

**For discussion on
18 March 2005**

Legislative Council Panel on Transport

Measures to Enhance Road Safety

PURPOSE

This paper sets out the Administration's revised proposal in regard to the penalty level for red light jumping offences.

BACKGROUND

2. To recap, we proposed in December 2004 a package of measures covering legislation, enforcement, publicity, education and technology application to enhance road safety and combat red light jumping and other driving offences. The proposed measures are:

Legislation

- Raise the driving offence points for red light jumping;
- Raise the fixed penalty of red light jumping from \$450 to \$600;
- Make the offence of using a handheld mobile telephone while driving enforceable through fixed penalty tickets and set the penalty at \$450;
- Make the offence of not driving in the nearside lane of an expressway enforceable through fixed penalty tickets and set the penalty at \$450;
- Make the offence of driving motorcycle/motor tricycle without the necessary lights illuminated enforceable by fixed penalty ticket and set the penalty at \$320;

Enforcement

- Carry out more enforcement operations against speeding and red light jumping;
- Make the display of the public light bus (PLB) driver's name plate a mandatory requirement;
- Make the display of the complaint hotline a mandatory requirement;

Application of Technology

- Install more red light camera housings and cameras;
- Install more speed enforcement camera housings and cameras;
- Make the installation of speed display devices on PLBs a mandatory requirement;
- Carry out trials of the vehicle monitoring system on PLBs;

Education and Publicity

- Carry out more education and publicity campaigns on safe driving;
- Encourage PLB drivers to attend continuous in-service training;
- Examine the feasibility of organizing refresher workshops and requiring PLB drivers to attend such courses regularly;
- Examine the feasibility of making pre-service training a mandatory requirement for new PLB drivers; and
- Promulgate the PLB Safety Charter.

We have already initiated actions on most of the above measures. A progress report is at **Annex A**.

Annex A

3. Members and various organizations from the transport trade expressed their views on the proposed measures, with the majority focusing on the proposed increase of the Driving Offence Points (DOPs) from 3 points to 8 points for red light jumping offences. Some organizations have also suggested other measures to enhance road safety. We have examined in detail these comments and suggestions, and our responses are at **Annex B**. We have also studied the road safety measures commonly adopted overseas and find that the vast majority of them have already been adopted in Hong Kong. Details of the measures are at **Annex C**.

MOTION

4. At the Panel meeting on 14 December 2004, a motion was carried by four to one. The motion requested the Administration “to adopt all possible and practical measures to improve the design of road junctions and traffic light signals to ensure the effective detection of deliberate red-light jumpers before considering raising the DOPs against such offences”.

5. As explained in Annexes B and C, we have examined in detail all the proposed measures adopted overseas as well as those suggested by Members and various organizations. We confirm that we have been applying all the possible improvement measures to our road junctions and traffic light system, and will continue to do so, should they prove to be practicable and effective. However, such measures alone would not be adequate to enhance road safety, particularly where the driving behaviour of motorists is concerned. We consider it absolutely necessary to put in place a compendium of measures, as those set out in paragraph 2 above, to combat red light jumping and other inappropriate driving behaviour.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

6. We are mindful of the concern raised by Members and the transport trade about the proposal to raise the DOPs for red light jumping from 3 to 8. At the same time, we are also mindful of the need to enhance road safety, which is of paramount importance to all roadusers, including

drivers, passengers and pedestrians. We thus consider it desirable to further gauge public opinion on the issue.

7. In February 2005, we commissioned the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong to carry out an opinion poll. It must be noted that although the Programme has conducted the poll upon our request, it has maintained absolute independence in the exercise. Hence, we were not involved in the exercise and the Programme worked independently in designing the questions for the poll, determining the survey methodology, carrying out the survey and analyzing the poll findings. The executive summary of the opinion poll is at **Annex D**. The key findings are summarized below :

Annex D

- (a) 39% of the respondents indicated that the current red light jumping activities were “totally unacceptable” or “unacceptable”, whereas 30% considered it “neither acceptable nor unacceptable”, and 28% considered it “acceptable” or “totally acceptable”.
- (b) 79% of the respondents considered that the Government should increase the DOPs, and only 9% objected to an increase in the DOPs.
- (c) 72% of the respondents considered that the level of fixed penalty should be raised, and 13% objected.
- (d) Of those respondents that had suggested a DOP for red light jumping¹, some 55% considered that it should be set at 5 points or above. The majority (43% of this group of respondents) supported 5 DOPs.
- (e) Given a free choice to determine the combination of DOPs and fixed penalty, the mean level of fixed penalty suggested by the respondents ranged from \$629 to \$1,106.

¹ This group comprises 1309 respondents, whereas for the whole survey, there were 1532 respondents.

REVISED PROPOSAL

8. We have further reviewed our proposal in the light of the above findings and other considerations. We remain of the view that the DOP for red light jumping should be increased to create a stronger deterrent effect. Nevertheless, we are prepared to adopt a phased approach – by raising the DOPs from 3 to 5 first. We will closely monitor the accident and enforcement statistics related to red light jumping, and will review the need for further adjustment should the current proposal prove to be not effective in deterring commitment of such offences.

