - Accessed July 2011.
2. Burkey, M. and Obeng, K. (2004). *A Detailed Investigation of Crash Reduction Resulting from Red Light Cameras in Small Urban Areas*, U.S. Department of Transportation, Research and Special Programs Administration, Washington, DC.
3. Council, F., Persaud, B., Eccles, K., Lyon, C., and Griffith, M. (2005). *Safety Evaluation of Red Light Cameras: Executive Summary*, Federal Highway Administration, Report No. FHWA HRT-05-049.
4. Cunningham, C. M. and Hummer, J. S. (2004). *Evaluating the Use of Red Light Running Photographic Enforcement Using Collisions and Red Light Running Violations*, North Carolina Governor's Highway Safety Program, Raleigh, NC.
5. Federal Highway Administration and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2003). *Guidance for Using Red Light Cameras*, <http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/enforce/guidance03/guidancereport.pdf> - Accessed August 2011.
6. Frangos, G. E. (undated). *Automated Enforcement: 10-Year Evaluation of Red Light Running Detection, Howard County, Maryland*, Howard County Traffic Division, Columbia, Maryland.
7. Garber, N. J., Miller, J. S., Eslambolchi, S., Khandelwal, R., Mattingly, K. M., Sprinkle, K. M., and Wachendorf, P. L. (2005). *An Evaluation of Red Light Camera (Photo-Red) Enforcement Programs In Virginia: A Report in Response to a Request by Virginia's Secretary of Transportation*, Virginia Transportation Research Council, Report No. VTRC 05-R21, Charlottesville, VA.
8. Hu, W., McCartt, A. T., and Teoh, E. (2011). *Effects of Red Light Camera Enforcement on Fatal Crashes in Large US Cities*, Insurance Institute of Highway Safety, <http://www.iihs.org/research/topics/pdf/r1151.pdf> - Accessed July 2011.
9. Insurance Institute of Highway Safety (2011). *Status Report, Special Issue: Red Light Running*, Vol. 46, No. 1, <http://www.iihs.org/externaldata/srdata/docs/sr4601.pdf> - Accessed July 2011.
10. Insurance Institute of Highway Safety, *Questions and Answers: Red Light Cameras*, <http://www.iihs.org/research/qanda/rlr.aspx>, Accessed March 2013
11. Kyrychenko, S. Y. and Retting, R. (2004). *Review of A Detailed Investigation of Crash Reduction Resulting from Red Light Cameras in Small Urban Areas*, Insurance Institute of Highway Safety, Arlington, VA.
12. Langland-Orban, B., Pracht, E. E., and Large, J. T. (2008). *Red Light Running Cameras: Would Crashes, Injuries, and Automobile Insurance Rates Increase If They Are Used In Florida?*, Florida Public Health Review, Vol. 5, pp. 1-7.

13. Martinez, K. L. and Porter, B. E. (2006). *Characterizing Red Light Runners Following Implementation of a Photo Enforcement Program*, Accident Analysis and Prevention, Vol. 38, No. 5, pp. 862-870.
14. McCartt, A. T. and Eichelberger, A. (2011). *Attitudes Towards Red Light Camera Enforcement in Cities with Camera Programs*, Insurance Institute of Highway Safety, Arlington, VA.
15. National Cooperative Highway Research Program 310 (2003). *Impact of Red Light Camera Enforcement on Crash Experience: A Synthesis of Highway Practice*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, DC.
16. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2004). *National Survey of Speeding and Other Unsafe Driver Actions, Volume 2 - Findings*, Report No. DOT HS 809 730.
17. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2010). *Highlights of 2009 Motor Vehicle Crashes*, Traffic Safety Facts: Research Notes, Report No. DOT HS 811 363.
18. Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (2011). *SHSP Reporting Dashboard*, <http://lashspdata.lsu.edu/#/Home> - Accessed July 2011.
19. Retting, R. A. (2010). *Two Decades of Photo Enforcement in the United States: A Brief Summary of Experience and Lessons Learned*, ITE Journal, Vol. 80, No. 11, pp. 22-24, 29.
20. Retting, R. A. and Williams, A. F. (2000). *Red Light Cameras and the Perceived Risk of Being Ticketed*, Traffic Engineering and Control, Vol. 41, pp. 224-225, 227.
21. Retting, R. A., Williams, A. F., Farmer, C. M., and Feldman, A. (1999). *Evaluation of Red Light Camera Enforcement in Oxnard, California*, Accident Analysis and Prevention, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 169-174.
22. Retting, R. A., Williams, A. F., Farmer, C. M., and Feldman, A. (1999). *Evaluation of Red Light Camera Enforcement in Fairfax, Virginia*, Institute of Transportation Engineers Journal, Vol. 69, No. 8, pp. 30-34.
23. Retting, R. A., Ferguson, S. A., and Farmer, C. M. (2008). *Reducing Red Light Running Through Longer Yellow Signal Timing and Red Light Camera Enforcement: Results of a Field Investigation*, Analysis and Prevention, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 327-333.
24. Roberts, C.A. and Brown-Esplain, J. (2005). *Technical Evaluation of Photo Speed Enforcement for Freeways*, Arizona DOT Report No. ADOT-AZ-05-596.
25. Ruby, D. E. (2003). *Assessment of Red Light Running Cameras in Fairfax County, VA*, Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of Transportation Research Board, Washington, DC.
26. Schneider, H. (2010). *Effectiveness of Red Light Cameras for Reducing the Number of Crashes at Intersections in the City of Lafayette*, Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, http://lhsc.lsu.edu/Reports/SpecializedReports/2010_Red_Light_Camera_Report_Lafayette.pdf - Accessed July 2011.
27. Walden, T. (2008). *Analysis on the Effectiveness of Photographic Traffic Signal Enforcement Systems in Texas*, Texas Transportation Institute at Texas A&M University

