

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: SB 672

INTRODUCER: Senator Garcia

SUBJECT: Uniform Traffic Control

DATE: March 25, 2011

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Davis	Spalla	TR	Pre-meeting
2.	_____	_____	CA	_____
3.	_____	_____	BC	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

I. Summary:

SB 672 repeals authorization to use traffic infraction detectors, commonly known as “red light cameras,” to enforce traffic safety laws, which were enacted in Ch. 2010-80, Laws of Florida, by the Florida Legislature during the 2010 Session.

Specifically, the bill repeals s. 316.0076, F.S., which preempts the regulation and use of all traffic camera enforcement systems to the state. The bill repeals s. 316.008(8), F.S., authorizing local governments to install traffic infraction detectors, and s. 316.0083, F.S., which provides local ordinance requirements, installation, signage and notification-of-violation processes, as well as distribution requirements for fines collected by traffic infraction detector programs. The bill also repeals s. 316.0776, F.S., which provides engineering specifications for installation of traffic infraction detectors.

The bill repeals portions of other sections in Chapter 316, Florida Statutes, in order to conform to the repealed sections described above, and it repeals two statutes relating to the implementation of the traffic infraction detector bill passed in 2010.

This bill substantially amends the following sections of the Florida Statutes: 316.640, 316.650, 318.14, 318.18, and 322.27.

This bill substantially repeals the following sections of the Florida Statutes: 316.003(87), 316.0076, 316.008(8), 316.0083, 316.00831, 316.07456, 316.0776, 321.50.

In addition, the bill repeals ss. 15 and 16, Chapter 2010-80, Laws of Florida.

II. Present Situation:

Traffic Infraction Detectors generally

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 is connected to the traffic signal and to sensors that monitor traffic flow at the crosswalk or stop line. The system continuously monitors the traffic signal, and the camera is triggered by any vehicle entering the intersection above a pre-set minimum speed and following a specified time after the signal has turned red. A second photograph typically shows the red light violator in the intersection. In some cases video cameras are used. Cameras record the license plate number, the date and time of day, the time elapsed since the beginning of the red signal, and the vehicle speed.

Traffic Infraction Detectors in Florida

In 2010, the Florida Legislature enacted Chapter 2010-80, Laws of Florida. The law expressly preempted to the state regulation of the use of cameras for enforcing the provisions of Chapter 316, Florida Statutes.¹ The law authorized the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV), counties, and municipalities to authorize officials to issue notices of 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 such violation was identified by a traffic infraction detector.²

Jurisdiction, Installation, and Awareness

Any traffic infraction detector installed on the highways, roads, and streets must meet requirements established by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and must be tested at regular intervals according to procedures prescribed by FDOT.³ Municipalities may install or authorize installation of traffic infraction detectors on streets and highways in accordance with FDOT standards, and on state roads within the incorporated area when permitted by FDOT.⁴ Counties may install or authorize installation of traffic infraction detectors on streets and highways in unincorporated areas of the county in accordance with FDOT standards, and on state roads in unincorporated areas of the county when permitted by FDOT.⁵ DHSMV may install or authorize installation of traffic infraction detectors on any state road under the original jurisdiction of FDOT, when permitted by FDOT.⁶

If DHSMV, a county, or a municipality installs a traffic infraction detector at an intersection, the respective governmental entity must notify the public that a traffic infraction device may be in use at that intersection, including specific notification of enforcement of violations concerning right turns.⁷ Such signage must meet the specifications for uniform signals and devices adopted by FDOT pursuant to s. 316.0745, F.S.⁸

¹ Section 316.0076, F.S.

² *See generally* s. 316.0083, F.S.

³ Section 316.07456, F.S.

⁴ Section 316.008(7), F.S.; s. 316.0776(1), F.S.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Section 321.50, F.S. As of March 2011, DHSMV has not undertaken any effort to install or authorize traffic infraction detectors itself.

⁷ Section 316.0776(2), F.S.

