

The Florida Senate
BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Transportation Committee

BILL: CS/SB 2004

INTRODUCER: Transportation Committee and Senator Altman

SUBJECT: Traffic Control/Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act

DATE: March 18, 2009 **REVISED:** _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Davis	Meyer	TR	Fav/CS
2.			CJ	
3.			CA	
4.			JU	
5.			TA	
6.				

Please see Section VIII. for Additional Information:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| A. COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE..... | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Statement of Substantial Changes |
| B. AMENDMENTS..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | Technical amendments were recommended |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Amendments were recommended |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Significant amendments were recommended |

I. Summary:

Senate Bill 2004 creates the “Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act” The bill preempts the regulation and use of all traffic camera enforcement systems to the state and creates s. 316.0083, F.S., establishing requirements for the use of traffic infraction detectors by counties and municipalities in enforcement of the requirements of s. 316.075(1)(c), F.S., which requires vehicles to stop before entering an intersection when so directed by a traffic signal. The bill authorizes counties and municipalities to enact ordinances permitting the use of traffic infraction detectors and specifies the required content of the ordinances. The penalty for failing to stop at a steady red light, as determined through the use of a traffic infraction detector, is a fine of \$150. The bill describes requirements that must be met when issuing a ticket through documentation by the traffic infraction detector and the challenge procedure to be followed if someone other than the vehicle owner was driving the vehicle at the time of the alleged violation.

The bill grants counties and municipalities access to Department of Transportation right-of-way to install, maintain, and operate traffic infraction detectors. In addition, the bill provides a “grandfather clause” (until September 30, 2010) for those counties and municipalities currently engaged in the used of traffic detectors. A severability clause is also provided.

The bill provides a complaint process for complaints that a county or municipality is employing traffic infraction detectors for purposes other than the promotion of public health, welfare, and safety or in a manner inconsistent with the law. Each county or municipality that operates a traffic infraction detector must submit an annual report to the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (the Department) which details the results of the detectors and the procedures for enforcement. The Department must submit a summary report to the Governor and Legislature on or before December 1, 2010, which includes a review of the information submitted by the counties and municipalities and any recommendations or necessary legislation.

To the extent local governments choose to enact ordinances to permit the use of traffic infraction detectors there will be a fiscal impact to the local governments for the cost of the installation and maintenance of the devices, the amount of which will vary depending on the negotiated agreement between the local government and any private vendor providing the equipment. There may be an increase in fine revenue for the local governments that choose to enact ordinances permitting the use of traffic infraction detectors, the amount of which is indeterminate and reliant on driver awareness and future behavior.

This bill substantially amends ss. 316.003, 316.0745, 316.1967, 395.4036; and reenacts s. 320.03 of the Florida Statutes.

This bill creates ss. 316.0076, 316.0083, and 316.0776, and a new unnumbered section of the Florida Statutes.

II. Present Situation:

Intersection Safety

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), more than 45 percent of all traffic crashes occur at intersections or are intersection-related. In 2005, nearly 9,200 people died and approximately one million people were injured in intersection-related crashes. NHTSA's Fatality Analysis Reporting System showed crashes caused by red light running resulted in an estimated 805 fatalities in 2005.¹ The Department reported there were 106 fatalities and 10,720 injuries related to red light running events in Florida during 2007. Two sections of Florida Statutes address red light running:

- Section 316.074(1), F.S., requires drivers to obey the instructions of any applicable official traffic control device, when properly installed, unless otherwise directed by a police officer.
- Section 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S., requires vehicles facing a steady red signal to stop before entering the intersection and to remain standing until a green indication is shown. Exceptions are made to provide for a right turn on red after stopping and in certain one-way traffic intersections, a left turn on red after stopping.

Violation of either section for a driver failing to stop at a traffic signal when so required constitutes a noncriminal traffic infraction, punishable under ch. 318, F.S., as a moving violation

¹ http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersections/inter_facts.htm

and a one hundred twenty-five dollar fine, sixty dollars of which is distributed as provided in s. 318.21, F.S., and the remaining \$65 remitted to the Department of Revenue for deposit into the Administrative Trust Fund of the Department of Health under s. 318.18(15), F.S. A violation of either section also results in the assessment of 4 points against a driver's license under s. 322.27(3), F.S.

