



**Legislative BPAC Subcommittee Meeting
September 15, 2021 10:30am to 11:25am
Online Zoom Meeting**

Attendees:

Haley Graf - NJT
Leigh Ann Von Hagen – VTC
Catherine Bull – VTC
Maxim Gladwell – VTC
Trish Sanchez – VTC
Sonia Szczesna – TSTC
Jim Hunt – NJBWC
Joe Rapp – NJDOT
Deb Kagan – NJBWC
John Boyle – GPBC
Jessica O’Connor, Esq. - NJMVC

Long Notes

Leigh Ann Von Hagen and Sonia Szczesna introduced the session and welcomed everyone.

Catherine Bull provided an update on the Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) Research.

- The literature on automated speed enforcement was reviewed by Julio Mora, and the analysis focused on best practice, legislation, and case studies. At the end, a written report will also be provided.
- Speeding is a concern, as all are aware. It is the reason for 59% of all aggressive driving, and fatal/serious injury crashes.
- ASE is a method of detecting speeding violations and recording identifying info through radar or other instruments. International and national benefits included:
 - High rates of violation detected
 - Physical safety of ASE operation (because it does not involve roadside stops)
 - More equitable operation, based solely on speeds recorded
 - More efficient use of resources
- Red Light Running (RLR) tracks red-light violations, whereas Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) tracks speeding violations.
- It has some limitations and concerns:
 - It has a gradual deterrent effect because it takes time for awareness to grow and behavior to shift after tickets are issued.



- There is a time-lag, as tickets can be received as much as 2 weeks after the original infraction.
- Requires interagency support and cooperation to be successful.
- Sometimes there are false-positives or other technological failures.
- There are concerns about surveillance and privacy due to the use of cameras, and the databases are privately maintained. There are specific concerns about ICE accessing these databases.
- AAA offered some insights regarding concerns – accountability (conflicts between what is or isn't a school zone), funding structure (companies paid per-ticket, incentivizing more ticketing), equipment reliability (calibration had no specific standards or required proof of speeding).
- Case law points to issues where a vehicle owner was ticketed because someone else was driving their vehicle.
- 50% of reported speed-related fatalities in 2014 occurred on roads with speed limits under 55mph, and 25% with speed limits under 35mph. In 2013, 10% of US drivers reported that they were stopped for speeding, although 70% of were identified as habitual or sometime speeders. This shows the potential of increasing the number of speeders caught.
- A map was presented showing states where red light cameras or speed cameras are currently used. 15 states (plus D.C.) have both, 7 have red-light only, 1 has speed-only, and 27 (including NJ) have none.
 - There is a state-by-state comparison available.
- New York City serves as a successful best-practice case study of what makes ASE effective.
 - After an initial trial in 20 school-zones, they have expanded to 750. They plan to have 2,000 cameras in operation by end of 2021. They are active Monday to Friday, 6am to 10pm, with a \$50 penalty.
 - They have seen a 70% decrease in speeding and a 17% decrease in severe/fatal injury crashes at camera sites. Health outcomes (Quality-of-Life Adjusted Years) are marginally increased while operating costs are reduced compared to no speed cameras.
 - Cameras create a “herd immunity” effect.
 - Analysis shows an optimal spacing where diminishing returns are reached.
- Benefits are many:
 - Continuous enforcement without police officers
 - Reduce racial bias
 - Effective in reducing speeding
 - Possible spillover effect of reducing speed on nearby roads
 - Environmental benefits by reducing gas consumption
- In Seattle and Philadelphia revenue is spent on general school road-safety improvements. NYC spends the ASE revenue on the general fund, Vision Zero revenue is spent on initiatives addressing injuries in streets (including the ASE program). NJ should consider reinvesting revenue from speeding tickets back into these automated speed enforcement programs.