⁸ *Id.*

Notifications and Citations

If a traffic infraction detector identifies a person violating ss. 316.074(1) or 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S., the visual information is captured and reviewed by a traffic infraction enforcement officer. A notification must be issued to the registered owner of the vehicle within 30 days of the alleged violation.⁹ The notice must be accompanied by a photograph or other recorded image of the violation, and must include a statement of the vehicle owner's right to review images or video of the violation, and the time and place, or Internet location where the evidence may be reviewed.¹⁰ Violations may not be issued if the driver is making a right-hand turn "in a careful and prudent manner."¹¹

If the registered owner of the vehicle does not submit payment within 30 days of receipt of the notification described above, the traffic infraction enforcement officer must issue a traffic citation to the owner.¹² A citation must be mailed by certified mail, and must be issued no later than 60 days after the violation.¹³ The citation must also include the photograph and statements described above regarding review of the photographic or video evidence.¹⁴ The report of a traffic infraction enforcement officer and images provided by a traffic infraction detector are admissible in court and provide a rebuttable presumption the vehicle was used in a violation.¹⁵

A traffic infraction enforcement officer must provide by electronic transmission a replica of the citation data when issued under s. 316.0083, F.S., to the court having jurisdiction over the alleged offense or its traffic violations bureau within 5 days after the issuance date of the citation to the violator.¹⁶

Defenses

The registered owner of the motor vehicle 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, in the care, custody, or control of another person; or
- Received a Uniform Traffic Citation (UTC) for the alleged violation issued by a law enforcement officer.¹⁷

To establish any of these defenses, the owner of the vehicle must furnish an affidavit to the appropriate governmental entity that provides detailed information supporting an exemption as

⁹ Section 316.0083(1)(b), F.S.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ Section 316.0083(2), F.S.

¹² Section 316.0083(1)(c), F.S.

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ Section 316.0083(1)(e), F.S.

¹⁶ Section 316.650(3)(c), F.S.

¹⁷ Section 316.0083(1)(d), F.S.

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.¹⁸ If the owner submits an affidavit that another driver was behind the wheel, the affidavit must contain the name, address, date of birth, and if known, the driver's license number, of the driver.¹⁹ A traffic citation may be issued to this person, and the affidavit from the registered owner may be used as evidence in a further proceeding regarding that person's alleged violation of ss. 316.074(1) or 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S.²⁰ Submission of a false affidavit is a second degree misdemeanor.

If a vehicle is leased, the owner of the leased vehicle is not responsible for paying the citation, nor required to submit an affidavit, if the motor vehicle is registered in the name of the lessee.²¹ If a person presents documentation from the appropriate governmental entity that the citation was issued in error, the clerk of court may dismiss the case and may not charge for such service.²²

Oversight and Accountability

By October 1, 2012, and annually thereafter, each county or municipality that operates a traffic infraction detector is required to submit a report to DHSMV containing the following:

- the results of using the traffic infraction detector;
- the procedures for enforcement; and
- statistical data and information required by DHSMV.²³

By December 31, 2012, and annually thereafter, DHSMV must submit a summary report to the Governor and Legislature which must contain:

- a review of the information, described above, received from the counties and municipalities;
- a description of the enhancement of the traffic safety and enforcement programs; and
- recommendations, including any necessary legislation.²⁴

Fines

A fine of \$158 is levied on violators who fail to stop at a traffic signal as required by ss. 316.074(1) or 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S. When the \$158 fine is the result of a local government's traffic infraction detector, \$75 is retained by the local government and \$83 is deposited with the Department of Revenue (DOR).²⁵ DOR subsequently distributes the fines by depositing \$70 in the General Revenue Fund, \$10 in the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund, and \$3 in the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund.²⁶

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.*

²² Section 318.18(15), F.S.

²³ Section 316.0083(4), F.S.

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ Section 318.18(15), F.S., s. 316.0083(1)(b)3., F.S.

