

**Greater Olney Civic Association**

**Traffic Cameras Task Force Report**

**May 22, 2015**

# Executive Summary

The Greater Olney Civic Association (GOCA) chartered the Traffic Cameras Task Force (Task Force) in May 2014. The three primary purposes for establishing the Task Force were to; 1) determine what position, if any, GOCA should take on the County's Traffic Camera Programs; 2) recommend modifications, if any, to be made to the current County policies; and 3) recommend modifications, if any, to be made to the way the current County policies are administered. Since its establishment, the Task Force has requested and collected data from Montgomery County, the State of Maryland, and other sources during the period June 2014 to March 2015. This report contains findings and recommendations the Task Force believes are of importance to the Olney-Sandy Spring communities and Montgomery County.

The Task Force thanks the members of the Montgomery County Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU) and the State Highway Administration (SHA) for their cooperation and assistance during the review.

## Statistical Findings:

- ***Olney-Sandy Spring with 85,451 citations and \$3.4 million in fines in Calendar Year (CY) 2013 was the geographic area with the highest number of speed camera citations.***
- ***With 85,451 speed camera citations, out of a total of 475,481 in CY 2013, approximately one out of every five speed camera citations in Montgomery County originated from cameras located in Olney-Sandy Spring.***
  - On several occasions the Task Force requested more current information, such as CY 2014 speed camera information, but unfortunately neither the Montgomery County ATEU nor its contractor, Xerox, provided the requested information. It is the understanding of the Task Force that Xerox has the requested data but it was not provided.
- ***In CY 2013 Olney had three of the top five grossing speed cameras in Montgomery County and five of the top twenty grossing cameras.***
- ***In CY 2013 Olney-Sandy Spring received 31 percent more citations than the second highest ranking speed camera locale, Silver Spring, despite having 7.7 million or 30% fewer vehicle passes at the Olney-Sandy Spring camera locations.***
- ***In Fiscal Year (FY) 2014, the single Olney camera (No. 1750) eastbound on Olney-Sandy Spring Road, east of Spartan Road (a.k.a. - St. Peter's camera) became the #1 citation producing camera in Montgomery County when comparing the citations issued from it to the citations issued by all 167 camera sites in existence in CY2013. It generated over 27,000 citations and \$1.1 million in speed camera revenue.***
  - This single Olney camera generated 20% more citations in FY 2013 than Bethesda's 10 speed cameras combined and more than 2 ½ times the number of tickets than Montgomery Village's 13

speed cameras combined in CY 2013 (the only year available for comparison based on County-provided data).

- This specific Olney speed monitoring camera was installed after the start of the fiscal year and therefore was operational for less than twelve months in FY 2014.
- ***Olney-Sandy Spring generated over \$3.4 million in speed camera fines in CY 2013, over \$800 thousand more than the second-ranking area, Silver Spring.***
- ***Olney-Sandy Spring speed camera citations in CY 2013 were 2.1 times greater than the number of citations generated by the third ranking speed camera citation area, Damascus (41,410 citations with 16 cameras).***
- ***Olney-Sandy Spring speed camera citations in CY 2013 were 5.7 times greater than the overall county average by geographic location.***
- ***In CY 2013, with 13 speed monitoring cameras, the Olney-Sandy Spring area had 2 ½ times more cameras in operation than the overall county average of five for each geographical locale or Census Designated Place.***
  - This represents more than nine standard deviations from the mean.
- ***One out of every nine vehicles or 11% of all vehicles which passed by a County speed monitoring camera in CY 2013 did so in Olney-Sandy Spring.***

***Due to the high concentration of speed monitoring cameras in Olney-Sandy Spring, vehicles in Olney-Sandy Spring were 3.4 times more likely to be monitored for speed than elsewhere in Montgomery County.***

- ***Olney-Sandy Spring has a disproportionately high rate of citations whether measured by population or by vehicle volume.***
  - Prior to installing speed monitoring cameras on Route 108 in Olney, the speed limits were lowered from 40 MPH to 30 MPH. This current speed limit is below the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed limit originally established by the SHA, a factor the Task Force believes contributes to the high incidence of citations in Olney. SHA publications indicate the 85th percentile speed is the speed that most motorists on that road consider safe and reasonable under ideal conditions. It is a good guideline for the appropriate speed limit for that road. (See page 39 for full reference).
- ***Accident rates in the Olney area, either before or after speed monitoring camera installations, do not explain the high number of Olney-Sandy Spring camera locations or citations.***
  - The Task Force obtained Olney accident data from the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) covering the years 2004 to 2013. Only 1/10<sup>th</sup> of one percent of accidents recorded between 2004 and 2013 in the Olney area have been definitively categorized as having the probable cause of the accident identified as exceeding the speed limit (1 out of 863 vehicle accidents).

### **Speed Camera Program Findings:**

- In the view of the Task Force, the Montgomery County ATEU takes its responsibilities seriously and the ATEU believes the program enhances traffic safety in the county. The Task Force recognizes and appreciates the strong personal commitment of the ATEU staff to the program.
- The Montgomery County Speed Camera program lacks transparency in both its data and its operations. While the ATEU was cooperative and provided some requested data, the ATEU was unable to provide timely, accurate, or complete basic data about the program and its operation. It is the view of the Task Force that as the program has matured since its inception in 2007, the program has not developed the internal controls expected for a law enforcement program with such an extensive impact on County residents and an annual gross revenue approximating \$20 million.
- Among the transparency issues: detailed citation data of speed traveled, time of day, etc., is not made public; the summary citation data that is published by the County is over a year out of date; camera placement locations under consideration are not made public; reasons for specific camera location determinations nor the advisory board recommendations are not made public; and the process for choosing the advisory board members is not public.
- Further transparency issues include the fact that neither Montgomery County nor the Speed Camera vendor under contract to the County (Xerox) make citation, vehicle volume, or accident data by camera location routinely available to the public. The County does publish annual citation and vehicle pass information, but not by camera location. Also the information published on its website is old and out of date. Comprehensive accident data is not collected, pre- or post-installation. Data provided to the Task Force was often incomplete or erroneous, indicating a lack of adequate internal controls under the current program and contract.
- The process for installing cameras lacks transparency, without adequate public notice of sites under consideration and without publically available reports documenting the specific conditions at each site that form the basis for ATUE determinations when cameras are installed. Also there is no adequate process for communities to request removal or reconsideration of camera locations.
- The program lacks a balanced and independent citizen's advisory board and lacks an independent citizen's advocate.

### **Recommendations:**

The Traffic Cameras Task Force requests that GOCA formally transmit this report to the Montgomery County Executive, the County Council, the Montgomery County Police Department(MCPD) and ATEU, the Montgomery County Inspector General, appropriate District Delegates and the State Highway Administration, with the following recommendations:

1. Consistent with the Montgomery County Executive's stated commitment to transparency, the ATEU should publish on its website on a monthly basis speed camera citations and vehicle pass volumes by camera location.
2. Montgomery County should revise the Citizen's Advisory Board for Traffic Issues (CAB-TI) applicable to the speed camera program, ensuring the Board is selected independently of the MCPD and ATEU, has established term limits, represents the full spectrum of views on the efficacy of speed camera usage, and that its views shall be considered by the ATEU.
3. Montgomery County should appoint, fully independent of the MCPD, ATEU, and Local Designee, a Citizen's Advocate to represent the citizens and communities regarding speed camera use, placement, and other concerns.
4. Montgomery County should modify the speed camera contract to stipulate that all data captured on each citation shall be the property of the County, not the vendor, and that such data on citations, citation camera location, ticketed speed, etc. will be provided to the ATEU and published on the county website (protecting all Personally Identifiable Information (PII)).
  - On several occasions the Task Force requested certain types of data but was informed the data being requested was maintained by the contractor (Xerox) in a proprietary data base and was not available.
5. The Task Force recommends the ATEU be provided with the appropriate funding to implement the internal controls, data integrity, and transparency improvements included in this report. Such funding should come from the positive net revenue generated by the speed camera fines, consistent with the stated public safety purposes for which speed camera net revenues are authorized to be used. This net revenue funding could also be utilized to address any outstanding citizen requests for consideration of speed monitoring cameras.

To address the disproportionately high incidence of Olney speed camera citations and based upon the lack of speed-related accidents at the existing camera locations below, the Task Force further recommends:

6. The SHA should modify the speed limit east bound on Olney-Sandy Spring Road, beginning immediately after Spartan Road, to be 35mph, providing for a safe incremental speed approaching the current 40mph section of Olney-Sandy Spring Road east of Prince Philip Drive.
7. The Task Force Recommends that SHA return the 40 mph to 30 mph changeover point on Olney-Laytonsville Rd (Route 108, near the Post Office) to Homeland Drive for both east and westbound traffic. Moving the 40 mph point back to Homeland Drive returns the Olney-Laytonsville Road speed limit back to what it was in 2009, while maintaining the current 30 mph speed limit before the Olney Library and through the Olney core commercial center.

8. The SHA should modify the speed limit on Georgia Avenue between King William Drive and Sandy Spring Bank to be 35mph, providing for a safe incremental speed between the existing 40mph roadway south of King William Drive and the 30mph area in the core Olney commercial center.
9. Montgomery County should take steps to have a plebiscite determine the future direction of the Safe Speed Program.

# Greater Olney Civic Association Traffic Camera Task Force Report

## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
I. GOCA Traffic Camera Task Force	7
II. Task Force Methodology	7 - 8
III. Origins and Overview of the Montgomery County Safe Speed Program	8 - 12
IV. Olney-Sandy Spring Camera Locations	
a. Montgomery County Geographic Locales Map	13
b. Olney-Sandy Spring Eight Primary Cameras – Site Photographs	13 - 21
V. Statistical Data and Analysis	22 - 31
VI. Accident/Crash Information	32 - 37
VII. ATEU and Speed Camera Revenues	38 - 39
VIII. Speed Limits	39 - 40
IX. Speed Camera Program Lacks Data Reliability and Transparency	40 - 42
X. Conclusions	43 - 44
XI. Task Force Recommendation for GOCA Resolution	45 – 46
XII. GOCA Traffic Cameras Task Force Membership	47

# **I. GOCA Traffic Camera Task Force**

The GOCA Traffic Cameras Task Force was chartered in May 2014. GOCA sought a balanced membership of Olney area residents to be on the Task Force, representing views favorable to the camera program as well as participants with concerns with the program. Both viewpoints were represented on the Task Force membership. The Task Force was led by a Chairman, with five additional Task Force members.

The purpose of the Task Force was to review the camera programs and provide findings and recommendations to GOCA. The review included a statistical analysis of the County speed camera citations. The Task Force was also to consider, as appropriate, whether the programs appeared to be operating within Maryland law, any issues with the County's speed camera contract with the private camera vendor, whether the program and/or camera placements were motivated by financial considerations, speed limits, and other relevant issues that came to the attention of the Task Force during its review.

The recommendations within this report represent a majority view of the Task Force.

## **II. Methodology**

To obtain relevant information on the operation of the Safe Speed program, the Task Force met with members of the Montgomery County Police Department's Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU); representatives of the State Highway Administration (SHA); and the Safe Speed Program's Citizens Advisory Board for Traffic Issues (CAB-TI). The Task Force met roughly on a bi-weekly basis, with several intermissions while it awaited data from the County and State and while members separately reviewed data. The Task Force provided a formal status report on its work at the September 9, 2014 GOCA meeting.

The Task Force also corresponded with the above offices on numerous occasions between June 2014 and March 2015, making formal requests for statistical and other information associated with the cameras, their placement, citation volumes, accidents, etc. The Task Force also incorporated publicly available information from Montgomery County, the State of Maryland, and other transportation-related sources regarding operation of the speed camera programs. Where appropriate, media reports of camera program operations were consulted, as was the calendar year 2012 speed camera citation data presented at the November 12, 2013 GOCA meeting.

The Task Force did not identify significant issues with traffic signal, i.e. "red light" cameras in Olney-Sandy Spring. Accordingly, the Task Force Report focuses on the Safe Speed Program and speed monitoring cameras.

