

CIVILLIBERTY101.COM
RESOLUTION: AGAINST RED LIGHT CAMERA BLOOD MONEY
(#StopGoLine Exposes Ambiguity in Traffic Intersection Law)

We are here today to witness as fact that this governing body is now fully apprised of the following:

- 1) In the capacity of whistleblower we inform all red light camera supporters that (to date) they have been unwitting co-conspirators in a criminal enterprise to profit from a deadly flaw in our traffic safety plan.
- 2) Any continued perpetuation of that safety flaw for profit, or refusal to use money gained from the red light camera enterprise to study and resolve the safety flaw, is evidence of criminal intent and culpability.
- 3) * Public Safety is your mandate to immediately write laws "**restricting the use of revenue from red light camera fines** for the sole purposes of: **a)** Scientific study of allegations that "*guessing at the yellow is a flaw in safety*" **b)** Study of viable and inexpensive solutions (*such as CivilLiberty101.com's #StopGoLine*) to remedy that flaw. **c)** Submit these findings to the Federal Highway Authority demanding they rectify the problem by ordering the ITE to amend the MUTCD accordingly. See CivilLiberty101.com for full details.

Guessing at the yellow light as a deadly flaw in our traffic safety plan. "*Guessing is not a safety plan; it's a recipe for disaster.*"(G.A.Finn) Every yellow light poses the question "*Should I stop or go?*" to every driver, and each driver has a different answer to that question. The problem is that each driver's decision is not based on facts or physics but rather on perception and opinion of speed, distance and time. This variety of opinion A) Proves the law is subjective and ambiguous B) Variety inevitably creates conflict (*Mass*Velocity+Conflict = Death and Destruction*). C) Instead of giving drivers mission critical information in advance, red light camera supporters choose to victimize helpless Americans.

Scientific study will prove: Aids to navigation -in advance of the red- cause drivers to make safer decisions. This hypothesis is easily proved if we adopt resolutions to use red light camera revenue to finance scientific study of goals stated in line 3) * above. Professor Yingzi Lin of North Eastern University is a recognized expert in traffic behavior and has no affiliation with me or CivilLiberty101.com's initiatives. She is familiar with these arguments and is fully qualified to investigate and submit a traffic analysis to the DOT on your behalf. Contact Dr. Lin today: yi.lin@neu.edu.

WHEREAS: Taking immediate action mitigates inference of culpability or liability we propose the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION 1) Red light camera revenue shall henceforth be restricted to the purposes stated in line item 3) * above.

RESOLUTION 2) Resolution 1 is to be retroactive to ___% of all funds previously received by these cameras.

RESOLUTION 3) Red light camera citations may be dismissed for defendants pleading "Not Guilty" because of ambiguity in the law.

It's my duty to publish on YouTube that I have submitted the above testimony to the City Council of ___(City)_____,
(State) on this _____ Day in the Month of _____ In the Year _____. (Witness initials)_

(We recommend you record the names of council members present on the reverse & have witnesses acknowledge.)

I am available as a witness (in any court established to determine criminality or liability of the above entities) to testify to the sincerity (*or callous disregard*) of this Council's choices the moment they were made aware of the serious nature of the issues stated above. (See attached "#StopGoLine PROVES YELLOW TRAFFIC LIGHT LAW IS AMBIGUOUS")

Will the Council now open a motion to accept any of the proposed resolutions or does the Council wish to send a message that it has a callous disregard for human suffering and basic civil rights?

RECORD COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: (Endorsed motions # _____ / (No motions Endorsed ___)/Other? _____

Sincerely

Name:

Address_

The undersigned are witness to the above testimony:

• NAME: _____

• Address: _____

• City-State-Zip _____

• Email: _____

• CELL PHONE: _____

• Permission to send SMS text to validate signature.

• NAME: _____

• Address: _____

• City-State-Zip _____

• Email: _____

• CELL PHONE: _____

• Permission to send SMS text to validate signature.