9. As for the level of the fixed penalty for red light jumping, we remain of the view that it should be increased from \$450 to \$600. We note that in the opinion poll and during the meeting of this Panel in December 2004, there were suggestions that the penalty level should be higher. We have taken note of these suggestions and will review the effectiveness of our measures regularly to see if the fixed penalty level needs to be revised further.

ADVICE SOUGHT

10. Members are invited to comment on the revised proposal to increase the penalty for red light jumping from 3 to 5 DOPs and to increase the fixed penalty from \$450 to \$600 as set out in paragraphs 8 and 9 above.

Environment Transport and Works Bureau
March 2005

Progress Report on Recommended Measures to Enhance Road Safety

Proposal	Progress
<i>Legislation</i>	
Raise the driving offence points for red light jumping	A revised proposal has been included in this Paper. We plan to submit the legislative proposal to the Legislative Council in mid 2005.
Raise the fixed penalty of red light jumping from \$450 to \$600	We plan to submit the legislative proposal to the Legislative Council in mid 2005.
Make the offence of using a handheld mobile telephone while driving a fixed penalty offence and set the penalty at \$450	We plan to submit the legislative proposal to the Legislative Council in mid 2005.
Make the offence of not driving in the nearside lane of an expressway enforceable through fixed penalty tickets and set the penalty at \$450	We plan to submit the legislative proposal to the Legislative Council in mid 2005.
Make the offence of driving motorcycle/motor tricycle without the necessary lights illuminated enforceable by fixed penalty ticket and set the penalty at \$320	We plan to submit the legislative proposal to the Legislative Council in mid 2005.

Proposal	Progress
<i>Enforcement</i>	
Carry out more enforcement operations against speeding and red light jumping	Enhancing road safety is one of the operational targets of the Commissioner of Police for 2005. The Police will continue their efforts in enforcement and will launch blitz operations from time to time. For example, in Operation 'Fossington' (from October to December 2004), 12 190 speeding cases were detected.
Make the display of the public light bus ("PLB") driver's name plate a legislative requirement	We will discuss with the trade the details of the proposal. We will submit relevant legislative proposals when the details have been agreed with the trade.
Make the display of the complaints hotline a mandatory requirement	We are discussing with the trade the idea of including this requirement into the Passenger Service Licence of all PLB.
<i>Application of Technology</i>	
Install more red light camera housings and cameras	We plan to procure 68 red light cameras and install housings at 20 additional locations. We plan to implement the measure in phases.
Install more speed enforcement camera housings and cameras	We are examining potential locations to install speed enforcement camera housings. The findings and recommendations will be available in late 2005.
Make the installation of speed display device a mandatory requirement	Starting from April/May 2005, PLB owners will be required to install speed display devices through the license conditions.
Carry out trials of the vehicle monitoring system on PLBs	The system has been installed in one PLB for trial. We are assessing the findings. If the system is technically feasible, we will consider expanding the trial.

Proposal	Progress
<i>Education and Publicity</i>	
Carry out more education and publicity campaigns on safe driving	<p>The Road Safety Council, the Police and the Transport Department (TD) are committed to enhancing road safety, minimising the number of traffic accidents, fostering the concept of “smart driving” and advocating considerate driving manners through publicity and education. The following measures will continue to be taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Distributing newsletters to PLB, taxi and non-franchised bus drivers regularly; (2) Launching of promotional activities on the safety of passenger vehicles. Road safety ambassadors have been appointed to distribute leaflets at PLB stands; (3) Producing TV and radio Announcements of Public Interest and increasing the number of airtimes for road safety messages; (4) Using mobile publicity media to spread road safety messages; (5) Displaying road safety messages at major roads and tunnel entrances/exits; (6) Organising talks and seminars on road safety for drivers; (7) Organising publicity activities on road safety; and (8) Distributing publicity pamphlets and launching on-street educational activities at major traffic blackspots, public carparks and boundary control points.
Encourage PLB drivers to attend continuous in-service training	In 2003 and 2004, around 700 PLB drivers have attended the course. We will continue to encourage PLB drivers to attend these courses.
Examine the feasibility of organizing refresher workshops and requiring PLB drivers to attend such courses regularly	We will examine with the Driving Improvement Schools and the Vocational Training Council the feasibility of organizing refresher workshops or seminars for PLB drivers and will follow up with the trade afterwards.
Examine the feasibility of making pre-service training a mandatory requirement for new PLB drivers	We will examine the effectiveness of this proposal, taking into account the experience of the pre-service training course for the taxi trade.
Promulgate the PLB Safety Charter	The launch of the Safety Charter will be carried out by the end of March.

