

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE BILL ANALYSIS

AMENDMENT DATE: 08/13/2012  
POSITION: Oppose

BILL NUMBER: SB 1303  
AUTHOR: Simitian, Joseph

**BILL SUMMARY: Vehicles: automated traffic enforcement systems.**

This bill would impose numerous restrictions on local agencies that use automated traffic enforcement systems (red light camera systems).

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

This bill could reduce revenues to the state and local governments if it discourages the use of red light cameras. Finance estimates that annual revenues from these devices provide \$83 million to the State and \$57 million to local jurisdictions.

Additionally, the bill could result in state reimbursable local mandate costs because of the additional signage requirements and the requirement to provide additional information in the notice to appear.

**COMMENTS**

Finance is opposed to the bill because it would discourage the use of red light camera systems, which is likely to result in reduced annual revenues to the State and to local governments. While formal studies are inconclusive, they suggest that red light camera systems reduce injury crashes and promote safer driving. Additionally, the bill would impose reimburseable state mandated costs by requiring that local agencies add additional information to the notice to appear. Since the added information appears to require local agencies to meet with red light violators in person or by phone, the costs could be considerable.

**ANALYSIS**

1. Programmatic Analysis

**Existing law:**

- Requires a governmental agency to identify a red light camera system by signs from all directions, or signs at all major entrances to the city.

**This bill** would require a government agency that operates red light camera systems to:

- Adopt a finding of fact establishing that the red light camera system is needed at a specific location for safety reasons.
- Post signs within 200 feet of an intersection where a red light camera system is operating. A system in place on January 1, 2013, need not be identified until January 1, 2014.
- Not consider revenue generation, beyond recovering the actual cost of operating the system, when deciding on a red light camera system installation.

Analyst/Principal P. Abahazi	Date	Program Budget Manager Kristin Shelton	Date
Department Deputy Director		Date	
Governor's Office:	By:	Date:	Position Approved _____ Position Disapproved _____
BILL ANALYSIS			Form DF-43 (Rev 03/95 Buff)

Simitian, Joseph

08/13/2012

SB 1303

**ANALYSIS** (continued)

- Include additional information in the notice to appear, including:
  - The methods by which the vehicle owner or violator may view and discuss, both by telephone and in person, the evidence used to substantiate the violation.
  - The issuing agency contact information.

**This bill would also** require a manufacturer that operates a red light camera system to submit an annual report to the Judicial Council that includes the number of violations captured, the number of citations issued based on the information from the automated system, the number of different type of violations (driving straight through or turning in the intersection), the number and percentage of citations dismissed by the court, and the number of traffic collisions that happened before and after the system installation.

**Discussion:**

The author's office indicates the bill has been introduced to protect the rights of Californians cited by red light camera systems and to increase public confidence in the purpose and fairness of these systems.

This bill is essentially the same as SB 29 (Simitian) from last year, which was vetoed. The veto message indicated that while the bill attempted to standardize procedures for red light cameras, "this is something that can and should be overseen by local elected officials."

## 2. Fiscal Analysis

This bill could reduce revenues to the state and local governments if it discourages the use of red light cameras. Red light camera operators indicate this bill would make the process cumbersome for cities and counties to comply, which could lead to discontinued use of the cameras because the revenues may not justify the additional activities required to continue operating the system. Finance estimates that annual revenues from these devices provide \$83 million to the State and \$57 million to local jurisdictions.

Additionally, the bill could result in state reimbursable local mandate costs because of the additional signage requirements and the requirement to provide additional information in the notice to appear. The notice to appear would be revised to require that the local agency inform the violator of when and where the violator can discuss the evidence with the citing agency. While the bill does not specifically require the agency to meet with violators, it implies that the option is available. This could cause considerable costs to local agencies to respond to requests for meetings on the evidence.

**BILL ANALYSIS--(CONTINUED)****Form DF-43****AUTHOR****AMENDMENT DATE****BILL NUMBER**

Simitian, Joseph

08/13/2012

SB 1303

Code/Department Agency or Revenue Type	SO	(Fiscal Impact by Fiscal Year)						Fund Code
	LA	(Dollars in Thousands)						
	CO	PROP						
	RV	98	FC	2012-2013	FC	2013-2014	FC	2014-2015
8885/Comm St Mndt	LA	No		----- See Fiscal Summary -----				0001
1644/Civ Crim Vio	RV	No	L	-6,000	L	-6,000	L	-6,000 0001
1643/PenAssessm	RV	No	L	-30,000	L	-30,000	L	-30,000 0903
1643/PenAssessm	RV	No	L	-15,000	L	-15,000	L	-15,000 0932
1644/Civ Crim Vio	RV	No	L	-19,500	L	-19,500	L	-19,500 0932
1643/PenAssessm	RV	No	L	-12,000	L	-12,000	L	-12,000 3086
<u>Fund Code</u>								<u>Title</u>
0001								General Fund
0903								Penalty Fund, State
0932								Trial Court Trust Fund
3086								DNA Identification Fund