Create three originals: # 1 for Council records and # 2 for your personal record. #3 for CivilLiberty101.com



CIVILLIBERTY101.COM

RED LIGHT CAMERAS - CRIMINALLY PROFIT
BY PERPETUATING A DEADLY FLAW IN TRAFFIC SAFETY



#StopGoLine PROVES YELLOW TRAFFIC LIGHT LAW IS AMBIGUOUS

Variance of opinion & perception proves the law is ambiguous. Law is not allowed to be ambiguous. Even law enforcement officials have different interpretations of the yellow traffic light? Some say "Yellow means stop". Others say "Yellow means slow down and be prepared to stop" or "React accordingly".

- Doesn't Yellow mean "slow down to stop"? **No!** Stopping short can initiate rear end collisions.
- Doesn't Yellow mean "Slow down and react accordingly"? **No!** This language is ambiguous.

DISTANCE DEPENDENT: Each driver's decision to stop (or go) is entirely dependent on perceived **distance** from the stop line immediately at the onset of yellow. (#StopGoLine = standard decision point)

PERCEPTION: Every driver has a different reaction - according to their ability to perceive: a) physical distance to the stop line, b) actual stopping distance required and c) time on the light. This variation in ability & perception creates chaos & conflict in the safety plan. (#StopGoLine eliminates conflict)

TIME: Every driver also has a different ability to perceive time depending on individual stress levels. ("Time flies when you're having fun" is a fundamental law of human nature.) (#StopGoLine neutralizes stress)

WHY DO DRIVERS ACCELERATE? Absent tools ensuring decision certainty, we must presume an equal number of drivers accelerate innocently (*Fearfully ensuring their decision succeeds*) as illegally.

#STOPGOLINES ARE REQUIRED: Absent a clearly marked decision point (*informing drivers to Go! -if you reach the indicated #StopGoLine decision point before light turns yellow- OR Stop! -if you don't*) the yellow light law remains ambiguous - no matter how much time is on the light.

THE SOLUTION IS TO CHANGE (from a subjective) TO AN OBJECTIVE METHOD

DEFINE THE BRAKE ZONE: The stopping distance should accommodate the heaviest vehicle rated for that road at the speed limit. (*If the 18 wheeler can stop, you have no excuse.*) (*You also do not want your elderly or teenage driver slamming on the brakes if the 18 wheeler -behind them- needs that space.*)

INDICATE THE BRAKE ZONE (#StopGoLine): ITE must update the MUTCD to include an indicator which defines the beginning of the brake zone and gives drivers that line in the sand they needed to make objective & certain decisions to that life and death question (*Should I stop or go at the yellow?*).

YELLOW TIME: Vehicles at the furthest extent of the Brake Zone need time to clear the stop bar. (*Citations may only be issued to people who were outside that braking distance and continue to run the red.* "You were given both fair warning and an objective method and you still gunned the gas to make the light").

What information do red light cameras give drivers in advance of the red light? (NONE!)

DRIVER AUTHORITY: By refusing to give drivers tools to make safer decisions, you are entrusting the driver with total authority to make the right decision (*it's unconstitutional to penalize drivers for making wrong decisions until you provide relevant information in advance & at precise -#StopGoLine- decision points*).

Example: Why not take away the lane markers and then penalize drivers for not staying in their lane. It's the same analogy. (*How many of you think we should remove lane markers as a fund raising scheme?*)

CONFLICT IN THE SAFETY PLAN: Any system interjecting fear & relying on wide variations of opinion encourages chaos and conflict. Conflict in the safety plan leads to death and destruction:

Mass x Velocity + Conflict = Death and Destruction.

These arguments prove a) the law is ambiguous and b) (*because chaos is designed into the plan*) our safety policy is really - a recipe for disaster. **Elected & Judicial representatives must choose between supporting our petition or supporting chaos and conflict as integral elements of our safety plan?**

REQUEST THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION: Dismiss all citations & resolve that all Red Light Camera revenue should finance scientific study of the #StopGoLine argument. Any other use of these monies is criminally perpetuating the death & dismemberment of American citizens for profit.

Thank you for your assistance and consideration.

Contact us directly to discuss details. Scientists at N.E.U. are waiting on your call.

RedLight@CivilLiberty101.com

George Finn