“DYNAMIC” SIGNAGE:

RESEARCH RELATED TO DRIVER DISTRACTION AND ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Submitted by

SRF Consulting Group, Inc.

Prepared for

City of Minnetonka

June 7, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This study was precipitated by concerns raised by the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota in regard to the installation of two LED ("light emitting diode") billboards along Interstate 394 and Interstate 494. The LED function was applied to two existing "static" image billboards located adjacent to the interstate. Following installation of the LED function, the City turned off the power to the signs though a stop work order based on current city ordinance prohibiting flashing signs, which is broadly defined, as well as permitting requirements for the retrofitting of the signs to the upgraded technology. The billboard owner sued the City, and the court response to this legal action as of the writing of this study has been to allow limited use of the LED billboards. A moratorium on further signage of this type was established by the City to facilitate the study of issues related to driver distraction and safety and appropriate regulatory measures for LED and other types of changeable signage.

This study was undertaken on behalf of the City of Minnetonka to examine these issues. While the concerns were precipitated by LED billboards in particular, this report examines more broadly "dynamic" display signage which is defined as any characteristics of a sign that appear to have movement or that appear to change, caused by any method other than physically removing and replacing the sign or its components, whether the apparent movement or change is in the display, the sign structure itself, or any other component of the sign. This includes a display that incorporates a technology or method allowing the sign face to change the image without having to physically or mechanically replace the sign face or its components. This also includes any rotating, revolving, moving, flashing, blinking, or animated display and any display that incorporates rotating panels, LED lights manipulated through digital input, "digital ink" or any other method or technology that allows the sign face to present a series of images or displays. These capabilities may be provided by a variety of technologies which are discussed later in this report.

As the study progressed, additional communities within the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, as well as the League of Minnesota Cities, expressed interest in these issues. However, it is not the intention of this report to provide a comprehensive study of all issues raised by dynamic signage, or other types of billboards, but rather to focus narrowly on the issues of concern to the City of Minnetonka.

2.0 PURPOSE OF STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

Driving a motor vehicle is a complex task that requires the ability to divide one's attention. Simultaneously maintaining a steady and legal speed, changing lanes, navigating traffic and intersections, reading and interpreting street signs, drivers are often challenged by conditions that can change in the blink of an eye. Internal and external physical conditions can affect how safely the driving task is accomplished. Drug or alcohol intoxication, fatigue and/or distractions in the driving environment all can play a role in motor vehicle crashes. However, these conditions are rarely the sole reason for a crash. Rather, these conditions serve to exacerbate an already-complex driving environment and subsequent mistakes in judgment can lead to crashes.

Increasingly complex traffic and roadway environments require greater attention to and focus on the driving task.

The purpose of this study is to understand what existing transportation research tells us about the effects of dynamic signs on motorists. This study also explores regulatory measures enacted in other jurisdictions to address concerns related to driver distraction. Due to time and scope constraints, this report is not comprehensive, but rather addresses the most frequently cited and easily accessible information available. The report concludes with a discussion of regulatory options for the City of Minnetonka to consider in their formulation of policies to address dynamic signage.

Information collected for this report draws from a variety of sources including interviews with subject matter experts, government and academic research, and policies developed to regulate various types of signage.

Several city and county sign ordinances were used as references for policy and regulatory research. In some cases, ordinances were brought to our attention by planners and others following the sign ordinance issue. In others, Internet searches were conducted using words and references that apply specifically to dynamic signs.

Several sign manufacturers and sign companies provided an industry perspective through a workshop with the SRF Consulting Group and the City of Minnetonka staff on February 27, 2007. This meeting yielded information about sign characteristics that can be addressed through policy and regulatory measures. Daktronics, a company that manufactures and markets LED signs, was also helpful in this regard, providing informational materials about characteristics of signs that can be regulated and examples of city sign ordinances with which they are familiar.

3.0 SELECTED RESEARCH FINDINGS

This following section presents a summary of expert opinions and selected driver distraction research conducted by government and academic researchers examining roadside signage and its effects on the driving task. Studies are organized around critical questions with serious research ramifications.

- *Is there reason to believe that billboards are a source of distraction?*
- *Is there reason to believe that "dynamic" billboards are an additional source of distraction?*
- *How much distraction is a problem?*
- *How does "brightness" affect driver safety concerns?*
- *How should billboards and other signage be regulated from a driver safety perspective?*

3.1 Expert Opinions

A combination of researchers and public policy experts were interviewed for this study. Individuals were identified while conducting background research into driver distraction and were interviewed because of their credibility in the field.

Kathleen Harder, a researcher at the University of Minnesota, has conducted driver distraction research for a variety of applications, including research for Mn/DOT. She is an expert in the field of human factors and psychology. She indicated that electronic billboards pose a driver distraction threat because of their ability to display high resolution color images, their ability to change images, and their placement in relationship to the roadway, particularly in areas where the road curves, exits and entrances are present, merges, lane drops, weaving areas, key locations of official signs, and/or areas where roadways divide.

Greg Davis, a researcher with the FHWA Office of Safety Research and Development, in Washington, DC was involved in the 2001 FHWA study on electronic billboards. He was interviewed to gain a deeper understanding of this critical study and to learn of recent research in this area. Davis stated that while no research has established a direct cause and effect relationship between electronic outdoor advertising signs and crash rates, the lack of such a research finding does not preclude a causal relationship between electronic billboards and crashes. He advocated for a new study that can control all variables and determine if a cause and effect relationship exists.

Scott Robinson, an outdoor advertising regulator for Mn/DOT, wrote the 2003 technical memorandum that addresses allowable changes for outdoor advertising devices. Mr. Robinson indicated that the memo was originally written in 1998 to establish a permitted rate of change for tri-vision signs and that the application to electronic billboards was not considered. The minimum change rate of 4.9 seconds for 70 mph roadways and 6.2 seconds for 55 mph roadways was based on the travel time between static signs spaced at the minimum allowed distance apart. Mr. Robinson also indicated that the memo is not a Mn/DOT policy, statute or rule, but rather it was written to provide internal guidance.

Jerry Wachtel, an Engineering Psychologist and highway safety expert in private practice, was the lead author for the FHWA's original (1980) study on electronic billboards. He has continued his active involvement in this field, and advises Government agencies as well as the outdoor advertising industry on sign ordinances, sign operations, and the implications of the latest research on road safety. Mr. Wachtel believes that it is neither feasible from the perspective of research design and methodology, nor necessary from a regulatory perspective, to demonstrate a causal relationship between digital billboards and road safety. Rather, he believes that we have a strong understanding, based on many years of research, of driver information processing capabilities and limitations, and of the contributions to, and consequences of, driver distraction, on crash risk; and that this understanding is sufficient to support development of guidelines and ordinances for the design, placement, and operation of digital billboards so as to lessen their potentially adverse impact on road safety and traffic operations.