The Task Force appreciated the willingness of the ATEU to meet and discuss the operation and intent of the Safe Speed program, and the openness of the SHA representative in meeting with the Task Force. All representatives were generous with their time in meeting with the Task Force and answering follow-up questions.



In mid-April 2015, the Task Force provided a draft version of this report to the ATEU and the SHA for comment prior to the finalization and transmission of the report to GOCA. The Task Force intended to include any ATEU and/or SHA comments as an appendix to this report. At the time of this report's publication in late May 2015, the SHA representative indicated SHA did not object to the contents of the report. The ATEU did not respond with comments.

### **III. Overview of Montgomery County Safe Speed Program**

#### **A. Program origins and overview:**

Montgomery County's Safe Speed program went into effect in May 2007 after the Maryland General Assembly passed MD Code 21-809. This code authorized Montgomery County to institute automated traffic enforcement of speed limits. Civil citations would be issued for violators traveling 11 mph or more over the posted speed limit. The owner of the vehicle would be fined \$40. The law allowed the positioning of cameras in certain residential areas in which the posted speed limit was at or under 35 mph as defined in MD Code 21-101 or school zones as defined by the Maryland SHA.

Of note, a residential zone is defined as: "not a business district and adjoins and includes a highway where the property along the highway, for a distance of at least 300 feet, is improved mainly with residences or residences and buildings used for business." [MD Code 21-101(s)(1) and (2)].

A school zone is defined by the SHA as: "a designated roadway segment approaching, adjacent to, and beyond school buildings or grounds, or along which school related activities occur and the area surrounding, and within one-half mile of, a school building or property and within which motor vehicle, pedestrian or bicycle traffic is substantially generated or influenced by the school." [MD Code 21-809(a) (7) et al].

It is important to note that the mere existence of a school along a state roadway does not create the school zone. According to MD Code 21-803.1 the naming of the school zone is up to the local jurisdiction. The Olney-Sandy Spring camera locations that are School Zone cameras are the two cameras on Olney-Sandy Spring Road (Route 108) at Sherwood Elementary School and the two cameras on Olney-Laytonsville Road (Route 108) west of Georgia Avenue at the Post Office and St. John's.

In 2009, MD Code 21-809 was amended as to school zone enforcement times and speed limit tolerances at which a citation is generated. Effective October 1, 2009, school zone speed enforcement was limited to Monday-Friday 6 AM - 8 PM throughout the entire year. Additionally, the speed at which a citation was issued was changed from 11 mph or more over the posted speed limit to 12 mph or more.

In May 2012 Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) began corridor enforcement. This program allows the MCPD ATEU to move cameras within a corridor area without further notice in order to prevent driver complacency. The County published the latest corridors on April 1, 2015, in the The Gazette [Source: The Gazette, 4-1-2015, page B-10]. The Corridor list is defined as broad stretches of certain roads, e.g. "Olney-Laytonsville Road Corridor, 3400 Block @ Georgia Ave. to 4200 Block @ Olney Mill Road."

In 2015 the Maryland General Assembly began debating a proposed amendment to MD Code 21-809 that would require additional auditing of cameras for accuracy. GOCA supported the amendment, with the additional recommendation that the audit be performed by an accredited and independent testing entity. GOCA sent its views to the District 14 and District 19 Delegates and Senators on February 16, 2015. [Source <http://www.goca.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Support-for-HB271.pdf>]. The Task Force notes the bill before the General Assembly was directed at equipment calibration, not at the broader internal control concerns raised in this report.

**B. Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU), Citizen Advisory Board for Traffic Issues (CAB-TI), and Ombudsman:**

The ATEU is a section of the MCPD. The commanding officer (and architect of the County's program) is Captain Thomas Didone. The ATEU runs the Safe Speed camera program and is responsible for camera site selection, operational administration of the contract with Xerox, the current camera vendor, and review of citations.

The ATEU functions with a Citizen Advisory Board for Traffic Issues, known as the CAB-TI. The CAB-TI members are chosen by the ATEU. The CAB-TI members are volunteers and serve without formal term limits. The CAB-TI reviews potential camera sites and brings other issues as its members deem fit to the attention of the ATEU. The CAB-TI members appear dedicated and motivated by their views of community safety concerns. The observations of the Task Force are that the current CAB-TI members have served with commitment and integrity.

However, the Task Force notes several significant concerns with the County's deployment of the CAB-TI (these observations apply to the County's implementation and operation of the CAB-TI, not at the current membership). There has not been an attempt to appoint a CAB-TI with balanced views of the camera program; instead, the members appear to be strongly pro-camera, consistent with the views of the ATEU itself. In discussion, the CAB-TI representative informed the Task Force that it could recollect objecting to only one camera placement during the tenure of the current CAB-TI.

The ATEU also had an Ombudsman position in the period leading up to 2014. The Task Force expected the Ombudsman to be a liaison between the community and the camera program, representing concerns of the community and individual citizens with the program, individual citation problems, etc. However, the Task Force found the original Ombudsman to be a full-time County employee in the ATEU, specifically an ATEU contracting official on the Xerox camera contract. The Task Force believes there is a strong conflict of interest issue in having a County contracting official, who manages the speed camera contract, also function as the program's Ombudsman.

In 2014, Maryland's Speed Monitoring System Reform Act of 2014 required local jurisdictions operating speed cameras to designate an official or employee to investigate and respond to questions or concerns about the

locality's speed camera program. Accordingly, Montgomery County changed its Ombudsman position to "Local Designee." Mr. David McBain is currently appointed to the post. The purpose of the designee is to review, at the request of citizens, citations before the payment due date expires, and if the citation is found to be erroneous the designee shall void the citation.

The Task Force found that neither the CAB-TI nor the Local Designee operate independent of the ATEU. The Local Designee can act on behalf of a citizen *on a specific citation* [emphasis added], but not have a role in broader advocacy on behalf of citizens or communities in the broad implementation policies of the Safe Speed Program. The Task Force is open to having a Citizen's Advocate that is either a county employee(s) outside the purview of the MCPD or be a local volunteer(s) selected by the Council serving a fixed term.

**An independent, balanced Citizen's Advisory Board and independent Citizen's Advocate are needed for the program:**

The Task Force strongly believes the Safe Speed program needs a balanced and formally structured Citizen's Advisory Board for Traffic Issues, and an independent Citizen's Advocate apart from the Local Designee. The Local Designee focus is to review citations and determine, within the confines of the existing program and rules, whether individual citations are proper or erroneous. There is still not an independent citizen advocate who can work with the ATEU and County on behalf of citizens or communities who have concerns or problems with the overall program, camera placements, or concerns with other program issues such as the disparate citation frequencies cited in this report. The Task Force suggests the County consider using the significant revenue from the camera programs to fund, consistent with the public safety requirements of the program, an independent Citizen's Advocate for the program.


**C. Speed Camera Contract with Xerox Corporation:**

The County has a contract with Xerox to install and maintain the speed cameras. The County imposes a \$40 fine on violators who exceed the speed camera tolerance threshold speed (i.e. tickets are given if a vehicle goes 12 mile per hour or more over the posted limit). The owner of the vehicle, regardless of who the driver may be, is responsible by law for paying the fine. Xerox has been receiving \$16 per ticket under the current contract. In 2016, due to changes in Maryland law, Xerox or its future vendor will receive a fixed amount annually rather than be paid based on ticketing volumes. The Task Force's understanding is that the change was made in response to perceived "bounty-hunting" abuses in generating speed camera citations. According to Captain Didone, he and the ATEU opposed the new law. Captain Didone stated that he testified in Annapolis regarding this change in the law. The ATEU prefers the per citation payment as it believes this encourages more accuracy from the vendor since the ATEU could reject any citations they believe were inappropriate and therefore the vendor would not be paid for that rejected citation.


According to the ATEU, the citation data captured with each ticket, and which Xerox prints on the citations, is held by Xerox in a proprietary database and belongs to Xerox, not the County. The citation data includes: Citation Number; Vehicle Tag Number; Violation Date; Violation Time; Vehicle Speed; Posted Speed Limit; Due Date; Amount Due; Camera/Violation Location; Name, Address, and Zip Code of Vehicle Owner.

**The County's Speed Camera contract provisions limit public access to citation data:** The Task Force was unable to obtain all the data it sought for its review as the ATEU indicated the data was the proprietary property of the camera vendor Xerox. The Task Force believes this is a major flaw with the contract. If the County is fining citizens based on the camera data, the vendor should be providing the full data to the County and the County should make the data (except for privacy related personally identifiable information) publicly available.

A sample citation appears below:

 **CITATION**  
**SPEEDING VIOLATION**

Mail Date: 05/06/09






Please take notice that the vehicle described and pictured herein was detected by radar exceeding the posted speed limit in violation of Maryland State Law TA 21-809. The pictured vehicle was traveling at the speed listed below at the place, date, and time specified. Therefore, under Maryland State Law TA 21-809, as the registered owner(s) or lessee (six months or more) you are liable for the violation. Unless you elect to go to court, a civil penalty in the amount of \$40.00 must be paid by the date due shown on this notice.



**WARNING: FAILURE TO PAY THE PENALTY SHOWN OR TO CONTEST LIABILITY DESCRIBED IN THE NEXT PARAGRAPH MAY RESULT IN THE REFUSAL OR SUSPENSION OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION.**

You must pay or contest this citation by the date due noted below. If you appear in court, the maximum amount you can be charged is a \$40.00 fine and court costs. Instructions for payment are on the reverse of this notice.

Recorded images are evidence of a violation of the Maryland Law.



Citation Number: 	Vehicle Tag: 
Violation Date: 04/23/09	Violation Time: 3:55:05 PM
Vehicle Speed: 48 mph	Posted Speed: 35 mph
Due Date: 06/05/09	Amount Due: \$40.00
Location: 6400 Blk Democracy Blvd w/b	

**PAYMENT OF THE PENALTY AMOUNT FOR THE VIOLATION WILL NOT RESULT IN POINTS AND CANNOT BE USED TO INCREASE YOUR INSURANCE RATES.**

A Public Safety Program of the Montgomery County, Maryland  
Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit: 1-866-818-3844


**Certificate**

I am a duly authorized operator for the Safe Speed Photo Radar program. Based on inspection of the recorded images shown above, the motor vehicle was operated in violation of TA 21-809, as evidenced by the above images. Sworn to or affirmed by:

Approver *Debra L. Payne* ID # 15370

# IV. Olney-Sandy Spring Camera Locations

**Montgomery County Map of Geographic Locales. County locales determined by Task Force using US Census Designated Places (CDP)**



## A. Olney-Sandy Spring Eight Primary Cameras – Site Photographs

According to information provided to the Task Force by the ATEU, in CY 2013 there were 92 fixed, portable and mobile speed monitoring cameras in operation in Montgomery County. These 92 cameras serviced 167 camera sites in 32 county locales that issued citations (see Page 25 for Summary and Pages 27 thru 30 for detail).

The Olney commercial center is bounded north, south, east, and west by speed cameras. Olney-Sandy Spring has 7% of the total Montgomery County camera locations based on 100,000 or more annual vehicle passes per camera. In Olney-Sandy Spring, there were 13 cameras that generated 85,451 citations and over \$3.4 million in gross fines in calendar year 2013 (see Page 27 for revenue detail of 13 cameras and Page 31 for top 8 camera locations in Olney-Sandy Spring).

Photographs of the Olney-Sandy Spring eight primary camera locations appear on the eight pages (14 thru 21) that follow.