- New Jersey still has no state law or city ordinance for camera enforcement programs. There is a current bill introduced for a 5-year pilot.
- There are some concerns from a survey in 2018 –
 - “Cameras may be placed where they will generate the most money” - Locations are identified by historical speeding and crashes, and at locations with higher vulnerable user traffic
 - “The poor and working middle class may be the people most impacted” - Violations are unbiased, focused only on the speed of vehicles.
 - “The money will be lost due to corruption, this is highway robbery” - All fines are just enforcing currently-existing speeding laws, and the end goal is to not collect any ticket money at all, because that means traffic is following posted speed limits.
- Considerations for New Jersey were summarized –
 - The program is meant to improve safety of ped/bike/other vulnerable users on dangerous road segments. Speed cameras are effective at reducing traffic crashes and injuries in school zones, residential zones, and work zones on highways. ASE is intended as a supplement, not a replacement of traditional enforcement operations.
 - Implementation should focus on locations around school zones and work zones, and times around commuting hours and active road work. Outreach should be extensive, bringing the community into the planning process, informing them of changing speed limits, the citation/appeal process, and the dangers posed by excessive speeding. Enforcement should be objective and therefore equitable. Local traffic patterns should not change.
 - Fees should follow an “enhanced penalty model” where fines increase for vehicles traveling at greater excess speeds. Sufficient grace periods should be applied, offering drivers warnings. Revenue should be used to fund infrastructure projects that improve safety for vulnerable road users, bicycles and pedestrians.
- A table was presented showing comparisons between case examples in Seattle, NYC, Baltimore and Philadelphia, available for referral.
- Next steps are to conduct interviews. We should talk to NYC, PennDOT (Philadelphia), Missouri DOT (St. Louis), Montgomery County, MD (Baltimore), etc. and we are interested in hearing any comments or questions.
 - VTC provided a link to a handout showing state-by-state comparisons.

Attendees discussed feedback and questions

- VTC mentioned that ASE will be a new proven safety countermeasure presented by FHWA, and we should add the question about the bill prohibiting ASE to our interview.
 - MVC manages contracting for the sale of personal information to various entities. They want to alleviate some of the privacy concerns about personal information (particularly in the immigration context) and how it is transmitted when it comes to other federal agencies. They contract with at least one private entity that facilitates ASE and RLR



systems in Pennsylvania road work zones. There is a bill that prohibits them from releasing this info to other states who want to use this type of program.

- Leigh Ann provided an invitation for a Vulnerable Road User Presentation in October.
- BCGP remarked that Pennsylvania's program should be highlighted. Many issues discussed in the presentation are addressed in Pennsylvania's law. Speed cameras have just been implemented but the red-light program has been in Pennsylvania for 10 years, providing revenue to the state.
- NJBWC asked, "At what point would it be the right time to mobilize a speed campaign from the advocacy side?" It would be a good idea to get some input from police and see where they are on speed cameras. New York implemented speed cameras in school areas and people valued this approach because it was about children's safety.
- TSTC asked about the best way to get the word out about the safe passing bill.
 - NJBWC stated that we now wait to see what happens in Title 39 when they draft the language. The bill itself has provisions that may be included, but there are some definitional elements that need to be included in Title 39. There might be a possibility to make other clarifications in Title 39 at the same time. Simultaneously, we should be asking everyone who knows about the safe passing law to begin think through a couple questions, like:
 - What is your greatest concern about the safe passing law?
 - What do you think we need to do to move this forward into public awareness and behavioral change?
 - What material would be helpful to you in implementing the safe passing law?
 Now that the bill has passed, we need to increase public awareness, develop public education materials (including Title 39), talk with law enforcement and discuss enforceability.
 - TSTC added that it would be helpful to think through every agency's educational resources that might be available. DOT has message boards. We should consider opportunities on how to pass on information. We should look into past bills and how education, training and outreach was handled.
 - NJBWC asked about the "Stop and Stay Stopped" education promotion. Are there lessons that can be learned from previous similar laws and implementations?
 - VTC suggested reaching out to Zoe Baldwin and making a list of documents that need to be updated, like MVC manuals, bike driver's manuals. They added that anyone should feel free to shoot an email to Jim Hunt if they are familiar with any of this. We could also look at implementing "near-miss" sensing technology for this bill.
 - VTC could also produce a video discussing the law, similar to the "How to Pass Safely" video.
 - The question was asked, "What was the first question in your mind once you heard the bill was passed?"



- How will it be enforced?
- Will training be developed for police officers?
- What is the fine?
 - The fine is \$100 if no injury occurs but more if there is an injury.
- From a driver's point of view, what do you do on a narrow road to pass as a driver (and get passed as bicyclist)?

The meeting closed automatically as everyone was redirected to the online general meeting room.