Comments/Suggestions raised by Various Organisations

Comments/Suggestions	Administration's Response
1. In addition to the high density of traffic flow and heavy traffic in Hong Kong, our road conditions are ever changing and vision is easily blocked. Drivers may get penalized without realizing that they have jumped red lights.	In general, there are at least three sets of traffic lights erected at each signalized junction, i.e. two primary signals at the roadside near the stop line and a secondary signal close to the far end of the junction. For wider junctions, a fourth one will be added at the far end of the junction. Therefore, drivers can get a clear vision of the signals and react accordingly.
2. Stiffer penalties will cause stress on professional drivers and in return affect safe driving.	All drivers should obey the law and professional drivers should be expected to drive lawfully because of their wider experience as compared to casual drivers. Driving offence points would not be incurred if the drivers do not commit the offence, and stiffer penalties would not affect law-abiding drivers.
3. Drivers are easily forced into the traps of traffic lights and inadequate facilities. TD refused to improve signals design but shifted the responsibility onto drivers.	Noted. The computerized traffic signal control system presently in use in Hong Kong is similar to that adopted in many places such as Singapore, the United Kingdom, Australia and major cities in China. Our system complies with international standards and is safe. We are most willing to review any specific junctions if the trade considers that there may be problems with the design.
4. Red minibus ran into business difficulties due to Government suppression. This will affect drivers and might lead to traffic accidents. TD should further review the feasibility of opening up of prohibited zones and restricted zones for PLBs.	Noted. To improve the operating environment of PLBs, TD has been reviewing the feasibility of opening up restricted zones and prohibited zones for PLB. Respective measures were already implemented at suitable locations. For instance, No Stopping Restriction at eight locations and PLB Prohibited Zone at two locations were lifted in the past two years.

Comments/Suggestions	Administration's Response
5. It is unfair to require all drivers to bear the responsibility because of individual accidents.	We need to deter inappropriate driving behaviour to protect the safety of road users. Only those drivers who are convicted of the traffic offence will incur additional driving offence points.
6. There are grey areas in enforcement. The drivers being charged and the police officer concerned might tell different stories. The drivers would often find it difficult to decide whether to halt or not.	Prosecutions for such offences are done under sections 16, 17 & 18 of the Road Traffic (Traffic Control) Regulations. Drivers can defend themselves if they consider that their driving behaviour is defensible or does not constitute the offence. The court will decide whether the defendant should be convicted.
7. Enforcement statistics reflected an increase in red light jumping cases because more red light cameras were installed recently; together with greater effort in combating the offence by the Police. Yet no efforts were made by the Administration on the improvement to technology application as well as publicity and education activities.	<p>With the additional red light cameras installed, the number of offences involving red light jumping has increased. This reflects the seriousness of red light jumping offences. Heavier penalties and strengthened enforcement will not only combat inappropriate driving behaviour but also bring about a deterrent effect.</p> <p>On publicity and education measures, please see the details in Annex A above.</p> <p>As for technology application, please see Annex A on the use of speed enforcement cameras, red light cameras and speed display devices etc.</p>
8. Red light jumping was not the major cause for the accidents involving PLBs.	In view of the high concentration of signal controlled junctions, the potentially serious consequence of red light jumping and the increase in the number of such offences, we have to take measures to protect the safety of roadusers.
9. Feeble enforcement action and low camera-to-housing ratio will encourage drivers to try jumping the red light.	Noted. Drivers should obey the law whether or not there are red light cameras. Nevertheless, we plan to increase the housing locations from 111 to 131, and raise the camera-to- housing ratio from 25% to 75%.

Comments/Suggestions	Administration's Response
10. Drivers would be prosecuted for careless driving or dangerous driving if red light jumping causes accident. The deterrent effect is adequate.	The Police will continue to diligently prosecute irresponsible motorists for jumping red lights. More red light cameras will be installed at identified blacksites to catch offenders in order to create greater deterrent effect. This is in addition to regular strategic operations mounted by traffic patrol officers in their normal duties in catching red light jumpers.
11. Drivers have to cope with work pressure and suffer from long working hours and some are inexperienced. Publicity and educational efforts made by the government are inadequate	Agreed. Publicity and education on safe driving has been our focus of work. For details, please refer to Annex A.
12. At the light rail intersections in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long, since light rail has priority over other vehicles, even if a vehicle has reached the intersection, the traffic signal will still turn red if a light rail train is approaching. This is when red light jumping takes place.	Priority of light rail at the intersections in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long should not cause red light jumping. When the train is arriving, only the green phase will be shortened. The amber light will be on for three seconds before the red light is on. The duration of the amber light for these junctions is the same as other junctions. Hence, there should be adequate warnings to motorists.
13. Heavier penalties will discourage people from buying vehicles and directly affect the business of the retail sector.	Road safety has been always the Administration's prime concern. To protect road users, heavier penalties are essential to deter irresponsible driving behaviour. The need to drive lawfully should in no way discourage people from buying vehicles.
14. Heavier penalties could achieve more deterrent effect.	Noted.

