



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: Jose (Joe) R. Ramos, Jr., P.E., Acting Director, Public Works Department

DATE: March 17, 2008

SUBJECT: Urban Transportation Commission Recommendations

At the March 11, 2008 meeting of the Urban Transportation Commission, the following recommendations were made:

1. Consider a Regulation Amendment to allow Decals be displayed on Taxicabs that qualify as Low-emission Vehicles

Motion: To recommend that the City Council Amend Section 13-2-386 of the Transportation Code to allow decals to be displayed on taxicabs that qualify as low-emission vehicles.

Motion passed 5 ayes / 3 absent.

2. Recommendation to support the installation of red light cameras at certain intersections

Motion: To support the installation of red light cameras at nine intersections identified by the Transportation Division of Public Works and the enforcement to be reviewed by Austin Police Department.

Motion passed 4 ayes / 1 abstained / 1 nay / 2 absent.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 974-8755.

Thank you,

  
Jose (Joe) R. Ramos, Jr., P.E., Acting Director  
Public Works Department

cc: Marc Ott, City Manager  
Rudy Garza, Assistant City Manager  
Gene Acuna, PIO



---

# Red Light Camera Project



# Red Light Cameras

- On a national basis red light running results annually in:
  - 200,000 crashes, 170,000 injuries, and 900 deaths
  - 47% of crashes result in injury
- Analysis of data (Safety Evaluation of Red-Light Cameras) from seven jurisdictions at 132 intersections using red light cameras found:
  - 25% decrease of total right-angle crashes
  - 16% decrease of injury right-angle crashes
  - 15% increase of total rear-end crashes
  - 24% increase of injury rear-end crashes
- Economic analysis showed that red light cameras saved society \$39,000 to \$50,000 annually at each intersection where they are installed. (Right angle crashes result in greater damage and more serious injury)



# Revenue

---

- Under SB 1119, 50% of net revenue will be sent to the State Controller.
- The city portion of the revenue will be deposited into a traffic safety fund and used for traffic and pedestrian safety projects, traffic enforcement efforts, roadway improvement projects, and costs affiliated with the administration of the program.



# Municipal Court

---

- Letters sent by vendor to vehicle owner will be downloaded to Court to create cases
  - Options/deadlines outlined in letter and online
  - Customer can view video online or at Court
- Customers can:
  - Pay online, over phone, mail, or in person
  - File affidavit for “sold vehicle, other person driving, etc.” as listed in ordinance
  - Contest the charge and have a hearing
  - If found liable at hearing, can appeal to Judge
- Enforcement
  - Delinquent letters
  - Collection agency
  - No warrants because cases civil, not criminal



# Municipal Court

---

- Penalty & Fees
  - Maximum penalty is \$75.00 and late fee (after 30 days) is \$25.00
- Anticipated expenses:
  - Continuing: one Hearing Officer, two full time clerks, printing & postage
  - One time: Computer interface with vendor, office equipment/furniture
- Court will provide contract oversight



# Public Works

---

- Conduct an engineering investigation prior to installation of a camera as required by SB 1119.
- Purpose of investigation is to identify engineering countermeasures to red light running.



- Review the captured incidents and approve or deny all violations.



# Engineering Investigation

- Obtained from APD list of 27 intersections with highest number of red light running crashes in 2006 & 2007.
- Determined crash patterns by intersection approach.
- Evaluated signal visibility.
- Compared actual yellow + all red duration to ITE recommendation.



# Investigation Results

---

- 7 intersections eliminated due to construction during 2006/2007.
- 7 intersections eliminated due to low number of collisions per approach.
- Yellow + all red increased by 0.5 seconds at 2 intersections per ITE.
- Design modifications to improve signal conspicuity at 3 intersections.



# Investigation Results

---

- Red light cameras recommended at 10 approaches at 9 intersections.



# Recommended Camera Locations

---

- MoPac NB & Howard/Wells Branch- EB approach ( 9 collisions)
- MoPac SB & Howard/Wells Branch- EB approach ( 8 collisions)
- Lamar EF & Ben White EB(SF)-EB approach ( 9 collisions)
- MoPac SB Svc Rd & US Hwy 290 EB-EB approach ( 10 collisions)
- I 35 NB Svc Rd & 11<sup>th</sup>- NB & EB approach (12/15 collisions)



## Locations (continued)

---

- I 35 SB Svc Rd & 15<sup>th</sup>- SB approach ( 9 collisions)
- Riverside & Pleasant Valley- SB approach ( 10 collisions)
- Lamar WF & Ben White (or Capital of TX) WB/NB- WB approach ( 10 collisions)
- I 35 SB Svc Rd & MLK- WB approach ( 12 collisions)

<p><b>Andrew J. Bucknall</b> Chair</p> <p><b>Rich MacKinnon</b> Vice-chair</p> <p><b>Ed Easton</b></p> <p><b>Patrick Goetz</b></p> <p><b>Melissa Hawthorne</b></p> <p><b>Dustin Lanier</b></p> <p><b>Dana Lockler</b></p> <p><b>Carl H. Tepper</b></p>	<p>Place 1</p> <p>Place 3</p> <p>Place 6</p> <p>Consensus</p> <p>Mayor Pro Tem</p> <p>Place 5</p> <p>Place 2</p> <p>Mayor</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Urban Transportation Commission Meeting Agenda</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Austin City Hall 301 West 2nd Street Boards and Commission Room, #1101</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">March 11, 2008 <b>Tuesday</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6:00 P.M.</b></p>
--	---	--	---