Wachtel also offered comments on drafts of this report. In later conversations related to his review, Wachtel stated his belief that even though visual fixations on roadway signs decrease as route familiarity increases, a strength of the new digital billboards is that they can present messages *that are always new.* Thus, the conclusion from the 1980 FHWA study is another argument against these billboards; namely, drivers spend more time looking at the unfamiliar signs than at familiar ones, suggesting digital billboards are more dangerous than traditional fixed billboards. Wachtel also suggested his preference for a goal to have any given driver experience only one, or a maximum of two, messages from an individual roadside sign.

3.2 Billboards: a Source of Driver Distraction? [1]

The purpose of a sign is to attract the attention of passersby so that a message is conveyed. To the degree signs attract the attention of vehicle drivers, they may distract them from the activity of driving. While this report primarily examines the impact of *dynamic* roadside advertising, the role traditional *static* advertising plays in driver distraction is discussed below.

The relationship between roadside advertising and crash rates has been the subject of several studies. The majority of this research was conducted in the 1950s, 60s and 70s. While some of the earliest studies have been subsequently criticized for flawed methodologies and improper statistical techniques, some findings emerge when the totality of the studies are examined. One of these findings is that the correlation between crash rates and roadside advertising is strongest in complex driving environments. For example, higher crash rates were found at intersections (generally considered a complex environment) that have advertising than those intersections that do not have advertising. A few of the studies that are important in this field are summarized below.

Minnesota Department of Transportation Field Study (1951) and Michigan State Highway Department Field Study (1952) [2]

These two studies from the early 1950s used similar methods but came to significantly different conclusions. Recognized as the more scientifically rigorous study, the Minnesota study found that increases in the number of advertising signs per mile are correlated with increases in motor vehicle crash rates. It also found that intersections with at least four advertising signs experienced three times more crashes than intersections with no advertising signs. Conversely, the less rigorous Michigan study found the presence of advertising signs had no effect on the number of crashes.

Iowa State College, Do Road Signs Affect Accidents? (Lauer & McMonagle, 1955)[3]

A laboratory test was created to determine the effect of advertising signs on driver behavior. The results of this study found removing all advertising signs from the driver's field of vision did not improve driver performance. When signs were included, driver performance was slightly better. Note that laboratory methods used in this study are considered to be dated by today's standards.

Faustman (California Route 40) Field Study (1961)[4] and Federal Highway Administration, Reanalysis of Faustman Field Study (1973)[5]

Two studies that appear to have stood the test of time are Faustman's original analysis of California Route 40 and its re-examination by FHWA more than a decade later. The original analysis tried to improve upon previous research by limiting variables, such as roadway geometric design and roadway access controls. The FHWA reanalysis focused on disaggregating the data and converting actual crashes to expected crash rates on specific roadway sections. Each of the sections was given a value based on the number of billboards on the section. A linear regression was performed to determine the expected crash rates. An analysis of variance of the regression coefficients found that the number of billboards on a section was statistically significant. The reanalysis found a strong correlation between the number of billboards and crash rates as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. FHWA Reanalysis of Faustman's Findings.

No. of Billboards	Expected No. of Accidents in a 5-year Period	Cumulative Increase in Accident Rate
0	5.92	
1	6.65	12.3
2	7.38	24.2
3	8.11	37.0
4	8.84	49.3
5	9.57	61.7

Federal Highway Administration

***Safety and Environmental Design Considerations in the Use of Commercial Electronic Variable-Message Signage* (Wachtel & Netherton, 1980)[6]**

This extensive review provides a comprehensive discussion of roadside advertising research as of 1980. The study authors noted "attempts to quantify the impact of roadside advertising on traffic safety have not yielded conclusive results." The authors found that courts typically rule on the side of disallowing billboards because of the "readily understood logic that a driver cannot be expected to give full attention to his driving tasks when he is reading a billboard." Because the distraction evidence is not conclusive, these decisions were generally not based on empirical evidence.

The research review noted that accident reports often cite "driver distraction" as a default category used by uncertain law enforcement officers who must identify the cause of a crash. As a result, the authors believe crashes due to driver distraction are not always properly identified. In addition, law enforcement officers often fail to indicate the precise crash locations on crash reports, making it difficult to establish relationships between crashes and roadside features.

Accident Research Unit, School of Psychology, University of Nottingham
Attraction and distraction of attention with roadside advertisements **(Crundall et al., 2005)** [7]

This research used eye movement tracking to measure the difference between street-level advertisements and raised advertisements in terms of how they held drivers' attention at times when attention should have been devoted to driving tasks. The study found that street-level advertising signs are more distracting than raised signs.

3.3 "Dynamic" Billboards: an Additional Source of Distraction?

Signage owners or leasers want to incorporate dynamic features into their signage for a number of reasons: to enhance the sign's ability to attract attention, to facilitate display of larger amounts of information within the same sign area, to conveniently change message content, and to enhance profitability. As mentioned earlier, this report uses the term "dynamic" signs to refer to non-static signs capable of displaying multiple messages. Several studies documented the ability of a sign to accomplish the first of these goals.

University of Toronto
Observed Driver Glance Behavior at Roadside Advertising Signs **(Beijer & Smiley, 2004)** [8]

Research done at the University of Toronto compared driver behavior subject to passive (static) and active (dynamic) signs. The study found that about twice as many glances were made toward the active signs than passive signs. A disproportionately larger number of long glances (greater than 0.75 seconds) taken were toward the active signs. The duration of 0.75 seconds is important because it is close to the minimum perception-reaction time required for a driver to react to a slowing vehicle. For vehicles with close following distances, or under unusually complex driving conditions, a perception delay of this length could increase the chance of a crash. The following findings were reported in this study:

- 88% of the subjects made long glances (greater than 0.75 seconds).
- 22% of all glances made at all signs were long glances (greater than 0.75 seconds).
- 20% of all the subjects made long glances of over two seconds.
- As compared to static and scrolling text signs, video and tri-vision signs attracted more long glances.
- Video and scrolling text signs received the longest average maximum glance duration.
- All three of the moving sign types (video, scrolling text and tri-vision) attracted more than twice as many glances as static signs.

University of Toronto
Impact of Video Advertising on Driver Fixation Patterns (Smiley et al., 2001) [9]

Another study completed at the University of Toronto used similar eye fixation information in urban locations to show that drivers made roughly the same number of glances at traffic signals and street signs with and without full-motion video billboards present. This may be interpreted to mean that while electronic billboards may be distracting, they do not appear to distract drivers from noticing traffic signs. This study also found that video signs entering the driver's line of sight directly in front of the vehicle (e.g., when the sign is situated at a curve) are very distracting.

