March 10, 2026

Chair O'Brien, Vice Chair Gavarone, Ranking Member Smith and members of the Senate Local Government Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide opposition testimony to Senate Bill 340.

Elovate is committed to fostering safer communities through the implementation of innovative, data-driven automated traffic enforcement solutions. Our company works with state and local governments across the country to make roads safer through automated traffic enforcement.

Automated traffic enforcement, whether through red-light enforcement or speed enforcement systems, is not designed or intended to be punitive. Instead, they are deployed to prevent dangerous driving behaviors that lead to serious injuries. Installation of automated traffic enforcement systems changes behaviors.

In Ohio, we are working with the city of Dayton to make roads safer, including a focus on school zones. Overall, automated traffic enforcement leads to a reduction in speeding anywhere from 14% - 65% in various communities. In addition, cameras can reduce fatal crashes by up to 44%. Specifically, a USDOT report found that fixed speed cameras can reduce crashes by 54% in urban areas with a 47% reduction in all injury crashes.

For more detailed information and city-specific statistics, please see Attachment A to this testimony.

S.B. 340, by requiring a ratifying vote of the electorate interferes with local government's ability to implement public safety measures. Requiring local governments to put public safety measures to a public vote creates a dangerous precedent. Aside from home-rule considerations, allowing citizens to vote on how police forces choose and deploy resources could lead to less safe streets, and put our safety forces unnecessarily in harm's way. Deployment of automated traffic enforcement systems is a clear public safety decision that helps municipalities prioritize limited law enforcement resources.

We respectfully ask the committee to reject S.B. 340.

750 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC, U.S.A. 20002
info@elovate.com
www.elovate.com

Attachment A

Elovate Opponent Testimony
Senate Local Government Committee, March 10, 2026

Automated Traffic Enforcement in the U.S.: A Statistical Overview

Sources: IIHS, NHTSA, FHWA, GHSA, CDC, NYC DOT, CDOT, Vision Zero Network, and peer-reviewed research

Executive Summary

Automated traffic enforcement (ATE) — encompassing speed cameras and red light cameras — is one of the most extensively studied traffic safety interventions in the United States. The body of evidence consistently shows that well-designed programs reduce speeding behavior, red-light violations, and associated crashes, injuries, and fatalities. As of March 2026, 350 communities operate speed camera programs and 338 communities in 22 states and D.C. operate red light camera programs.

National Context

- Speeding-related crashes killed **12,151 people** in 2022, accounting for **29% of all U.S. traffic fatalities** (NHTSA).
- Red light running killed **1,086 people** in 2023 and injured more than **135,000 others**. Half of those killed were pedestrians, cyclists, or occupants of other vehicles — not the red-light runners themselves (IIHS).
- The IIHS estimates that if all large U.S. cities used red light cameras, roughly **800 deaths per year** could be prevented.
- If all U.S. communities had speed camera programs comparable to Montgomery County, Maryland's, more than **21,000 fatal or incapacitating injuries** could have been prevented in a single year (IIHS).
- The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) reports that speed cameras reduce the percentage of speeding vehicles by **14% to 65%** and can cut serious injuries and fatal crashes by up to **44%**.
- The USDOT Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse reports that fixed speed cameras on urban arterials are associated with a **54% reduction in all crashes** and a **47% reduction in injury crashes**.

- A 2019 meta-analysis found red light cameras reduced total crashes by **12%**, with particularly strong reductions in right-angle crashes and increasing safety benefits over time.

City & State Program Results

New York City, NY — Speed Cameras (School Zones)

NYC's program grew from a 20-camera pilot in 2013 to over 2,400 cameras across all 750 school speed zones, operating 24/7 since 2022.

