OFFICIAL FILE COPY
CLERK OF THE BOARD
OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

MEMORANDUM

Agenda Item No. 7(A)

(Second Reading 1-20-11)

TO: Honorable Chairman Joe A. Martinez
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

DATE: October 5, 2010

FROM: R. A. Cuevas, Jr.
County Attorney

SUBJECT: Ordinance relating to traffic intersection safety and red light violations; creating Section 30-422 of the Code authorizing and regulating the use of traffic infraction detectors in the unincorporated area consistent with the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act

Ordinance No. 11-01

The accompanying ordinance was prepared and placed on the agenda at the request of Prime Sponsor Commissioner Joe A. Martinez and Co-Sponsor Commissioner Sally A. Heyman.

R. A. Cuevas, Jr.
County Attorney

RAC/cp

Memorandum

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Date: January 20, 2011

To: Honorable Chairman Joe A. Martinez
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

From: George M. Burgess
County Manager

Subject: Preliminary Fiscal Impact for Ordinance Relating to Traffic Intersections Safety and Red Light Violations

---

The implementation of a red-light camera program in the Unincorporated Municipal Service Area (UMSA) will have a fiscal impact on Miami-Dade County, the basis of which contains a great number of assumptions that continue to be refined. An updated fiscal impact will be provided prior to the considerations of this item by the full Board. Whether the program will ultimately result in a positive or negative fiscal impact to the County and the value of that impact is dependent on a number of factors, including, but not limited to, the number of intersections that will be implemented, the number of valid violations that result, the number of violations paid and violations challenged in court, the terms of the contract with the selected vendor(s), and potential administrative costs.

State Statute 316.0083 provides for a $158 fine, which breaks down as follows:

- $75 – Retained by the County
- $70 – Remitted to the Department of Revenue (DOR)
- $10 – Remitted to DOR for deposit into the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund
- $ 3 – Remitted to DOR for deposit into the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund

Based on the assumption that Miami-Dade County would implement the system at 200 approaches, if 120 violations were recorded per month at each approach, and 63 percent of violations were paid, the annual revenue is estimated to be $13.5 million per year. Assuming the County leases the 200 systems at a cost of $4,000 per month per camera system, the annual leasing cost is estimated to be $9.6 million per year. Processing costs for the 288,000 annual violations (120 x 12 x 200) to be reviewed is estimated to be $4.36 per violation or $1.256 million annually. Therefore, the net positive fiscal impact is projected to be approximately $2.6 million for the first year of full implementation. If paid violations exceed the levels assumed, the net revenue to the County would be greater.

It should be noted that some vendors are willing to offer a minimum guarantee or a "no negative cash flow" to the County. For example, a vendor might provide for a minimum monthly payment or if the citation revenue is only $3,000 in any given month, the rental charge will be reduced to $3,000 for that month. Any guarantees would have a positive effect on the fiscal impact. The cameras are anticipated to be phased-in over several months by the selected vendor(s) and alternatives to equipment leasing may be considered.

Other jurisdictions have utilized significantly higher revenue estimates for purposes of budgeting for the current and future fiscal years. Because this program is designed to provide an additional tool for traffic enforcement, not to be a program to generate revenue, and based on the experience of other jurisdictions, the number of violations we are utilizing is merely an estimate and resulting revenue is expected to decrease over time as drivers become more aware of the program. These projections also assume that no citations will be issued for right-turn-on-red violations.

It is important to note that the preliminary financial analysis above only accounts for the costs incurred by the Miami-Dade Police Department to review the violations and costs associated with the vendor that will install, maintain, and perform other responsibilities of the program. In addition, other County departments have been identified that may see an increase in workload, including Finance, Public Works, and the Clerk of Courts. There may also be an additional burden on the court system. We are still working to determine the impact to each department. An effort is being made to identify all increased costs related to the implementation of this program and a more detailed fiscal impact statement will be provided when this ordinance is considered by the full Board.

Assistant County Manager

Fis1211 (c)

MEMORANDUM
(Revised)

TO: Honorable Chairman Joe A. Martinez and Members, Board of County Commissioners

DATE: January 20, 2011

FROM: R. A. Cuevas, Jr. County Attorney

SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 7(A)

Please note any items checked.