**Camera #1630 - 3500 Block EB Olney-Laytonsville Rd (Rt. 108) past Post Office**



CY 2013 Statistics this Olney-Sandy Spring camera:

Citations: 20,689 – Fines: \$827,560

CY 2013 Average All County Cameras:

Citations: 2,847 – Fines: \$113,880

The Task Force notes this camera was installed after the Route 108 speed limits were lowered from 40 mph to 30 mph in 2009. In CY 2013 it was the highest citation revenue generating camera in Olney-Sandy Spring, and the second highest citation revenue generating camera in the County. In FY 2014 this camera was exceeded in citations by the camera at St. Peter's east of Spartan Road eastbound on Olney-Sandy Spring Road (Route 108), but remains one of the highest citation-issuing locations in the County. The ATEU stated this camera is considered a School Zone camera. Thus, it can operate only from 6:00 AM to 8:00 PM on weekdays all year long, due to the legislative change that occurred in the MD state code that went into effect on October 1, 2009.

**Camera #1637–3400Block WB Olney-Laytonsville Rd (Rt. 108) at St. John’s**



CY 2013 Statistics this Olney-Sandy Spring camera:	Citations: 19,089 – Fines: \$763,560
CY 2013 Statistics all cameras at this general location:	Citations: 19,272 – Fines: \$770,880
CY 2013 Average All County Cameras:	Citations: 2,847 – Fines: \$113,880

The Task Force notes this was the third highest grossing citation camera in the County in CY 2013. The annual citation level decreased in FY 2014. The ATEU indicated this location is a School Zone camera. Thus, it can operate and generate citations only from 6:00 AM to 8:00 PM on weekdays all year long due to the legislative change that occurred in the MD state code that went into effect on October 1, 2009.

The Task Force notes that the County also employed two other mobile camera units (Nos. 1629 and 1712) at the adjacent 3500 Block of Olney-Laytonsville Road near St. John’s in CY 2013. The cumulative statistics for all three cameras sites at or near St. John’s are shown above.



**Camera #1329 - 17700 Georgia Avenue NB approaching Sandy Spring Bank**



CY 2013 Statistics this Olney-Sandy Spring camera:

Citations: 16,857 – Fines: \$674,820

CY 2013 Average All County Cameras:

Citations: 2,847 – Fines: \$113,880

The camera approaching Sandy Spring Bank is a fixed location box camera, one of the earliest in Olney and one which continues to generate among the highest citation numbers in the County. It was the third highest grossing camera in the County in FY 2013. The camera is on a two lane divided highway marked 30 mph, placed approximately 300 yards south of the bank and commercial area, with one residential driveway and one commercial driveway before reaching the bank area. The Task Force believes the camera is located in an area where a ramp-down speed limit of 35 mph is appropriate for safe driving, a change that may mitigate a sizeable percentage of the fines at this location. The Task Force requested but was not provided the data that would enable it to state definitively the specific number of citations that would be mitigated. See also report commentary on page 41.

**Camera #1341 - 19600 Georgia Avenue NB approaching Brookeville**



CY 2013 Statistics this Olney-Sandy Spring camera:  
CY 2013 Average All County Cameras:

Citations: 7,473 – Fines: \$298,920  
Citations: 2,847 – Fines: \$113,880

This camera located on Georgia Avenue northbound approaching Brookeville is a fixed pole camera. Since CY 2012 and FY 2012 citations have declined at this camera location.

## Camera #1750 - 3500 Block Olney-Sandy Spring Rd (Rt. 108) EB at St. Peter's



CY 2013 Statistics this camera (partial year):	Citations: 6,965 – Fines: \$ 278,600
FY 2014 Statistics (partial year)	Citations: 27,123 – Fines: \$1,084,920
CY 2013 Average All County Cameras:	Citations: 2,847 – Fines: \$113,880

**The Task Force notes this camera became the single highest revenue producing camera in Montgomery County when comparing the citations it issued in FY 2014 to that of all CY 2013 camera sites throughout the County. Although installed after the start of the fiscal year and therefore not in existence for a full 12 months in FY 2014, it surpassed the #1 Montgomery County citation revenue generating camera that is located in Silver Spring and was in existence for a full twelve months in CY 2013.** The road has a minimum of 3 lanes in either direction plus dedicated turn lanes. Eastbound, the road opens after St. Peter's without pedestrian crossings, residential or commercial entries, and is the approach to a 40 mph zone. There is no ramp-up 35 mph zone, although in the view of the Task Force one is recommended. Further school protection past the St. Peter's driveway can be provided with fencing funded by camera net revenues under the County's stated Public Safety purpose of the program. The Task Force contrasts the 30 mph speed limit on that open portion of Olney-Sandy Spring Road with the 40 mph speed limit at St. Elizabeth's school on Montrose Road in Rockville, another 3 lane road but which is undivided and has more cross streets, driveways, and overall traffic. Similarly, Rockview Elementary in Kensington is on a six-lane divided highway with 40 mph speed limits. The disparate treatment between Olney versus Rockville, North Potomac, and Kensington is, in the view of the Task Force, a major contributor to the disproportionately high citation frequency borne by Olney-Sandy Spring residents and visitors.

**Camera #1749 - 3500 Blk Olney-Sandy Spring Rd (Rt. 108) WB before Spartan Rd**



CY 2013 Statistics this camera (partial year):

Citations: 3,046 – Fines: \$121,840

FY 2014 Statistics this camera (partial year):

Citations: 7,830 – Fines: \$313,200

CY 2013 Average All County Cameras:

Citations: 2,847 – Fines: \$113,880

The Task Force notes this camera placement was also a high revenue producing camera in FY 2014, even though it too was in existence only for a partial year. It exceeded the citations issued during the partial-year installation in CY 2013 by a sizeable margin. The Task Force notes the camera placement is largely concealed by the curbside trees. The Task Force recommends should a camera be necessary in this location, that it be moved to a more visible location west of Spartan Road in the Olney core commercial center.

**Camera #1358 - 1500 Block Olney-Sandy Spring Rd EB Sherwood Elementary**



CY 2013 Statistics this Olney-Sandy Spring camera:

Citations: 4,324 – Fines: \$172,960

CY 2013 Average All County Cameras:

Citations: 2,847 – Fines: \$113,880

The ATEU indicated this camera is considered a School Zone camera and therefore can generate citations only from 6:00 AM to 8:00 PM on weekdays all year long due to the change in the MD state code that went into effect on October 1, 2009. Citations declined from both calendar and fiscal year 2012 to 2013 as well as from FY2013 to FY 2014.

**Camera #1359 - 1300 Block Olney-Sandy Spring Rd WB Sherwood Elementary**



CY 2013 Statistics this Olney-Sandy Spring camera:  
CY 2012 Average All County Cameras:


Citations: 2,142 – Fines: \$ 85,680  
Citations: 2,847 – Fines: \$113,880

The ATEU indicated this camera is considered a School Zone camera and therefore can generate citations only from 6:00 AM to 8:00 PM on weekdays all year long due to the change in the MD state code that went into effect on October 1, 2009. Citations declined from both calendar and fiscal year 2012 to 2013 as well as from FY 2013 to FY 2014.

# V. Statistical Data and Analysis


The Task Force obtained and analyzed a broad array of citation, vehicle volume (i.e. “vehicle passes”) and other data during its review. The results are portrayed on the charts that follow. *The Task Force encourages readers to closely review the arrayed charts and data. The solid red line represents the number of cameras per locale, while the vertical blue bars represent citations.*

## Olney-Sandy Spring Citations Compared to Other County Locales



Source: Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU) Calendar Year 2013 Citations by Geographical Area


# Olney-Sandy Spring Citations Lead Top 20 Citation Locales



Source: Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU) Calendar Year 2013 Top Twenty Citation Generating Cameras



## Montgomery County - Top Five Citation Generating Speed Cameras by Area (CY 2013)



**Note:** the three colors of the vertical bar for Olney represent the three highest citation generating cameras in Olney for calendar year 2013. The blue segment is the 3500 Blk Olney-Laytonsville Rd eastbound camera at the Post office; the red segment is the 3400 Blk Olney-Laytonsville Road westbound camera at St. John's; the green segment is the 17700 Blk Georgia Avenue northbound camera approaching Sandy Spring bank. Not shown (because this is calendar 2013 data) is the new No. 1 citation-generating camera based on fiscal year 2014 data, the 2900 Blk Olney-Sandy Spring Road eastbound at St. Peters (27,000+ citations).

# Summary of Citations, Vehicle Passes, Cameras, and Population by Geographic Locale

Montgomery County Speed Monitoring Program  
 Summary of Citations, Number of Cameras, Vehicle Passes, Land Mass & Population by Geographical Camera Locations  
 Calendar Year 2013

#	Geographical Location	CITATIONS				CAMERAS			VEHICLE PASSES			CITATIONS to PASSES		LAND AREA		POPULATION	
		Number of	\$'s	Percentage of Total	Rank Order	Number of	Percentage of Total	Rank Order	Number of	Percentage of Total	Rank Order	Ratio	Rank Order	Square Miles	Rank	People	Rank
1	Olney	78,985	\$ 3,159,400	16.6%	1	11	6.6%	4 tie	13,122,512	7.6%	3	0.6019%	6	13.00	6	33,844	9
2	Sandy Spring	6,466	258,640	1.4%	18	2	1.2%	17 tie	5,289,979	3.0%	13	0.1222%	29	2.66	23	2,396	27
	Olney & Sandy Spring	85,451	\$ 3,418,040	18.0%	1A	13	7.8%	3A	18,412,491	10.6%	2A	0.4641%	7A	15.66	4A	36,240	8A
3	Silver Spring	64,988	2,599,520	13.7%	2	15	9.0%	2	26,159,865	15.1%	1	0.2484%	19	7.92	14	71,452	2
4	Damascus	41,410	1,656,400	8.7%	3	16	9.6%	1	11,871,265	6.8%	5	0.3488%	13	9.60	11	15,257	17
5	Potomac	36,930	1,477,200	7.8%	4	11	6.6%	4 tie	9,022,033	5.2%	7	0.4093%	9	25.20	3	44,965	7
6	Chevy Chase	28,446	1,137,840	6.0%	5	10	6.0%	6 tie	11,393,889	6.6%	6	0.2497%	18	2.50	24	9,545	20
7	Chevy Chase View	25,137	1,005,480	5.3%	6	2	1.2%	17 tie	12,184,869	7.0%	4	0.2063%	22	0.28	32	920	30
8	Bethesda	22,578	903,120	4.7%	7	10	6.0%	6 tie	6,969,573	4.0%	11	0.3240%	14	34.00	2	60,858	4
9	North Potomac	21,144	845,760	4.4%	8	6	3.6%	10 tie	3,478,166	2.0%	15	0.6079%	5	6.50	17	24,410	11
10	Darnestown	18,217	728,680	3.8%	9	4	2.4%	14 tie	4,589,148	2.6%	14	0.3970%	10	16.60	4	6,802	24
11	Wheaton-Glenmont	17,400	696,000	3.7%	10	10	6.0%	6 tie	21,262,364	12.3%	2	0.0818%	31	9.70	10	61,813	3
12	Agriculture West 1	16,913	676,520	3.6%	11	5	3.0%	12 tie	2,053,017	1.2%	19	0.8238%	4	145.00	1	8,750	22
13	Gaithersburg	16,360	654,400	3.4%	12	2	1.2%	17 tie	7,267,255	4.2%	10	0.2251%	21	10.30	9	59,933	5
14	North Bethesda	11,722	468,880	2.5%	13	5	3.0%	12 tie	8,141,945	4.7%	9	0.1440%	26	8.80	13	43,828	8
15	Germantown	11,695	467,800	2.5%	14	10	6.0%	6 tie	3,282,422	1.9%	17	0.3563%	12	10.80	7	86,395	1
16	Montgomery Village	10,593	423,720	2.2%	15	13	7.8%	3	3,467,544	2.0%	16	0.3055%	17	4.00	20	32,032	10
17	Aspen Hill	7,800	312,000	1.6%	16	6	3.6%	10 tie	5,330,636	3.1%	12	0.1463%	25	10.50	8	48,759	6
18	White Oak	7,054	282,160	1.5%	17	2	1.2%	17 tie	8,339,834	4.8%	8	0.0846%	30	5.00	18	17,403	14
19	Barnesville	5,367	214,680	1.1%	19	2	1.2%	17 tie	405,385	0.2%	28	1.3239%	2	0.49	31	172	32
20	Cabin John	4,850	194,000	1.0%	20	2	1.2%	17 tie	1,044,157	0.6%	22	0.4645%	7	1.00	29	2,280	29
21	Agriculture East 2	4,110	164,400	0.9%	21	2	1.2%	17 tie	1,320,593	0.8%	21	0.3112%	16	15.00	5	20,000	12
22	Poolesville	3,397	135,880	0.7%	22	2	1.2%	17 tie	825,074	0.5%	23	0.4117%	8	3.95	21	4,883	26
23	Hillandale	3,256	130,240	0.7%	23	2	1.2%	17 tie	2,302,476	1.3%	18	0.1414%	27	2.00	26	6,043	25
24	Colesville	2,506	100,240	0.5%	24	1	0.6%	29 tie	195,438	0.1%	30	1.2822%	3	9.20	12	14,647	19
25	Cloverly	2,244	89,760	0.5%	25	2	1.2%	17 tie	1,446,816	0.8%	20	0.1551%	24	3.90	22	15,126	18
26	Redland	1,551	62,040	0.3%	26	4	2.4%	14 tie	480,316	0.3%	25	0.3229%	15	6.90	16	17,242	15
27	Calverton	1,434	57,360	0.3%	27	1	0.6%	29 tie	381,352	0.2%	29	0.3760%	11	4.60	19	17,724	13
28	Derwood	1,129	45,160	0.2%	28	3	1.8%	16	457,930	0.3%	26	0.2465%	20	0.63	30	2,381	28
29	Burtonsville	610	24,400	0.1%	29	1	0.6%	29 tie	38,663	0.0%	32	1.5777%	1	7.80	15	8,323	23
30	North Kensington	570	22,800	0.1%	30	2	1.2%	17 tie	405,770	0.2%	27	0.1405%	28	1.50	27	9,514	21
31	Takoma Park	367	14,680	0.1%	31	1	0.6%	29 tie	788,214	0.5%	24	0.0466%	32	2.09	25	16,715	16
32	Laytonsville	252	10,080	0.1%	32	2	1.2%	17 tie	140,181	0.1%	31	0.1798%	23	1.04	28	353	31
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>475,481</b>	<b>\$ 19,019,240</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>167</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>173,458,681</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>0.2741%</b>		<b>365.76</b>		<b>764,765</b>	
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>14,859</b>	<b>\$ 594,351</b>			<b>5.2</b>			<b>5,420,584</b>			<b>County Totals ==&gt;</b>	<b>491.25</b>		<b>971,777</b>		