Metric	Result
Reduction in speeding violations at camera locations	**94%**
Reduction in crashes at camera locations (2022 installations)	**14%**
Reduction in fatalities and injuries at camera locations	**14%**
Reduction in speeding violations (school zones, 91 new cameras)	**73%**
Total injury reduction at school zone corridors	**17%**
Motor vehicle occupant injury reduction	**19%**
Cyclist injury reduction	**17%**
Reduction in pedestrian fatalities (first half of 2023 vs. prior years)	**~20%**
Traffic fatalities in camera zones during expanded overnight/weekend hours (post-24/7 launch)	**Down 25%**
Net program revenue (FY 2014–2019)	**$89.6 million**

Sources: NYC DOT 2024 Speed Camera Report; Governor Hochul's office; FHWA; ITS Deployment Evaluation; NYU Tandon C2SMARTER (2025)

New York City, NY — Red Light Cameras

- Average daily violations per camera dropped from **more than 30 in 1994 to 7 in 2021**, reflecting long-term behavioral change.
- New York State announced in October 2024 that red light running and related crashes had fallen by **73%** where cameras were installed, prompting expansion of the program.

Source: NYC DOT; Smart Cities Dive

Montgomery County, MD — Speed Cameras (School & Residential Zones)

One of the most rigorously studied programs in the country, launched in 2007 in zones with speed limits of 35 mph or lower.

Metric	Result
Reduction in vehicles exceeding limit by 10+ mph (first 6–8 months)	**70%**
Reduction in likelihood of speeding 10+ mph over limit (vs. comparable VA roads)	**59%**
Reduction in likelihood of a fatal or incapacitating injury crash	**19%**
Spillover effect: injury likelihood reduction on nearby 40 mph roads	**27%**
Drivers aware of the program (survey)	**95%**
Drivers who reported reducing their speed because of cameras	**>75%**
Drivers who support cameras on residential streets	**62%**

Source: IIHS (2014 longitudinal study); Vision Zero Network

Washington, D.C. — Speed & Red Light Cameras

D.C. has operated ATE cameras for over 25 years and, as of 2024, has approximately 500 active cameras (speed, red light, stop sign, and bus lane). The program was transferred from MPD to DDOT in 2020.

Metric	Result
Reduction in mean traffic speeds (speed cameras)	**14%**
Reduction in vehicles speeding more than 10 mph above limit	**82%**
Speeding reduction at certain camera locations	**Up to 96%**
Traffic tickets issued by cameras (vs. police officers)	**>95%**
ATE revenue collected (2022)	**$113 million**

Sources: DDOT; DC Council Budget Office; Greater Greater Washington analysis; IIHS Cochrane Review

Chicago, IL — Speed & Red Light Cameras

Chicago operates one of the nation's largest combined ATE programs, with 300 red light cameras at 149 intersections, plus speed cameras near parks and schools.

Red Light Cameras (2005–2024):

Metric	Result
Reduction in right-angle ("T-bone") crashes at camera intersections	**Down to 57% of 2005 baseline**
Reduction in all crash types at red light camera intersections	**Down to 49% of 2005 baseline**

Source: Chicago CDOT 2022 Annual Report; City of Chicago Red Light Camera Program (analysis through 2024)

Speed Cameras (University of Illinois Chicago Study, 2015–2017):

Metric	Result
Reduction in fatal and severe injury crashes (within 250m of cameras)	**15%**
Reduction in moderate injury crashes	**9%**
Reduction in minor injury crashes	**14%**
Reduction in total injury and fatal crashes	**12% (204 fewer crashes)**
Reduction in speeding events per camera in year 1	**43% average**

Source: Sutton & Tilahun, University of Illinois Chicago (2022)

Portland, OR — Speed Safety Cameras

Oregon has one of the longest-running automated speed enforcement programs in the country, using fixed cameras, mobile vans, and intersection safety cameras.

