

As shown in the chart, the number of violations at these intersections has declined approximately 40% over the last three years, which indicates that the cameras have been effective in reducing red light running. Staff have also observed that traffic flows have improved in these high volume areas. The Caltrans intersections generate approximately 53% of all Photo Red Light citations and continued use of these cameras eliminates the projected program deficit.

City of Moreno Valley

As requested by the City of Moreno Valley, the camera at Day Street and Canyon Springs Parkway was turned off on August 6, 2012. The intersection was experiencing approximately 3,000 left turn and thru movement citations annually when it was turned off.

City Controlled Intersections

The Public Works Department reviewed the remaining 24 locations based on historical accident and violation data for the past three years. Overall, the City has seen a decrease in the number of citations issued utilizing photo enforcement. In March 2007, on the average 194 citations were issued per camera or 4,076 citations (21 cameras) total for the month, however, in March 2012, on the average only 80 citations were issued per camera or 2,405 citations (30 cameras) total for the month. The average number of citations has declined by more than 50% and is evidence that the cameras have reduced red light running.

Based on this review, it was determined that 11 locations (Exhibit A) should be eliminated from the program. All of the 11 locations have experienced significant reduction in the number of red light violations and currently 10 of the locations experience less than one violation per day. A letter was sent to Redflex on August 24, 2012 requesting the removal of the cameras within 30 days in accordance with the First Amendment to the Agreement between the City and Redflex for the Photo Red Light Enforcement Program. The remaining 13 locations (Exhibit B) still experience more than one violation per day and continue to have accidents that result from red light violations.

Furthermore, Public Works has reviewed other intersections throughout the City for possible camera installation and will continue to evaluate the remaining camera locations to determine if additional cameras should be removed and/or relocated. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure a successful traffic safety program.

Budget Impact

The administrative changes to the program outlined in this report (with adjustments made for freeway construction impacts) have eliminated the projected deficit. With these changes, expenditures are estimated to be \$1,816,886 and revenues are projected to be \$1,900,500 for the current fiscal year.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The adopted Fiscal Year 2012/13 budget includes a \$611,000 deficit for the Red Light Enforcement Program. The administrative changes to the program will eliminate this deficit and thus have a positive impact on the general fund with expenditures at \$1,816,886 and revenue estimated at \$1,900,500.

The minimum fine for a violation of failing to stop at a red light is now \$500. Of the total fine, approximately \$150 is remitted to the City. The remainder of the fine is disbursed amongst the Courts in Riverside County, the County of Riverside, the Department of Motor Vehicles, and the State of California.

Prepared by: Thomas J Boyd, P.E., Public Works Director/City Engineer
Sergio Diaz, Police Chief

Certified as to

Availability of funds: Brent A. Mason, Finance Director/Treasurer

Approved by: Deanna Lorson, Assistant City Manager
for Scott C. Barber, City Manager

Approved as to form: Gregory P. Priamos, City Attorney

Attachments:

1. Cameras Removed (Exhibit A)
2. Cameras Remaining (Exhibit B)

Exhibit A

Removed			
Intersection		ID	Approach
Canyon Springs Parkway	Day Street	RIV-CSDA-01	EB
Requested Removal			
Intersection		ID	Approach
Van Buren Boulevard	Trautwein Avenue	RIV-VBTR-01	EB
Main Street	Columbia Avenue	RIV-MACO-01	NB
Van Buren Boulevard	Dufferin Avenue	RIV-VBDU-01	SB
Van Buren Boulevard	Trautwein Avenue	RIV-VBTR-03	WB
Market Street	University Avenue	RIV-MAUN-01	SB
Canyon Crest Drive	Central Avenue	RIV-CCCE-01	NB
Mission Inn Avenue	Lime Street	RIV-MILI-01	WB
University Avenue	Iowa Avenue	RIV-UNIO-01	EB
Third Street	Chicago Avenue	RIV-3CH-01	EB
Van Buren Boulevard	Arlington Avenue	RIV-VBAR-01	NB
Van Buren Boulevard	Arlington Avenue	RIV-VBAR-03	SB