Source: Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU) and 2010 US Census

# Eight Primary Camera Sites in Olney-Sandy Spring 2012 to 2014

The Task Force considers this chart important as it contains the Olney-Sandy Spring citation and related data for FY 2014 applicable to only Eight Primary Camera Sites. The Task Force requested but the County did not provide other County-wide data to the Task Force for FY 2014, citing either restrictions providing data it said was proprietary to Xerox and/or problems with available personnel at Xerox of provide the data, etc. Speed Camera citations in Olney-Sandy Spring increased by 12% from FY 2013 to FY 2014 while in the previous fiscal years it more than doubled(i.e., FY2012 to FY2013).

**Montgomery County Traffic Speed Camera Program  
Comparison of the Eight "Primary" Camera Sites Located within Olney and Sandy Spring  
For the Calendar and Fiscal Years Indicated**

Camera Location Description	VIOLATIONS					
	Calendar Year			Fiscal Year Ended June 30		
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014
1 2900 Block (EB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - St Peter's	Didn't Exist	6,965 (A)	Unavailable	Didn't Exist	Didn't Exist	27,123 (A)
2 17700 Block (NB) Georgia Ave - Approaching Sandy Spring Bank	17,743	16,857	Unavailable	19,303	17,322	15,883
3 3400-3500 Block (WB) Olney-Laytonsville Rd - St John's	16,983	19,272	Unavailable	Didn't Exist	25,556	15,668
4 3500 Block (EB) Olney-Laytonsville Rd - Post Office	13,248	20,689	9,413	Didn't Exist	22,460	11,810
5 2900 Block (WB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Approaching Spartan Rd	Didn't Exist	3,046 (A)	Unavailable	Didn't Exist	Didn't Exist	7,830 (A)
6 19600 Block (NB) Georgia Ave - Approaching Brookeville	8,528	7,473	Unavailable	9,618	7,909	6,456
7 1500 Block (EB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Sherwood Elem School	5,270	4,324	Unavailable	6,686	4,512	3,454
8 1300 Block (WB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Sherwood Elem School	2,821	2,142	Unavailable	3,599	2,261	1,517
	<b>64,593</b>	<b>80,768</b>	<b>Unavailable</b>	<b>39,206</b>	<b>80,020</b>	<b>89,741</b>

Camera Location Description	VEHICLE PASSES					
	Calendar Year			Fiscal Year Ended June 30		
	2013	2014		2012	2013	2014
1 2900 Block (EB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - St Peter's	239,550 (A)	Unavailable		Didn't Exist	Didn't Exist	2,022,604 (A)
2 17700 Block (NB) Georgia Ave - Approaching Sandy Spring Bank	5,016,407	Unavailable		1,026,213	6,956,900	4,990,785
3 3400-3500 Block (WB) Olney-Laytonsville Rd - St John's	(B) 2,953,393	Unavailable		Didn't Exist	2,681,202	2,362,329
4 3500 Block (EB) Olney-Laytonsville Rd - Post Office	2,911,923	Unavailable		Didn't Exist	Unavailable	Unavailable
5 2900 Block (WB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Approaching Spartan Rd	434,648 (A)	Unavailable		Didn't Exist	Didn't Exist	2,199,007 (A)
6 19600 Block (NB) Georgia Ave - Approaching Brookeville	1,315,065	Unavailable		1,552,801	1,315,442	1,553,872
7 1500 Block (EB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Sherwood Elem School	(C) 2,624,395	Unavailable		2,881,861	2,653,405	2,595,385
8 1300 Block (WB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Sherwood Elem School	(C) 2,665,584	Unavailable		2,936,072	2,704,149	2,627,018
	<b>18,160,965</b>	<b>Unavailable</b>		<b>8,396,947</b>	<b>Unavailable</b>	<b>Unavailable</b>

Camera Location Description	VIOLATION to VEHICLE PASSES - PERCENTAGE					
	Calendar Year			Fiscal Year Ended June 30		
	2013	2014		2012	2013	2014
1 2900 Block (EB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - St Peter's	2.908%	Can't Determine		Didn't Exist	Didn't Exist	1.341%
2 17700 Block (NB) Georgia Ave - Approaching Sandy Spring Bank	0.336%	Can't Determine		1.881%	0.249%	0.318%
3 3400-3500 Block (WB) Olney-Laytonsville Rd - St John's	0.653%	Can't Determine		Didn't Exist	0.953%	0.663%
4 3500 Block (EB) Olney-Laytonsville Rd - Post Office	0.710%	Can't Determine		Didn't Exist	Can't Determine	Can't Determine
5 2900 Block (WB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Approaching Spartan Rd	0.701%	Can't Determine		Didn't Exist	Didn't Exist	0.356%
6 19600 Block (NB) Georgia Ave - Approaching Brookeville	0.568%	Can't Determine		0.619%	0.601%	0.415%
7 1500 Block (EB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Sherwood Elem School	0.165%	Can't Determine		0.232%	0.170%	0.133%
8 1300 Block (WB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Sherwood Elem School	0.080%	Can't Determine		0.123%	0.084%	0.058%
	<b>0.445%</b>	<b>Can't Determine</b>		<b>0.467%</b>	<b>Can't Determine</b>	<b>Can't Determine</b>

(A) - The camera located on this site was not in existence for the full Calendar Year 2013, nor the full Fiscal Year 2013.

(B) - CY 2013 Vehicle Pass information provided to the Task Force was only 41,470 for this site. Due to this data anomaly the Task Force adjusted this number and added 2,911,923 to it or the same number of passes associated with the camera located across the street, which should now approximate actual information.

(C) - CY 2013 Vehicle Pass information provided to the Task Force was approximately 1 Million passes less than both FY 2013 and FY 2014 for each of these two sites. Due to this data anomaly the Task Force adjusted these numbers to the FY13 and FY14 average of these sites, which should approximate actual information.

Source: Montgomery County Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU)

# Detailed Listing of All County Speed Cameras by Location-CY 2013

## Detailed Listing of all (167) Traffic Speed Cameras within Montgomery County by Geographical Location Calendar Year 2013

