

## **HB15-1098 Concerning the Elimination of the Use of Automated Vehicle Identification Systems for Traffic Law Enforcement**

Studies have shown that the use of Red Light Cameras increases accidents, contradicting the claims made by the private companies who operate them.

Take for example these studies:

- **Red Light Camera Studies show increase in accidents**

POSTED BY Shawn Dow October 26, 2012

A 2008 University of South Florida report found:

---

“Comprehensive studies conclude cameras actually increase crashes and injuries, providing a safety argument not to install them.... public policy should avoid conflicts of interest that enhance revenues for government and private interests at the risk of public safety.”

- **A 2007 Virginia Department of Transportation study found:**

“The cameras were associated with an increase in total crashes... The aggregate EB results suggested that this increase was 29%... The cameras were associated with an increase in the frequency of injury crashes... The aggregate EB results suggested an 18% increase, although the point estimates for individual jurisdictions were substantially higher (59%, 79%, or 89% increases) or lower (6% increase or a 5% decrease).”

- **A 2006 Winnipeg, Canada city audit found:**

“The graph shows an increase of 58% in the number of traffic collisions from 2003 to 2004.... Contrary to long-term expectations, the chart shows

an increase in claims at each level of damage with the largest percentage increase appearing at the highest dollar value.”

- **A 2005 Virginia DOT study found:**

“The cameras are correlated with an increase in total crashes of 8% to 17%.”

- **In 2005, The Washington Post found:**

“The analysis shows that the number of crashes at locations with cameras more than doubled, from 365 collisions in 1998 to 755 last year. Injury and fatal crashes climbed 81 percent, from 144 such wrecks to 262. Broadside crashes, also known as right-angle or T-bone collisions, rose 30 percent, from 81 to 106 during that time frame.”

- **A 2004 North Carolina A&T University study found:**

“Our findings are more pessimistic, finding no change in angle accidents and large increases in rear-end crashes and many other types of crashes relative to other intersections.”

- **A 2003 Ontario Ministry of Transportation study found:**

“Compared to the average number of reported collisions occurring in the before period, the average yearly number of reported collisions increased 15.1 per cent in the after period.”

- **A 1995 Australian Road Research Board study found:**

“The results of this study suggest that the installation of the RLC at these sites did not provide any reduction in accidents, rather there has been increases in rear end and adjacent approaches accidents on a before and after basis and also by comparison with the changes in accidents at intersection signals.”

- **A 1995 Monash University (Australia) study found:**

“a simple correlation analysis was undertaken for red light running data in the current study and revealed no significant relationship between the

frequency of crashes at RLC and non-RLC sites and differences in red light running behaviour.”

**The importance of the yellow warning signal time in reducing the instances of red light running is found in the following reports:**

- **A 2004 Texas Transportation Institute study found:**

“An increase in yellow duration of 1.0 seconds is associated with a of about 0.6, which corresponds to a 40 percent reduction in crashes.”

- **A 2001 report by the Majority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives found:**

“The changes in the yellow signal timing regulations have resulted in the inadequate yellow times. And these inadequate yellow times are the likely cause of almost 80 percent of red light entries.”

---