City of Seattle Report (Wachtel, 2001) [10]

The City of Seattle commissioned a report in 2001 to examine the relationship between electronic signs with moving/flashing images and driver distraction. The report found that electronic signs with moving images contribute to driver distraction for longer intervals than electronic signs with no movement. Following are major points made in the report:

- New video display technologies produce images of higher quality than previously available technologies. These signs have improved color, image quality and brightness.
- New video display technologies use LEDs with higher viewing angles. Drivers can read the sign from very close distances when they are at a large angle from the face of the sign.
- Signs with a visual story or message that carries for two or more frames are particularly distracting because drivers tend to focus on the message until it is completed rather than the driving task at hand.
- Research has shown that drivers expend about 80 percent of their attention on driving related tasks, leaving 20% of their attention for non-essential tasks.
- The Seattle consultant suggests a "10 second rule" as the maximum display time for a video message.

The expanded content of a dynamic sign also contributes to extended distraction from the driving task. The Seattle Report examined how this may be due in part to the *Zeigarnik effect* which describes the psychological need to follow a task to its conclusion. People's attention is limited by the ability to only focus on a small number of tasks at a time, and by the tendency to choose to complete one task before beginning another. In a driving environment, drivers' attention might be drawn to the sign rather than the task of driving because they are waiting to see a change in the message. This loss of attention could lead to unsafe driving behaviors, such as prolonged glances away from the roadway, slowing, or even lane departure.

While the Zeigarnik effect may be present in a wide variety of driving situations, possible scenarios that could affect drivers include:

- A scrolling message requires the viewer to concentrate as the message is revealed. Based on the size and resolution of the sign, and the length of the message, this could range from less than one second to many seconds.
- A sequence of images or messages that tell a story, during which the driver's attention may be captured for the entire duration that the sign is visible. Instead of merely glancing at the sign and then returning concentration to the driving task, more attention may be given to the message.
- Anticipation of a new image appearing, even if the expected new image is not related to the first image. In this case, the driver may be distracted while waiting for the change.

Federal Highway Administration
***Safety and Environmental Design Considerations in the Use of Commercial Electronic Variable-Message Signage* (Wachtel & Netherton, 1980)** [11]

This research provides information on the use of on-premise Commercial Electronic Variable-Message Signs (CEVMS) that display public service information (i.e,. time and temperature) and advertising messages along the Interstate highway system. The research found the following major considerations:

- Highway Safety Considerations

  The link between changing messages that attract drivers' attention and crashes has been an issue of concern since the earliest forms of electronic signage became available. This study thoroughly reviewed the literature seeking information regarding a potential link between CEVMS and crashes:

  > *"Although a trend in recent findings has begun to point to a demonstrable relationship between CEVMS and accidents, the available evidence remains statistically insufficient to scientifically support this relationship."*

  The study also noted that studies have not documented information about "such occurrences as 'near misses' or traffic impedances that are widely recognized as relevant to safety, and which may or may not be attributable to the presence of roadside advertising."

- Human Factors Considerations

  Human factors relate to all the elements that explain driver behavior, such as eye glances and driver responses to a variety of driving-related stimuli. The study makes the point that simple driving-related tasks consume relatively little information processing capacity. However, when other conditions, such as congestion, complicated roadway geometries, or weather are also considered, the marginal extra

amount of attention required to read roadside advertisements could lead to driving errors that could cause crashes.

> *"The enormous flexibility of display possessed by CEVMS makes it possible to use them in ways that can attract drivers' attention at greater distances, hold their attention longer, and deliver a wider variety of information and image stimuli than is possible by the use of conventional advertising signs."*

Texas Transportation Institute for FHWA, Impacts of Using Dynamic Features to Display Messages on Changeable Message Signs (Dudek et al., 2005) [12]

This study examined the comprehension times for three different scenarios for DOT-operated changeable message signs. The scenarios evaluated were:

- Flashing an entire one-phase message
- Flashing one line of a one-phase message while two other lines of the message remain constant
- Alternating text on one line of a three-line CMS while keeping the other two lines of text constant on the second phase of the message

The findings of this study were:

- Flashing messages did not produce faster reading times.
- Flashing messages may have an adverse effect on message comprehension for unfamiliar drivers.
- Average reading times for flashing line messages and two-phase messages were significantly longer than for alternating messages.
- Message comprehension was negatively affected by flashing line messages.

While this research did not evaluate advertising-related signs, it does demonstrate that flashing signs require more of the driver's time and attention to comprehend the message. In the case of electronic billboards, this suggests that billboards that flash may require more time and attention to read than static ones.

3.3.1 OTHER INFORMATION

NHTSA Driver Distraction Internet Forum (2000) [13]

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration held an internet forum to gather research and public comment related to driver distraction with an emphasis on the use of cell phones, navigation systems, wireless Internet and other in-vehicle devices. During this forum, participants were invited to take a poll to determine the most prominent driver

distraction issues. Electronic billboards were identified as one of six noted sources of distraction.

Parliament of Victoria, Australia, Report of the Road Safety Committee on the Inquiry into Driver Distraction (2006) [14]

This report identified road signs and advertising as one of the largest sources of driver distraction. At least three billboards near Melbourne, Australia display moving images.

> *"The Committee considers these screens to be at the high end of potential visual distraction and accordingly, present a risk to drivers."*

The study also included a quote from the Manager of the Road User Behaviour group at VicRoads (the State's road and traffic authority) from a December 2005 hearing:

> *What we do know is when there is movement involved, such as flicker or movement in the visual periphery, that this is more likely to capture a driver's attention. We actually are hard-wired as human beings to movement, so particularly moving screens and information that scrolls at intersections and in highly complex driving situations – these are risky, and in particular researchers have been most concerned about those sort of advertising materials.*

This opinion would suggest that electronic signs can present a distraction to drivers.