1. Citizen's Communications  
The first four (4) speakers signed up to speak will be allowed three minutes to address their concerns.
2. Introduction of Public Works Acting Director Joe Ramos, P.E.
3. Plans for Connector Buses at Rail Stops  
Update by: John-Michael Cortez, Capital Metro
4. Simplification of The Dillo Routes  
Update by: John-Michael Cortez, Capital Metro
5. General Overview of Towing Procedures  
Presentation by: Robert Loosier, Detective, Office of Wrecker Enforcement, Austin Police Department
6. Consider a Taxicab Regulation Amendment that will allow Decals to be displayed on Taxicabs that qualify as Low-emission Vehicles  
Update by: Ronnie Bell, Transportation Engineer, Public Works  
Memorandum from Fred Blood, Manager Austin Energy
7. Red Light Camera Project  
Presentation by: Ronnie Bell, Transportation Engineer, Public Works
8. Review proposed changes to Section 13-2-388, Advertising on Taxicabs Permitted, of Chapter 13-2, Ground Transportation Services, of the Code of Ordinances. These changes are proposed in accordance with City Council Resolution 20071108-128, approved November 8, 2007, concerning amendments to certain advertising regulations  
Presentation by: Jessica Kingpetcharat, Principal Planner, Watershed Protection and Development Review, and Steve Grassfield, Transportation Regulatory Manager, Public Works

9. Projected Transportation Projects for City Council Action
10. Approval of Minutes from the January 29, 2008 Meeting
11. Approval of Minutes from the February 12, 2008 Meeting
12. Announcement of Upcoming Events
13. Committee and Commission Reports
  - Downtown Commission – Goetz
    - a. CMTA Subcommittee – MacKinnon
    - b. Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee – Goetz
    - c. CAMPO Subcommittee – MacKinnon
    - d. Ground Transportation Subcommittee – Tepper
    - e. LUT Subcommittee – Bucknall
    - f. TOD Subcommittee – Easton
    - g. SCIP Subcommittee – Lockler
14. Future Agenda Items
  - Meeting date – Work Session
  - TIA update
15. Adjourn

The Commission may take items in any order, and may take action on any item.

Direct any questions on this agenda or the Commission to Gilda Powers at the Public Works Department, 974-7092.

March 11, 2008

Future Transportation Items for City Council Action Information

None

Signal Phasing / Lane Assignment Change Information

San Antonio Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Street - Added a Left Turn Signal for Eastbound Traffic on 15<sup>th</sup> Street, and installed timing changes to make the turn protected/permissive for both eastbound and westbound left turns.

Riverside Drive and American Statesman - "Split" out the Pedestrian Signals to cross Riverside Drive, to avoid both automatically coming up together.

## Minutes

**Urban Transportation Commission  
Tuesday, March 11, 2008 6:00 P.M.  
303 W. 2nd Street  
Boards and Commissions Room**

**Members Present:**

Andrew Bucknall  
Melissa W. Hawthorne  
Ed Easton  
Carl Tepper  
Richard MacKinnon  
Patrick Goetz

**Members Absent:**

Dustin Lanier  
Dana Lockler

**Public Works Staff Present:**

Jose (Joe) R. Ramos  
Ronnie Bell  
Joana Perez  
Steve Grassfield  
Leanne Vaughn

Mr. Bucknall opened the Urban Transportation Commission meeting at 6:10 p.m.

**1. Citizens Communications**

Ms. Betsy Bird, with the Texas Commission for Environmental Quality (TCEQ), expressed her gratitude, and that of her agency for the support given by the UTC members and staff to the program that serves as an umbrella to the Clean Cities Initiative. She spoke in support of the Amendment that will allow decals to be displayed on Taxicabs that qualify as Low-emission Vehicles.

Mr. Andrew Clements, citizen, addressed the Commissioners and expressed his concerns about the rush to develop the area behind the Seaholm Power Plant, specifically the Green Water Treatment Plant. Mr. Clements said the City needs to consider the different areas where rail or mass transit could be an option before it continues the development of these areas. He stated that per the City Charter, the City Council is not allowed to sell or lease a substantial part of a City controlled utility. Commissioner Easton asked about the eastern curve issue that was presented in the past by Mr. Clements. Mr. Clements said that the property has not been sold yet and has not come to the City Council for approval.

Commissioner MacKinnon commented that the eastern curve was viewed by Capital Metro as not necessary to be controlled by them. He would like to hear more about this before the city loses control of the area.

## **2. Introduction of Public Works Department Acting Director Jose (Joe) R. Ramos, P.E.**

Public Works Department Acting Director Jose (Joe) R. Ramos, P.E. introduced himself to the Commissioners and gave a brief overview of his tenure with the City. He also answered general questions regarding the interaction of the Public Works Department with other groups or City Departments that have an impact on transportation issues.

