

**Statement before the Maryland Senate
Judicial Proceedings Committee**

Automated Speed Enforcement

Stephen L. Oesch

March 25, 2004

**INSURANCE INSTITUTE
FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY**

1005 NORTH GLEBE ROAD ARLINGTON, VA 22201

PHONE 703/247-1500 FAX 703/247-1678

<http://www.highwaysafety.org>

The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety is a nonprofit research and communications organization that identifies ways to reduce the deaths, injuries, and property damage on our nation's highways. We are supported by the nation's automobile insurers. The Institute is submitting research results showing the benefits of automated enforcement technology in reducing speeding on high-risk roads.

Speeds Are Increasing

Speed limits are higher on many U.S. roads than they used to be, and motorists are going faster — in many cases a lot faster than the newly posted limits. Recent Institute surveys of vehicle speeds in six states, including Maryland, found a significant number of motorists traveling faster than the posted limit.¹ In Maryland, with a posted rural interstate speed limit of 65 mph, 17 percent of vehicles were traveling faster than 70 mph. Similar speeds were seen on urban interstates. In the Washington, D.C. area, with a posted speed limit of 55 mph, 31 percent of vehicles were traveling faster than 70 mph.

New Ways Needed to Reduce Speeding on High-Risk Roads

The perception of the risk of getting a speeding ticket strongly influences motorists' speed choices. Traditional police enforcement can be an effective method of apprehending motorists who travel at excessive speeds. But the number of drivers and vehicle miles traveled have risen faster than the availability of officers whose routine duties include traffic law enforcement.² Other police priorities such as apprehension of violent criminals and, more recently, anti-terrorism efforts can limit resources available for traffic enforcement. In addition, on multi-lane roads with heavy traffic moving in both directions it often is dangerous for police to make traditional traffic stops.

Speeding Poses Multiple Risks to Everyone on the Road

Speeding is one of the most prevalent factors contributing to motor vehicle crashes.³ It contributes to both crash frequency and severity.⁴ Speed increases frequency because at higher speeds motorists have less time to react and stopping distances are longer. Even more important is that the probability of severe injury in crashes increases sharply with the impact speeds of the vehicles, reflecting the laws of physics.

The risk to pedestrians — the most vulnerable people on the road — is even greater when speed limits are violated.⁵ The risk of pedestrian death increases by a factor of 2.5 when the speed of a striking vehicle increases from 25 to 31 mph.⁶ Urban areas are prime candidates for

effective speed enforcement because, on a national basis, approximately 26 percent of all crashes occur on streets with speed limits of 30 mph or less.⁷

How to Reduce Speeding on High-Risk Roads

The challenge is to find better methods of controlling speeds, and speed cameras can help. They photograph motor vehicles going a specified amount above the posted speed limit, and violators are ticketed by mail. Camera systems typically consist of a radar unit to measure speeds and a camera to photograph the vehicles that are violating the speed limit. The time, date, location, and speed of the vehicle are recorded on the film. And to increase the deterrent value, prominently posted signs should be used to alert motorists that cameras are being used.

Research from British Columbia demonstrates that this method of speed control is effective. Evaluating a program that involved 30 cameras, researchers found a 7 percent decline in crashes and up to 20 percent fewer deaths the first year cameras were used. The proportion of speeding vehicles at camera sites declined from 66 percent in 1996 to fewer than 40 percent a year later.^{4,8} Researchers also attributed a 10 percent decline in daytime injuries to speed cameras. And although nearly 250,000 tickets have been issued, public support remains relatively high. Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed in British Columbia said they favor the program.

The Transportation Research Board⁹ and others have reported the following examples of the successful use of speed cameras:

- Victoria, Australia, launched a speed camera program in 1989. A little more than a year later, 54 cameras were operating. The frequency of crashes involving injuries or deaths decreased by about 30 percent.⁴
- On a stretch of Autobahn A3 between Cologne and Frankfurt, Germany, where speed cameras were deployed, total crashes dropped from about 300 per year to fewer than 30. Injury crashes decreased by a factor of 20.⁴
- Speed cameras were deployed on 64 roads in Norway, producing an overall 20 percent reduction in injury crashes compared with before the program. The largest reduction was 26 percent, and the smallest was 5 percent.⁴