____	**"3-Day Rule" for committees applicable if raised**
√	**6 weeks required between first reading and public hearing**
√	**4 weeks notification to municipal officials required prior to public hearing**
____	**Decreases revenues or increases expenditures without balancing budget**
____	**Budget required**
____	**Statement of fiscal impact required**
____	**Ordinance creating a new board requires detailed County Manager's report for public hearing**
____	**No committee review**
____	**Applicable legislation requires more than a majority vote (i.e., 2/3's ____, 3/5's ____, unanimous _____) to approve**
____	**Current information regarding funding source, index code and available balance, and available capacity (if debt is contemplated) required**

Approved _____ Mayor
Veto _____
Override _____

Agenda Item No. 7(A)
1-20-11

ORDINANCE NO. 11-01

ORDINANCE RELATING TO TRAFFIC INTERSECTION SAFETY AND RED LIGHT VIOLATIONS; CREATING SECTION 30-422 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AUTHORIZING AND REGULATING THE USE OF TRAFFIC INFRACTION DETECTORS IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA CONSISTENT WITH THE MARK WANDALL TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT; PROVIDING PENALTIES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE

WHEREAS, during the 2010 state legislative session, the Florida Legislature passed HB 325, the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act, authorizing the use of cameras for red light enforcement, and on May 13, 2010, the Governor signed HB 325 into law, Chapter 2010-80, Laws of Florida; and

WHEREAS, HB 325 authorizes cities, counties and the Florida Department of Highway Safety & Motor Vehicles to install traffic infraction detectors, also known as red light cameras; and

WHEREAS, HB 325 requires any traffic infraction detectors that are installed to meet specifications established by the Florida Department of Transportation no later than December 31, 2010; and

WHEREAS, HB 325 also requires signage at any intersection where traffic infraction detectors are installed and a public awareness campaign no less than 30 days before traffic infraction detectors are installed; and

WHEREAS, HB 325 provides that no points shall be imposed for red light violations identified by camera and prohibits insurers from using red light violations identified by camera for the purposes of setting motor vehicle insurance rates; and

WHEREAS, HB 325 imposes a fine of $158 for red light violations identified by camera, of which $75 would be retained by the County and $70 would go to the state general revenue fund; and

WHEREAS, $10 from each red light camera violation would go to trauma centers, including Jackson Memorial Hospital, while $3 from each red light camera violation would go to the Miami Project to Cure Paralysis; and

WHEREAS, traffic infraction detectors to deter red light violations can reduce accidents and improve public safety at intersections in Miami-Dade County,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1. Section 30-422 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida, is hereby created to read as follows:

Sec. 30-422. Traffic intersection safety and traffic infraction detectors.

(1) *Purpose and intent.* The purpose of this ordinance is to implement the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act, Chapters 2010-80 and 2010-163, Laws of Florida (HB 325 and HB 5501), as such may be amended from time to time (hereinafter the "Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act" or the "Act"), in order to promote, protect and improve the health, safety and welfare of individuals and protect property in Miami-Dade County.

(2) *Scope of regulation and applicability.* The provisions of this section shall apply to and be enforced in only the unincorporated areas of Miami-Dade County.

(3) *Use of Traffic Infraction Detectors.* Miami-Dade County hereby exercises its authority pursuant to the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act to use traffic infraction detectors within the unincorporated areas of Miami-Dade County to enforce the Uniform Traffic Code of the State of Florida. The Mayor or designee is authorized to implement the provisions and requirements of the Act consistent with the specifications established by the Florida Department of Transportation, as such may be amended from time to time. The County is expressly authorized to use traffic infraction detectors to enforce red light signal violations pursuant to sections 316.074(1) and 316.075(1)(c)1., Florida Statutes, when a driver fails to stop at a traffic signal on streets and highways within the unincorporated areas of Miami-Dade County. The provisions of this ordinance shall not otherwise prohibit a law enforcement officer from issuing a traffic citation to a driver for a red light signal violation in accordance with Chapters 316 and 318, Florida Statutes.

(4) *Right turn on red enforcement by traffic infraction detectors prohibited.* Traffic infraction detectors shall not be used to enforce red light signal violations when a driver is making a right turn where such turns are permissible. This subsection shall not otherwise prohibit a law enforcement officer from issuing a traffic citation to a driver for a right turn violation in accordance with Chapters 316 and 318, Florida Statutes.