Metric	Result
Reduction in annual traffic fatalities since program inception (1986–1995 vs. 2006–2014)	**~53%** (56.8 avg deaths/yr → 30.5 avg deaths/yr)
Speeding reduction at camera locations (Seattle comparison)	**64% drop in violations over 2 years**

Source: Vision Zero Network; Portland.gov

Seattle, WA — School Zone Speed Cameras

Metric	Result
Reduction in average traffic violations (fixed program, Dec 2012–Dec 2014)	**64%**

Reduction in citations at 4 school zone van cameras (year-over-year)	**34%** (~10,000 fewer speeding vehicles annually)

Source: Vision Zero Network; PMC/NIH peer-reviewed study (Quistberg et al.)

Maryland — SafeZones Work Zone Speed Enforcement Program

Maryland's SafeZones program launched on October 1, 2009, as one of the earliest state-level work zone automated speed enforcement programs in the country. It is jointly administered by MDOT SHA, the Maryland Transportation Authority, and the Maryland State Police. The program uses mobile ASE units (speed cameras mounted in SUVs) that rotate through work zones on expressways and controlled-access highways with speed limits of 45 mph or greater. As of 2025, the state averages around 300 active highway work zones with more than 1,000 workers deployed daily.

Metric	Result
Speeding rate (12+ mph over limit) when program began	**~7% of all drivers**
Speeding rate after program matured	**<1–2% of drivers**
Overall reduction in work zone speed violations	**~80–90%**
Citations issued (July 2010 – December 2015)	**Over 2.5 million**
Work zone crashes in Maryland (2019–2023 average)	**~1,400 per year**
People killed in Maryland work zones (2019–2023)	**45 fatalities; 2,587 injured**
Citations issued in first 2 months of expanded program (2025)	**48,000+**

The program's most notable achievement is long-term behavioral change: when it began, roughly 7 in every 100 drivers in monitored work zones were detected speeding by 12 mph or more. Over time, that figure dropped to fewer than 2 in 100 — an approximately 80–90% reduction in violations. In 2024, Governor Moore signed HB513 expanding the program to cover more work zones and introducing a tiered fine structure (ranging from $60 to $500+, with fines

doubling when workers are present), replacing the flat $40 fine that had been among the lowest in the country.

Sources: Maryland SafeZones / MDOT SHA; National Operations Center of Excellence (2019); FHWA Work Zone Safety Podcast; Zero Deaths Maryland; 7News Baltimore (2025)

Providence, RI — School Zone Speed Cameras

Rhode Island authorized municipalities to use school zone speed cameras in 2016. Providence began operating cameras in January 2018, starting with 5 locations, expanding to 10 by March 2018, and reaching 20 cameras by fall 2023. Cameras enforce a 20 mph school zone limit on school days, Monday–Friday, 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., and issue $50 citations to drivers traveling 11 mph or more over the limit.

Providence's program is part of a broader Rhode Island ATE landscape. The Pawtucket Police Department, which operates cameras in that city, reported a "drastic reduction in the number of violations since the inception of the program," consistent with behavioral change seen in other cities. Speed was a contributing factor in more than 45% of all Rhode Island traffic fatalities at the time the law was enacted, a key driver of the legislative authorization.

Sources: NBC 10 I-Team / WJAR (2023); City of Providence; Breakstone, White & Gluck (2023); Rhode Island DOT; WPRI

Baltimore, MD — Speed Cameras (I-83 / Jones Falls Expressway & Citywide)

Baltimore City operates approximately 160 speed cameras citywide through its Automated Traffic Violation Enforcement System (ATVES), including two cameras on the notoriously dangerous I-83 Jones Falls Expressway (JFX), which local drivers had nicknamed the "Grand Prix" for its reckless speeding. The I-83 cameras were installed in April 2022, with enforcement beginning July 13, 2022. In July 2025, the Maryland General Assembly authorized two additional I-83 cameras, expanding the program to four expressway locations.