3.4 How Much Distraction Is a Problem?

A number of studies were identified that discussed concerns with driver distraction generally. It should be noted that some of the studies cited use specific crash data that is ten or more years old. Direct comparison of distraction sources to influences of today may not be completely valid due to increased technological sophistication of distracting influences. These could include in-vehicle technology (e.g., navigation systems, MP3 players, DVD players, CD players, computer systems, etc.) as well as other potentially distracting influences (e.g., cell phones, text messaging, dynamic signage, other roadway elements, etc.) that were not commonplace when the data for these studies was collected:

Australian Road Research Board
***Investigations of Distraction by Irrelevant Information* (Johnston & Cole, 1976)** [15]

This research used five experiments to test whether drivers could maintain efficient performance in their driving tasks while being subjected to content that was information rich, but irrelevant to driving. The findings were that a small, but statistically significant amount of performance degradation was observed when the participant was under a critical load of stimuli.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration/ Virginia Tech Transportation Institute

***Impact of Driver Inattention on Near-Crash/Crash Risk: An Analysis Using the 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study Data* (Klauer et al., 2006)** [16]

This study analyzed the data from a driving database developed by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. This database contained exhaustive data recorded by instrumented vehicles that measured glance position, impairment, drowsiness, risk taking and many other parameters potentially involved in crash causation. Vehicles were instrumented so that an observer did not need to be in the vehicle to collect data. Automated data collection reduced the problem of an observer influencing driver behavior. The study found that glances of two seconds or greater doubled the risk of crashes or near-crashes. The study also found that 22 percent of crashes are accompanied by "secondary-task" distraction whether inside or outside the vehicle.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration/ Virginia Tech Transportation Institute

***Driver Inattention is a Major Factor in Serious Traffic Crashes* (2001)** [17]

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration commissioned a study to examine the causes of crashes. The study gathered information from four areas throughout the country and used data from the National Automotive Sampling System (NASS) from April 1996-April 1997 for analysis. The geographic areas were selected because they had good crash investigation practices and high interview completion rates. The results of this study are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Crash Causation Summary

Causal Category	Percentage of Drivers Contributing to Causation
Driver Inattention	22.7
Vehicle Speed	18.7
Alcohol Impairment	18.2
Perceptual Errors	15.1
Decision Errors	10.1
Incapacitation	6.4
Other	8.8

Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine

***The Role of Driver Inattention in Crashes; New Statistics from the 1995 Crashworthiness Data System* (Wang, 1996)** [18]

This report analyzed the NHTSA 1995 Crash Worthiness Data System (CDS). It found that the greatest source of driver distraction (3.2 percent) was due to a specified person, object or event outside the vehicle. The full results of the study are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Percentage of CDS Crashes Involving Inattention-Distraction Related Crash Causes

Data Element	% of Drivers	% of Crashes
Attentive or not distracted	46.6%	28.4%
Looked but did not see	5.6%	9.7%
Distracted by other occupant [specified]	0.9%	1.6%
Distracted by moving object in vehicle [specified]	0.3%	0.5%
Distracted while dialing, talking, or listening to cellular phone [location and type of phone specified]	0.1%@	0.1%@
Distracted while adjusting climate controls	0.2%@	0.3%@
Distracted while adjusting radio, cassette, CD [specified]	1.2%	2.1%
Distracted while using other device/object in vehicle [specified]	0.1%	0.2%
Sleepy or fell asleep	1.5%	2.6%
Distracted by outside person, object, or event [specified]	2.0%	3.2%
Eating or drinking	0.1%	0.2%
Smoking-related	0.1%	0.2%
Distracted/inattentive, details unknown	1.5%	2.6%
Other distraction [specified]	1.3%	2.2%
Unknown/No Driver	38.5%	46.0%

Weighted driver N = 4,627,000 (7,943, unweighted); weighted crash N = 2,619,000 (4,536);
In order for a *crash* to classified "attentive," all involved drivers had to be classified "attentive."
@ - estimate based on 5-9 cases.

University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center
The Role of Driver Distraction in Traffic Crashes (Stutts et al., 2001) [19]

A study prepared by the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center for the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety examined the sources of driver distraction in traffic crashes. The data came from the CDS from 1995-1999. Of the thirteen specific sources of distraction tracked by the study, the greatest source of distraction was an outside person, object or event. While the study does not break down the sources of outside distraction, it does show that distractions outside the vehicle are the largest factor in distraction-related crashes. The results of this study are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Specific Sources of Distraction Among Drivers in Distraction–Related Crashes

Specific Distraction	Percentage of Drivers
Outside person, object or event	29.4
Adjusting radio, cassette, CD	11.4
Other occupant in vehicle	10.9
Moving object in vehicle	4.3
Other device/object brought into vehicle	2.9
Adjusting vehicle/climate controls	2.8
Eating or drinking	1.7
Using/dialing cell phone	1.5
Smoking related	0.9
Other distraction	25.6
Unknown distraction	8.6
Total	100.0

Three studies were found which attempted to measure driver behavior specifically in response to dynamic signage. Two of these studies demonstrated a potential relationship between dynamic signage and crash rates:

Minnesota Department of Transportation, The Effectiveness and Safety of Traffic and Non-Traffic Related Messages Presented on Changeable Message Signs (CMS) (Harder, 2004) [20]

This study used a driving simulator to measure the effect of Department of Transportation changeable message signs on traffic flow. The two messages evaluated were a "crash ahead" warning and an AMBER Alert (child abduction information). The research found that just over half of the participants used the "crash ahead" message and 60 percent could recall the AMBER Alert with scores of Good or Better. Over one fifth of the participants slowed down by at least 2 mph upon seeing the AMBER Alert, demonstrating that messages relevant to drivers are associated with changes in at least some drivers' travel speed .

Decision of the Outdoor Advertising Board in the Matter of John Donnelly & Sons, Permitee, Telespot of New England, Inc., Intervenor, and Department of Public Works, Intervenor, with Respect to Permit Numbered 19260 as Amended **(1976)** [21]

This proceeding documents the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Outdoor Advertising Board's ruling regarding one of the first changeable signs. This sign was located near an arterial road in Boston and used magnetic discs to portray a message that changed every 30 seconds. The original sign permit was rejected based on four criteria, one of which was safety. Upon appeal, the Massachusetts Department of Public Works allowed the permit based on the fact that the sign would give the public a benefit. However, they ultimately determined that the sign was a safety hazard based on crash rates before and after the sign was installed. Tables 5 and 6 show the change in crash rates.

Table 5. Telespot Sign Crash Rates - Expressway Southbound

	Average per year (1/1/1970-12/31/1972)	**Average per year (1/1/1973-3/31/1975)**	**Average Percent Change**
Crashes where the sign was viewable (north of sign)	29.0	20.0	-31.0
Crashes where the sign was not viewable (south of sign)	39.0	15.6	-60.0

Table 6. Telespot Sign Crash Rates - Expressway Northbound

	Average per year (1/1/1970-12/31/1972)	**Average per year (1/1/1973-3/31/1975)**	**Average Percent Change**
Crashes where the sign was viewable (south of sign)	46.3	42.7	-7.8
Crashes where the sign was not viewable (north of sign)	8.0	1.8	-77.5

This analysis shows that while crash rates decreased on comparable sections in the years after the sign was installed, the sections where the sign was visible experienced smaller crash rate decreases. Due to these arguments, the Board ruled that the operation of the sign must be terminated.

Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Milwaukee County Stadium Variable Message Sign Study – Impacts of an Advertising Variable Message Sign on Freeway Traffic (1994) [22]

A study prepared by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) examined crash rates before and after an advertising variable message sign was installed in 1984 on the Milwaukee County Stadium, home of the Milwaukee Brewers professional baseball team. Crash statistics were analyzed for the three years before and the one and three years after the sign was installed. As they are often associated with driver distraction, side-swipe and rear-end crashes, as well as total crashes, were examined for both the eastbound and westbound directions. The sign was much more visible to eastbound traffic due to the stadium's proximity to the roadway and the amount of visual obstructions for westbound traffic.

The analysis found an increase in crash rates for all crash types in the eastbound direction after the sign was installed. Most pronounced was an 80 percent increase in side-swipe crashes after the first year of installation. Results in the westbound direction were mixed, with a 29 percent decrease in crashes the first year the sign was in place and a 35 percent increase in the three years the sign was in place. Although no control roadway sections were studied, an interview with the study author revealed that the introduction of a sign on a high volume curving roadway may have introduced enough distraction to an already demanding driving environment to explain the higher crash rate in the eastbound direction. The study author also stated that the study was not able to establish a causal relationship between the sign and the crash rates.[23]

Federal Highway Administration
Research Review of Potential Safety Effects of Electronic Billboards on Driver Attention and Distraction (2001) [24]

The Federal Highway Administration published a comprehensive report in 2001 that consisted of a literature search, literature review and a description of research needs for

the topic of electronic billboards (EBBs). While the study did not conduct any new research, it does provide an excellent summary of the role electronic billboards play in traffic safety and includes good descriptions of the terminology related to electronic billboards. Selected findings from that synthesis are provided below:

> *"In most instances, researchers were not able to verify that an EBB was a major factor in causing a crash. Only one study since the 1980 review and one lawsuit were identified."*
>
> *"Studies were identified that verified that: an increase in distraction, a decrease in conspicuity, or a decrease in legibility may cause an increase in the crash rate."*
>
> *"Commercial EBBs are designed to 'catch the eye' of drivers. Their presence may distract drivers from concentrating on the driving task and visual surrounds."*
>
> *"There is indication that individual differences in age and driving experience may be important considerations in driver distraction, and are relevant to understanding driver responses to the external environment. Furthermore, research regarding driver familiarity of their route demonstrated that visual fixations on roadway signs decreases as route familiarity increases. This research may show that there is a difference between commuter and visiting drivers."*

Based on these findings, the FHWA recommended additional research to further demonstrate how roadway characteristics, sign characteristics and legibility, driver characteristics and other potential driver distractions affect traffic safety. FHWA was contacted to see if any new information was available. Greg Davis, a Research Psychologist with the FHWA Office of Safety R&D, indicated that the FHWA has not performed additional studies on the topic since the report was published. He stated that there is "no direct correlation between electronic outdoor advertising signs and crash rates". He referred to a before/after study of electronic signs installed along a freeway in Las Vegas that found no change in crash rates. He went on to say that the lack of a research finding that links signs with crash rates does not mean that a causal relationship does not exist. He indicated that he has been contacted by several law enforcement agencies regarding the link between driver distraction and dynamic message signs/electronic billboards. He indicated that this is a timely and pertinent topic for many states due to the increasing popularity and capabilities of electronic outdoor advertising devices, and he expects further research to be forthcoming. He advocates for a new study that can control for all variables and determine if a cause and effect relationship exists.[25]

3.5 How Does "Brightness" Affect Driver Safety Concerns?

The brightness of any sign, static or dynamic, raises concerns with discomfort or disability glare to the driver that may arise when viewing any lighted object. *Disability Glare* occurs when a

driver is exposed to a light source so bright that it temporarily blinds the driver, impairing their ability to perform driving tasks. This temporary blindness is brief, but can be dangerous. *Discomfort Glare* occurs when a light source is bright enough to distract or encourage the driver to look away from the light, but is not blinding. Discomfort glare is of particular concern in cases where a bright sign is located in the same line of sight as a traffic sign, signal or another vehicle.

While concerns about glare are not unique to dynamic signs, newer sign technologies, which often include dynamic components, have the technical capability to emit more light and/or respond to ambient light conditions, raising additional concerns about sign brightness in areas where signs compete with regulatory traffic signs or signals.

3.6 Billboards and Other Signage Regulation: a Minnesota Perspective

Roadside signage is governed by policies and laws at the federal, state and local levels. Minnesota Statute, Chapter 173 seeks to "reasonably and effectively regulate and control the erection or maintenance of advertising devices on land adjacent to such highways." The statute requires adherence to federal statutes with respect to interstate and primary systems of highways.

Minnesota Statute Ch. 173.16 Subd. 3. regulates lighting of signs. Signs which are "illuminated by any flashing light or lights, except those giving public service information" (time, date, temperature, weather or news) are prohibited. This section also states:

> (b) Advertising devices shall not be erected or maintained which are not effectively shielded so as to prevent beams or rays of light from being directed at any portion of the traveled way of an interstate or primary highway, of such intensity or brilliance as to cause glare or impair the vision of the operator of any motor vehicle; or which otherwise interfere with any driver's operation of a motor vehicle are prohibited.
>
> and
>
> (c) Outdoor advertising devices shall not be erected or maintained which shall be so illuminated that they interfere with the effectiveness of or obscure any official traffic sign, device or signal.

3.7 Billboard and Other Signage Regulation: Other Perspectives

During the course of this study, several articles were found which summarize regulation of dynamic signage in other states:

> **Wisconsin Department of Transportation**
> ***Electronic Billboards and Highway Safety* (2003)** [26]
>
> The Wisconsin Department of Transportation also published a literature review report to further explain the current state of EBB research. Although much of the information is

mentioned in other sections of this report, the Wisconsin review did summarize Wisconsin's regulations for electronic billboards.

- No message may be displayed for less than one-half second;
- No message may be repeated at intervals of less than two seconds;
- No segmented message may last longer than 10 seconds;
- No traveling message may travel at a rate slower than 16 light columns per second or faster than 32 columns per second (light column defined as pixel column);
- No variable message sign lamp may be illuminated to a degree of brightness that is greater than necessary for adequate visibility.

National Alliance of Highway Beautification Agencies (1999) [27]

Although this survey is eight years old, it generated the following information related to electronic billboards:

- Nine states had specific regulations governing signs,
- Nine states had regulations on tri-vision signs that were either being drafted or in pending legislation,
- Fifteen states had regulations regarding moving parts and/or lights,
- Nine state had no regulations on tri-vision signs, and
- Six states and Washington, DC, prohibited tri-vision signs.

An investigation into state outdoor advertising regulations was also conducted.

- Thirty-six states had prohibitions on signs with red, flashing, intermittent, or moving lights,
- Twenty-nine states prohibited signs that were so illuminated as to obscure or interfere with traffic control devices, and
- Twenty-nine states prohibited signs located on interstate or primary highway outside of the zoning authority of incorporated cities within 500 ft of an interchange or intersection at grade or safety roadside area.