(5) *Traffic infraction enforcement officers.* The Mayor or designee is authorized to designate traffic infraction enforcement officers to administer the County's red light camera program pursuant to the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act, as such may be amended from time to time.

(6) *Notice and appeals.* Notification of a violation of the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act and appeals shall be provided as set forth in the Act, as such may be amended from time to time. The notice expressly shall advise the registered owner of the vehicle that he or she has a right to review the photographic or electronic images or streaming video evidence.

(7) *Penalties.* A violation of the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act and section 30-422 shall be punishable as set forth in

the Act, as such may be amended from time to time. The Act currently sets the fine at $158 per violation.

(8) *Signage and public awareness campaign.* The Mayor or designee is directed to:

i. Prior to installation of a traffic infraction detector at an intersection, install signage at the intersection indicating that traffic infraction detectors may be in use; and

ii. No less than 30 days before traffic infraction detectors are installed, conduct a public awareness campaign related to traffic infraction detectors and red light safety.

(9) *Permits for installation of traffic infraction detectors by municipalities on county roads and infrastructure.* The Mayor or designee shall develop a policy for approval by this Board consistent with the Act setting the requirements for municipalities to acquire permits from the County to install traffic infraction detectors, including any applicable fees:

i. On County roads within or adjacent to cities; and

ii. On County traffic signal mast arms and other county infrastructure.

(10) *Revenue.* Revenue realized by the County pursuant to the Act, once all associated costs have been paid and distributions made as required by the Act, shall supplement the unincorporated municipal service area (UMSA) budget. This provision shall be subject to annual appropriation by the Board.

(11) *Reporting.* The Mayor or designee shall submit a report by October 1, 2012, and annually thereafter, to both the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles or its successor state department (DHSMV) and this Board detailing the results of using traffic infraction detectors and the procedures for enforcement for the preceding state fiscal year. The information submitted must include statistical data and information required by the DHSMV to complete the report required by the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act.

Section 2. Upon becoming effective, this Ordinance shall supersede Resolution No. 759-10 to the extent of any conflict.

Section 3. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or provision of this ordinance is held invalid, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected by such invalidity.

Section 4. It is the intention of the Board of County Commissioners, and it is hereby ordained that the provisions of this ordinance, including any sunset provision, shall become and be made a part of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The sections of this ordinance may be renumbered or relettered to accomplish such intention, and the word "ordinance" may be changed to "section," "article," or other appropriate word.

Section 5. This ordinance shall become effective ten (10) days after the date of enactment unless vetoed by the Mayor, and if vetoed, shall become effective only upon an override by this Board.

PASSED AND ADOPTED: January 20, 2011

Approved by County Attorney as to form and legal sufficiency:

Prepared by: JMM

Jess M. McCarty

Prime Sponsor: Chairman Joe A. Martinez
Co-Sponsor: Commissioner Sally A. Heyman

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR

Legislative Notes

Agenda Item:	**7(A)**
File Number:	**102260**
Committee(s) of Reference:	**Board of County Commissioners**
Date of Analysis:	**December 12, 2010**
Type of Item:	**Ordinance**
District:	**Unincorporated Areas**
Sponsor:	**Commissioner Joe A. Martinez**
Co-Sponsor:	**Commissioner Sally A. Heyman**

Summary

This ordinance creates Section 30-422 of the Code of Miami-Dade County; and authorizes and regulates the use of Traffic Infraction Detectors in the Unincorporated Areas consistent with the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act, HB 325, approved by the Florida Legislature during the 2010 state legislative session.

The Mark Wandall Act authorizes the use of cameras for traffic enforcement in Florida and requires cameras to be tested regularly and to comply with specifications established by the Florida Department of Transportation. The Act was named after Mark Wandall, a man who was killed by a red-light runner in 2003.

Background Legislative History

- On August 23, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), through Resolution 937-05, directed the County Manager to explore the feasibility, cost and benefit of installing cameras at certain dangerous intersections with traffic signals to curb red-light running.
- On November 6, 2007, the BCC through 1248-07, urged the Florida Legislature to allow the use of unmanned cameras at intersections with traffic signals in an effort to reduce red-light running.
- On July 8, 2010, the BCC, through Resolution 759-10, established policy for Miami-Dade County authorizing the installation of red light cameras at high crash, high volume intersections; and directed the Mayor or his designee to implement a red light camera program in Miami-Dade County. *This proposed ordinance would supersede Resolution 759-10.*
- On September 16, 2010, the Health, Public Safety and Intergovernmental Committee deferred a resolution directing the Mayor or designee to study the feasibility of negotiation with municipalities in Miami-Dade County to create a single, uniform countywide program for red light cameras with revenues generated in municipalities to be provided to such municipalities.