About 75 countries use cameras to supplement conventional police enforcement of speed limits, especially on high-risk roads. But this technology is used in only about a dozen U.S. communities. In 2002 the Institute evaluated the effect of a city-wide speed camera program begun in 2001 by the District of Columbia. The program involved 5 vehicles equipped with cameras ro-

tated among 60 enforcement zones throughout the city. Institute researchers measured travel speeds on 7 neighborhood streets before cameras were deployed and again at the same sites 6 months after deployment. At all of the sites, the proportion of motorists going fast enough to warrant getting a ticket (more than 10 mph above the speed limit) went down dramatically. Reductions ranged from 38 to 89 percent. Institute researchers also measured travel speeds in Baltimore, Maryland, a comparable city that does not use speed cameras. At the same time D.C. was experiencing a decrease in travel speeds because of the speed camera enforcement program, the proportion of motorists going more than 10 mph above the speed limit at 8 sites in Baltimore stayed about the same or increased slightly.¹⁰

Similar results were found in a pilot speed camera program in Beaverton and Portland, Oregon.¹¹ Engineers compared vehicle speeds before and after implementation of speed cameras. In Beaverton the percentage of vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit by more than 5 mph decreased 28 percent on streets with speed cameras and increased 16 percent on streets without cameras. Likewise, in Portland the percentage of vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit by more than 10 mph decreased by 27 percent on streets with speed cameras and increased by 12 percent on streets without photo radar.

One reason cameras are not used more in this country is that many elected officials believe there is an absence of public support. Concerns have been expressed about privacy, with opponents invoking the "big brother" issue. However, a nationwide telephone survey conducted in 1995 found that 57 percent of U.S. residents favor using cameras to enforce speed limit laws, and such laws have attracted strong public support in countries where they have been used. A recent Institute survey in Washington, D.C., after the speed camera enforcement program began, found a majority (51 percent) supported the enforcement program and only a third of respondents opposed it.¹² An evaluation of the speed camera program in Beaverton and Portland, Oregon, found strong public support for the use of cameras in school zones (88-89 percent) and neighborhoods (74-78 percent). Allowing a pilot program to use speed cameras in Maryland can help police enforce speed limits more effectively.

References

1. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. 2003. On rural and urban roads, motorists are traveling faster and faster, but consequences are forgotten. *Status Report* 38(10):3. Arlington, VA. Available: <http://www.highwaysafety.org/srpdfs/sr3810.pdf>.
2. Freedman, M. and Paek, N. 1992. Police enforcement resources in relation to need: changes during 1978-89. Presented at the Transportation Research Board 72nd Annual Meeting, Washington, DC. Arlington, VA: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.
3. Bowie, N.N. and Waltz, M. 1994. Data analysis of the speed-related crash issue. *Auto and Traffic Safety* 1:31-38.
4. Transportation Research Board. 1998. Special report 254; managing speed: review of current practice for setting and enforcing speed limits. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.
5. Davis, G.A. 2001. NASCOP: an evaluation of photo-radar speed enforcement program. San Jose, CA: City of San Jose.
6. Kallberg, V.P. 1997. Speed can endanger your health. *Nordic Road and Transport Research* 9:9-12. Espoo, Finland: Technical Research Centre of Finland.
7. U.S. Department of Transportation. 2000. Traffic safety facts, 2000. Report no. DOT HS-809-337. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Transportation.
8. Chen, G.; Wilson, J.; Wu, J.; Mehle, W.; and Cooper, P. 1998. Interim evaluation report: photo radar program one year after introduction of the violation ticket phase. Victoria, British Columbia: Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.
9. Blackburn, R.R. and Gilbert, D.T. 1995. Photographic enforcement of traffic laws. *NCHRP Synthesis of Highway Practice* 219. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board.
10. Retting, R.A. and Farmer, C.M. 2003. Evaluation of speed camera enforcement in the District of Columbia. *Transportation Research Record* 1830:34-37. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board.
11. Portland Office of Transportation, City of Beaverton. 1997. Photo radar demonstration project evaluation: cities of Beaverton and Portland. Portland, OR: Oregon Department of Transportation. Available: <http://www.portlandonline.com/police/index.cfm?c=cjiha&a=dcdii>.
12. Retting, R.A. 2003. Speed cameras ó public perceptions in the US. *Traffic Engineering and Control* 44:100-01.