Commissioner Hawthorne asked for a brief explanation on how the Public Works projects tie together with other Departments. Mr. Ramos explained that in most cases it depends on the type of project. The Public Works Department, in most part, reviews and conveys standards and specifications to ensure that regulations are followed correctly, and works closely with CAMPO, other State Agencies, and several Boards and Commissions. The Public Works staff is constantly trying to address the transportation issues that concern to the citizens of Austin.

Commissioner Hawthorn and Chair Bucknall thanked Mr. Ramos for his visit.

## **3. Plans for Connector Buses at Rail Stops**

John-Michael Cortez, Community Relations Specialist with Capital Metro, introduced Meredith Highsmith, with the Capital Metro Task Force. Mr. Cortez also wanted to clarify that in the last meeting he had stated the wrong number of books sold on line. He will review the numbers and update the Commission either via electronic mail or during the next meeting.

Ms. Highsmith gave a presentation about the Capital Metro Red Line and the conceptual connector service, including a brief overview of the nine passenger rail stations. Ms. Highsmith stated that the Red Line is scheduled to open in late 2008 with nine passenger rail stations and three of those will offer Park & Ride facilities. The initial service will be offered during weekday morning and afternoon peak hours and will operate at 30 minute intervals. She presented a matrix with the different stations and the time it is estimated to take to go from point A to point B. Many express and local bus schedules will be adjusted to meet commuter trains. New connector services will provide direct connections from select Red Line stations to key destinations with parking available at three suburban rail stations. One of the key issues Capital Metro will be promoting is the employer-sponsored shuttles to encourage employees to use the service. She gave detailed information on each one of the stations and the services each will offer to the public. The next steps of the conceptual connector service are public involvement, finalizing routing and schedules, and start-up of the Red Line in late 2008.

Chair Bucknall asked if the Paratransit service that is offered at the Plaza Saltillo Rail Station is only for that station or is it be offered throughout Austin. Ms. Highsmith said the service is currently offered in Austin as part of the Capital Metro services to the community and it will continue when the rail opens.

## **4. Simplification of the Dillo Routes**

Ms. Meredith Highsmith also gave an overview of the history of the Dillo and the Task

Force. The Dillo system has been in operation since the 1970's and was first introduced by the City of Austin. In its peak it served up to 5000 passengers daily with four Dillo routes in the late 1990. Today the Dillo serves approximately 4200 passengers with eight routes in operation. The Task Force was first installed in 1999-2000 to address specific key target markets identified during a review. These markets included circulation and Park & Ride for downtown employees, and circulation of visitors and other Convention Center attendees. The current Task Force was formed in 2007 to begin restructuring the existing system. This proposed restructuring is schedule to be implemented in August 2008 to increase rider ship and decrease the number of vehicles citizens need to conduct business in the downtown area.

Ms. Highsmith explained the difference between the circulating routes versus the linear routes that currently cover downtown, and the changes that are happening in the downtown area that have an effect on the use of the Dillo routes. She also mentioned some of the recommendations that the Task Force has identified, such as hours of operation, fares, type of vehicles to be used, a countdown LED to let riders know when the next Dillo is approaching, and more linear routes to serve Congress Avenue and 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> Streets as the north/south and east/west corridors.

Commissioner Easton asked if a countdown would be necessary if the Dillo has a specific route and schedule to follow. Ms. Highsmith responded that technically it is not needed, but that the Task Force felt strongly about it and included it as part of their recommendations.

Commissioner Tepper asked the reasons why sometimes the Dillos stack-up in the streets or do not come when scheduled. Ms. Highsmith said the issue is being looked into as part of this reorganization process.

Chair Bucknall asked if the current five routes would be reduced to two routes and how will this affect the students. Ms. Highsmith explained that the proposed changes are not official yet but that routes may be consolidated and consideration is being given to different scenarios using regular buses to move the passengers around.

## **5. General Overview of the Towing Procedures**

Detective Robert Loosier with the Austin Police Department Wrecker Enforcement Unit, gave a detailed presentation of the City's Towing Procedures. Detective Loosier said that according to Texas Law, cities can regulate towing by licensing the tow truck operators, if the tow truck operator performs tows in the city that were not initiated by the owner or driver of the vehicle, and by regulating the fees for tows that were not initiated by the owner or operator of the vehicle. Detective Loosier stated that Chapter 13-6 of the City Code is the City Ordinance on vehicle transportation services and it says that a person may not perform non-consent tows in the city without a tow truck operator's license issued under this article and the tow truck operator must display the operator's license while performing a non-consent tow. Detective Loosier explained that the towing rules allow the Chief of Police a certain amount of latitude to change zones and times to keep traffic moving, and allow for the denial of license to undesirable or unsafe applicants.

Detective Loosier explained the difference between non-consent tows and towing from crash scenes. The Austin Police Department has a rotation list depending on the incident.