The Office of the Commission Auditor compiled research pertaining to jurisdictions nationwide that implemented automated enforcement laws.

Automated Enforcement laws by State (December 2010)
Automated enforcement refers to the use of technology to enforce traffic safety laws. Although many jurisdictions that use automated enforcement are in states that have laws authorizing its use, not all states where automated enforcement is in use have such laws, nor are they always necessary.

Most automated enforcement programs and laws are for red light violations; however, the use of automated enforcement for speed is increasing, and a few jurisdictions use automated enforcement for other violations such as failing to pay a toll and disobeying a railroad crossing signal. In states that have automated enforcement laws, the laws vary from state to state; some authorize enforcement statewide, whereas others permit use only in specified communities.

- Red light camera systems are triggered when a vehicle enters an intersection after the light has been red for a predetermined time. Automated speed enforcement systems are triggered when a vehicle exceeding the speed limit by a predetermined amount is observed. Moreover, the proportion of vehicles exceeding the speed limit by more than 10 mph declined 82 percent.
- A few jurisdictions treat automated enforcement citations just like parking tickets in that the registered owner is liable. Similarly, just as parking tickets do not result in points or are not recorded on a driver's record, many jurisdictions do not assess points or make a record of automated enforcement citations. Automated enforcement laws associated with moving violations are summarized in the following table.

State	Statewide or only specified locations?	Violations	Citation issued to whom?	Who is liable?	What image is taken?	Traditional enforcement penalties	Auto enforcement penalties/record
Alabama	Montgomery	red light	owner	owner	2 images; tag included	$100 fine/3 points	$110; no points
Arizona	statewide	red light	not addressed	not addressed	not addressed	$250 fine/2 points	$165; no points
	statewide	speed	not addressed	not addressed	not addressed	$250 fine/2 points	$165; no points
Arkansas	use of photo radar by county or state government prohibited except at school zones and railroad crossings; officer must be present and citation must be issued at time of offense						
California	statewide	red light	registered owner	driver	tag and driver	$100 fine/1 point	same as for traditional citation
	statewide	rail crossing	registered owner	driver	tag and driver	$100 fine/1 point	same as for traditional citation
Colorado	Colorado law grants the authority to use automated enforcement to capture any traffic violation						
	statewide	red light	registered	driver	tag and	$110 fine	$75; no points or

State	Statewide or only specified locations?	Violations	Citation issued to whom?	Who is liable?	What image is taken?	Traditional enforcement penalties	Auto enforcement penalties/record
						surcharge)/4 points	
	restricted to construction and school zones, residential areas, or adjacent to a municipal park	speed	registered owner	driver	tag and driver	$151 (including surcharge)/4 points	$40 maximum fine ($80 in school zones); no points or record; warning only for first photo radar offense if speed within 10 mph of limit
Delaware	statewide	red light	registered owner	owner	2 or more images of the vehicle	$75-$230 fine	$110 maximum fine; not a record or conviction offense; not to be used by insurers
District of Columbia	DC grants jurisdiction-wide authority to use automated enforcement to capture all moving infractions						
	entire jurisdiction	red light	registered owner	owner	not addressed	$75 fine/2 points	$75 fine; no points
	entire jurisdiction	speed	registered owner	owner	not addressed	$75 fine/2 points	$75 fine; no points
Florida	statewide	red light	registered owner	owner	tag and traffic control device	$125 fine/3 points	$158; no points
Georgia	statewide	red light	registered owner	owner	license tag, intersection, and light	$1,000 maximum fine/3 points	$70 maximum fine; not a conviction or record offense; no points; not a moving violation; not to be used by insurers
Illinois	Illinois has several different automated enforcement laws						
	Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, Madison, McHenry, St	red light	registered owner	owner	2 or more images of vehicle and tag	$500 maximum fine/20 points	$100 or the completion of a traffic education program, or