A number of factors contribute to red light running-related crashes. According to the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Red Light Camera Systems Operational Guidelines (January 2005)², while deficiencies in the design and configuration of signalized intersections may contribute to red light violations, driver behavior is the most significant contributing factor to the occurrence of red light running. According to the FHWA guidelines, the solution to the red light running problem and resulting crashes may require one or a combination of the following:

- *Intersection Engineering Improvements* including modifying traffic signal timing, improving signing and marking, improving sight lines, modifying grades and/or grade separation, adjusting the prevailing speeds, changes in surface treatments, altering lane configuration, and replacing the traffic signal with some other form of traffic control device or intersection type.
- *Education* to assist motorists and the general public in understanding the safety issues inherent to red light running.
- *Traditional Enforcement By Law Enforcement Officers* specifically targeting red light running violators can be a cost effective deterrent in reducing red light violations at problem intersections.
- *Red Light Camera Systems* can be a cost effective tool to reduce red light violations and should be part of a comprehensive intersection safety program, which considers all countermeasures to reduce fatal and injury crashes at intersections.

Red Light Cameras

Traffic infraction detectors, or "red light cameras," are used to enforce traffic laws by automatically photographing vehicles whose drivers run red lights. A Red Light Camera System is a system for detecting and recording traffic violations occurring when a motor vehicle fails to obey a traffic control device. Red light camera systems use sensors connected to computers which measure a vehicle's speed. If the measured speed indicates the vehicle is unlikely to stop for a traffic signal's stop phase, high-speed cameras are engaged to record photographic evidence of a violation. Typically, two photos are taken: one of the front of the vehicle as it enters the intersection, and the second photo is taken of the rear of the vehicle when the vehicle is in the intersection during the stop phase. Most red light camera systems also record digital video data of the event, bracketing the alleged violation with several seconds of video to show any extenuating circumstances, e.g., a police officer directing traffic or the presence of emergency vehicles. When used as photo enforcement of traffic laws, traffic infraction enforcement officials remotely review the evidence, and, when warranted, issue a citation which is mailed to the registered owner of the vehicle. Most applications include processes allowing owners to challenge the citation if he or she was not the driver at the time of the violation. The United

² http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersections/rlc_guide/rlcguide05jan.pdf

States Supreme Court has held that driving in open view on a public highway does not afford Fourth Amendment protection of an individual's privacy.³

Numerous studies examining red light camera systems' impact on safety have shown mixed results. A 2005 publication by FHWA exemplifies the findings. The comprehensive report, "Safety Evaluation of Red-Light Cameras" (FHWA-HRT-05-048)⁴, included data from seven jurisdictions (Baltimore, MD; Charlotte, NC; El Cajon, CA; Howard County and Montgomery County, MD; and San Diego and San Francisco, CA) and 132 intersections. The study showed red light cameras led to a decrease in the types of crashes most likely to cause death and injury while property-damage-only crashes increased. Specifically, the report showed a:

- 25 percent decrease in total right-angle crashes.
- 16 percent reduction in injury right-angle crashes.
- 15 percent increase in total rear-end crashes.
- 24 percent increase in injury rear-end crashes.

An overall economic analysis from the study showed that red light camera systems provide a modest aggregate crash-cost benefit. According to the study, the greatest economic benefits provided by red light cameras would be at intersections with:

- relatively few rear end crashes and many right-angle ones,
- a higher traffic volume, especially when entering from the major road,
- shorter signal cycle lengths and intergreen periods (yellow clearance + all red), and
- one or more left turn protected phases.⁵

The study also found that high public awareness, such as the presence of warning signs at both red light camera-enforced intersections and city limits of jurisdictions using red light camera systems, will enhance the benefits of the detectors.