²⁶ *Id.*

If a law enforcement officer cites a motorist for the same offense, the fine is still \$158, but the revenue is distributed from the local clerk of court to DOR, where \$30 is distributed to the General Revenue Fund, \$65 is distributed to the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund, and \$3 is distributed to the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund. The remaining \$60 is distributed in small percentages to a number of funds pursuant to s. 318.21, F.S.²⁷

Violations of ss. 316.074(1) or 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S., enforced by traffic infraction detectors may not result in points assessed against the operator’s driver’s license and may not be used for the purpose of setting motor vehicle insurance rates.²⁸

The following chart details amounts remitted from participating local governments to the Department of Revenue as a result of traffic infraction detector programs in place from July 2010 through February 2011:²⁹

JURISDICTION	COUNTY	Grand Total
COCOA BEACH	Brevard	\$218,207
PALM BAY	Brevard	\$117,445
FORT LAUDERDALE	Broward	\$376,717
HALLANDALE BEACH	Broward	\$54,697
PEMBROKE PINES	Broward	\$90,087
HOLLYWOOD	Broward	\$3,486
COLLIER COUNTY BOCC	Collier	\$270,165
PALM COAST	Flagler	\$103,086
HILLSBOROUGH BOCC	Hillsborough	\$807,406
TEMPLE TERRACE	Hillsborough	\$66,566
CAMPBELLTON	Jackson	\$54,780
TALLAHASSEE	Leon	\$326,273
BRADENTON	Manatee	\$134,228
DUNNELLON	Marion	\$97,525
AVENTURA	Miami-Dade	\$810,246
HOMESTEAD	Miami-Dade	\$179,861

JURISDICTION	COUNTY	Grand Total
MIAMI BEACH	Miami-Dade	\$268,090
MIAMI GARDENS	Miami-Dade	\$640,594
NORTH MIAMI	Miami-Dade	\$570,459
OPA LOCKA	Miami-Dade	\$196,673
WEST MIAMI	Miami-Dade	\$152,388
SWEETWATER	Miami-Dade	\$120,931
APOPKA	Orange	\$468,120
MAITLAND	Orange	\$5,312
OCOE	Orange	\$314,736
ORLANDO	Orange	\$927,442
PALM SPRINGS	Palm Beach	\$195,963
WEST PALM BEACH	Palm Beach	\$113,365
PORT RICHEY	Pasco	\$345,446
HAINES CITY	Polk	\$24,651
LAKELAND	Polk	\$358,311
WINTER SPRINGS	Seminole	\$39,342

Grand Total	\$8,452,598
\$70 General Revenue portion	\$7,132,152
\$10 Health Admin. Trust Fund	\$1,018,859
\$3 Brain & Spinal Cord Injury TF	\$305,654

Appropriations

²⁷ Section 318.18(15), F.S.

²⁸ Section 322.27(3)(d)6., F.S.

²⁹ Data accurate as of March 26, 2011. The Department of Revenue makes its most-recent data available online at http://dor.myflorida.com/dor/taxes/red_light_camera_coll/rldr.xls.

Section 16, Ch. 2010-80, L.O.F., appropriated during Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-2010, \$100,000 to DOR to implement the act. Any unexpended funds from the appropriation must be reappropriated for FY 2010-2011; however, DOR stated “those appropriated funds have been spent.”³⁰

Litigation

Prior to the passage of Ch. 2010-80, L.O.F., some cities in Florida implemented camera enforcement programs of their own as local ordinances, notwithstanding concerns stated by the Attorney General’s office. A 1997 Attorney General opinion concluded that nothing precludes the use of unmanned cameras to record violations of s. 316.075, F.S., but “a photographic record of a vehicle violating traffic control laws may not be used as the [sole] basis for issuing a citation for such violations.”³¹ A 2005 Attorney General opinion reached the same conclusion, stating that, “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.³²

A lawsuit filed in the 15th Judicial Circuit (Palm Beach) argues that as a result of ch. 2010-80 L.O.F., the ‘burden of proof’ has been unconstitutionally shifted from the state to the motorist, because the statute provides that “if the state is able to prove that a vehicle registered to the Petitioner was involved in the commission of a red light camera violation, [the owner] is presumed to be guilty.”³³ The suit further asserts that “the State is not required to prove the identity of the driver of the vehicle who committed the red light camera violation.”³⁴ In its Motion to Dismiss, the state (among other defenses) argues that the law affords adequate due process to violators by creating a “rebuttable presumption” that the owner was also the operator. The burden-shifting created by this rebuttable presumption is appropriate in “noncriminal situations... [that] contemplate reasonable notice and an opportunity to hear and be heard. The state also asserts that this case must first be raised in the County Court.”³⁵ The court granted the state’s Motion to Dismiss, and has set a rehearing on this order for April 8, 2011.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