The approved companies participate in Traffic Incident Management (TIM) and on the Rush Hour Rotation List. These wreckers must respond within 20 minutes. Tow companies assigned to specific zones, are responsible for all collisions occurring in that zone during rush hour and are allowed to solicit the driver of a vehicle to have the vehicle removed from the scene. If the owner refuses, the zone tow company is still responsible for moving the vehicle from the roadway up to one mile to a place of safety at no charge. A consent tow is a tow of a vehicle initiated by the owner or operator of the vehicle but the term does not include a tow of a motor vehicle initiated by a police officer due to a collision.

Per City Ordinance 13-6-41, there are specific fees established depending on the size of the vehicle. For example the maximum towing fee for a vehicle 10,000 pounds or less is \$150.00. These fees do not include the impound facility and State fees. He also explained the difference between police impounds of a vehicle and a private property impound.

Chair Bucknall asked for the fees of a consent tow. Detective Loosier explained that consent tows are not regulated or controlled by the Austin Police Department. It is an agreement between a customer and a tow company. He also explained that as of January 1, 2008, the licensing of tow trucks, storage facilities and its employees that were performed by the Texas Department of Transportation (TX DOT), has been transferred to the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (TDLR). He also stated that nothing will change for the City of Austin and all ordinances and procedures will remain in place.

Chair Bucknall asked if the City has had any input on the type of payment that a towing company can accept and if there is a requirement to have that information on the towing sign. Detective Loosier said that the City Ordinance that was passed in August of 2006 states that a towing company has to accept cash or a major credit card as a method of payment. In regards to the posting of a method of payment on the sign, he said there is none and the only time a citizen is informed of this is when they are read their Bill of Rights by an officer. Chair Bucknall asked about the procedure to file a complaint against a tow company. Detective Loosier said there are three avenues, first with the State; second by calling 311; and third, the complaint could be filed with a Justice of the Peace at a hearing.

Commissioner MacKinnon stated that there are some hidden fees associated with a tow. As examples he said there is the Taxicab fee, the ATM fees, etc. which can be very expensive. He said that in his particular case, the impound facility did not want to take credit card payment. Detective Loosier said that if a towing facility or company does not accept a credit card payment, they could be cited by the Austin Police Department for failure to comply. He also explained that in the past ordinance, if a tow truck had already backed up to the vehicle, the owner would have to pay \$15.00 whether the vehicle was towed or not. In the new ordinance, if a tow truck is not fully prepared for transport, the owner can stop the tow and there should be no charge, but if it is fully hooked up the owner could pay a maximum of \$50.00, cash or credit card, and take the vehicle right then and there.

Lt. Ken Cannaday, with Austin Police Department, addressed the Commissioners to clarify some points in regards to the decision to let the towing companies be outside the city limits. For logistical reasons the decision was made to let some of these companies be located at a maximum of 5000 feet outside the city limits. Commissioner Tepper asked

about the towing regulations inside a private property. Lt. Cannaday explained that is a contract between the property owner and a particular towing company to enforce some of their own rules. He also explained that the City could only regulate the non-consent tows and some of the responsibilities of the two detectives that work the Austin Police Department Wrecker Unit are to ensure these towing companies stay in compliance with the law and investigate complaints from citizens.

Commissioner Easton asked about the total fees that are charged once the vehicle is impounded. Lt. Cannaday said that the city regulates the initial \$150.00 fee for the towing of the vehicle, but the State regulates the storage facility fee and the fees charged once the vehicle gets there cannot be altered by the towing facility.

Commissioner Tepper asked how the City Council came up with the \$150.00 towing fee that seems to be excessive in comparison with a consent tow fee charged by a private company. Lt. Cannaday said that the City Council made the determination based on recommendations by towing companies. He also explained that the Austin Police Department has jurisdiction over the towing company and their facility even though their lot is outside the city limits because the violation occurred inside the limits.

Chair Bucknall asked if there was a State mandate for towing companies to accept credit card payments. Lt. Cannaday said it is a city ordinance and even if the towing facility is located outside the city limits, the incident occurred within the City of Austin, therefore the payment rules apply and the towing company will be held accountable for non-compliance. He also explained that in the event of a violation, the best way to report a problem is by calling 311.

Commissioner Tepper asked if there was anything that could be done to regulate the amount of loading zones that are all over downtown. Ronnie Bell, Engineer with Public Works, said that it is a Public Works issue and it could be addressed in a future meeting.

Commissioner MacKinnon asked for clarification regarding when a vehicle is in a wreck, if a driver can call a particular tow company. Detective Loosier said that the driver can call any company as long as it is on APD's approved towing company list.

Chair Bucknall thanked the Austin Police Department Detectives for their presentation and the job they do on a daily basis.

The Commissioners discussed at length different options for towing signage and decided to add this issue to next meeting's agenda.

**6. Consider a Taxicab Regulation Amendment that will allow Decals to be displayed on Taxicabs that qualify as Low-emission Vehicles**

Ronnie Bell, Engineer with Public Works, briefly reviewed the issue that was presented on the February 12, 2008 meeting. He said that after further discussions with the TCEQ, it was determined that the proposed amendment to the current regulation covers a broader spectrum and it would not interfere with their current rules. Mr. Bell explained that the current ordinance states that all vehicles in a particular fleet are required to have the same identical markings, therefore if there is one vehicle that qualifies as low-emission, the Taxicab company could not identify just that one vehicle as low-emission. The proposed

amendment will allow the Taxicab companies to display a decal on any vehicle in their fleet that qualifies as low-emission not just hybrid vehicles like the current TCEQ provision.