Comments/Suggestions	Administration's Response
15. Support raising the DOPs from 3 to 8 and fixed penalty to \$1000	Noted.
16. Research in Australia showed that the use of countdown device would lead to more traffic accidents. Object to such devices.	Agreed.
17. Government should not protect interest of the transport trades at the expense of public safety.	Noted.
18. Support raising the DOPs from 3 to 8 and fixed penalty to \$600	Noted.
19. Mandatory installation of Speed Display Device on PLBs	Agreed. Details of our action are in Annex A.
20. Mandatory courses on safe driving	Agreed. Details of our action are in Annex A.
21. Mandatory display of complaints hotline	Agreed. Details of our action are in Annex A.
22. Mandatory display of the driver name plate	Agreed. Details of our action are in Annex A.
23. Install red light cameras at traffic blackspots and crossroads	Agreed. Details of our action are in Annex A.
24. Promulgate PLB Driver Safety Charter	Agreed. Details of our action are in Annex A.

Comments/Suggestions	Administration's Response
25. Speed up the introduction of Euro III short wheelbase PLBs fitted with seat belts	Noted. Euro III short wheelbase PLBs are already available in the market. Since August 2004, fitting of seatbelts has become a legal requirement for all new PLBs. The trade can choose from Euro III models available on the market for replacement.
26. Improve road facilities and traffic light design, enhancing road safety measures and reducing accident blackspots that jeopardize road safety.	Noted. Our road design, including the traffic light system, is comparable with the best standards worldwide. Nevertheless, we will continue to review and update our standards, and where necessary, improve the design.
27. Prolong the amber phase from three seconds to six.	Noted. The 3-second amber time is adequate if drivers follow the speed limit. Lengthening the amber period would affect the throughput and cause congestion, and may increase the risk of head-rear collision.
28. Add a green flashing phase before the signal turns amber, changing the steady amber signal into flashing signals for three seconds and installing vehicle countdown devices.	Noted. Studies and trials conducted by overseas reveal that advance warning devices for vehicular traffic may significantly increase the risk of head-rear collision due to motorists' different responses to the information displayed. Furthermore, such devices are generally incompatible with our modern computerized traffic control systems with adaptive control function. It is relevant to note that Guangzhou and Shenzhen have dismantled their vehicle countdown devices due to the aforesaid reasons.
29. Erect overhead traffic light signals at junctions so that vehicles can halt timely even if vision is blocked by large vehicles ahead	Noted. In general, there are at least three traffic lights erected at each signalized junction, two primary signals at the roadside near the stop line and a secondary signal close to the far end of the junction. For wider junctions, a fourth one will be added at the far end. Drivers can get a clear vision of the signals and react appropriately. TD will consider installing overhead traffic lights if there are special factors

Comments/Suggestions	Administration's Response
	like speed, site constraints and accident rates. Suggestions on potential sites are welcome.
30 Apart from the 3 DOPs, the court should impose severe penalty that could produce stronger deterrent effect. Compulsory driver improvement course should be applied to repeat offenders.	Noted. We will examine the feasibility of introducing of mandatory driving improvement courses for repeated offenders. The Court will impose penalties according to provision under the law as well as prevailing social climate.
31. Establish an advisory framework or expanding the existing mechanism to gather views from the trades.	Noted. TD meets regularly with the trades to exchange views. Channels for communication are in place and have shown to be effective. Further views from the trade on how to enhance communication are welcome.
32. Provide guidelines on road safety and improve the design of lights at roadwork	Agreed. The Highways Department has in 2004 issued supplementary instructions regarding the lighting, signages and guarding of road works.
33. Carry out minor improvement works at blind spots that block drivers' eyesight: - From Chatham Road South to Gascoigne Road – change the give way marking into double white lines to provide a parallel eastbound lane to Gascoigne Road - Right-turn from Devon Road to Cornwall Street – vision blocked by trees	Noted. Motorists merging onto Gascoigne Road have an adequate sightline of oncoming traffic and therefore the existing arrangement should be safe. Since the traffic on Gascoigne Road eastbound is very busy during peak hours and the road is too narrow for additional lane, the proposal is not feasible. Agreed. We have moved the give way transverse marking forward to further improve sightline at the junction.

Comments/Suggestions	Administration's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The roundabout outside Tsing Yi Police Station – vision blocked by trees - Tung Lung Road/Tung Tau Tsuen Rd – vision blocked by the flowerbed 	<p>Agreed. We have trimmed the plants at the central divider of Tsing Yi Heung Sze Wui Road near the roundabout outside Tsing Yi Police Station. We will arrange more frequent trimming in the future.</p> <p>Agreed. We notice that the plants might block the vision when they grow to a certain height. We have taken action to replace the plants with lower shrubs.</p>
<p>34. Red light traps on roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From Gillies Avenue to Wuhu Street; from Nathan Road to Mongkok Road; from Nam Cheong Street to Tai Po Road - Right-turn pocket (from Nathan Road to Mongkok Road; junction between Nam Cheong Street and Tai Po Road - Difficulties in braking for heavy vehicles in front of traffic lights - Vision blocked by heavy vehicles or double-decked buses 	<p>Noted. We cannot detect any particular red light traps at the said locations. We will liaise with the complaining organisation and organise a joint site visit.</p> <p>Noted. The right-turn pocket is designed to allow right turning vehicles to wait inside the pocket until there is a gap in the oncoming traffic. Motorists should be aware of the purpose of the pockets.</p> <p>Noted. Roads are designed for safe use by all types of vehicles including heavy vehicles. Drivers should pay attention to road conditions and be prepared to stop at any time when approaching signalised junctions in order to react accordingly.</p> <p>Noted. Most junctions in Hong Kong have three traffic lights i.e. two at the roadside near the stop line and the third one at the far end of the junction. Where necessary, a fourth traffic light is also erected. Suggestions on specific locations are welcome.</p>