According to FHWA's Red Light Camera Systems Operational Guidelines, the following critical elements should be considered while installing red light camera systems:

- Conduct an engineering study before considering camera installation.
- Evaluate effective engineering and education alternatives before considering photo enforcement.
- Make sure the red light camera program is engineered and installed properly.
- Measure, document, and make safety results available.
- Ensure complete oversight and supervision by public agencies.
- Avoid compensating vendors based on the number of citations.
- Include an ongoing photo-enforcement public education program.

Photo Enforcement in Florida

³ *Photographic Traffic Law Enforcement* (National Cooperative Highway Research Program's Legal Research Digest Number 36, 1997)

⁴ <http://www.tfhrc.gov/safety/pubs/05048/>

⁵ The study suggested the presence of protected left turn phases may be a proxy for high numbers of left turning vehicles.

Since red light cameras first became feasible in the early 1990s, a number of Florida communities have employed red light cameras in some form, most often as a research tool or for issuing warnings to red light running violators. Responding to a request relating to whether a county might enact an ordinance authorizing the use of unmanned cameras at traffic intersections for the purpose of issuing citations for red light running violations, a 1997 Attorney General Opinion⁶ concluded nothing in Florida Statutes precluded the recording of violations, but photographic evidence could not “be used as the sole basis for issuing citations” since statutes provide a citation may be issued only when an officer observes the infraction. A 2005 Attorney General Opinion⁷ on the same subject concluded a local government may “enact an ordinance authorizing the city:

- to monitor violations of traffic signals within the city and to use unmanned cameras to monitor intersections and record traffic violations;
- to monitor violations of traffic signals within the city and to use unmanned cameras to record the license tag numbers of cars involved in such violations; and
- to advise a car owner that his or her license tag number has been recorded in a violation of the traffic laws.”

The 2005 opinion also stated “legislative changes are necessary before local governments may issue traffic citations and penalize drivers who fail to obey red light indications on traffic signal devices” as collected from a photographic record from unmanned cameras monitoring intersections.

Statutory authority for photo enforcement of required highway toll payment was provided by the Legislature in 1993. Section 316.1001(2)(d), F.S., provides for the admissibility of photographic evidence in enforcing toll payment violations. Toll facility operators use camera systems to photograph the license plates of vehicles passing a tolling point without tendering payment. If no payment is received and the vehicle is not qualified for video billing, the registered owner of the vehicle is issued a Uniform Traffic Citation by first class or registered mail. If the vehicle was not in the care and control of the registered owner at the time of the violation, the owner is afforded the opportunity to establish this as fact and identify the driver via an affidavit.

Red Light Camera System Procurement

State and local governments have a number of choices in the development and operation of red light camera systems. FHWA’s Red Light Camera Systems Operational Guidelines, offers the following guidance:

Where a private contractor is responsible for installation and operation of the red light camera equipment, the State or local agency should establish the necessary procedures so that the agency has complete oversight and day-to-day supervision of the program.

and:

⁶ Attorney General Opinion 97-06.

⁷ Attorney General Opinion 05-41.

Where a private contractor is responsible for the processing of citations, compensation to private vendors based on the number of citations issued should be avoided. In multiple jurisdictions, the courts have determined that it is inappropriate for the private contractor to be responsible for determining installation locations and operation of the system because of an appearance of a conflict of interest. This conflict of interest should be avoided in all phases of the system installation and operation: startup, design, installation, operation, and maintenance. At all times, the State or local agency should verify and exercise complete oversight of all actions of the private contractor.

Some agencies are compensating their camera system vendors based on a flat fee per location per time period. Others have installed and operated their own systems. It may also be appropriate to pay a vendor to operate and maintain an agency-designed and -implemented system. Compensation should be based solely on the value of the equipment or the services provided.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

Authorization

Senate Bill 2004 creates the “Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act.” The bill preempts the regulation and use of all traffic camera enforcement systems to the state. In addition, the bill creates s. 316.0083, F.S., authorizing counties and municipalities to enact ordinances permitting the use of traffic infraction detectors and specifies the required content of the ordinance. Pursuant to the new statute, each local ordinance must:

- provide for the use of a traffic infraction detector to enforce s. 316.075(1)(c), F.S., which requires the driver of a motor vehicle to stop when facing a traffic signal steady red light on the streets and highways under the jurisdiction of the county or municipality;
- authorize a traffic infraction enforcement officer to issue a ticket for violation of s. 316.075(1)(c), F.S., and to enforce the payment of tickets for such violation;
- require signs, which conform to Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) specifications, to be posted at locations designated by the county or municipality providing notification that a traffic infraction detector may be in use;
- require the county or municipality to make a public announcement and conduct a public awareness campaign of the proposed use of traffic infraction detectors at least 30 days before commencing the enforcement program; and
- establish a fine of \$150 to be assessed against the owner of a motor vehicle whose vehicle fails to stop when facing a red light, as determined through use of a traffic infraction detector.

The ordinance must allow the county or municipality to install, maintain, and operate traffic infraction detectors on the right-of-way owned or maintained by FDOT, county, or municipality in which the traffic infraction detector is to be installed.

Fines

The fine imposed by the local ordinance is done so in the same manner and is subject to the same limitations as provided for parking violations under s. 316.1967, F.S. The Department’s

authority to suspend or revoke a license (contained in ch. 318 and s. 322.27, F.S.) is not applicable to a violation of an ordinance enacted under s. 316.0083, F.S. A violation is not a conviction of the operator, may not be made a part of the operator's driving record, may not be used for purposes of setting motor vehicle insurance rates, and may not result in points assessed against the operator's driver's license.

Fines assessed under the ordinance are disbursed as follows:

- Three-fifths to be retained by the county or municipality enforcing the ordinance;
- One-fifth as provided by s. 318.21, F.S.;⁸ and
- One-fifth to be deposited in the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund, with the following further direction as provided in s. 395.4036(1), F.S.:
 - Twenty percent allocated to verified trauma centers that have local funding contribution as of December 31. Distribution is based on trauma caseload volume for most recent calendar year available;
 - Thirty-nine percent allocated to verified trauma centers based on trauma caseload volume for the most recent calendar year available. Determination of caseload volume is based on the Department of health's Trauma Registry date; and
 - Thirty-nine percent allocated to verified trauma centers based on severity of trauma patients for the most recent calendar year available;
 - Two-percent allocated to non-trauma center public hospitals based on proportionate number of emergency-room visits.

In addition, the bill redirects two-percent of funds collected under s. 318.15, F.S., and currently distributed to verified trauma centers that have a local funding contribution. The redirected funds are to be distributed to provide an enhanced Medicaid payment to nursing homes that serve residents with brain and spinal cord injuries who are Medicaid recipients.

Procedure for Issuance and Contestation of Tickets

The bill cites current statutory procedures addressing liability for payment of parking ticket violations and other parking violations⁹ and applies those procedures to violations of ordinances created under s. 316.0083, F.S., with the following additional requirements regarding the information which must be included in the ticket:

- the name and address of the person alleged to be liable as the registered owner or operator of the vehicle involved in the violation;
- the registration number of the vehicle;
- the violation charged;
- a copy of the recorded image;
- the location where the violation occurred;
- the date and time of the violation;
- information that identifies the device that recorded the violation;

⁸ Section 318.21, F.S. contains the general disposition of all civil penalties by county courts.

⁹ Section 316.1967(2)-(5), F.S.

- a signed statement by a specifically trained technician employed by the agency or its contractor that, based on inspection of recorded images, the motor vehicle was being operated in violation of s. 316.075(1)(c), F.S.;
- the amount of the fine;
- the date by which the fine must be paid;
- the procedure for contesting the violation alleged in the ticket; and
- a warning that failure to contest the violation in the manner and time provided is deemed an admission of the liability and that a default may be entered thereon.

The violation is processed by the county or municipality that has jurisdiction over the street or highway where the violation occurred or by any entity authorized by the county or municipality to prepare and mail the ticket. The ticket must be sent by first-class mail to the owner of the vehicle involved in the violation no less than 30 days after the date of the violation.