Parliament of Victoria, Australia, Report of the Road Safety Committee on the Inquiry into Driver Distraction (2006) [28]

This report, cited earlier for its driver distraction opinions, identifies road signs and advertising as one of the largest sources of driver distraction. VicRoads, the state's road and traffic authority, has implemented the following regulations.

Figure 1. VicRoads' Ten Point Road Safety Checklist

An advertisement, or any structure, device or hoarding for the exhibition of an advertisement, is considered to be a road safety hazard if it:

1. obstructs a driver's line of sight at an intersection, curve or point of egress from an adjacent property; or
2. obstructs a driver's view of a traffic control device, or is likely to create a confusing or dominating background which might reduce the clarity or effectiveness of a traffic control device; or
3. could dazzle or distract drivers due to its size, design or colouring, or it being illuminated, reflective, animated or flashing; or
4. is at a location where particular concentration is required (eg. high pedestrian volume intersection); or
5. is likely to be mistaken for a traffic control device, for example, because it contains red, green or yellow lighting, or has red circles, octagons, crosses or triangles, or arrows; or
6. requires close study from a moving or stationary vehicle in a location where the vehicle would be unprotected from passing traffic; or
7. invites drivers to turn where there is fast moving traffic or the sign is so close to the turning point that there is no time to signal and turn safely; or
8. is within 100 metres of a rural railway crossing; or
9. has insufficient clearance from vehicles on the carriageway; or
10. could mislead drivers or be mistaken as an instruction to drivers.

VicRoads also gives operational requirements for electronic advertising message signs. Signage must:

- not display animated or moving images, or flashing or intermittent lights;
- remain unchanged for a minimum of 30 seconds;
- not be visible from a freeway; and
- satisfy the ten-point checklist.

4.0 SUGGESTED REGULATORY APPROACH

Local governments regulate electronic outdoor advertising devices in widely varying degrees. Some cities completely prohibit the use of all electronic signs (sometimes specifying LED signs), while others have no regulations specific to electronic signs. Between those two extremes, there are many levels and types of control that can be applied.

The primary concerns to keep in mind when considering sign regulations are 1) First Amendment rights, which can be affected by regulations that affect the content of a sign's message, and therefore should be avoided, and 2) changing technology, which can quickly make a sign ordinance no longer applicable if the ordinance has been specifically written to address a certain type of sign technology. Performance based measures may therefore be preferable as they remain viable even as sign technology advances.

4.1 Definitions

Signage discussions often include a number of different words or phrases used to describe the technical characteristics of signage devices or their components (such as LEDs). For the purpose of zoning, some additional terms are also used to describe sign characteristics. Any regulatory efforts should take care to precisely define terminology. One possible resource in this effort is "Street Graphics and the Law," published by the American Planning Association (APA) Planning Advisory Service[29].

4.2 Types of Regulatory Measures

4.2.1 Complete or Partial Prohibition of Electronic Signs

Some cities have completely prohibited the use of electronic outdoor advertising devices. For example, the City of Maple Valley, WA prohibits all types of electronic outdoor advertising devices including animated signs, electronic changeable message signs, flashing signs or displays, moving signs, scrolling displays, and traveling displays. This applies to both on-premise and off-premise signs.

Other cities are very selective about where electronic signs are allowed, allowing them only in certain zoning districts. There are very few "standard" approaches. For the most part, each local

government tailors their regulations to their own situation. One approach adopted by cities is to prohibit electronic outdoor advertising devices in residential zoning districts, and for a certain distance away from residential zoning districts, similar to the zoning limitations placed on illuminated signs. Some ordinances require that electronic signs be situated such that the sign face is not visible from nearby residences.

4.2.2 Size Limitations on Electronic Signs

Another way of regulating electronic signs is to limit their size. Again, there is no set standard for this. One ordinance reviewed for the purpose of this study limits the electronic portion of a sign to no more than 50 percent of the sign face with the overall size determined by whatever the sign ordinance allows for a particular zoning district. Other examples of electronic sign size limitations include five square feet, 1,000 square inches, 20 square feet, and so forth. In other ordinances, there is no differentiation made between the size of electronic signs and other signs.

According to input from representatives of the sign industry, the smaller the size of the electronic sign, the more desirable it is for businesses to use frequent message changes, or sequenced messages, where more than one screen of text is used to convey an entire message.

4.2.3 Rate-of-Change Limitations on Electronic Signs

Many communities that allow electronic signs also regulate the rate at which the messages on the signs can be changed. Research on sign codes has shown this to range from as little as four seconds to as long as 24 hours.

The Interstate 394 sign between Ridgedale Drive and Plymouth Road is visible for approximately 45 seconds at free flow traffic speeds. Depending on text size, the message may not be readable by drivers during this entire duration, but the message changes can attract attention from long distances. Depending on how often the message changes occur and the speed of traffic, drivers on this segment could see a varying number of discrete messages. Table 7 provides the number of message changes a driver would see at different change durations and traffic speeds.

Table 7. Number of New Messages Seen at Various Driver Speeds and Time Intervals Between Messages

		Number of Messages Seen					
		Message Display Time (seconds)					
Speed (mph)	**Time sign is clearly visible* (seconds)**	**6**	**8**	**10**	**60**	**1800 (30 minutes)**	**3600 (1 hour)**
30	60	11	9	7	2	1	1
45	40	8	6	5	2	1	1
55	33	7	5	4	2	1	1

*Assuming the sign is clearly visible from one-half mile away.

Prohibiting displays from changing quickly can minimize potential driver distraction, but it would significantly limit the message owner's ability to convey information that does not fit on one screen of the sign. Using two or more successive screens to convey a message is referred to as sequencing. Based on the studies summarized in part 3 of this Report, including the glance duration studies performed by Klaur for the FHWA in 2006 and by Beijer & Smiley in 2004, and Wachtel's analysis for Seattle of the Zeigarnik effect, a message delivery system such as sequencing that requires or induces a driver to watch the sign for several seconds increases the likelihood of driver distraction. Based on information from the sign industry, for sequencing to be effective in a marketing sense, a brief rate-of-change (1-2 seconds) is generally used before transitioning into the next screen.

Some codes specify how an image changes, while other codes prohibit the use of transitions. The change from one image to another can be accomplished by various techniques: no transition – simply a change from one screen to another, or fading or dissolving one image into the next. Flashing, spinning, revolving, or other more distracting transition methods can be prohibited, allowing businesses to use sequencing in an effective manner without making the signs overly distracting. Another way of regulating distracting transitions is to require a very short time of a dark or empty screen between images.