State	Statewide or only specified locations?	Violations	Citation issued to whom?	Who is liable?	What image is taken?	Traditional enforcement penalties	Auto enforcement penalties/record
	Clair, and Will counties; requires local ordinance						both; not a moving violation or record offense
	statewide only in construction zones or Illinois Toll Authority roads	speed	registered owner	driver	tag and driver	mandatory $250 fine/20 points	$250 fine or 25 hours community service
	any county or municipality may use automated enforcement in cooperation with the Illinois DOT and ICC; ordinance required	rail crossing	registered owner	driver (owner if driver not identified by owner)	vehicle, driver, and tag	$250 maximum fine/20 points	$250 fine or 25 hours community service
	local authorities are prohibited from using speed cameras; state may use speed cameras, but only when a law enforcement officer is present and witnesses the event	speed	not addressed	not addressed	not addressed	not addressed	not addressed
Louisiana	state law provides that convictions resulting from camera enforcement shall not be reported for inclusion in driver record; law is silent on other issues						
Maine	all photo enforcement prohibited						
Maryland	statewide	red light	registered owner	owner	2 or more images of rear of vehicle and tag in any medium	$500 maximum fine/2 points	$100 maximum civil penalty; no points or record; not a moving violation; may not be used by insurers
	Montgomery County school zones and residential	speed	registered owner	owner	2 or more images of rear of vehicle and	maximum fine $500 in residential district	$40 maximum fine; no points

State	Statewide or only specified locations?	Violations	Citation issued to whom?	Who is liable?	What image is taken?	Traditional enforcement penalties	Auto enforcement penalties/record
	districts, Prince George's County school zones (effective 06/01/10), statewide in school zones by local ordinance and work zones				tag in any medium	$1,000 in school zone; points depend on speed	
	Montgomery and Prince George's County	rail crossing	registered owner	owner	vehicle, driver and tag	$500 maximum fine/1 point	$100 maximum fine; no points
Mississippi	all localities prohibited from using automated enforcement; all current programs prohibited effective 3/20/09						
Montana	all localities prohibited from using red light cameras; rail crossings excepted						
Nevada	prohibits use of imaging equipment unless it is hand held by an officer, installed in a vehicle or facility of a law enforcement agency; traditional enforcement penalties: $1,000 maximum fine and 4 points						
New Hampshire	prohibited unless there is specific statutory authorization						
New Jersey	photo radar is prohibited						
	local jurisdictions must pass an ordinance and apply to Transportation Commissioner to participate in a pilot program	red light	registered owner	registered owner and driver are jointly liable	two or more images of vehicle and tag	$85	penalty same as for traditional citation; no points
New Mexico	no state law specifically authorizing automated enforcement; NMDOT has banned red light cameras and mobile enforcement vans on state and federal roadways; state law requires counties and municipalities using camera enforcement to post a warning sign and a warning beacon						
New York	cities of at least 1 million people, up to 150 intersections in each city; Effective 5/28/09: counties of Nassau and Suffolk, the cities of Rochester and	red light	owner	owner	2 or more images of rear of vehicle and tag in any medium	$100 maximum fine/3 points	$50 fine; not a record or conviction offense; may not be used by insurers

State	Statewide or only specified locations?	Violations	Citation issued to whom?	Who is liable?	What image is taken?	Traditional enforcement penalties	Auto enforcement penalties/record
	Buffalo, by local ordinance, up to 50 intersections; Yonkers, by local ordinance, up to 25 intersections						
North Carolina	where specified by statute (Albemarle, Charlotte, Chapel Hill, Cornelius, Durham, Fayetteville, Greensboro, Greenville, High Point, Huntersville, Lumberton, Matthews, Nags Head, Newton, Pineville, Rocky Mount, Spring Lake, and Wilmington)	red light	owner	owner	photo, video, electronic image	$100 maximum fine/3 points	$75 civil penalty; no points
Oregon	cities statewide	red light	registered owner or driver, if identifiable	registered owner	photographs; digital images	$300 maximum fine	penalty same as for traditional citation
	Albany, Beaverton, Bend, Eugene, Gladstone, Medford, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Portland, and Tigard (may not be used for more than four hours per day in any one location)	speed	registered owner or driver, if identifiable	registered owner	photographs; digital images	$300 maximum fine	penalty same as for traditional citation
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	red light	registered owner	owner	photographs	$25 fine/3 points	$100 maximum; not on operating