Exhibit B

Remaining Locations			
Intersection		ID	Approach
Tyler Street	WB 91 FWY Ramps	RIV-TY91-01	SB
Indiana Avenue	Tyler Street	RIV-INTY-01	WB
Chicago Avenue	Martin Luther King Boulevard	RIV-CHML-01	NB
Van Buren Boulevard	Indiana Avenue	RIV-VBIN-01	NB
Indiana Avenue	Arlington Avenue	RIV-INAR-01	NB
Indiana Avenue	Arlington Avenue	RIV-INAR-03	NB
Mulberry Street	Fourteenth Street	RIV-MU14-01	SB
Fourteenth Street	Mulberry Street	RIV-14MU-01	EB
Columbia Avenue	Main Street	RIV-COMA-01	WB
Van Buren Boulevard	Dufferin Avenue	RIV-VBDU-03	NB
Alessandro Avenue	Sycamore Canyon	RIV-ALSC-01	WB
Iowa Avenue	University Avenue	RIV-IOUN-01	SB
Chicago Avenue	Third Street	RIV-CH3-01	NB
Magnolia Avenue	Tyler Street	RIV-MATY-01	WB
Chicago Avenue	Alessandro Boulevard	RIV-CHAL-01	WB
Indiana Avenue	Van Buren Boulevard	RIV-INVB-01	EB
Van Buren Boulevard	Wood Road	RIV-VBWO-01	EB
Arlington Avenue	Van Buren Boulevard	RIV-ARVB-01	EB

Subject: RE: red light camera motion?

From: Kevindaw@aol.com [mailto:Kevindaw@aol.com]

Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 7:51 AM

To: Nicol, Colleen; Melendrez, Andy; MacArthur, Chris; Loveridge, Ron; Hart, Nancy; Gardner, Mike; rbaily@riversideca.gov; Adams, Steve

Subject: red light camera motion?

Sept.18 2012

Hi Colleen,

I have a concern I want to discuss with you. The red light camera issue is something I'm very interested in and I was at council on July 10 when it was last on the agenda (I was there until after midnight). I was upset to read in the PE that the city manager is taking the position that the motion approved that night was to give the issue 60 days to become cost neutral, and that if it was made cost neutral, the issue didn't have to come back to council. That was not the memory I have of that night.

I went back to the video of the meeting and Mr. Adams made a motion to give them 60 days. And a few minutes later, the Mayor asked what his motion was and Adams said he wants to give them 60 days and "come back if they have anything to contribute to that". Then Loveridge asked if there was a second and there was. (this would be about 5:25:52 on the city council video online and that section is attached as an audio file to this email). The final vote was taken about 5:47:10 and the Mayor rushed, stating the motion is for 60 days, but no other details. Remember, this is after midnight and was the third of three very long and contentious issues.

I believed at the time that the issue would be brought back to the council and I certainly think that was the impression left with other people too. So, what was the actual motion? Is it what the councilman made and had a second? Or is it what the Mayor sloppily rushed at the end of a long evening? Why doesn't the minutes reflect Adam's "come back if they have anything to contribute to that"? Obviously there should have been requests for clarification that evening but everyone was emotionally racked and tired. We are now faced with a question of how to proceed. When there is ambiguity on such a contentious issue, shouldn't they error on the side of open discussion? I believe the issue should come back to the council.

Could you please send me information on how to bring forward a ballot initiative, with regard to the City of Riverside?