**Motion by:** Patrick Goetz

**Seconded by:** Carl Tepper

**Motion:** Consider a Regulation Amendment to allow decals be displayed on Taxicabs that qualify as Low-emission Vehicles

**Ayes:** Bucknall/MacKinnon/Tepper/Easton/Goetz

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Hawthorne/Lanier/Lockler

## **7. Red Light Camera Project**

Mr. Ronnie Bell also presented the City's project for the installation of Red Light Cameras at identified intersections. Mr. Bell said that statistics show that red light running is a problem not only in Austin but throughout the nation. For this reason the Transportation Division Engineers have been working towards the identification of the intersections that have had the most accidents in a certain period of time and that were caused by drivers running red lights.

Mr. Bell explained that during the past legislative session, Senate Bill 1119 was passed to modify the rules under which cities can implement this project. These new rules said that 50% of the net revenue will be sent to the State Controller. The city portion of the revenue will be deposited into a traffic safety fund and used for traffic and pedestrian safety projects, traffic enforcement efforts, roadway improvement projects, and costs affiliated with the administration of the program. The City has contracted with a company to administer the project and procedures have been set in place to enforce it and do the necessary follow up. He said that after the picture is taken, it will be reviewed by a police officer to ensure there is a real violation. Once the Police Department determines there is a violation, letters will be mailed to the owner of the vehicle with a copy to Municipal Court for follow up, if necessary. The letter will have information on the procedures to take care of the citation and the options to pay the fine or to contest the charge with a Municipal Court Judge. For the enforcement part there will be delinquency letters and the owner of the vehicle could be turned over to a collection agency. No warrants will be issued because it is a civil case not a criminal case.

Mr. Bell said that the maximum penalty is \$75.00 with a late fee after 30 days. These fees will pay for the anticipated expenses of hiring one officer and two full time clerks, printing and postage, computer interface with the vendor, and office equipment and furniture. The Court will provide for the contract oversight. One of the requirements the State law included was that before a city could installed a red light camera at any intersection, an engineering study must be conducted to identify if there were any countermeasures that could be implemented instead of installing the red light camera. The Transportation Division Engineers worked with the Austin Police Department to obtain a list that contained 27 intersections with the highest number of accidents caused by vehicles running red lights during 2006 and 2007. They determined crash patterns, signal

visibility, and the duration of the yellow and all-red lights. The investigation results eliminated 17 of these intersections. The staff recommended that red light cameras be installed at 10 approaches at 9 intersections. These locations are listed on Appendix A.

Chair Bucknall asked if the presentation has gone before the Public Safety Task Force. Mr. Bell said that he did not know. Commissioner Tepper said that this was the Public Safety Task Force issue and was supported by Council Member Martinez. Commissioner Easton asked for more clarification on how the revenue would be split between the state and the city and he was concerned that there would not be much going towards the public safety fund as stated in the Senate Bill. Mr. Bell explained that the fee of \$75.00 will cover all operating expenses and that 50% of the net revenue, after all administrative costs have been paid, is the amount that would go to the State.

Commissioner MacKinnon asked if the cameras would be easy for the drivers to see to serve also as a deterrent. Mr. Bell said that there will be signs at the intersections where the cameras are located indicating the intersection is a Red Light Enforcement Intersection. He also explained that the officer conducting the review will be able to identify conditions that could have prevented the driver from stopping on time, i.e. weather. Chair Bucknall said that knowing there is an actual person reviewing the cases instead of a computer makes it easier to support this issue. The commissioners asked for clarification on vehicles that have already entered the intersection, either to make a left turn or behind another vehicle, when the light turns red. Mr. Bell explained that the red light camera enforcement is for vehicles that are approaching the intersection and could have stopped but chose not to do so.

**Motion by:** Melissa Hawthorne

**Seconded by:** Ed Easton

**Motion:** To support the installation of red light cameras at nine intersections identified by the Transportation Division of Public Works and the enforcement to be reviewed by Austin Police Department.

**Ayes:** Bucknall/Hawthorne/Easton/MacKinnon

**Nays:** Tepper

**Abstain:** Goetz

**Absent:** Lanier/Lockler

8. **Review proposed changes to Section 13-2-399. Advertising on Taxicabs Permitted, of Chapter 13-2, Ground Transportation Services, of the Code of Ordinances. These changes are proposed in accordance with City Council Resolution 20071108-128, approved November 8, 2007, concerning amendments to certain advertising regulations.**

Ms. Jessica Kingpetcharat, Principal Planner with Watershed Protection and Development Review Department, presented a review of the proposed language changes to the current Chapter 13-2 of the Code of Ordinance pertaining to advertising on taxicabs. Ms. Kingpetcharat explained that in November of 2007, the City Council passed a resolution regarding mobile advertising, including registration requirements and fees upon taxicabs that advertise unrelated businesses. The proposed language change states that a franchise holder may affix some advertisement to a taxicab that does not obstruct the view of the

driver, the vehicles lights, or the visibility of signs or signal equipment required by the sub-chapter. For each taxicab displaying an advertisement, the franchise shall pay a fee to be regulated by a separate ordinance. This is the portion that is being presented for review and for further recommendation, and action will come at a later date.