4.2.4 Motion, Animation, or Video Limitations on Electronic Signs

Motion on a sign can consist of everything from special text effects (spinning, revolving, shaking, flashing, etc.) to simple graphics, such as balloons or bubbles rising across the screen, to more realistic moving images that have the appearance of a television screen. According to sign industry representatives, video imagery on a sign is referred to as "animation" if the sign is limited to the capability of 10 frames per second. Fewer frames per second make the moving image look more like animation. Imagery produced by signs that have the capability of processing up to 30 frames per second is accurately referred to as "video" imaging.

Many communities that allow dynamic signs do not allow the application of any type of motion, animation, or video on the signs. However, Seattle was obliged to allow video imagery on their signs after earlier signage code regulating certain types of signs was not strictly enforced. In addition to requiring a dark period between successive messages to overcome the Zeigarnik effect, Seattle also limits the duration of the video message to a minimum of two seconds and a

maximum of 10 seconds. This time frame was established based upon careful calculations of the streets from which these signs could be seen, speed limits and traffic volumes in addition to the community's concern over the extent to which moving images could distract drivers. However, Seattle also limits the size of their electronic signs to a maximum of 1,000 square inches, with no single dimension greater than three feet, thus minimizing the effect of video images.

4.2.5 Sign Placement and Spacing

Regulating the number of dynamic sign potentially visible to a driver at any one time as well as the position of the sign in relationship to the roadway may reduce distraction to drivers. Spacing requirements should consider the speed, width and horizontal and vertical alignment of the roadway.

Some communities have established minimum distances between electronic signs. Establishing an adequate distance between these types of devices seems particularly important if a fairly fast rate of change is allowed for the purpose of facilitating sequenced messages or if animation and video imaging is allowed. Closely spaced signs attempting to convey sequenced messages may simply create visual overload and an over-stimulated driving environment. Research conducted to date has not yielded information about optimal electronic sign spacing. Seattle adopted a 35-foot spacing requirement for their electronic signs based upon multiple levels of analysis of the downtown city environment in which these signs are present.

Due to the varying characteristics of individual roadways in this regard, overlay districts allowing dynamic signage with conditions specific to that area could be considered. Overlay districts could also take into account other locational factors such as offset from the roadway and conspicuity. Determining appropriate offsets from the roadway must consider roadway clear zone requirements as well as spacing of frontage roads and access points, while also considering the signage too far outside the driver's line of sight may be a further distraction. Conspicuity, a sign's ability to stand out from its surroundings, should also be considered.

4.2.6 Text Size

Legibility is another important property of signage. The preferred approach used within highway signing is that drivers can read text that is 1 inch high from 30 feet away. Larger text is needed for signs to be legible at greater distances. Large, legible text allows the driver to read the billboard from varying distances and focus on the driving task. Conversely, with small text, the driver is more likely to focus on the sign for a longer period of time and possibly be more adversely distracted. However, the size or type of text or the amount of text due is rarely regulated.

4.2.7 Brightness Limitations on Electronic Signs

One of the main concerns about the use of electronic signs, regardless of whether they consist of changeable text, animation, or video, is the brightness of the image. The brightness of an object can be characterized in two ways. *Iluminance* is the total brightness of all the light at a point of measurement. Illuminance often describes ambient light and can be measured with a standard light meter such as is used in photography. *Luminance* is the measure of the light emanating from an object with respect to its size and is the term is used to quantify electronic sign brightness. The unit of measurement for luminance is nits, which is the total amount of light emitted from a sign divided by the surface area of the sign (candelas per square meter).

Many, but not all, LED-type signage can be time-programmed to respond to day and nighttime light levels. Higher-end signage types are equipped with photo cells to respond to ambient light conditions. Despite these controls, LED signs have been observed that are considered to be excessively bright. Sign industry representatives indicate that excessive brightness can be the result of 1) sign malfunction or improper wiring, 2) lack of photo cell and/or dimming mechanism, or 3) operator error or lack of understanding that brightness is not necessarily an advantage, especially if it makes a sign unreadable or unpleasant to look at. They also maintain that the intent of the electronic sign industry is to establish a brightness level that is similar to a traditional internally or externally lit sign. Recent observations of sign technicians calibrating the Interstate 394 LED billboard noted that the brightness controls are not calibrated to specific nit levels, but rather vary in proportion to a set maximum level, like a volume control dial on a typical car radio.

To control the extent to which electronic signs are a distraction or the extent to which they are readable, many local governments have adopted regulations that limit nit levels. At this time, ordinances that use nit level limitations typically differentiate between day time and night time nit levels. A common daytime nit limitation ranges from 5,000 to 7,000 nits. A common nighttime limitation is 500 nits, although in areas that are extremely dark at night, with very little in the way of ambient light levels, less than 500 nits may be appropriate. Other communities have taken this farther, such as Lincoln, Nebraska, whose sign code incorporates a graph of varying ambient light levels ranging from night time to a bright sunny day and all conditions between those two extremes, and has correlating nit limitations for the various ambient light levels.

Enforcement of these types of regulations is challenging as luminance of electronic signs is very difficult to measure in the field. Typically, sign luminance is measured and calibrated in a controlled factory setting using a spectral photometer to measure the light output. This calibration setting is then used in conjunction with a photo cell to control the brightness of the sign. The higher the ambient light levels, the brighter the sign. There are different nit thresholds for various colors. White is most often used to set dimming levels because at a constant nit level, white has the most intensity as perceived by the human eye.

Lincoln uses a light meter to conduct testing on electronic signs and found a wide range of luminance levels. One small electronic sign had luminance levels of 13,000 nits. The process that Lincoln uses to check luminance levels is to hold a luminance meter close to the face of the sign so that it captures only the light emitted from the sign. They have not had any requests to

measure the brightness of LED billboards, so the viability of using this approach on billboards has not been explored.

In Seattle, sign luminance was found too difficult to measure, so signs are visually inspected when complaints from the public are received. Sign owners are then contacted and asked to adjust sign luminance accordingly.

Both Mesa, Arizona and Lincoln, Nebraska have included a requirement for written certification from the sign manufacturer that the light intensity has been preset not to exceed the illumination levels established by their code, and the preset intensity level is protected from end user manipulation by password protected software or other method approved by the appropriate city official. This language appears to offer the advantage of ensuring that electronic signs, at a minimum, cannot exceed a certain established level of brightness.

At a minimum, it is important for communities to require all electronic signs to be equipped with a dimmer control. A requirement for both a dimmer control and a photo cell, which constantly keeps track of ambient light conditions and adjusts sign brightness accordingly, is optimal.