#	Camera Number	Camera Site Description	Geographical Location	Camera Type	Violations		Vehicle Passes	% of Violations to Passes
					Number	\$		
1	1630	3500 Blk Olney Laytonsville Rd e/b - (Post Office)	Olney	Mobile	20,689	\$ 827,560	2,911,923	0.7105%
2	1637	3400 Olney Laytonsville Rd w/b - (St. John's)	Olney	Mobile	19,089	763,560	2,911,923 (A)	0.6555%
3	1329	17700 Blk Georgia Ave n/b (Approaching Sandy Spring Bank)	Olney	Fixed	16,857	674,280	5,016,407	0.3360%
4	1341	19600 Blk Georgia Ave n/b (Approaching Brookeville)	Olney	Fixed	7,473	298,920	1,315,065	0.5683%
5	1750	2900 Blk Olney Sandy Spring Rd e/b - (St. Peter's)	Olney	Mobile	6,965	278,600	239,550	2.9075%
6	1620	2300 Blk Gold Mine Rd e/b	Olney	Mobile	3,447	137,880	111,231	3.0990%
7	1749	2900 Blk Olney Sandy Spring Rd w/b - (Approaching Spartan RD)	Olney	Mobile	3,046	121,840	434,648	0.7008%
8	1695	1700 Blk Gold Mine Rd w/b	Olney	Mobile	1,116	44,640	40,971	2.7239%
9	1712	3500 Blk Olney Laytonsville w/b - (St. John's)	Olney	Mobile	159	6,360	37,355	0.4256%
10	1728	4200 Blk Olney Laytonsville e/b - (Olney Mill)	Olney	Mobile	120	4,800	99,324	0.1208%
11	1629	3500 Blk Olney Laytonsville w/b - (St. John's)	Olney	Mobile	24	960	4,115	0.5832%
<b>Sub-Total Olney</b>					<b>78,985</b>	<b>3,159,400</b>	<b>13,122,512</b>	<b>0.6019%</b>
12	1358	1500 Olney Sandy Spring Rd e/b (Sherwood Elem. School)	Sandy Spring	Fixed	4,324	172,960	2,624,395 (B)	0.1648%
13	1359	1300 Olney Sandy Spring Rd w/b (Sherwood Elem. School)	Sandy Spring	Fixed	2,142	85,680	2,665,584 (B)	0.0804%
<b>Sub-Total Sandy Spring</b>					<b>6,466</b>	<b>258,640</b>	<b>5,289,979</b>	<b>0.1222%</b>
<b>Total Olney &amp; Sandy Spring</b>					<b>85,451</b>	<b>\$ 3,418,040</b>	<b>18,412,491</b>	<b>0.4641%</b>
14	1361	18800 Blk Muncaster Rd s/b	Agriculture East 2	Fixed	2,922	116,880	685,858	0.4260%
15	1362	18500 Blk Muncaster Rd n/b	Agriculture East 2	Fixed	1,188	47,520	634,735	0.1872%
16	1665	22400 Blk Dickerson Rd s/b	Agriculture West 1	Mobile	8,093	323,720	640,325	1.2639%
17	1336	14500 Blk Schaeffer Rd w/b	Agriculture West 1	Fixed	4,779	191,160	548,414	0.8714%
18	1664	22000 Blk Dickerson Rd n/b	Agriculture West 1	Mobile	2,850	114,000	418,708	0.6807%
19	1335	14400 Blk Schaeffer Rd e/b	Agriculture West 1	Fixed	1,017	40,680	431,933	0.2355%
20	1646	12800 West Old Baltimore Rd e/b	Agriculture West 1	Mobile	174	6,960	13,637	1.2759%
21	1315	3100 Blk Bel Pre Rd w/b	Aspen Hill	Fixed	3,118	124,720	2,772,626	0.1125%
22	1694	14500 Blk Homecrest Rd s/b	Aspen Hill	Mobile	2,329	93,160	180,585	1.2897%
23	1653	14000 Blk Homecrest Rd n/b	Aspen Hill	Mobile	1,046	41,840	128,215	0.8158%
24	1314	3200 Blk Bel Pre Rd e/b	Aspen Hill	Fixed	670	26,800	1,948,429	0.0344%
25	1355	5200 Russett Rd e/b	Aspen Hill	Fixed	637	25,480	300,774	0.2118%
26	1641	11077 Blk Parkland Dr s/b	Aspen Hill	Mobile	-	-	7	0.0000%
27	1364	22300 Blk Old Hundred Rd s/b	Barnesville	Fixed	3,490	139,600	178,689	1.9531%
28	1363	18500 Blk Barnesville Rd e/b	Barnesville	Fixed	1,877	75,080	226,696	0.8280%
29	1616	5600 Blk Massachusetts Ave w/b	Bethesda	Mobile	4,244	169,760	1,025,406	0.4139%
30	1745	5600 Blk Bradley Blvd n/b	Bethesda	Mobile	3,372	134,880	224,668	1.5009%
31	1337	4300 Blk East West Hwy w/b	Bethesda	Fixed	3,116	124,640	1,780,054	0.1751%
32	1342	6100 Blk Wilson Ln w/b	Bethesda	Fixed	1,977	79,080	894,535	0.2210%
33	1614	5700 Blk Massachusetts Ave e/b	Bethesda	Mobile	1,919	76,760	931,643	0.2060%
34	1613	9100 Blk Cedar Ln w/b	Bethesda	Mobile	1,908	76,320	547,695	0.3484%
35	1748	5900 Blk Bradley Blvd s/b	Bethesda	Mobile	1,870	74,800	145,704	1.2834%
36	1612	9100 Blk Cedar Ln e/b	Bethesda	Mobile	1,835	73,400	454,032	0.4042%
37	1342	6400 Blk Wilson Ln e/b	Bethesda	Fixed	1,561	62,440	809,759	0.1928%
38	1705	5800 Blk Wilson Ln w/n	Bethesda	Mobile	776	31,040	156,077	0.4972%
39	1672	3400 Blk Gateshead Manor Way n/b	Burtonsville	Mobile	610	24,400	38,663	1.5777%
40	1356	6900 Seven Locks Rd s/b	Cabin John	Fixed	4,243	169,720	595,619	0.7124%
41	1357	6700 Seven Locks Rd n/b	Cabin John	Fixed	607	24,280	448,538	0.1353%
42	1643	2900 Blk Calverton Blvd e/b	Calverton	Mobile	1,434	57,360	381,352	0.3760%
43	1624	6300 Blk Wisconsin Ave s/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	11,475	459,000	5,274,370	0.2176%
44	1691	4500 Blk Jones Bridge Rd e/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	5,667	226,680	2,012,138	0.2816%
45	1685	4400 Blk Jones Bridge Rd w/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	4,815	192,600	1,001,555	0.4808%
46	1717	4100 Blk Jones Bridge Rd w/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	3,066	122,640	1,312,790	0.2335%
47	1704	6000 Blk Wisconsin Ave s/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	1,346	53,840	882,135	0.1526%
48	1683	4200 Blk Jones Bridge Rd e/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	1,238	49,520	265,035	0.4671%
49	1703	6400 Blk Wisconsin Ave s/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	593	23,720	332,994	0.1781%
50	1716	4100 Blk Jones Bridge Rd e/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	144	5,760	234,386	0.0614%
51	1671	3700 Blk Jones Bridge Rd w/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	77	3,080	44,573	0.1728%
52	1670	3700 Blk Jones Bridge Rd e/b	Chevy Chase	Mobile	25	1,000	33,913	0.0737%
53	1366	10100 Blk Connecticut Ave s/b	Chevy Chase View	Fixed	18,809	752,360	6,366,265	0.2954%

Source: Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU)

# Detailed Listing of All County Speed Cameras by Location - CY 2013

Detailed Listing of all (167) Traffic Speed Cameras within Montgomery County by Geographical Location  
Calendar Year 2013

#	Camera Number	Camera Site Description	Geographical Location	Camera Type	Violations		Vehicle Passes	% of Violations to Passes
					Number	\$		
54	1366	10100 Blk Connecticut Ave n/b	Chevy Chase View	Fixed	6,328	253,120	5,818,604	0.1088%
55	1312	1000 Blk Briggs Chaney Rd s/b	Cloverly	Fixed	1,129	45,160	686,044	0.1646%
56	1313	1000 Blk Briggs Chaney Rd n/b	Cloverly	Fixed	1,115	44,600	760,772	0.1466%
57	1751	300 Blk Bonifant Rd w/b	Colesville	Mobile	2,506	100,240	195,438	1.2822%
58	1731	27300 Blk Ridge Rd s/b	Damascus	Mobile	8,957	358,280	1,782,135	0.5026%
59	1678	25800 Blk Ridge Rd s/b	Damascus	Mobile	7,400	296,000	2,120,727	0.3489%
60	1348	27000 Blk Ridge Rd s/b	Damascus	Fixed	6,540	261,600	1,700,972	0.3845%
61	1710	27000 Blk Ridge Rd n/b	Damascus	Mobile	5,809	232,360	1,344,117	0.4322%
62	1700	25800 Blk Woodfield Rd s/b	Damascus	Mobile	3,926	157,040	1,006,667	0.3900%
63	1706	27300 Blk Ridge Rd s/b	Damascus	Mobile	3,591	143,640	1,002,411	0.3582%
64	1328	24200 Blk Woodfield Rd s/b	Damascus	Fixed	2,337	93,480	1,051,561	0.2222%
65	1676	24100 Blk Ridge Rd s/b	Damascus	Mobile	927	37,080	497,859	0.1862%
66	1701	25800 Blk Woodfield Rd n/b	Damascus	Mobile	733	29,320	378,894	0.1935%
67	1711	23000 Blk Woodfield Rd n/b	Damascus	Mobile	528	21,120	224,187	0.2355%
68	1327	24200 Blk Woodfield Rd n/b	Damascus	Fixed	333	13,320	483,945	0.0688%
69	1736	24100 Blk Woodfield School Rd w/b	Damascus	Mobile	146	5,840	9,479	1.5402%
70	1677	25800 Blk Ridge Rd n/b	Damascus	Mobile	107	4,280	167,209	0.0640%
71	1675	24100 Blk Ridge Rd n/b	Damascus	Mobile	72	2,880	93,809	0.0768%
72	1734	23500 Blk Log House Rd s/b	Damascus	Mobile	4	160	2,533	0.1579%
73	1732	23800 Blk Woodfield Rd n/b	Damascus	Mobile	-	-	4,760	0.0000%
74	1334	13600 Blk Darnestown Rd w/b	Darnestown	Fixed	9,078	363,120	2,009,265	0.4518%
75	1333	14200 Blk Darnestown Rd e/b	Darnestown	Fixed	5,879	235,160	1,576,076	0.3730%
76	1346	15700 Blk Germantown Rd s/b	Darnestown	Fixed	2,182	87,280	530,935	0.4110%
77	1345	15500 Blk Germantown Rd n/b	Darnestown	Fixed	1,078	43,120	472,872	0.2280%
78	1622	16100 Blk Crabbs Branch Way n/b	Derwood	Mobile	941	37,640	382,226	0.2462%
79	1659	17300 Blk Bowie Mill Rd w/b	Derwood	Mobile	112	4,480	60,518	0.1851%
80	1623	16100 Blk Crabbs Branch Way s/b	Derwood	Mobile	76	3,040	15,186	0.5005%
81	1709	1000 Blk Quince Orchard s/b	Gaithersburg	Mobile	13,663	546,520	3,581,727	0.3815%
82	1349	1030 Blk Quince Orchard Rd s/b	Gaithersburg	Fixed	2,697	107,880	3,685,528	0.0732%
83	1721	20800 Blk Father Hurley Blvd e/b	Germantown	Mobile	6,930	277,200	1,080,003	0.6417%
84	1723	22000 Blk Father Hurley Blvd w/b	Germantown	Mobile	2,489	99,560	1,102,989	0.2257%
85	1725	20100 Blk Father Hurley Blvd w/b	Germantown	Mobile	603	24,120	351,196	0.1717%
86	1720	20300 Blk Father Hurley Blvd e/b	Germantown	Mobile	492	19,680	150,739	0.3264%
87	1650	19200 Blk Father Hurley Blvd w/b	Germantown	Mobile	306	12,240	151,778	0.2016%
88	1360	12500 Wisteria Dr e/b	Germantown	Fixed	270	10,800	306,099	0.0882%
89	1649	19200 Blk Father Hurley Blvd e/b	Germantown	Mobile	265	10,600	46,169	0.5740%
90	1667	20200 Blk Wynnfield Dr w/b	Germantown	Mobile	264	10,560	12,586	2.0976%
91	1719	18800 Blk Father Hurley Blvd e/b	Germantown	Mobile	76	3,040	57,314	0.1326%
92	1724	20800 Blk Father Hurley Blvd w/b	Germantown	Mobile	-	-	23,549	0.0000%
93	1319	2000 Blk Powder Mill Rd w/b	Hillandale	Fixed	1,681	67,240	1,394,651	0.1205%
94	1318	2000 Blk Powder Mill Rd e/b	Hillandale	Fixed	1,575	63,000	907,825	0.1735%
95	1605	21400 Blk Laytonsville Rd s/b	Laytonsville	Mobile	210	8,400	81,444	0.2578%
96	1604	21400 Blk Laytonsville Rd n/b	Laytonsville	Mobile	42	1,680	58,737	0.0715%
97	1697	20200 Blk Montgomery Village Ave s/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	4,877	195,080	1,088,766	0.4479%
98	1652	19500 Blk Montgomery Village Ave e/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	2,302	92,080	733,697	0.3138%
99	1687	18700 Blk Montgomery Village Ave s/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	1,599	63,960	799,049	0.2001%
100	1656	19300 Blk Father Hurley Blvd w/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	447	17,880	144,484	0.3094%
101	1651	19500 Blk Montgomery Village Ave n/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	359	14,360	205,803	0.1744%
102	1655	19300 Blk Father Hurley Blvd e/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	307	12,280	89,767	0.3420%
103	1633	10100 Blk Apple Ridge Rd w/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	283	11,320	90,831	0.3116%
104	1686	18700 Blk Montgomery Village Ave n/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	143	5,720	170,728	0.0838%
105	1625	7800 Blk East Village Ave e/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	130	5,200	33,426	0.3889%
106	1534	9800 Blk Apple Ridge Rd w/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	77	3,080	15,382	0.5006%
107	1696	19900 Blk Montgomery Village Ave n/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	65	2,600	52,766	0.1232%
108	1713	19600 Blk Goshen Rd s/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	4	160	42,470	0.0094%
109	1626	7800 Blk East Village Ave w/b	Montgomery Village	Mobile	-	-	375	0.0000%

Source: Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU)

# Detailed Listing of All County Speed Cameras by Location - CY 2013

## Detailed Listing of all (167) Traffic Speed Cameras within Montgomery County by Geographical Location Calendar Year 2013