28. Washington, S. and Shin, K. (2005). *Impact of Red Light Cameras (Automated Enforcement) on Safety in Arizona*, Arizona Department of Transportation, Report No. FHWA-AZ-05-550.

APPENDIX A

Tier 1 Survey

Your input is needed on red light running cameras. The Louisiana Transportation Research Center (LTRC) is conducting a public opinion survey regarding red light running camera programs. The information you provide will be used to support research developing guidance for communities considering implementing red light camera programs. Please take 5 minutes to complete the following survey questions. Thank you for your time!

1. In what zip code do you live? _____
2. In what zip code do you work or attend school? _____
3. Is there a red light camera program where you:

Live	Work or Attend School
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know
4. Is running red lights a problem where you live?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion
5. Do you favor the use of red light cameras as a tool to reduce red light running at intersections?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly favor
<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat favor
<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat oppose
<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly oppose
<input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion

If you **favor** the use of red light cameras can you tell us why?

<input type="checkbox"/> Reduces red light running
<input type="checkbox"/> Reduces crashes
<input type="checkbox"/> Encourages drivers to obey traffic Laws
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
6. If you **oppose** the use of red light cameras can you tell us why? (*select as many as appropriate*)

<input type="checkbox"/> It is just a program to increase revenue for local government and/or the police department.
<input type="checkbox"/> Red light cameras go against our system of justice since so no police officer actually witnessed the driver committing the offense.
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't think they are effective.
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
7. If you **oppose** using red light cameras, what could your community do to change your mind about red light cameras? (*select as many as appropriate*)

<input type="checkbox"/> Use the revenue generated to improve safety in the community.
<input type="checkbox"/> Better warning about when and where red light cameras were going to be implemented
<input type="checkbox"/> Education about the effectiveness of red light cameras
<input type="checkbox"/> Education about how the revenue from red light cameras is actually used
<input type="checkbox"/> other _____
8. Would you be willing to participate in a more detailed phone interview about red-light running cameras? If so, please provide your name and phone number below.

Name _____

Phone Number _____

APPENDIX B

Tier 2 Survey

Hello, my name is _____. In late December or early January, you responded to a survey about red light cameras and indicated willingness to participate in a follow-up telephone interview. We do not record anyone's name and we do not share any of your personal information or telephone number with anyone outside the Transportation Research Center. Do you have about five minutes to participate in this eight question survey now?

IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS YES:

Great... thanks ! QUESTION 1.

IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS NO:

Okay, thanks for your time and interest in the initiative.

Please answer yes, no, or I don't know to the following questions.

1. Do you believe red light cameras are effective in improving traffic safety at intersections?
 - a) *Yes.*
 - b) *No.*
 - c) *Don't know.*
2. Have you received a ticket for running a red light during the past two years?
 - a) *Yes. (If yes, ask: Was this a police-issued ticket or a red light camera ticket? Yes, no, don't know)*
 - b) *No.*
 - c) *Don't know.*
3. Has someone you know received a ticket for running a red light during the past two years?
 - a) *Yes. (If yes, ask: Was this a police-issued ticket or a red light camera ticket? Yes, no, don't know)*
 - b) *No.*
 - c) *Don't know.*
4. In your opinion, how likely is it for someone to get caught if they run a red light?
 - a) *Not likely.*
 - b) *Likely.*
 - c) *Very likely.*
 - d) *Don't know.*
5. I'm going to read a few statements to you, please select the statement that best reflects your views:

NOTE TO SURVEYOR – ASK ITEMS “a” THROUGH “e” IN RANDOM ORDER.