The owner is responsible for payment of the fine unless the owner can establish that the vehicle:

- Passed through the intersection to yield the right-of-way to an emergency vehicle or as part of a funeral procession;
- Passed through the intersection at the direction of a law enforcement officer;
- Was, at the time of the violation, reported as stolen;
- Received a Uniform Traffic Citation (UTC) for the alleged violation; or
- Passed through the intersection as the result of a medical emergency.

The owner of the vehicle must, within 30 days of receipt of notification, furnish an affidavit to the county or municipality that provides detailed information supporting an exemption as provided above, including relevant documents such as a police report (if the car had been reported stolen) or a copy of the UTC, if issued.

A person may elect to contest the determination that they failed to stop at a red light as evidenced by the traffic infraction detector by electing to appear before a judge authorized to adjudicate traffic infractions. If the person elects to appear before the court, he or she is deemed to have waived the limitation of civil penalties imposed for the violation and the court may impose a civil penalty not to exceed \$150 plus court costs and order the registered owner of the motor vehicle to attend a basic driver improvement course if the court finds a violation was committed. The court may take appropriate measures to enforce collection of any penalty not paid within the time permitted by the court.

A certificate sworn to or affirmed by a person authorized under s. 316.0083, F.S., who is employed by or under contract with the county or municipality where the infraction occurred, or a fax of such a certificate, that is based upon inspection of photographs or other recorded images produced by the traffic infraction detector, is considered evidence of the facts contained in the certificate. A photograph or other recorded image evidencing a violation of s 316.075(1)(c), F.S., must be available for inspection in any proceeding to adjudicate liability for violation of an ordinance enacted under s. 316.0083, F.S.

The bill authorizes counties and municipalities to provide the names of those who have one or more outstanding violations, as recorded by traffic infraction detectors, to the Department. Pursuant to s. 320.03(8), F.S., if a person's name appears on the Department's list, a license plate or revalidation sticker may not be issued until the fine has been paid.

Oversight and Accountability

The bill authorizes the placement and installation of traffic infraction detectors on the State Highway System, county roads, and municipal streets under specifications developed by FDOT, so long as safety and operation of the road facility is not impaired. Any traffic infraction detector installed on the State Highway System must meet requirements established by the FDOT and must be tested at regular intervals according to procedures prescribed by FDOT. The bill provides a 'grandfather clause' for those counties and municipalities that have already instituted a traffic infraction detector program. These counties and municipalities are not required to meet the uniform system requirements provided by the bill until September 30, 2010.

The bill provides for a complaint process for complaints that a county or municipality is employing traffic infraction detectors for purposes other than the promotion of public health, welfare, and safety or in a manner inconsistent with the law. A complaint may be submitted to the governing board of the county or municipality.

Each county or municipality that operates a traffic infraction detector is required to submit an annual report to the Department, which must contain:

- the complaints received, along with any investigation and corrective action taken by the governing body;
- the results of using the traffic infraction detector; and
- the procedures for enforcement.

The Department must submit an annual summary report to the Governor and Legislature which must contain:

- a review of the information received from the counties and municipalities;
- a description of the enhancement of the traffic safety and enforcement programs; and
- recommendations, including any necessary legislation.

The first report must be submitted on or before December 1, 2010. After reviewing the report, the Legislature may exclude a county or municipality from further participation in the program.

The bill provides a severability clause and is effective upon becoming law.

Other Potential Implications:

Approximately 35 counties and municipalities currently operate red light camera systems in the state of Florida that will be affected by the bill.

IV. Constitutional Issues:**A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:**

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:**A. Tax/Fee Issues:**

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

To the extent local governments choose to enact ordinances to permit the use of traffic infraction detectors there may be a fiscal impact to the private sector. Traffic infraction detectors will increase the scope of a local government's enforcement of red light violations, therefore increasing the possibility of a motor vehicle owner receiving a ticket for a red light violation. The fine for the ordinance violation, as determined by a traffic infraction detector, is \$150. If a person chooses to contest the ticket, they may appear before a judge, but they are deemed to have waived the limitation of civil penalties imposed for the violation and, if the ticket is upheld by the judge, may be charged the \$150 fine plus court costs and ordered to attend a basic driver improvement course.

