

**The Citizen's Photo Enforcement Oversight Committee met Tuesday 22 January 2007 and voted 4 to 2 to recommend the removal of the red light cameras from Lubbock streets.**

**What follows are the prepared remarks of one of the committee members sent to Pratt on Texas.**

What did we learn from the meeting a week ago? That the purpose of Red Light Cameras is to change city-wide driver behavior. Recall that is the reason Marsha said the cameras were spread around the city. Looking at the data, it is OBVIOUS that the cameras have changed city-wide driver behavior - the problem is it changed for the worse. Now we've got to use common sense as we look at this situation and analyze the data.

Before getting into my family business, I was a structural engineer in Dallas, and I've analyzed a lot of data in my life. As we analyze the data, and this is true for any data, we must consider these major factors:

- 1) Is the change statistically significant?
- 2) Is there enough data to provide a good sampling?
- 3) Is the sampling consistent? Has anything changed from sample to sample?
- 4) When there is a lot of data (like this), what is the big picture shown by the data?
  - 1) Obviously, there is a huge difference in the data on accidents before and after cameras - VERY statistically significant.
  - 2) Everyday in Lubbock, the number of cars passing through the 24 measured intersections is in the hundreds of thousands. Over six months, this is tens of millions of cars passing through intersections. Plenty of data!!
  - 3) You've got about the same amount of Tech students and high school students driving, weather days, construction, holidays, etc. Even if there are some differences in these factors, there is NO WAY for these small differences to have caused this much negative change in driver behavior. The only thing that has changed in the samples is the cameras.
  - 4) We've got a whole lot of data here, and while it is possible that you could look at the data on a very detailed basis and find some discrepancies, the big picture here is one of overwhelming negative change. (An example of Discrepancies might be some accidents at some intersections not caused by anything related to red lights, but figuring that out would require a lot of speculation and mind-reading.) With this big of a sampling group, small differences and discrepancies tend to average out and cancel each other out. The Big Picture from this data is very negative toward the cameras.

Should we give the cameras more time? Absolutely not! As stated, the purpose of the cameras is to IMPROVE DRIVER BEHAVIOR CITY-WIDE. In six months, driver behavior has seriously, and statistically significantly, GOTTEN MUCH WORSE. If some MAGIC change occurred, and suddenly people started driving better (and there's no reason to think this might happen - what would cause such a change?), we've got a long way to go just to get back to where we were. And to expect (the desired) improvement on top of that? You've got to be kidding. Remember - Common Sense.

And even if you thought some MAGIC change might occur - how much additional property damage and potential injuries are you willing to allow while we wait for the MAGIC change to come about? If you assume the average rear-end collision causes \$5,000 damage (and that might be low), the total additional cost to Lubbock motorists is well over a Million dollars. How much more can we afford? Regarding injuries, common sense tells you that the injuries from a “T-Bone” red light collision are more serious than rear-ending. However, we learned at the last meeting that an Injury is defined as someone telling the policeman that he is injured at the scene. If it starts hurting later (such as often happens with neck injuries due to whiplash from rear-ending), that doesn’t count as an injury. So you can make a case for even the one small improvement in the stats as being not real - just due to the way injuries are counted.

To say that injuries are down at camera-controlled intersections and up at non-camera intersections is poor reasoning - 1) the cameras are supposed to improve driver behavior citywide and 2) a lot of that change occurred between '05 and '06 before cameras ('05 to '07 difference is -23% and +15% = 38% difference, '06 to '07 difference is -12% and +7% = 19% difference).

And finally, in regard to injuries, some who favor the cameras have noted that injuries are down 2.7% from 2005 to 2007. This slight improvement (statistically insignificant?) is very misleading, because most of the decline (2.2%) occurred between 2005 and 2006, BEFORE the cameras.

The state passed a law in September ‘07 to create this Commission, and that was a wise move. This situation is a great example of what happens when a group of well-intentioned people get together with a for-profit business and try to come up with a solution to a very difficult and complex problem. The people who came up with the “solution” are very defensive of it - they want to see it succeed and have a vested interest in it, both emotionally (the CTC and the City Staff) and financially (ATS). The state legislature recognized this tendency and created this board to look at the cameras objectively.

In conclusion, we should remember why we are here - to evaluate the cameras and make a recommendation to the City Council. We’ve got to use common sense and look at the data - and this makes it obvious the cameras should be removed. NO hard feelings, No “I-told-you-so’s”, just a clear and objective recommendation to end this experiment NOW.

**The committee may not want an I-told-you-so but here is a big one from me:  
I TOLD YOU SO.**