Comments/Suggestions	Administration's Response
35. Strengthen enforcement against red light jumping & not keeping left on highways	Agreed. The Police will continue their enforcement actions against such offences.
36. Government should look into the supply of oil/fuel, insurance etc to ensure that the supplies are not being monopolized	Noted. The Administration will closely monitor the situation and facilitate a fair and free market for all businesses.
37. Install speed limiter on PLBs	Noted. The fundamental question is whether PLBs should be subject to a speed limit, irrespective of the speed limit of the roads on which they run (eg 70km/h on a road with speed limit of 80 km/h). This will have implications on both PLB operations and the traffic flow in the territory. We will examine the issue in greater detail.
38. Install external indicator light on PLB to indicate the vehicle exceeds the preset speed limit	Noted. Similar to speed limiter, we would need to consider whether PLBs should be subject to a particular speed limit, irrespective of the speed limit on the road. We would also need to consider the effectiveness of this device as well as the possible confusion and distraction that it may bring about to other drivers and road users.

Measures commonly adopted overseas to prevent red light jumping and their application in Hong Kong

Measures	Purpose	Current situation in Hong Kong
Traffic signal co-ordination	Such would enable motorists to move smoothly in platoons from intersection to intersection while reducing the risk of red light jumping and resulting accidents.	Done. Most signalized junctions have already installed such a traffic signal coordination system. We will continue to apply the system to the remaining junctions.
Advance vehicle detection	Advance vehicle detection may be employed to hold green signal indications for the maximum allowable time, allowing motorists at the back of platoons or under light traffic conditions, to legally enter and traverse a signalized intersection.	Done. We have already put in place advance vehicle detection systems at suitable signalized junctions. We will continue to identify locations suitable for such signal operation.
Advance yellow flashing lights to warn motorists of the existence of signalized intersection	The device is erected in advance of the intersection and will flash to warn approaching motorists that the signal would likely be red when motorists reach the intersection. The device is not commonly used. They are only used at the end of expressways, at slip roads leading from expressways to local roads, or at widely spaced junctions with curved approaches/steep grades/restricted visibility.	Not applicable. The vast majority of signalised junctions in Hong Kong are closely spaced and within 50 km/h speed limit zones.
Length of amber phase	The international standard for the duration of the amber phase ranges from 3 to 6 seconds. The duration is based on the time needed for a vehicle to travel at the allowed speed through the junction or to stop comfortably.	Done. The 3-second amber time is adequate if drivers follow the speed limit. Lengthening the amber period would affect the throughput and cause congestion, and may increase the risk of head-rear collision.

Measures	Purpose	Current situation in Hong Kong
All-red interval	An all-red or clearance interval provides additional time for motorists already in the intersection to proceed through the junction while holding cross traffic on the cross street approaches.	Done. All-red intervals have been adopted to provide sufficient time to clear the motorists at signal control junctions to enhance road safety.
Additional signal lights	Adding signal lights may help the driver's view of the traffic signal and reduce the frequency of red light jumping.	Done. Most signalized junctions have 3 traffic lights i.e. 2 primary signals at the roadside near the stop line and a secondary signal at the far end of the junction. At large junctions, a fourth signal may be added.
Removal of on-street parking	To enhance the driver's view of signages, signals, pedestrians and cross-traffic near the junction.	Done. On-street parking is only permitted where it will not compromise safety and capacity.
Removal of unwarranted traffic signals	Junctions with little throughput may have less red light jumping if the traffic lights are removed and other forms of traffic control are used.	Done. Traffic signals are only erected at junctions with larger throughput where they could provide the safest and most efficient form of junction control.
Review intersection geometry	To remove junction geometry deficiencies.	Done. Our junctions are generally in compliance with international standards. We will provide additional signs and warnings at locations where the geometry is hindered by geographical constraints.
Signalized junction warning signs to motorists they are nearing a signalized intersection	To post advance warning signs upstream on an approach road to alert motorists that they are nearing a signalized junction.	Done. We already employ such signs whenever such is applicable eg slip roads leading from expressways to local roads with signalised junctions. However, most of the junctions in Hong Kong are very close to each other.