#	Camera Number	Camera Site Description	Geographical Location	Camera Type	Violations		Vehicle Passes	% of Violations to Passes
					Number	\$		
110	1331	6400 Blk Democracy Blvd e/b	North Bethesda	Fixed	4,255	170,200	3,554,217	0.1197%
111	1332	6400 Blk Democracy Blvd w/b	North Bethesda	Fixed	4,057	162,280	3,021,619	0.1343%
112	1320	5800 Blk Grosvenor Ln w/b	North Bethesda	Fixed	1,954	78,160	827,623	0.2361%
113	1632	6400 Blk Democracy Blvd w/b	North Bethesda	Mobile	1,284	51,360	594,326	0.2160%
114	1631	6400 Blk Democracy Blvd e/b	North Bethesda	Mobile	172	6,880	144,160	0.1193%
115	1615	11200 Blk Connecticut Ave s/b	North Kensington	Mobile	302	12,080	209,067	0.1445%
116	1614	11100 Blk Connecticut Ave n/b	North Kensington	Mobile	268	10,720	196,703	0.1362%
117	1673	14400 Blk Duffie Mill Rd s/b	North Potomac	Mobile	5,508	220,320	830,232	0.6634%
118	1727	14100 Blk Travilah Rd n/b	North Potomac	Mobile	5,202	208,080	503,928	1.0323%
119	1729	14100 Blk Travilah Rd s/b	North Potomac	Mobile	4,654	186,160	742,512	0.6268%
120	1309	13500 Blk Travilah Rd n/b	North Potomac	Fixed	2,906	116,240	900,205	0.3228%
121	1726	13800 Blk Glen Mill Rd s/b	North Potomac	Mobile	2,214	88,560	161,279	1.3728%
122	1351	14000 Glen Mill Rd s/b	North Potomac	Fixed	660	26,400	340,010	0.1941%
123	1326	20100 Blk Fisher Ave s/b	Poolesville	Fixed	2,010	80,400	251,224	0.8001%
124	1323	19500 Blk Fisher Ave n/b	Poolesville	Fixed	1,387	55,480	573,850	0.2417%
125	1730	10700 Blk River Rd e/b	Potomac	Mobile	8,369	334,760	1,341,061	0.6241%
126	1347	9000 Blk River Rd w/b	Potomac	Fixed	7,009	280,360	1,972,841	0.3553%
127	1344	9800 Blk Seven Locks Rd s/b	Potomac	Fixed	5,957	238,280	1,647,897	0.3615%
128	1638	11500 Blk Gainsborough Rd n/b	Potomac	Mobile	4,369	174,760	388,545	1.1245%
129	1668	9600 Blk Glen Rd e/b	Potomac	Mobile	4,162	166,480	478,553	0.8697%
130	1708	10600 Blk River Rd w/b	Potomac	Mobile	2,424	96,960	634,935	0.3818%
131	1707	10600 Blk River Rd e/b	Potomac	Mobile	1,864	74,560	517,741	0.3600%
132	1330	10500 Blk River Rd e/b	Potomac	Fixed	1,699	67,960	1,637,695	0.1037%
133	1352	10500 Oaklyn Dr e/b	Potomac	Fixed	528	21,120	187,040	0.2823%
134	1323	10200 Oaklyn Dr s/b	Potomac	Fixed	450	18,000	203,313	0.2213%
135	1639	11500 Blk Gainsborough Rd s/b	Potomac	Mobile	99	3,960	12,412	0.7976%
136	1662	8100 Blk Midcounty Hwy s/b	Redland	Mobile	1,266	50,640	364,614	0.3472%
137	1660	17100 Blk Redland Rd s/b	Redland	Mobile	140	5,600	57,738	0.2425%
138	1714	17300 Blk Redland Rd s/b	Redland	Mobile	82	3,280	30,559	0.2683%
139	1661	8100 Blk Midcounty Hwy n/b	Redland	Mobile	63	2,520	27,405	0.2299%
140	1628	8800 Blk 16th St s/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	26,819	1,072,760	5,922,577	0.4528%
141	1627	8800 Blk 16th St n/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	13,286	531,440	5,393,046	0.2464%
142	1618	9000 Blk Georgia Ave s/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	7,564	302,560	4,634,652	0.1632%
143	1688	9200 Blk 16th St s/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	6,157	246,280	1,952,818	0.3153%
144	1619	9000 Blk Georgia Ave n/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	6,062	242,480	4,041,596	0.1500%
145	1339	9200 Blk Brookville Rd n/b	Silver Spring	Fixed	2,070	82,800	1,212,266	0.1708%
146	1340	9300 Blk Brookville Rd s/b	Silver Spring	Fixed	1,579	63,160	1,073,675	0.1471%
147	1307	600 Blk Wayne Ave e/b	Silver Spring	Fixed	551	22,040	732,148	0.0753%
148	1308	900 Blk Wayne Ave w/b	Silver Spring	Fixed	327	13,080	795,373	0.0411%
149	1689	8900 Blk Georgia Ave s/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	269	10,760	204,555	0.1315%
150	1690	9000 Blk Georgia Ave n/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	108	4,320	99,615	0.1084%
151	1602	2400 Blk Seminary Rd w/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	100	4,000	31,828	0.3142%
152	1609	1400 Blk Dennis Ave e/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	78	3,120	17,989	0.4336%
153	1608	1400 Blk Dennis Ave w/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	18	720	45,518	0.0395%
154	1603	2400 Blk Seminary Rd e/b	Silver Spring	Mobile	-	-	2,209	0.0000%
155	1322	7900 Blk Piney Branch Rd s/b	Takoma Park	Fixed	367	14,680	788,214	0.0466%
156	1680	13500 Blk Layhill Rd s/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Mobile	4,544	181,760	1,396,597	0.3254%
157	1303	4600 Blk Randolph Rd e/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Fixed	4,161	166,440	6,152,884	0.0676%
158	1304	4600 Blk Randolph Rd w/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Fixed	3,000	120,000	5,877,221	0.0510%
159	1607	1900 Blk Randolph Rd e/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Mobile	2,653	106,120	1,174,691	0.2258%
160	1679	13400 Blk Layhill Rd n/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Mobile	1,349	53,960	448,804	0.3006%
161	1302	3300 Blk Randolph Rd w/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Fixed	1,096	43,840	2,661,425	0.0412%
162	1301	3300 Blk Randolph Rd e/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Fixed	486	19,440	3,371,883	0.0144%
163	1611	11900 Blk Claridge Rd s/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Mobile	71	2,840	15,390	0.4613%
164	1606	1900 Blk Randolph Rd w/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Mobile	40	1,600	158,250	0.0253%
165	1610	11800 Blk Claridge Rd n/b	Wheaton-Glenmont	Mobile	-	-	5,219	0.0000%

Source: Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU)

# Detailed Listing of All County Speed Cameras by Location - CY 2013

## Detailed Listing of all (167) Traffic Speed Cameras within Montgomery County by Geographical Location Calendar Year 2013

#	Camera Number	Camera Site Description	Geographical Location	Camera Type	Violations		Vehicle Passes	% of Violations to Passes
					Number	\$		
166	1367	12200 Blk New Hampshire Ave n/b	White Oak	Fixed	3,770	150,800	4,117,444	0.0916%
167	1368	12200 Blk New Hampshire Ave s/b	White Oak	Fixed	3,284	131,360	4,222,390	0.0778%
<b>Grand Totals</b>					<b>475,481</b>	<b>\$ 19,019,240</b>	<b>173,458,681</b>	<b>0.2741%</b>

(A) - CY 2013 Vehicle Pass information provided to the Task Force was only 41,470 for this site. Due to this data anomaly the Task Force adjusted the Vehicle Pass number to equal the exact same number of passes with the camera located across the street, which should approximate actual passes.

(B) - CY 2013 Vehicle Pass information provided to the Task Force was approximately 1 Million less than both the FY 2013 and FY 2014 passes for each of these sites. Due to this data anomaly the Task Force adjusted these numbers to the FY13 and FY14 average of these sites, which should approximate actual passes.

Source: Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU)

# Revenue from Eight Primary Olney-Sandy Spring Cameras

## Montgomery County Traffic Speed Camera Program Citation Dollars Generated by the Eight "Primary" Camera Sites Located within Olney and Sandy Spring For the Calendar and Fiscal Years Indicated

Camera Site Location	Camera Type	Calendar Year			Fiscal Year Ended June 30			FY 2014 %
		2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	
1 2900 Block (EB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - St Peter's	Mobile	Didn't Exist	\$ 278,600 (A)	Unavailable	Didn't Exist	Didn't Exist	\$ 1,084,920 (A)	30%
2 17700 Block (NB) Georgia Ave - Approaching Sandy Spring Bank	Fixed	709,720	674,280	Unavailable	772,120	692,880	635,320	18%
3 3400-3500 Block (WB) Olney-Laytonsville Rd - St John's	Mobile	679,320	770,880	Unavailable	Didn't Exist	1,022,240	626,720	17%
4 3500 Block (EB) Olney-Laytonsville Rd - Post Office	Mobile	529,920	827,560	376,520	Didn't Exist	898,400	472,400	13%
5 2900 Block (WB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Approaching Spartan Rd	Mobile	Didn't Exist	121,840	Unavailable	Didn't Exist	Didn't Exist	313,200	9%
6 19600 Block (NB) Georgia Avenue - Approaching Brookeville	Fixed	341,120	298,920	Unavailable	384,720	316,360	258,240	7%
7 1500 Block (EB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Sherwood Elem School	Fixed	210,800	172,960	Unavailable	267,440	180,480	138,160	4%
8 1300 Block (WB) Olney-Sandy Spring Rd - Sherwood Elem School	Fixed	112,840	85,680	Unavailable	143,960	90,440	60,680	2%
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 2,583,720</b>	<b>\$ 3,230,720</b>	<i>Unavailable</i>	<b>\$ 1,568,240</b>	<b>\$ 3,200,800</b>	<b>\$ 3,589,640</b>	<b>100%</b>
Annual Percentage Change		25%			104%		12%	
Cumulative Percentage Change							129%	

(A) - The camera located on this site was not in existence for the full Calendar Year 2013 nor the full Fiscal Year 2013

SUMMARY by TYPE of CAMERA							
Camera Type	Calendar Year			Fiscal Year Ended June 30			
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	
Fixed	\$ 1,374,480	\$ 1,231,840	Unavailable	\$ 1,568,240	\$ 1,280,160	\$ 1,092,400	
Mobile	1,209,240	1,998,880	Unavailable	Didn't Exist	1,920,640	2,497,240	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,583,720</b>	<b>\$ 3,230,720</b>	<i>Unavailable</i>	<b>\$ 1,568,240</b>	<b>\$ 3,200,800</b>	<b>\$ 3,589,640</b>	

Source: Montgomery County Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU)



## VI. Accident/Crash Information

The Task Force obtained Olney accident data from the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) during 2004 to 2013. Accident information provided by the SHA was applicable to Route 97, Georgia Avenue from King William Drive to Market Street (northbound and southbound) as well as from Route 108 Headwaters Drive to Norwood Road (eastbound and westbound).

The Task Force notes that of the 863 reported accidents identified in the Olney area (278 on Georgia Avenue and 585 on Route 108) only 1 accident, or one tenth of one percent, was definitively associated with “Exceeding the Speed Limit.” The Task Force recognizes some accidents may have a combination of causal factors but used the SHA-provided data which the Task Force understands originates with police reports and represents the cited probable cause for the accident.

Overall, the number of Olney area accidents has declined each year since 2005, two years prior to the start of the Safe Speed Program and installation of the first cameras in Olney on Georgia Avenue. It also had also declined steadily for each of the five years before the installation of any cameras in Olney on Route 108.

The data provided by the SHA indicated the three primary reasons (i.e., “probable causes”) for 95% (820 of the 863 reported accidents) were as follows:

- 1) Failure to Give Full Attention – 37% of all accidents (36% of all accidents occurring on Route 97 and 38% of all accidents occurring on Route 108);
- 2) Failure to Yield Right of Way – 22% of all accidents (16% of all accidents occurring on Route 97 and 25% of all accidents occurring on Route 108);
- 3) Unknown or no reason provided, but not associated with the categories provided, including speeding – 35% of all accidents.

Additionally, there were 42 total accidents (4.9%) that were reported as “Too Fast for Conditions.” Of these 42 accidents, 71% of them occurred under “Wet/Snowy Weather Conditions” and 29% occurred under “Dry Conditions.” Speeding may or may not have been a contributing factor in these 42 accidents.