State	Statewide or only specified locations?	Violations	Citation issued to whom?	Who is liable?	What image is taken?	Traditional enforcement penalties	Auto enforcement penalties/record
Rhode Island	statewide	red light	registered owner	driver	2 or more images of vehicle and tag in any medium	$75 fine	$75 fine; not a criminal or record offense; not a moving violation; not to be used by insurers until there is a final adjudication of the violation
	statewide	school bus safety violations	registered owner	registered owner	2 or more images of vehicle and tag in any medium	$500 fine	$500 fine; not a criminal or record offense; not a moving violation; not to be used by insurers
South Carolina	photo enforcement prohibited with narrow exception; citations for violating traffic laws relating to speed or disregarding traffic control devices may only be used when the State declares an emergency and citations must be served in person within one hour of the violation						
Tennessee	statewide except for interstate highways that are not work zones	traffic violation	registered owner	registered owner	not addressed	$50 fine/points	not reportable; no points may be assessed
Texas	a Texas municipality may not use an automated traffic control system to enforce speed						
	statewide; requires local ordinance	red light	registered owner	owner	2 or more photographic or digital images of tag	$200 maximum fine	$75; not a criminal or record offense
Utah	statewide only school zones or where limit is 30 mph or less; officer must be present; requires local ordinance	speed	not addressed	not addressed	photograph	$1,000 maximum fine/50 points	not reportable; no points may be assessed
Virginia	counties, cities, and towns may operate cameras at no more than	red light	registered owner	driver	2 photographs or other recorded	$200 maximum fine/4 points	$50 maximum fine; no court costs; not a criminal offense;

State	Statewide or only specified locations?	Violations	Citation issued to whom?	Who is liable?	What image is taken?	Traditional enforcement penalties	Auto enforcement penalties/record
	every 10,000 residents; requires local ordinance; the exception is the Washington, DC metropolitan area, it permits up to 10 camera sites or 1 site per 10,000 residents, whichever is greater						not be used by insurers
Washington	cities and counties statewide where two arterial roads intersect	red light	registered owner	registered owner	vehicle, license tag	$250 maximum fine	fine up to the maximum for parking violations in the jurisdiction; no record; no points
	school zone	speed	registered owner	registered owner	vehicle, license tag	$250 maximum fine	fine up to the maximum for parking violations in the jurisdiction; no record; no points
	cities and counties statewide	rail crossing	registered owner	registered owner	vehicle, license tag	$250 maximum fine	fine up to the maximum for parking violations in the jurisdiction; no record; no points
West Virginia	all photo enforcement prohibited						
Wisconsin	photo radar is prohibited						
The states below do not have state law specifically authorizing automated enforcement:							
Alaska; Connecticut; Hawaii; Idaho; Indiana; Iowa; Kansas; Kentucky; Massachusetts; Michigan; Minnesota; Missouri; Nebraska; New Mexico; North Dakota; Ohio; Oklahoma; South Dakota; Vermont; and Wyoming.							

Source: *National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, High Loss Data Institute, December 2010*

Additional Information

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) reports that in 2005 alone, nearly 9,200 people died and approximately one million people were injured in intersection-related crashes—approximately 40-45 percent of all crashes. According to 2005 data from NHTSA's Fatality Analysis Reporting System, crashes caused by red light running resulted in an estimated 805 fatalities.

Listed below are the municipalities in Florida that currently operate red light programs or are in the process of installing photo enforcement technology:

Apopka; Aventura; Bal Harbour; Bradenton; Casselberry; Clearwater; Cocoa Beach; Collier County; Coral Gables; Coral Springs; Cutler Bay; El Portal; Florida City; Fort Lauderdale; Fort Meyers; Gulf Breeze; Haines City; Hallandale Beach; Hialeah; Hillsborough County; Hollywood; Homestead; Juno Beach; Jupiter; Kenneth City; Key Biscayne; Lake Worth; Lakeland; Miami Gardens; Miami; North Miami; North Miami Beach; Ocoee; Oldsmar; Orlando; Palm Beach County; Palm Coast; Pembroke Pines; Port Richey; South Pasadena; Sunny Isles Beach; Sweetwater; Tallahassee; Temple Terrace; West Boca; and Winter Springs.

Prepared by: Michael Amador-Gil