I-83 / Jones Falls Expressway Cameras:

Metric	Result
Total crashes on I-83 in Baltimore (2021, before cameras)	**399**
Total crashes on I-83 in Baltimore (2022, partial camera year)	**293**

Total crashes on I-83 in Baltimore (2023, first full camera year)	**215**
Crash reduction in 2-mile area around cameras (first year)	**~50%** (18 crashes July–Dec 2022 vs. 55 in same period of 2021)
Total citations issued since camera installation (through late 2023)	**~585,000**
Trend in citations over time	**Declining year-over-year** as drivers slow down
Average citation speed	Dropped from **65.9 mph to 65.3 mph**, indicating behavioral change

A 2023 analysis by engineering firm Mead & Hunt found significant reductions in average, 85th-percentile, and 95th-percentile speeds near camera locations following enforcement, confirming genuine behavioral change rather than just camera avoidance.

Sources: Baltimore Banner (2023–2024); Baltimore Sun (2023); AirSage/Mead & Hunt analysis (2023); Baltimore City DOT; BCDOT press releases (2025)

Philadelphia, PA — Red Light Cameras

- Philadelphia implemented its red light camera program in 2005 and had 34 locations as of fiscal year 2023.
- Studies found cameras reduced injury crashes at camera intersections by approximately **24%**.
- In 2022, violations generated over **$15 million** for the Pennsylvania DOT, distributed to 22 municipalities for 28 traffic safety projects.

Source: Smart Cities Dive; IIHS

Virginia (County-Level) — Red Light Cameras

A 2010 study examined four red light cameras in a Virginia county one year after installation:

- The odds of violations occurring **1.5+ seconds after the light turned red** were significantly lower at camera intersections compared to the pre-ticketing warning period.

Source: CDC Motor Vehicle Injury Prevention Calculator

Summary: IIHS Study on Red Light Camera Removal (14 Cities)

When 14 cities discontinued their red light camera programs:

- Fatal red-light-running crashes increased significantly.
- Deaths rose by approximately **30%** in those cities after cameras were removed.

This "natural experiment" provides some of the strongest evidence of the programs' direct causal effect on fatalities.

Source: IIHS (2017)

Key Themes Across Programs

Behavioral change is real and lasting. Multiple studies — from Montgomery County (7+ years), NYC (10+ years), and DC — show that reductions in speeding are sustained over time, not just a short-term novelty effect. Cameras typically achieve strong results within **six months** of installation (NYU Tandon, 2025).

"Halo" effects extend beyond camera locations. Drivers slow down not just at camera sites but on nearby roads. Montgomery County saw a 27% reduction in injury crashes on roads *adjacent* to camera-eligible corridors.

Equity implications are complex. A 2024 study found automated enforcement produces more racially equitable enforcement than police stops. However, the placement of cameras in lower-income and minority neighborhoods has raised disproportionate financial burden concerns (notably in Chicago). Community engagement and transparent placement criteria are widely recommended best practices.

Limitations and Caveats

- **Rear-end crashes:** Red light cameras are consistently associated with a modest increase in rear-end collisions as drivers brake sharply. Programs that optimize yellow light timing can mitigate this effect.
- **Revenue concerns:** Community trust suffers when programs are perceived as revenue-generating rather than safety-focused. NHTSA recommends full transparency and a stated goal of reducing violations, not maximizing fines.
- **Placement matters:** School zones account for very few national speeding fatalities. NTSB and others have noted that cameras placed on high-risk arterials and corridors produce greater safety returns.
- **Enforcement limitations:** In jurisdictions where citations carry no license points (treated as civil/parking violations), deterrent effects are weaker.

- **Political and legal opposition:** Eight states prohibit automated enforcement outright. Community opposition has led numerous cities to discontinue programs despite evidence of safety benefits.

Report compiled from: IIHS, NHTSA, FHWA, GHSA, CDC, NYC DOT, Chicago CDOT, DDOT, Vision Zero Network, Smart Cities Dive, University of Illinois Chicago, NYU Tandon School of Engineering, and peer-reviewed literature.