Commissioner Hawthorne asked if there would be limitations on the type and size of the advertising. Ms. King said that at this time they have been working on the proposed changes to the language but not on specifics such as the size, square footage, etc.

Commissioner Tepper asked if this resolution was based on the trucks that have been around downtown advertising or bandit signs. Ms. King said this resolution was originated by Council Member Martinez and Mayor Pro-Tem Dunkerley with the intent to use these fees for enforcement purposes and as revenue generator. The change only applies to taxicabs and does not include Capital Metro which is exempt in the current ordinance. Ms. King also mentioned that fees have yet to be decided but they have received comments from the taxicab industry requesting that the fee comparable to that of billboards. Normally these fees are based on the cost of administering the program.

Mr. Girard Kinney, IAI, President of Scenic Austin, addressed the Commissioners to offer his support to the amendment as long as it includes all mobile advertising not only taxicabs. Mr. Kinney expressed that Scenic Austin has no objection to the idea of imposing a fee as a method of paying for enforcement. He also said that he would like the UTC to take a look at all forms of advertising on roadways, not only for aesthetic reasons but for safety issues as they distract drivers.

Ms. Kingpetcharat clarified that the purpose of their presentation was for review purposes only, not for approval or recommendation for action. That would be an item for the next UTC meeting. Commissioner Tepper mentioned that taxi drivers are already paying high prices on gasoline and he feels that imposing another fee on them would not be such a good idea. Commissioner Hawthorne said she would like to see some regulation not only on the content but on the size of the signs.

Mr. Steve Grassfield, Transportation Regulatory Manager with Public Works, explained that the size of advertisement and decals on taxicabs is regulated but not the content. Commissioner Goetz said that this issue attacks a particular group and he feels that it is fundamentally wrong. Commissioner Easton said he would like to see a set fee before he can give his approval to this change. Mr. Grassfield said that the fee could be collected by the Transportation Division at the same time the taxi drivers come in for their inspection which is once a year. He also said that he would estimate a fee of maybe a \$10.00. Mr. Ronnie Bell said that the amount is one that the Transportation Division has proposed to cover the administrative costs, but once the resolution goes to Council for approval it could be changed.

Commissioner MacKinnon said he had concerns regarding the two topics that have been included, the surcharge to taxicabs for advertising, and the language on the other billboard issues. Ms. Kingpetcharat clarified the billboard ordinance that has been in effect since the late 1990's which specifically says that no new billboards should be installed in the City of Austin but that a sign could be relocated to a different site. She also said that there had been a stakeholders meeting that included the City of Austin, taxicab franchises, Scenic Austin, Capital Metro and the Billboard industry, and that out of this meeting there was

one agreement, that this resolution be addressed in three components: billboards, mobile advertisement, and taxicabs. The taxicabs portion is what has been presented to the UTC for review.

**9. Projected Transportation Projects for City Council Action**

**10. Approval of Minutes from the January 29, 2008 Meeting**

**Motion by:** Melissa Hawthorne  
**Seconded by:** Ed Easton

**Motion:** To approve the minutes.

**Ayes:** Bucknall/Easton/Hawthorne/MacKinnon/Goetz  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** Tepper  
**Absent:** Lanier/Lockler

**11. Approval of Minutes from the February 12, 2008 Meeting**

**Motion by:** Ed Easton  
**Seconded by:** Melissa Hawthorne

**Motion:** To approve the minutes.

**Ayes:** Bucknall/Easton/Hawthorne/Tepper  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** MacKinnon/Goetz  
**Absent:** Lanier/Lockler

**12. Announcement of Upcoming Events**

None

**13. Committee and Commission Reports**

Commissioner Hawthorne informed that she had gone to the Planning Commission meeting and would like to encourage others to attend the next meeting as they are very much involved and interested in the transportation issues and share the same goals. She also said that the Planning Commission is expecting a report on the TIA revision and perhaps there is some combined work that could be done. Commissioner Hawthorne suggested joint committee work with the Planning Commission regarding projects with Public Works.

Commissioner Tepper stated that he met with the pedicab operators and the issue was resolved as per the recommendation from the Transportation Division. The pedicabs will be restricted to mostly the downtown area with restrictions on the hours of operation on certain roads during rush hour and lunch time. The agreement was made right before

South By Southwest and everyone seem to be happy with the resolution. He thanked Steve Grassfield and Ronnie Bell for their efforts.

Chair Bucknall asked clarification on a memorandum that was sent by Assistant City Manager Bert Lumbreras, in regards to the ordinance that revised Chapter 2-1 of the Code pertaining to Boards and Commissions. Mr. Ronnie Bell said that the memo covers questions that were raised on how to apply this ordinance with existing members, their absences, and terms in office.