Measures	Purpose	Current situation in Hong Kong
Adjusting the speed limits of the approach roads	Adjusting the speed limits of approach roads to signalized junctions may help to reduce red light jumping activities.	Done. Where necessary, we will reduce the speed limit of approach roads leading to the signalised junctions. However, most of the signalized junctions in Hong Kong operate within the 50km/h speed limit.
Improving signal head visibility	Signal head visibility can be improved by increasing the size of the traffic signal lamps. Improving signal visibility can be beneficial where the sun angle silhouettes the traffic signal head thus making it difficult to see the signal. Addition of backplates can also make signals more visible.	Done. We do provide larger size signal heads when such is considered necessary. In addition, backplates have already been added to the signal heads to make the signals more visible.
Education campaigns	To assist motorists and the general public in understanding the safety issues.	Done. Education and publicity have always been the focus of our road safety campaign.
Targeted enforcement	Increased enforcement by law enforcement officers in patrol cars or motorcycles can be a cost effective solution to reduce red light jumping.	Done. The Police will continue to strengthen their enforcement actions and carry out blitz operations.
Technology application	Red light cameras may be useful.	Done. Such cameras have already been installed, and as mentioned in Annex A, we will expand the coverage of red light cameras and housings.

Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong

Public Opinion Survey on
Red Light Jumping and Level of Penalty

Summary of Survey Results

Written by Dr Robert Chung, Pang Ka-lai and Lam Mo-chun

March 2005

Copyrights of all data in this report belong to
the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau and the University of Hong Kong

Opinion Survey on
Red Light Jumping and Level of Penalty
Conducted by Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong

Summary of Survey Results

1. The Environment, Transport and Works Bureau (ETWB) of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region commissioned the Research Team of the Public Opinion Programme (POP) in February 2005 to conduct an “Opinion Survey on Red Light Jumping and Level of Penalty” in order to assess public opinions on red light jumping and gauge views and suggestions on the current penalty level of the offence. The questionnaire was designed independently by the Research Team after consultation with the ETWB. Operation and data analysis are solely conducted and done by the Research Team free from intervention from any authorities or bodies.
2. The survey was conducted between 21 and 24 February, 2005. 1,532 people in Hong Kong, aged 18 or above and Cantonese speaking, were successfully interviewed over the telephone. The overall response rate was 66.6% with standard deviation less than 1.3% and confidence level at 95%. The sampling error for all percentages recorded was under +/- 2.6%.
3. As for the weighted samples, 522 driving licence holders (34% of the sampling population) and 1,009 people who do not have a driving licence (66% of the population) were interviewed. There was one respondent who refused to disclose whether he/she has a driving licence.
4. In respect of the current overall road conditions, 39% of the respondents considered the gravity of red light jumping by drivers in general “unacceptable”. 28% found it “acceptable” and 30% “half half”. In addition, compared with those without a driving licence, licence-holders were more inclined to consider the current red light jumping activities “acceptable”. The “acceptable” rates are 26% and 31% for non licence-holder and licence holder respectively.

5. Also, 48% of the respondents considered that red light jumping by professional drivers in general “unacceptable”. It is slightly more than those who rated the same for private car drivers (46%). In addition, licence-holders have a better impression on private car drivers on red light jumping when compared with non licence-holders. 42% of the licence-holders considered the gravity of red light jumping by private car drivers “unacceptable” while the percentage of non licence-holders is 48%.
6. In respect of professional drivers for different types of vehicles, respondents considered red light jumping by minibus drivers (64%) “unacceptable”, followed by taxi drivers (31%), bus drivers (24%), light goods vehicles or van drivers (23%) and goods vehicle drivers (22%).
7. At present, 3 Driving Offence Points (DOPs) are incurred for red light jumping and the driving licence will be suspended when 15 points are accumulated within two years. The survey revealed that as much as 79% of the respondents supported the government’s proposal to raise the DOPs for red light jumping.
8. When being asked to decide on the number of points to be incurred for red light jumping assuming that the 15-point suspension rule is retained, by ignoring the “don’t know” responses and invalid responses, the suggested DOP point was 4.6 points on average with a median of 5 points. According to the figures, 55% of the respondents who suggested a DOP considered that it should be set at 5 points or above. 43% of which were of the view that the DOP should be set at 5 points.
9. According to the current legislation, red light jumping also carries a \$450 fine. The survey revealed that 72% of the respondents supported the government to raise the fixed penalty for the offence. This is 7% less than the percentage recorded for those who supported an increase in DOPs.
10. Assuming red light jumping DOPs (3 points) remains unchanged, the respondents suggested an average of \$810 as the fine for red light jumping, and the median is \$600. Again, both the “don’t know” responses and invalid responses were not counted.

11. According to the survey results, if respondents were free to choose the combination of DOP and the amount of fine, the average suggested DOP was 4.6 points and \$803 fine after ignoring those invalid responses. If the analysis focused on groups with higher response rates (sample size over 30), the average fine ranged from \$629 to \$1,106.
12. The survey results also showed that on average the respondents witnessed 3.1 cases of red light jumping during the month preceding the survey. Licence-holders reported 4.5 cases and non licence-holders 2.3 cases.
13. An analysis of the background of the respondents showed that male respondents, relatively young with lower education level, students and manual workers generally supported the proposed increase in the level of penalty but the support was relatively weak.
14. The statistics so obtained may not be the thoughtful response by the respondents. But generally speaking, considerable support to raise the penalty for red light jumping was noted in the survey, in particular the suggestion on raising the DOPs.