The decline in Olney-Sandy Spring accidents since 2005 corresponds to a decline in accidents nationwide 2005-2011. Nationwide accident rates increased slightly during 2012. The national data include all states, i.e. areas with and without speed cameras. [Source: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Traffic Safety Facts 2012 DOT HS812 032 2013, Table 3, page 21]. Further, a University of Tennessee study in 2013 found no consensus on whether the cameras contributed to safety. [Source: [www.autoblog.com/2015/02/26/us-congressman-federal-ban-traffic-cameras/?icid=autoblog](http://www.autoblog.com/2015/02/26/us-congressman-federal-ban-traffic-cameras/?icid=autoblog)].


The Task Force notes the rate of accidents declined more noticeably after the installation of the cameras. However, the Task Force also took note of other factors that may have influenced accident rates in the Olney area at the same time, meaning the cameras were not the only safety enhancement made during those years. First, the Maryland legislature passed a bill in 2010 making it a violation to use a hand held device (e.g., cell phone) while driving for either talking or texting. The new law may have influenced the decrease in accident rates both in the County and in the Olney area. For example, The National Highway Transportation Safety Administration

publications state that a driver is 23 times more likely to crash because of texting. Second, significant improvements were made at the Route 108 (Olney-Sandy Spring Road) and Spartan Road intersection since 2010 and the opening of the Fair Hill shopping center. New lane configurations were implemented and dedicated left turn signals were also introduced. The Task Force experience has been that the intersection has seen fewer accidents since the signal improvements. The Task Force does not believe the speed camera site which is located eastbound after St. Peter's can be justified by accident issues associated with the prior poor configuration of the Olney-Sandy Spring Road - Spartan Road intersection, which is three-tenths of a mile to the west (i.e., prior to traffic reaching the speed camera position).

The available data specific to the Olney area indicates that the accident rate decreased before the installation of speed cameras and continued to decline since the installation. The Task Force notes this is consistent with a national decline in accident rates in areas with and without cameras.


The following charts are derived from data provided by the SHA. The data is for the Olney area as previously defined in the first paragraph of Page 32. It represents a distance of approximately 3 miles north-south on Route 97 and 2.6 miles east-west on Route 108. Thus, the accident data are **not** solely at camera sites but are from the Olney core area and the adjacent areas for roughly a mile and a half in every direction, e.g., on Georgia Avenue northbound, the data would include any accidents that were recorded at the entrance to the Giant Food shopping center, not just at the speed camera site proper. Similarly, the Route 108 data includes accidents at the Route 108/Spartan Drive intersection near the Harris Teeter shopping center, not accidents only at the Spartan Drive and/or St. Peter's camera locations (if any).

# Georgia Avenue Crashes (King William Drive to Market Street)



Source: Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)


# MD Route 108 Crashes Headwaters Drive to Norwood Road



Source: Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)

## Olney Combined Crash Data


The following chart combines the data from the prior two charts. It represents reported accidents in the areas along Route 97, Georgia Avenue from King William Drive to Market Street (northbound and southbound) as well as Route 108 from Headwaters Drive to Norwood Road (eastbound and westbound) (see page 32 for area explanation). The chart **is not** solely accidents at the Georgia Avenue and Route 108 intersection itself.



Source: Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)

# Probable Causes of Olney Crashes over Ten Year Period 2004-2013 as Provided by the Maryland State Highway Administration

The following chart is for accidents in the areas along Route 108 from Headwaters Drive to Norwood Road (eastbound and westbound) as well as from Route 97, Georgia Avenue from King William Drive to Market Street (northbound and southbound) (see page 32 for area explanation). The chart is **not** solely accidents at the Georgia Avenue and Route 108 intersection itself.



## VII. ATEU and Speed Camera Revenues

The ATEU representatives, in multiple discussions with the Task Force have been emphatic that the speed camera program is not motivated by revenue. The ATEU indicated its budget is not derived from speed camera revenue.

The Task Force reviewed the Fiscal Year 2014, 2015, and 2016 Montgomery County Budget proposals as presented by the County Executive and concurs there is no direct funding of the ATEU by speed camera revenues. However, speed camera citation fines are included as revenue in the Police segment of the budget according to the County's Budget Summary. Other sources of police revenue include money from red light violation citations, licenses and permits, 911 fees, vehicle auction proceeds, etc. Speed camera gross revenue make up 37.1% of the estimated FY15 general fund *revenue* under the Police budget based on estimated gross collections of \$16.7 million from speed camera citations as presented in the County Executive's FY16 Operating Budget. [Source: County Executive's FY16 Operating Budget and Public Service Program FY16-21, Section 44, Police/Public Safety, page 44-6]. Data cited is gross revenue as presented in County budget.

**The Task Force notes the County's proposed FY16 budget estimate for speed camera revenues forecasts a 14% increase over actual FY14 speed camera collections despite declining accident frequencies as reported by County data. The Task Force observes the 14% revenue increase will require the County to install additional cameras in order to generate the additional funds. The Task Force also notes the County published an expanded Speed Camera Corridor and Speed Camera location listing in The Gazette on April 1, 2015.**

The total recommended MCPD general fund expenditures for FY16 from the County Executive budget are \$270,537,964, with speed cameras revenue equating to approximately 6.2 percent of the police general fund expenditure needs, up from 5.3% of the total police budget estimate for FY15. [Source: County Executive's FY16 Operating Budget and Public Service Program FY16-21, Section 44, Police/Public Safety, page 44-6].

Net revenue to the County from the speed camera program, after paying the Xerox contract fees, was \$8.271 million in FY13. [Source: Montgomery County Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU); [www.mymcpnews.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/Expenditure-Summary-March](http://www.mymcpnews.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/Expenditure-Summary-March)]

While the ATEU maintains its operations and camera placements are not revenue driven, the Task Force is concerned the County's motivations have been clouded as evidenced by a WUSA9 media report on February 24, 2014 that indicated the County would not provide refunds for approximately \$340,000 of citations issued from improperly installed camera locations. [Source WUSA9 News, February 24, 2014]. The County admitted installing several cameras (not in Olney) without providing the legally required public notice of the locations. While Prince Georges County provided refunds in a similar situation, Montgomery County took the stance that by paying the citations, the vehicle owners were admitting to the violation. That Task Force did not identify other instances of this same County behavior. Nonetheless, the Task Force believes Montgomery County has

compromised its “cameras-are not-revenue-motivated” stance by retaining funds earned from camera locations operating outside legal requirements.

The Task Force notes that federal legislation has been introduced that would ban speed cameras, except in a school zone or construction zone, due to concerns over revenue-based motivations. The Prohibited Automated Enforcement Act of 2015 (H.R. 950), introduced by a Colorado congressman, has been referred to a House of Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure subcommittee.

## VIII. Speed Limits

Excerpted from the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) website:

### WHAT IS THE 85TH PERCENTILE SPEED?

The 85th percentile speed is the speed at or below which 85 percent of the motorists drive on a given road when unaffected by slower traffic or poor weather. This speed indicates the speed that most motorists on that road consider safe and reasonable under ideal conditions. It is a good guideline for the appropriate speed limit for that road

### WILL CRASHES INCREASE IF THE SPEED LIMIT IS RAISED?

Probably not. Research has shown that the posted speed limit has little effect on the speeds at which most motorists drive. Raising the speed limit does not significantly raise the speeds at which motorists drive, and lowering the limit generally does not appreciably decrease their speeds. However, the more motorists learn from their experiences that speed limits are set at speeds that they consider safe and reasonable the greater the chances that the motorists will heed them. Speed limits significantly lower than the 85th percentile speed are ignored by many drivers and difficult to enforced

In most instances, a speed limit based on the 85th percentile reflects the expectations of the largest proportion of drivers; is found by most to be a safe and comfortable limit; facilitates speed enforcement; and offers the greatest chance of achieving some uniformity in speeds on a given road. When motorists drive at a relatively uniform speed, tailgating, lane changing, and overtaking are reduced. As a result, collisions are less likely to occur.

Those who drive much faster or slower than most of the drivers around them place themselves and others at considerable risk of a collision. When the posted limit is reasonable, enforcement can be targeted to the relatively small percentage that exceeds the speed limit. Source: [www.sha.maryland.gov](http://www.sha.maryland.gov).

## **Olney Speed Limits were lowered prior to introduction of the Speed Cameras**

In the 2008 timeframe, Olney Town Center Advisory Committee (OTAC) representatives approached SHA representatives to make the Route 108 entrance to Olney Shopping Center easier for turning vehicles and to make the Georgia Avenue/Route 108 crossing area safer for pedestrians. The OTAC representatives also had suggestions for improving the Route 108/Spartan Road intersection. The OTAC representatives advocated for a lower Route 108 speed limit.[Source: OTAC representative email response to Task Force inquiry 5/20/2015]. The OTAC speed limit views communicated to SHA were not endorsed by a GOCA vote.



The SHA responded by making several adjustments, including lowering the speed limits on Route 108 in 2009. They were lowered from 40 mph to 30 mph along Route 108 in an area extending from west of the Post Office on Olney-Laytonsville Road to midway between Prince Philip Drive and Old Baltimore Road on Olney-Sandy Spring Road. Speed monitoring cameras were installed shortly thereafter near the Post Office and Saint John's, creating two of the highest revenue producing camera sites. In 2013, speed cameras were installed on Olney-Sandy Spring Road, on the east side of Olney. The westbound camera on Olney-Sandy Spring Road is located near to or approaching Spartan Road, while the eastbound camera on Olney-Sandy Spring Road is near Saint Peter's, with the eastbound camera becoming the top, or one of the top, revenue producing cameras in the county.

The Task Force notes that prior to the OTAC requested lower speed limit, the original Route 108 speed limit of 40 mph was based on the SHA-recommended 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed for Olney-Laytonsville Road and Olney-Sandy Spring Road.

The Task Force recommends that SHA modify the speed limit east bound on Olney-Sandy Spring Road, beginning immediately after Spartan Road, to be 35 mph, providing for a safe incremental transition speed approaching the current 40 mph section of Olney-Sandy Spring Road east of Prince Philip Drive.(See Recommendation 6).

The Task Force Recommends that SHA return the 40 mph to 30 mph changeover point on Olney-Laytonsville Rd (Route 108, near the Post Office) to Homeland Drive for both east and westbound traffic. Moving the 40 mph point back to Homeland Drive returns the Olney-Laytonsville Road speed limit back to what it was in 2009, while maintaining the current 30 mph speed limit before the Olney Library and through the Olney core commercial center where OTAC and some residents are concerned about access to the shopping center and library.(See Recommendation 7).

## **IX. The Speed Camera Program Lacks Data Reliability and Transparency**

The Task Force notes although the ATEU representatives were cooperative in providing some data for this report, there was significant difficulty receiving timely, accurate, and complete data from the Xerox contractor and/or ATEU. Further, publicly available data is only available at a summary level and is outdated. The Task Force found the ATEU data is not made available consistent with the County Executive's public commitment to financial transparency [Source: News Releases, Montgomery County, Maryland, 7/28/2014, "*Montgomery County Unveils First Stages of Transparency Suite*"]. Finally, the Task Force notes the ATEU does not make publicly available the new sites it has under consideration, wait times for decisions or routine information on why specific new camera sites require a camera.

The Task Force requested both fiscal and calendar year data from the ATEU on at least three separate occasions. There were multiple, material discrepancies among the various data provided. Accordingly, the Task

Force submitted supplemental data requests. In some instances, the ATEU could not account for the discrepancies. The data integrity problems included cameras labeled as eastbound in some reports and westbound in others; camera locations mislabeled; and citation data and vehicle pass data completely omitted for Olney camera locations for certain time periods.