- a) *Red light cameras are just a way for the police department to make money.*

ASK THIS QUESTION ONLY IF THE RESPONDENT SELECTED OPTION 5A –

What types of information about the REVENUE from red light camera programs would influence your opinion?

- Pause and wait to see if respondent provides answers. If the respondent provides an answer, record it.
- If the respondent does not provide an answer, make suggest:
 - a) Information about ticket revenue and spending,
 - b) Information about costs of crashes and emergency response,
 - c) Costs of intersection safety improvements,
 - d) Fees paid to red light camera vendors,
 - e) Something else?
- b) *Red light cameras go against our system of justice because no law enforcement officer actually witnessed the driver committing the offense.*

ASK THIS QUESTION ONLY IF THE RESPONDENT SELECTED OPTION 5b

What would you do to ensure that justice could be served with red light cameras?

- Pause and wait to see if respondent provides answers. If the respondent provides an answer, record it.
 - If the respondent does not provide an answer, suggest possibilities such as:
 - a) The use of video to backup the red light camera photos.
 - b) Assurance that a sworn law enforcement officer viewed the red light camera photos and issued a ticket.
 - c) Limiting the penalty for red light camera tickets to a fine, with no points or other effects on insurance.
 - d) Something else?
 - c) *Red light cameras are an effective way to give tickets to drivers for running red lights.*
 - d) *Red light cameras make it easier for law enforcement to do their jobs.*
 - e) *None of these reflect my views.*
6. Select the statement that best reflects your views; the majority of drivers:
- a) *Believe a yellow light is just a suggestion.*
 - b) *Believe you can enter an intersection on a yellow light.*
 - c) *Slow down immediately on a yellow light and prepare to stop.*
 - d) *Don't know*

7. Please answer yes, no, or I don't know to the following question. Do you believe warning signs and media attention about red light cameras stop people from running red lights?
 - a) *Yes.*
 - b) *No.*
 - c) *Don't know.*

8. For this last question, where would you like to see red light camera revenues used in your community?
 - Pause and wait to see if respondent provides answers. If the respondent provides an answer, record it.

 - If the respondent does not provide an answer, make suggest:
 - a) Safety projects in schools/colleges.
 - b) Safety projects near parks/recreational areas.
 - c) Road maintenance projects.
 - d) Intersection improvements.
 - e) New roads.
 - f) Others.

That was the last question, thank you. We will be integrating your ideas from this survey into our research and policy guidelines for automated enforcement in Louisiana. I appreciate your time, have a nice day.

APPENDIX C
Current State Automated Enforcement Policy

APPENDIX D

Data Assumptions and References used in Comparison of Traditional Enforcement versus Red Light Cameras

Vendor payments for deployment of camera technology: Based on the following payment structure reported in Lafayette, LA and an estimate of 88 paid citations per month per intersection (based on average data across all monitored intersections in Lafayette):

- The number of paid citations from 1 to 150 per month at each intersection will be paid at \$39 each
- The number of paid citations from 151 to 300 per month at each intersection will be paid at \$39 each
- The number of paid citations exceeding 300 per month at each intersection will be paid at \$39 each

In 2010 an estimated 1,051 red light camera citations were paid in Lafayette across 12 monitored intersections.

Officer salary & fringe: When nonsworn personnel are excluded, local police departments cost \$116,500 per officer to operate for 2007. Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2010. Local Police Departments, 2007.

<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/lpd07.pdf> Assuming \$120,000 per year based on inflation since 2007, and 2,000 working hours per year, an hourly cost of \$60 is estimated.

Patrol car: \$16.25/hr based on FEMA rate schedule

<http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/pa/eqrates.shtm>

Court time: assumes 4 days per month for a police officer assigned full-time to traffic enforcement

Fraction of Sgt. Salary: assumes a ratio of 1 Sergeant to 8 police officers

Red light camera costs: based on interviews with red light camera vendors

Officer oversight for red light cameras: assumes $\frac{1}{4}$ of officer salary; this cost is assumed to be the same for a single intersection or multiple intersections monitored by red light cameras