Respectfully,

Kevin Dawson

ward 2

951-781-0386 h

Subject: FW:

From: <jewconsult@aol.com>

Date: September 23, 2012 9:17:10 AM PDT

To: <mgardner@riversideca.gov>, <asmelendrez@riversideca.gov>, <rbailey@riversideca.gov>, <pdavis@riversideca.gov>, <cmacarthur@riversideca.gov>, <nhart@riversideca.gov>, <sadams@riversideca.gov>

Cc: <citymgr@riversideca.gov>, <callcenter@riversideca.gov>, <cprc@riversideca.gov>, <RPDChiefOnline@riversideca.gov>

Dear Council Members and Officials,

If the city of Riverside simply added one second to the yellow intervals on the lights, the violation rate would drop so far that removing the cameras would be the only sane decision.

Honoring the will of the electorate which does NOT want the cameras would also be a sane decision. In 23 of 24 votes, the cameras lost. It is not rocket science for elected officials who give a tinker's you-know-what to understand they should end the predatory ticket camera program and honor the will of the people. Over 35 cities in California have dropped camera programs and Riverside needs to add to that list.

If this does NOT happen, and the cameras remain in place, then Riverside voters have a simple option. Vote out every official that supported ticket cameras and replace them with officials who will honor the will of the people.

James C. Walker
Life Member - National Motorists Association
Board Member and Executive Director - National Motorists Association Foundation
www.motorists.org
2050 Camelot Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
734-668-7842

Subject: FW: City Council Website Feedback

> -----Original Message-----

> From: webmaster@riversideca.gov [mailto:webmaster@riversideca.gov]

> Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2012 10:09 AM

> To: Gardner, Mike

> Cc: Anderson, Lynn; 1Council

> Subject: City Council Website Feedback

>

> First Name: Joe

> Last Name: Geinieć

> Address: 4276 Miramonte Pl

> Zip: 92501

> Phone: 781-0855

> Email Address: genetz2003@yahoo.com

> City Official: Ward 1 - Mike Gardner

> Comments: Howdy Mike:

>

> Several years ago you knocked on my door to introduced yourself when challenging Betro.

>

> You were the new guy on the block, not a career politician, so, the wife, brother, daughter and mother gave you our votes.

>

> Now that you have had time to become a career politician, it appears, in my opinion you have forgotten that you work for me, not yourself.

>

> I say this because of your opposition to getting rid of the red light cameras.

>

> I am a former LEO, so, I have enforced criminal laws for many years, however, it is clear to me from the obscene amount of funds derived from the red light camera that you prefer to do what you can to bring funds into the city, which a true politician does, rather than act fairly as my representative.

>

> I know that I am not the only person who shares the same opinion in this District, so, if you don't gt back to your roots, then I will do everything I can to get someone int office that represents my best interests, not your agenda.

>

> An angry constituent,

>

> Joseph M. Gienieć

>

> PS: why don't you do a poll like Mr. O'bama to see where your interests best lie.

>

Subject: FW: City Council Website Feedback

-----Original Message-----

From: webmaster@riversideca.gov [mailto:webmaster@riversideca.gov]

Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2012 9:33 AM

To: Gardner, Mike

Cc: Anderson, Lynn; 1Council

Subject: City Council Website Feedback

First Name: Jan

Last Name: Tavaglione

Address: 3825 Westwood Drive

Zip: 92504

Phone: 951-689-9078

Email Address: janetltava@hotmail.com

City Official: Ward 1 - Mike Gardner

Comments: I would like to express my support to keep as many red light cameras that the budget will support. I feel it is a life saver for all and the city should do everything possible to keep them!

Subject: FW: City Council Website Feedback

-----Original Message-----

From: 1Council
Sent: Monday, September 17, 2012 9:18 AM
To: Melendrez, Andy
Subject: FW: City Council Website Feedback

-----Original Message-----

From: webmaster@riversideca.gov [mailto:webmaster@riversideca.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 2:01 PM
To: 1Council
Subject: City Council Website Feedback

First Name: Teresa
Last Name: Wassman
Address:
Zip:
Phone: 951-781-8205
Email Address: FULLMAA@YAHOO.COM
City Official: Ward 2 - Andy Melendrez
Comments: Why did you break your promise to the people on the red light camera vote?