SB 672 repeals all provisions of ch. 316, F.S., that were created by ch. 2010-80, L.O.F. Specifically, the bill repeals s. 316.003(87), F.S., which provides the definition of “traffic infraction detector.” The bill repeals s. 316.0076, F.S., which preempts the regulation and use of all traffic camera enforcement systems to the state. The bill repeals s. 316.008(8), F.S., which authorizes local governments to install traffic infraction detectors, and s. 321.50, F.S., which authorizes DHSMV to install traffic infraction detectors. The bill repeals s. 316.0083, F.S.,

³⁰ Department of Revenue, *2011 Bill Analysis: SB 672*, (on file with the Senate Transportation Committee).

³¹ Attorney General Opinion AGO 97-06.

³² Attorney General Opinion AGO 2005-41.

³³ Action for Declaratory Judgment, *Salvatore Altimari vs. State of Florida; City of West Palm Beach*, 2010 CA 022083, (15th Cir.) A copy of this pleading is on file with the Committee.

³⁴ *Id* at 2.

³⁵ Defendant State of Florida’s Motion to Dismiss, *Salvatore Altimari vs. State of Florida; City of West Palm Beach*, 2010 CA 022083, (15th Cir.) A copy of this pleading is on file with the Committee.

which details ordinance requirements, installation and notification processes, and fine distributions related to traffic infraction detectors. The bill also repeals s. 316.0776, F.S., which provides engineering specifications for installation of traffic infraction detectors.

In order to conform to these repealed sections, SB 672 also:

- Repeals portions of ss. 316.640 and 316.650, F.S., authorizing “traffic infraction enforcement officers” to enforce s. 316.0083, F.S.;
- Repeals a portion of s. 318.14, F.S., which provides distribution requirements for fines collected from traffic infraction detector programs;
- Repeals portions of s. 318.18, F.S., which provide (i) distribution requirements for fines collected from traffic infraction detector programs, (ii) an exemption process for those motor vehicle owners who have successfully appealed a violation from a traffic infraction detector, and (iii) a provision that individuals may not receive commissions or per-ticket fees from the installation of traffic infraction detector programs; and
- Repeals a sentence from s. 316.27(3)(d)6., F.S., providing that points are not placed on the license of a person receiving a violation from a traffic infraction detector.

The bill repeals two additional statutes relating to the implementation of Ch. 2010-80, Laws of Florida. It repeals s. 316.00831, F.S., which authorizes local governments to retain traffic infraction detector fines until such time as DOR creates a specific accounting process for receiving such remittances,³⁶ and repeals s. 316.07456, F.S., which provides a “transitional implementation” period during which traffic infraction detectors installed prior to the passage of the 2010 law are permitted to operate, and allows such non-compliant operation only until July 1, 2011.

Lastly, the bill repeals ss. 15 and 16, Ch. 2010-80, L.O.F; however, s. 15, Ch. 2010-80, L.O.F., was codified as s. 316.00831, F.S., which is also repealed in the bill. Section 16, Ch. 2010-80, L.O.F., appropriated \$100,000 to DOR for implementation of the act, and according to DOR, those funds have been spent.

Other Potential Implications:

As indicated in the body of the analysis, from July 2010 through January 2011, fines collected by local governments from violations of traffic infraction detectors have resulted in approximately \$8.4 million. \$7.1 million has been deposited into the General Revenue Fund; \$1 million has been deposited into the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund; and \$305,000 has been deposited into the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Program Trust Fund. SB 672 would eliminate the source of this revenue.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

³⁶ The Department of Revenue notified local governments and DHSMV that it was prepared to accept remittances from traffic infraction detectors as of August 1, 2010.

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:

The bill removes the possibility of private motor vehicle operators being issued a \$158 fine for violating a red light camera ordinance.

C. Government Sector Impact:

Current law requires \$83 out of each \$158 traffic infraction fine (approximately 52.5 percent) to be distributed to the Department of Revenue, with local governments retaining \$75 (approximately 47.5 percent). Based on the \$8.4 million actually received by DOR between July 2010 and February 2011, approximately \$7.6 million has been retained by local governments that have installed traffic infraction detectors. SB 672 would eliminate the source of this revenue.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

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.)

None.

B. Amendments:

None.