#### **14. Future Agenda Items**

- Bicycle access through Riverside Drive – Status (Annick Beaudet?)
- More accommodation for bicycle riders at public facilities and new constructions
- Mueller Project needs bicycle lanes, parking and accommodations. Why was land given away and promised project not completed? (Jim Walker – Pam Hefner, Principal Planner with Economic Growth)
- Advertising on Taxicabs changes
- Development of the Seaholm Power Plant area
- Review of the downtown area commercial and loading zones to allow for more parking during the evening hours
- Review of the towing signs to include phone numbers of the regulatory agency or 311
- Towing Bill of Rights

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

---

Andrew Bucknall, Chair  
Urban Transportation Commission

---

Jose R. Ramos, P.E., Acting Director  
Public Works Department

## Exhibit A

---

### Recommended Camera Locations

- MoPac NB & Howard/Wells Branch- EB approach ( 9 collisions)
- MoPac SB & Howard/Wells Branch- EB approach ( 8 collisions)
- Lamar EF & Ben White EB(SF)-EB approach ( 9 collisions)
- MoPac SB Svc Rd & US Hwy 290 EB-EB approach ( 10 collisions)
- I 35 NB Svc Rd & 11th- NB & EB approach (12/15 collisions)
- I 35 SB Svc Rd & 15th- SB approach ( 9 collisions)
- Riverside & Pleasant Valley- SB approach ( 10 collisions)
- Lamar WF & Ben White (or Capital of TX) WB/NB- WB approach (10 collisions)
- I 35 SB Svc Rd & MLK- WB approach ( 12 collisions)



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: US Hwy 290 EB (South Service Road) with Mo-Pac SB Svc Rd (West Service Road)  
 Approach Name: eastbound lanes

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	7 collisions	3 collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions
Rear-End Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= 4.5\* seconds Approach Speed V= 45 mph  
 All-red Interval AR= 1.0 seconds Cross Street Width W= 28.8 feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= 0.007 (uphill is positive)

\*Implemented on 01/24/2008.

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	4.235 sec	Calculated all-red:	0.738 sec	
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	1.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate? Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	54 feet	
Diameter of signal lenses		8 inch <input type="checkbox"/>	12 inch <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Recommend Automated Enforcement be provided on the eastbound approach.



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: **MoPac NB** with **Howard Ln/Wells Branch Pkwy**  
 Approach Name: **Eastbound (ESR)**

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>
Left-Turn Collisions	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Rear-End Collisions	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= \* seconds Approach Speed V= \* mph  
 All-red Interval AR= \* seconds Cross Street Width W= \* feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= **-0.5%** (uphill is positive)

*\* Pending Information from TxDOT.*

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow: * sec	Calculated all-red: * sec		
Actual Yellow: * sec	Actual all-red: * sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

*\* Pending Information from TxDOT.*

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		8 inch <input type="checkbox"/>	12 inch <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

\* Pending information from TxDOT.



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: **MoPac SB** with **Howard Ln/Wells Branch Pkwy**  
 Approach Name: **Eastbound (WSR)**

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Time Period		
Right-Angle Collisions	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
Left-Turn Collisions	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Rear-End Collisions	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= \* seconds Approach Speed V= \* mph  
 All-red Interval AR= \* seconds Cross Street Width W= \* feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= **-0.5%** (uphill is positive)

*\* Pending Information from TxDOT.*

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow: * sec	Calculated all-red: * sec		
Actual Yellow: * sec	Actual all-red: * sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

*\* Pending Information from TxDOT.*

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		8 inch <input type="checkbox"/>	12 inch <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N  NA

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

\* Pending information from TxDOT.



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: **IH-35 Northbound Service Road** with **East 11<sup>th</sup> Street**  
 Approach Name: **Eastbound East 11<sup>th</sup> Street**

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	<b>10</b> collisions	<b>5</b> collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	<b>0</b> collisions	<b>0</b> collisions
Rear-End Collisions	<b>0</b> collisions	<b>0</b> collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= **4** seconds      Approach Speed V= **30** mph  
 All-red Interval AR= **1.5\*** seconds      Cross Street Width W= **53.8** feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= **+2.2%** (uphill is positive)

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	3.059 sec	Calculated all-red:	1.673 sec		
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	1.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate?	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

\* Implemented on 1/24/08

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement		Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	723 feet	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	73 feet	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses	8 inch <input type="checkbox"/> 12 inch <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	2 heads	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Implement auto enforcement of red light violations.



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: **IH-35 Northbound Service Road** with **East 11<sup>th</sup> Street**  
 Approach Name: **Northbound Service Road**

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	9 collisions	3 collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions
Rear-End Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= **4** seconds Approach Speed V= **40** mph  
 All-red Interval AR= **1.5\*** seconds Cross Street Width W= **51.2** feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= **+0.90** (uphill is positive)

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	3.857 sec	Calculated all-red:	1.211 sec		
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	1.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate?	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

\* Implemented on 1/24/08.

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		8 inch <input type="checkbox"/>	12 inch <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? N/A Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Implement auto enforcement of red light violations.