C. Government Sector Impact:

To the extent local governments choose to enact ordinances to permit the use of traffic infraction detectors there may be a fiscal impact to the local governments for the cost of the acquisition, installation and maintenance of the devices, the amount of which will vary depending on the negotiated agreement between the local government and any private vendor providing the equipment and service. The price of a traffic infraction detector ranges from \$50,000 to \$100,000 each. There may also be installation, maintenance and monitoring fees, based on the negotiated agreement.

In 2007, there were 376,673 citations issued statewide by law enforcement officers for violations of ss. 316.074(1) and 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S., for a driver's failure to stop at a traffic signal when so directed. Due to the technological advantage of red light camera systems in enforcing red light running violations, estimating the margin of additional violations with any degree of accuracy is difficult. Further complicating any estimation, it is not clear how effective red light camera systems would be in modifying driver

behavior, but some reduction in the initial number of violations should be expected subsequent to the implementation of a red light camera system.

The Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund will receive one-fifth of all revenue generated by the bill. Specifically, the fines are to be distributed as follows:

- 20% to verified trauma centers that have a local funding contribution; the funds are to be distributed based on caseload volume;
- 39% to verified trauma centers based on trauma caseload volume from the most recent calendar year;
- 39% to verified trauma centers based on trauma caseload volume from the most recent calendar year; and
- 2% will be distributed to non-trauma center hospitals, based on their proportional number of emergency-room visits.

The bill provides that three-fifths of the revenue generated by the tickets is retained by the local jurisdiction. As a result, there may be an increase in fine revenue for any local governments that choose to enact ordinances permitting the use of traffic infraction detectors. The amount of revenue is indeterminate, as the number of ordinance violations to be issued is unknown and depends on driver awareness and future behavior.

The remaining one-fifth of the revenue collected is distributed pursuant to s. 318.21, F.S., which contains the general disposition of all civil penalties by county courts. Revenue distributed under this section benefits counties and municipalities as well as numerous judicial and administrative services, law enforcement, health and emergency services, and educational and vocational services.

Local court systems may see a caseload increase, in the event that vehicle operators choose to contest tickets as permitted under the bill. Although the bill permits the court to impose a penalty “not to exceed \$150 plus court costs,” there may be an indeterminate cost to the local court system.

Two state agencies will incur minor expenses as a result of this legislation. The bill requires the Department to collect reports from municipalities and to prepare an annual report for the Legislature. The bill also requires the FDOT to prepare standards for traffic infraction detectors.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

Page 8, lines 208-210 should be clarified to ensure costs may be imposed by the courts. This is due to a potential conflict with page 5, lines 120-126.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Additional Information:**A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:**
(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)**CS by Transportation on 3/17/09:**

- Preempts the regulation and use of traffic enforcement cameras to the state.
- Increases the fine for failing to stop at a steady red light, as determined through the use of a traffic infraction detector, (from \$125 to \$150).
- Requires the court to order offenders, who elect to appear before the court to contest and the court determines a violation was committed, to attend a basic driver improvement course.
- Changes the disbursement of the fines. Counties and municipalities will retain three-fifths of the fine (from 100 percent), one-fifth remitted to the county courts for distribution as provided in s. 318.21, F.S., and one-fifth to the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund.
- Authorizes, per ordinance, the county or municipality to install, maintain, and operate traffic infraction detectors on the right-of-way owned or maintained by FDOT, county, or municipality in which the traffic infraction detector is to be installed.
- Specifies placement and installation of traffic infraction detectors is allowed on the State Highway System, county roads and municipal streets under FDOT specifications, so long as safety and operation of the road facility is not impaired.
- Provides a ‘grandfather clause’ for those Florida municipalities already engaged in the use of traffic infraction detectors.
- Lengthens the amount of time counties and cities have to notify offenders (from 14 days to 30 days).
- Adds another exemption to the permitted reasons a person might violate a red light (“medical emergency”).
- Lengthens the period an alleged violator has to prepare an affidavit identifying a valid reason for violating a red light (from 20 to 30 days).

B. Amendments:

None.