Appendix 1

Background Data of Respondents

Appendix 1: Background Data of Respondents

Table 1 Gender

	<u>Original Samples</u>		<u>Weighted Samples</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Male	700	45.7	739	48.3
Female	832	54.3	793	51.7
Total	1,532	100.0	1,532	100.0

Table 2 Age Group

	<u>Original Samples</u>		<u>Weighted Samples</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Aged 18-20	96	6.9	73	5.2
Aged 21-29	181	13.0	236	16.9
Aged 30-39	249	17.9	331	23.8
Aged 40-49	362	26.0	316	22.6
Aged 50-59	261	18.7	177	12.7
Aged 60 or above	245	17.6	262	18.8
Total	1,394	100.0	1,394	100.0
Deficiency	138		138	

Table 3 Education Attainment

	<u>Original Samples</u>		<u>Weighted Samples</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Primary or below	299	19.9	277	18.5
Secondary	839	55.7	821	54.7
Tertiary or above	367	24.4	403	26.8
Total	1,505	100.0	1,501	100.0
Deficiency	27		31	

Table 4 Housing

	<u>Original Samples</u>		<u>Weighted Samples</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Self-purchased	816	55.7	807	55.2
Rented	649	44.3	654	44.8
Total	1,465	100.0	1,461	100.0
Deficiency	67		71	

Table 5 House Type

	<u>Original Samples</u>		<u>Weighted Samples</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Public rented housing	554	37.3	556	37.4
Housing Authority subsidized sale flat	224	15.1	215	14.5
Housing Society subsidized sale flat	24	1.6	24	1.6
Private housing	631	42.5	636	42.8
Village : villas/bungalows/modern village houses	19	1.3	19	1.3
Village house: Simple stone structures/ traditional village house	18	1.2	19	1.2
Staff quarters	11	0.7	11	0.8
Others	5	0.3	6	0.4
Total	1,486	100.0	1,486	100.0
Deficiency	46		46	

Table 6 Occupation

	<u>Original Samples</u>		<u>Weighted Samples</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Administrators and Professionals	276	18.8	303	20.6
Clerks and service workers	318	21.6	342	23.2
Manual workers	181	12.3	175	11.9
Students	117	8.0	109	7.4
Full-time housewives	306	20.8	262	17.8
Others	273	18.6	279	19.0
Total	1,471	100.0	1,470	100.0
Deficiency	61		62	

Table 7 Holders and non-holders of driving licence

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	522	34.1
No	1,009	65.9
Total	1,531	100.0
Deficiency	1	

Table 8 Licence-holding Experience (for drivers only) – How many years have you been holding a driving licence?

	Frequency	Percentage of the total number of respondents (Base=521)	Percentage of the sample (Base=1,532)
Not more than 6 months	6	1.2	0.4
1 – 5 years	100	19.2	6.5
6 – 10 years	113	21.8	7.4
11 – 15 years	68	13.1	4.4
16 – 20 years	74	14.3	4.9
More than 20 years	141	27.0	9.2
Can't remember	18	3.5	1.2
Total	521	100.0	
Deficiency	1		

Table 9 Driving Experience (for drivers only) – Which type of vehicle did you drive most frequently in the past three months?

	Frequency	Percentage of the total number of respondents (Base=516)	Percentage of the sample (Base=1,032)
Private car	245	47.4	16.0
Light goods vehicle	18	3.5	1.2
Goods vehicle	14	2.7	0.9
Bus	6	1.1	0.4
Taxi	5	0.9	0.3
Private Motorcycle	5	1.0	0.3
Container truck	4	0.7	0.2
Minibus	3	0.5	0.2
Government vehicle (vehicle with “AM” plate)	2	0.4	0.1
Others (please state in detail)	1	0.2	0.1
Did not drive or rarely drove	215	41.7	14.0
Total	516	100.0	
Deficiency	6		

Appendix 2

Questionnaire

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Part I : Self Introduction

Hello, I am an interviewer from the Public Opinion Programme of The University of Hong Kong. We would like to ask for your opinion regarding road safety. It would take you only a couple of minutes and the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. If you have any questions about this interview, please call our hotlines at 3471 7310 and contact our supervisor or 2857 2988 during office hour to verify the interview and my identity.

- District of residence
- Household size

Part II : Selection of Respondents

How many persons aged over 18 are now in your house? We are doing sampling and therefore, if there is more than one, may I speak to the one who will have his/her birthday next? (Interviewer can give examples like, “Any person who will have his/her birthday in February or the next three months?) [The interview terminates if there are no adults at home. The interviewer should say thank you and hang up.]

Yes

No → Interview completed, thank you. Bye. (skip to end)

Part III : Questions

Q1 According to your own observation, do you think red light jumping by drivers in general, including professional drivers and private car drivers, totally unacceptable, unacceptable, “half half”, acceptable or totally acceptable?

- | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| 1 totally unacceptable | 2 unacceptable | 3 “half half” |
| 4 acceptable | 5 totally acceptable | |
| 6 don’t know/ hard to say | 7 refused to answer | |

Q2 Do you think red light jumping by professional drivers in general totally unacceptable, unacceptable, “half half”, acceptable or totally acceptable?

- | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| 1 totally unacceptable | 2 unacceptable | 3 “half half” |
| 4 acceptable | 5 totally acceptable | |
| 6 don’t know/ hard to say | 7 refused to answer | |

Q3 Do you think red light jumping by private car drivers in general totally unacceptable, unacceptable, “half half” , acceptable or totally acceptable?

- | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| 1 totally unacceptable | 2 unacceptable | 3 “half half” |
| 4 acceptable | 5 totally acceptable | |
| 6 don’t know/ hard to say | 7 refused to answer | |

Q4 According to your own observation, red light jumping by which types of professional drivers would you find unacceptable? [Do not read out the answers, multiple responses allowed. The interviewer should probe and ask “anymore?”]

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 none | 2 minibus drivers | 3 taxi drivers |
| 4 bus drivers | 5 van drivers | 6 goods vehicle drivers |
| 7 container truck drivers | 8 dumper drivers | 9 motorcyclists |
| 10 others (please specify) | 11 don’t know/hard to say | 12 refused to answer |

Q5 At present, red light jumping incurs 3 Driving Offence Points (DOPs) and the driving licence will be suspended when 15 points are accumulated within two years. Are you for or against Government's proposal to increase the number of points for red light jumping? [Probe into the degree]

- | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 1 very much against | 2 against | 3 neutral |
| 4 for | 5 very much for | 6 don't know/hard to say |
| 7 refused to answer | | |

Q6 If you can decide on the number of points incurred for red light jumping and the driving licence will be suspended when 15 points are accumulated within two years, how many points do you think should be incurred for each offence committed?

_____ [exact number between 0 and 15 should be recorded, approximation not to be acceptable]
don't know/hard to say
refused to answer

Q7 At present, besides the 3 DOPs incurred, red light jumping carries a fine of \$450. Are you for or against Government's proposal to raise the level of penalty for red light jumping? [Probe into the degree]

- | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 1 very much against | 2 against | 3 neutral |
| 4 for | 5 very much for | 6 don't know/hard to say |
| 7 refused to answer | | |

Q8 If the DOPs incurred for red light jumping remains at 3 but you can decide on the level of penalty, what do you think the level should be?

_____ [exact number between \$0 and \$2,000 should be recorded, approximation not to be accepted]
don't know/hard to say
refused to answer

Q9 (For respondents of Q6 who gave a number between 0 and 15, excluding those who gave 3 as the answer) Based on your suggestion given just now that red light jumping should incur (read out the answer for Q6. In case the answer is 3, the interviewer should key in the answer for Q8 without repeating the question) points, what do you think the level of penalty for red light jumping should be?

_____ [exact number between \$0 and \$2,000 should be recorded, approximation not to be accepted]

Don't know/hard to say

Refused to answer

Q10 In the preceding month, how many times did you witness red light jumping activities? You can be walking on the street, travelling on vehicles, or you yourself jumping the red light.

_____ [exact number between 0 and 100 should be recorded, approximation accepted]

can't remember /hard to say

refused to answer

Q11 Do you hold a driving licence?

1 yes

2 no (skip to personal particulars)

3 refused to answer (skip to personal particulars)

Q12 (For drivers only) How many years have you been holding a driving licence?

_____ [exact number should be recorded and approximation accepted. 0=less than half a year, 1= half a year to less than one year and a half, 2= one year and a half to less two years etc, 21= over 20 years]

Can't remember

Refused to answer

Q13 For drivers only) In the past three months, which type of vehicles did you drive most frequently? [Interviewer should note the difference between private motorcycle and delivery motorcycle. Probing is required for a single answer]

- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 none or rarely drive | 2 private car | 3 minibus | 4 taxi |
| 5 bus | 6 van | 7 truck | 8 container truck |
| 9 dumper | 10 private motorcycle | 11 delivery motorcycle | |
| 12 government vehicle | 13 others (please specify) | 14 refused to answer | |

Part IV : Personal Particulars

[DM1] Gender

Male

Female

[DM2] Age

_____ [exact number]

Refused to answer

[DM3] Education Attainment

Primary or below

Secondary

Matriculated

Tertiary, non-degree course

Tertiary, degree course

Postgraduate or above

Refused to answer

[DM4] The flat you are residing at is

Self-purchased or

Rent?

Refused to answer

[DM5] House type

Public rented housing

Housing Authority subsidized sale flats

Housing Society subsidized sale flats

Private housing

Village: villas / bungalows / modern village houses

Village: simple stone structures / traditional village houses

Public temporary housing

Private temporary housing

Staff quarters

Others

Refused to answer

[DM6] Occupation

Managers and administrators

Professionals

Associate professionals

Clerks

Service workers and shop sales workers

Skilled agricultural and fishery workers

Craft and related workers

Plant and machine operators and assemblers

Non-skilled workers

Students

Housewives

Unclassified

Others (unemployed, retired, etc.)

Refused to answer