As noted in Section III of this report, the Task Force was unable to obtain all of the data it sought for its review as the ATEU indicated the data was proprietary information owned and controlled by Xerox. The Task Force believes the County erred in signing a contract that gave the vendor, rather than the County, ownership of the citation data. We also note that Xerox was unable to provide accurate and complete data when requested by the Task Force, giving the Task Force considerable concern with the contractor's internal control process surrounding the citation program.

The Task Force requested, but the County did not provide, Zip Code information for Olney-Sandy Spring citations, thus the Task Force could not determine the share of Olney-Sandy Spring citations received by residents vs. pass-through commuters. (The Task Force notes that knowing who receives the citations would not change the findings or recommendations of the report).

The Task Force also requested vehicle speed information for all of the citations issued from the eight primary cameras located in Olney-Sandy Spring in FY 2014. Unfortunately the ATEU stated this data is maintained by the vendor (i.e., Xerox) in a proprietary data base and is therefore not available to the Task Force (or presumably citizens). The Task Force was interested in obtaining a complete understanding of the Safe Speed program and therefore wanted to provide summary information within its report on the percentage of speeding citations that were issued for each one mph over the speed limit tolerance. This was of interest because in its 2012 report the Montgomery County Public Safety Committee along with the Office of Legislative Oversight has stated in the past that 32% of all speeding citations were exactly 1 mile per hour over the speed limit tolerance.[Source: PS Committee #1, September 13, 2012, Memorandum of September 11, 2012 from Susan J. Farag, Legislative Analyst, Subject: Update- Speed and Red Light Camera Programs, page 44].See [http://www6.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/council/pdf/agenda/cm/2012/120913/20120913\\_PS1.pdf](http://www6.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/council/pdf/agenda/cm/2012/120913/20120913_PS1.pdf) The Task Force sought detailed citation data that would have allowed the Task Force to provide updated data to show at what speeds over the tolerance threshold most citations were given, but the County did not provide that data.

In an effort to gain a complete understanding of the County's Traffic Cameras Speed Monitoring Program, the Task Force reviewed documents published on the county's website as well as videos and agenda materials for the County's Public Safety Committee. Unfortunately, in the course of completing this research it became apparent that a different set of numbers were being referred to by public officials that were not in agreement with other documents shown on the County's website. An example of this is a document that was published and distributed to the County's Public Safety Committee for its meeting of September 13, 2012. Although the meeting occurred eleven weeks into the new fiscal year, estimated and not actual gross revenue information was provided for the prior fiscal year citations.

The Montgomery County Police Department – Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit website provides a historical summary by Fiscal Year (FY) summarizing the number of citations and revenues generated for both the speed and red light cameras. Unfortunately the information that is shown on this website and available to the general public has not been updated in quite some time. For example, as of May 2015, the website is updated with data only through March 2014. There is no citation or revenue information shown on the website for the current fiscal year (FY15), which began more than 10 ½ months ago on July 1, 2014.

Reviewing a different section of the county website, which provides actual fiscal year information, indicated there were significant differences between its information and that which had been provided to the Public Safety Committee eleven weeks into a new fiscal year for the prior fiscal year. Shown below is a summary of the two sources of information along with their corresponding differences.

Source	FY 2012 Camera Citations Revenue		
	Speed	Red Light	Total
Information per ATEU Website (actual)	\$13,905,521	\$1,919,602	\$15,825,123
Information per Public Safety Document (estimated)	\$11,999,870	\$1,645,330	\$13,645,200
<b>Difference or Understatement</b>	<b>\$1,905,651</b>	<b>\$274,272</b>	<b>\$2,179,923</b>
<b>Percent Difference</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>

**Data integrity and transparency must be improved:** Providing both current and reliable information is an example of good governance, transparency, and a prerequisite of soundly managed financial programs. Posting of outdated information and the inability to provide accurate statistical information undermines the credibility of the Safe Speed program. Publishing accurate and up-to-date current information should be the standard that is followed in order to avoid public policy and law enforcement program decisions being made based upon information that is materially different from actual information. Citation and other program data should be the property of the County, not the proprietary data of the camera contractor. The Task Force also notes that the ATEU does not publish any information on pending citizen requests for camera installations or the justifications under review. The Task Force suggests this data also be made available on the ATEU website so that communities can monitor pending actions and provide input as appropriate.

# X. Conclusions

The GOCA Traffic Cameras Task Force found:

- A. In CY 2013, Olney-Sandy Spring was the number one citation area in all of Montgomery County, incurring 31% more speed camera citations than the second-highest grossing area, Silver Spring, despite 7.7 million fewer vehicle passes (i.e. less traffic) in Olney-Sandy Spring. Olney-Sandy Spring generated more citations than all 10 speed cameras in Bethesda combined, and more than twice the citations than all six cameras in Montgomery Village combined. The disproportionate citation level in Olney-Sandy Spring is unexplained by pre- or post-camera accident data. The Task Force makes several recommendations to lessen the disproportionate citation impact on the Olney-Sandy Spring area (see Page 4).
- B. The revenue from the Olney-Sandy Spring speed cameras amounted to approximately \$3.4 million in CY 2013 (13 cameras), higher than any other location in the County for this time period. It also generated an additional \$3.6 million in FY 2014 from its eight primary cameras. Montgomery County budgets are becoming increasingly reliant on increased speed camera revenue. In 2015, speed camera revenue was 5.3% of the Police budget. For FY2016, speed camera revenue is projected to be 6.2% of the Police budget. The County is forecasting speed camera revenue for FY2016 to be a 14% increase over FY2014 collections. The Task Force is concerned this increasing reliance on growing speed camera revenue creates a situation where the County must install more and more cameras in order to generate enough citations to meet growing future budget requirements. The increased reliance on speed camera revenue is another reason to make the camera installation process more transparent, so that citizens can see the safety related purpose for each camera site/future camera site.
- C. The Task Force found the ATEU operates the County's Safe Speed Program with personal commitment and integrity. The Safe Speed program has not suffered from allegations of camera inaccuracy and other shortcomings associated with some other camera programs (i.e. Baltimore). The commitment of the CAB-TI members is also evident and appreciated. The Safe Speed program has shown that it decreases traffic speeds (as measured by numbers of citations) at camera locations over time.
- D. Montgomery County should strengthen the Safe Speed program transparency, data integrity, balanced citizen input, and oversight of the camera contractor as recommended in this report.

The GOCA Traffic Cameras Task Force has provided several recommendations to ensure that the County strengthens the transparency of the Safe Speed program, improves the data integrity of the program operated by the ATEU and the Safe Speed contract vendor, and for GOCA and the County Council to take steps to reduce the disproportionate financial impact of the speed camera program on Olney-Sandy Spring residents and visitors given the lack of demonstrated safety problems in the associated camera areas.

The GOCA Traffic Cameras Task Force requests that GOCA formally transmit this report to the Montgomery County Executive, the Montgomery County Council, the Montgomery County Police Department, the Montgomery County Inspector General, appropriate District Delegates and the State Highway Administration, for review and action as appropriate.

Finally, the Task Force has significant concern with the materially higher level of ticketing in Olney-Sandy Spring as it is profoundly disproportionate to either demonstrated Olney safety concerns or to the levels of ticketing elsewhere in the County (thus bringing into question the efficacy or necessity of the subjectively reduced speed limits in Olney-Sandy Spring). The Task Force has also taken note of movements elsewhere in the nation to repeal or curb speed camera programs due to real and perceived lack of fairness to local populations. The financial impact on Olney-Sandy Spring and its visitors, including commuters, is significant at over \$3.6 million per year. The financial impact is particularly concerning given that the speed cameras were introduced after speed limits were reduced based on limited community requests without corresponding speed studies. The disproportionate impact on the Olney-Sandy Spring area brings into question the efficacy of the program. Accordingly, the Task Force presents in Section XI a resolution for presentation to GOCA delegates, and further recommends a plebiscite decide the future direction of the County's Safe Speed Program.

## **XI. Task Force Recommendation for GOCA Resolution**

The Task Force, through the submission of this report to the GOCA Officers, hereby introduces the following resolution:

### **GOCA Resolution on the County Speed Camera Program**

Whereas the geographic area within Montgomery County with the highest number of speed camera citations is Olney-Sandy Spring with 85,451 citations and \$3.4 million in fines in calendar year 2013, significantly higher than any other locale in the County; and

Whereas Olney had three of the top five grossing speed cameras in Montgomery County and five of the top twenty grossing cameras in calendar year 2013; and

Whereas in calendar year 2013 Olney-Sandy Spring received 31 percent more citations than the second highest ranking speed camera locale, Silver Spring, despite having 7.7 million or 30% fewer vehicle passes, and Olney-Sandy Spring citations were more than all ten Bethesda speed cameras combined, and were more than twice the number of tickets than Montgomery Village's six speed cameras combined; and

Whereas Olney-Sandy Spring speed camera citations in CY 2013 were 5.7 times greater than the overall county average by geographic location and vehicles traveling in Olney-Sandy Spring were 3.4 times more likely to pass a speed monitoring camera than elsewhere in Montgomery County; and

Whereas accident rates in the Olney area, either before or after camera installation, do not explain the high number of Olney-Sandy Spring camera locations or citations;

**Now therefore be it resolved** that the Greater Olney Civic Association (GOCA) should formally transmit the Camera Task Force Report to the Montgomery County Executive, the County Council, the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) and ATEU, the Montgomery County Inspector General, appropriate District Delegates, and the State Highway Administration, asking that the County's elected officials take action to eliminate the disproportionate impact of the camera program on the Olney-Sandy Spring area by implementing the following recommendations:

1. Consistent with the Montgomery County Executive's stated commitment to transparency, the ATEU should publish to its website on a monthly basis speed camera citations and vehicle pass volumes by camera location.

2. Montgomery County should revise the Citizen's Advisory Board for Traffic Issues (CAB-TI) applicable to the speed camera program, ensuring the Board is selected independently of the MCPD and ATEU, has established term limits, represents the full spectrum of views on the efficacy of speed camera usage, and that its views shall be considered by the ATEU.
3. Montgomery County should appoint, fully independent of the MCPD, ATEU, and Local Designee, a Citizen's Advocate to represent the citizens and communities regarding speed camera use, placement, and other concerns.
4. Montgomery County should modify the speed camera contract to stipulate that all data captured on each citation shall be the property of the County, not the vendor, and that such data on citations, citation camera location, ticketed speed, etc. will be provided to the ATEU and published on the county website (protecting all Personally Identifiable Information (PII)).
5. The ATEU should be provided with the appropriate funding to implement the internal controls, data integrity, and transparency improvements included in the GOCA Traffic Cameras Task Force report. Such funding should come from the positive net revenue generated by the speed camera fines, consistent with the stated public safety purposes for which speed camera net revenues are authorized to be used. This net revenue funding should also be utilized to address the substantial backlog of citizen's requests for speed monitoring cameras.
6. The SHA should modify the speed limit east bound on Olney-Sandy Spring Road, beginning immediately after Spartan Road, to be 35 mph, providing for a safe incremental speed approaching the current 40 mph section of Olney-Sandy Spring Road east of Prince Philip Drive.
7. The Task Force Recommends that SHA return the 40 mph to 30 mph changeover point on Olney-Laytonsville Rd (Route 108, near the Post Office) to Homeland Drive for both east and westbound traffic. Moving the 40 mph point back to Homeland Drive returns the Olney-Laytonsville Road speed limit back to what it was in 2009, while maintaining the current 30 mph speed limit before the Olney Library and through the Olney core commercial center.
8. The SHA should modify the speed limit on Georgia Avenue between King William Drive and Sandy Spring Bank to be 35mph, providing for a safe incremental speed between the existing 40mph roadway south of King William Drive and the 30mph area in the core Olney commercial center.
9. Montgomery County should take steps to have a plebiscite determine the future direction of the Safe Speed Program.

## **XII. GOCA Traffic Cameras Task Force Membership**

Gary Manion, Chairman

Perry Buckberg

Benson King

Lee Lofthus

Alex Tordella

Anthony Watkins

The GOCA Task Force is committed to safe Olney-Sandy Spring pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle travel and submits this report to GOCA for action with the County.