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: **IH-35 Southbound Service Road** with **East 15<sup>th</sup> Street**  
 Approach Name: **Southbound Service Road**

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	4 collisions	5 collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions
Rear-End Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= **4.5\*** seconds Approach Speed V= **40** mph  
 All-red Interval AR= **1.5\*** seconds Cross Street Width W= **76** feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= **-2.60%** (uphill is positive)

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	4.209 sec	Calculated all-red:	1.633 sec		
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	2.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate?	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

\* Implemented on 1/24/08

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		8 inch <input type="checkbox"/>	12 inch <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? N/A Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Implement auto enforcement of red light violations



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: **IH-35 Southbound Service Road** with **MLK Jr. Blvd**  
 Approach Name: **Westbound MLK Jr. Blvd**

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	7 collisions	5 collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	7 collisions	1 collisions
Rear-End Collisions	1 collisions	0 collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= **4** seconds Approach Speed V= **35** mph  
 All-red Interval AR= **2** seconds Cross Street Width W= **50.9** feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= **-3.80%** (uphill is positive)

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	3.931 sec	Calculated all-red:	1.378 sec		
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	2.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate?	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Implement auto enforcement of red light violations



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: Ben White (or Capital of Texas) EB (South Service Road) with Lamar EF (East Service Road)  
 Approach Name: eastbound lanes

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	5 collisions	4 collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions
Rear-End Collisions	0 collisions	1 collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= **4.5\*** seconds Approach Speed V= **45** mph  
 All-red Interval AR= **1.5\*** seconds Cross Street Width W= **46.2** feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= **0.008** (uphill is positive)

\*Implemented on 01/24/2008.

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	4.224 sec	Calculated all-red:	1.001 sec		
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	2.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate?	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		8 inch <input type="checkbox"/>	12 inch <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Recommend Automated Enforcement be provided on the eastbound approach.



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: Pleasant Valley with Riverside (south intersection)  
 Approach Name: southbound lanes

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	5 collisions	4 collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	2 collisions	1 collisions
Rear-End Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= 4.0 seconds Approach Speed V= 45 mph  
 All-red Interval AR= 1.5\* seconds Cross Street Width W= 54.8 feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= 0.038 (uphill is positive)

\*Implemented on 01/28/2008.

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	3.947 sec	Calculated all-red:	1.131 sec	
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	1.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate? Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Y  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Recommend Automated Enforcement be provided on the southbound approach.



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: Southwest Parkway with Mo-Pac SB Svc Rd (West Service Road)  
 Approach Name: westbound lanes

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	5 collisions	2 collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	0 collisions	2 collisions
Rear-End Collisions	0 collisions	1 collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERS

Yellow Interval Y= 4.5\* seconds Approach Speed V= 50 mph  
 All-red Interval AR= 1.0 seconds Cross Street Width W= 44.5 feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= 0.012 (uphill is positive)

\*Implemented on 01/24/2008.

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	4.538 sec	Calculated all-red:	0.878 sec	
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	1.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate? Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Y  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Not recommended for Automated Enforcement because both the yellow phase and yellow plus all-red were significantly less than calculated values. May be re-evaluated in future if collisions remain high.



# Assessment Sheet: Engineering Countermeasures to Reduce Red-Light Running

Intersection: Ben White (or Capital of Texas) WB (North Service Road) with Lamar WF (West Service Road)  
 Approach Name: westbound lanes

## RECENT 2-YEAR COLLISION SUMMARY

Time Period	Most Recent 12 months 01/01/2007 to 12/19/2007	Prior 12 months 01/01/2006 to 12/31/2006
Right-Angle Collisions	5 collisions	5 collisions
Left-Turn Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions
Rear-End Collisions	0 collisions	0 collisions

## CHECK SIGNAL CONTROL PARAMETERSK

Yellow Interval Y= **4.5\*** seconds Approach Speed V= **45** mph  
 All-red Interval AR= **1.5\*** seconds Cross Street Width W= **46.9** feet  
 Grade (%/100) g= **0.001** (uphill is positive)

\* Implemented on 01/24/2008.

Calculate the needed change period (CP) for this approach using the following equation:

$$CP = 1.0 + \frac{1.47 * V}{20 + 64.4g} + \frac{W + 20}{1.47 * V}$$

Calculated Yellow:	4.297 sec	Calculated all-red:	1.011 sec		
Actual Yellow:	4.0 sec	Actual all-red:	2.0 sec	Are yellow and all-red adequate?	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL VISIBILITY

Type of Signal Mounting: Mast Arm:  Span Wire:  Pole:   
 Can signal faces on other approaches be seen: Y  N   
 Is anything blocking the view of signals (e.g., utility lines or foliage)? Y  N

Measurement	Reference	Is Existing Adequate?	
Distance upstream is visible on approach	MUTCD Table 4D-1	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from stop bar to signal	MUTCD Figure 4D-2	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
Diameter of signal lenses		8 inch <input type="checkbox"/>	12 inch <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Near side signal		Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of signals	Per MUTCD, at least 2 signals for the major movement	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## CHECK SIGNAL CONSPICUITY

Is there visual clutter at the intersection that could detract from the signal? Y  N   
 Are the signal indications confusing? Y  N   
 Is the left turn signal discernable from the through signal? Y  N

## RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Recommend Automated Enforcement be provided on the westbound approach.