Over time, the LEDs used in electronic signs have a tendency to lose some of their intensity, and an owner may choose to have the sign adjusted and calibrated, which involves adjusting the level of electrical current in a manner that affects the brightness of the sign. This occurs over the course of two or three years. Having maximum nit levels established would ensure that the sign company has upper limits to work with as far as adjusting the sign is concerned.

4.3 Public Review

Most communities establish rules within their sign code and do not create opportunities for electronic signs to be approved through conditional use permits or special use permits. Some communities with special overlay districts, or areas that are oriented toward entertainment and night life, have established a review process for electronic signs, or for various functions of electronic signs such as animation and video.

Other communities take the opposite approach, where they allow electronic signs with no controls whatsoever, except in certain special areas, such as a historic overlay district, or a historic downtown district, where the signs are prohibited. Each community needs to tailor their application of electronic signs to meet their needs.

As of the writing of this report, no ordinances have been discovered that have a special review committee just for the purpose of electronic signs. Typically, sign regulations established in the zoning ordinance would be reviewed in accordance with existing review and approval processes. As with other development features, dynamic signage should be either prohibited, permitted, or conditional depending upon the zoning district and/or the specific features of the sign as established within the city's regulations (i.e. size, specific location with respect to the adjacent roadway, zoning district, proximity of sensitive uses). The recommended review process for permitted dynamic signs should be the same as procedures already in place for administrative

review. For dynamic signs requiring a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), the standard process for public notification and a public hearing before the planning commission should apply.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Driver distraction plays a significant role in traffic safety. Driver distraction is a factor in one in four crashes, and of those crashes involving driver distraction, one in four involves distractions outside the vehicle. The extent to which dynamic signage contributes to traffic safety has been examined in this study. Following are some of the major findings from a review of available research.

- Drivers that are subjected to information-rich content that is irrelevant to the driving task (such as digital advertising) may be temporarily distracted enough to cause a degradation in their driving performance. This degradation could lead to a crash.
- The unlimited variety of changing content allows dynamic signage to attract drivers' attention at greater distances and hold their attention longer than traditional static billboards.
- Several studies have found a correlation between crashes and the complexity of the driving environment. For example, crash rates are higher at intersections because the difficulty of the driving task is increased by the roadway's complexity. Complex driving environments place a high demand on drivers' attention. Introducing a source of distraction in an already demanding driving environment is more likely to result in crashes. This is illustrated by the 1994 Wisconsin DOT study that examined crash rates before and after installation of an electronic sign on a high-volume curving roadway. Introduction of this sign was identified as a likely factor of the 80 percent increase in side-swipe crashes that was experienced.
- Many studies have noted a correlation between outdoor advertising signs and crash rates, but have not established a *causal* relationship between the signs and crash rates. Driving is a complex task influenced by multiple factors. It is not necessary to establish a direct causal relationship between outdoor advertising signs and crash rates to show that they can make the driving task less safe. While the research shows that driver distraction is a key factor in many motor vehicle crashes, this often includes many interacting factors that distract drivers. The specific driver distraction danger that advertising signs contribute is difficult to quantify. A study that could control for multiple variables (human factors, vehicle, enforcement and the roadway environment) would be needed to provide a definitive statement on the level of driver distraction that signs produce. Such a study would likely find that not all advertising signs cause distraction that would lead to crashes, but some signs in some situations are more likely to contribute to crashes than others.

Overall, the literature review conducted for the purpose of this study identifies a relationship between driver distraction and electronic outdoor advertising devices. As indicated, driver distraction is a significant factor in crashes. The purpose of dynamic signage is to attract the attention of people in vehicles, so a natural conclusion from that knowledge is that drivers may be distracted by them. Professional traffic engineering judgment concludes that driver distraction generally contributes to a reduction in safe driving characteristics.

For this reason, state departments of transportation have carefully studied the design and location of dynamic signs within the highway right-of-way. Their goal is to convey a message to the traveling public in a manner that is as straight-forward and readable as possible without being a visual "attraction". The goal of the outdoor advertising sign is to be a visual attraction outside the right-of-way, possibly making it a source of driver distraction. Nevertheless, the actual change in crash rates influenced by the presence of any specific device has not been quantified in a manner that fully isolates the impacts of an electronic sign. Recent studies conducted by FHWA and others have cited the need for further research.

In the interest of promoting public safety, this report recommends that electronic signs be viewed as a form of driver distraction and a public safety issue. Therefore, the ordinance recommendations identified here should be considered. These recommendations should be reviewed in the future as additional research becomes available.
With respect to regulatory measures for electronic outdoor advertising signs, it is important that local governments take a thorough approach to updating their ordinances to address this issue. For example, an ordinance that addresses sign motion, but does not address brightness and intensity levels may leave the door open for further controversy. This report seeks to identify all of the aspects of electronic outdoor advertising devices that are subject to regulation. It does not specifically state what those regulations should be (e.g. the size of electronic signs), since these are all things that policy makers and staff must take into careful consideration. Further, as driver distraction and resulting influences on safety do not, in a practical sense, distinguish between on-premise and off-premise signage, this distinction is not highlighted in the recommendations below.

Regulatory Measures recommended for consideration

To properly address the issue of dynamic signage, it is recommended that the sign code address the following:

1. Identify specific areas where dynamic signs are prohibited. This would typically be done by specifying certain zoning districts where they are not allowed under any circumstances. If dynamic signs are to be allowed in specific areas, this could be done by zoning district (only higher level commercial districts are recommended for consideration) or by zoning overlay related to specific purposes (e.g. entertainment or sports facility district) or to specific roadway types.

2. Determine the acceptable level of operational modes in conjunction with such zoning districts or overlays. The various levels include:

    a. Static display only, with no transitions between messages,

    b. Static display with fade or dissolve transitions, or transitions that do not have the effect of moving text or images,

    c. Static display with scrolling, traveling, spinning, zooming in, or similar special effects that have the appearance of movement, animation, or changing in size, or get revealed sequentially rather than all at once (e.g. letters dropping into place, etc.), and

d. Full animation and video.

3. If one of the forms of static display is identified as the preferred operational mode, a minimum display time should be established. This display time should correspond to the operation roadway speed (rather than posted speed limit), allowing at most one image transition during the time that the sign if visible to a driver traveling at the operational speed.

   If a shorter minimum display time is considered, the effects of message sequencing should be considered. Wait intervals of more than 1-2 seconds between sequenced messages have the potential to become more of a distraction as viewers wait impatiently for the next screen, in an effort to view the complete message.

4. If the community wishes to accommodate animation or video in some or all locations where dynamic are permitted, a minimum and maximum duration of a video image should be established. The purpose for establishing a time limit is to ensure that the message is conveyed in a short, concise time frame that does not cause slowing of traffic to allow drivers to see the entire message. Given the creativity of advertising, these video images may be seen as a form of entertainment, and people typically like to see an entertaining message through to the end.

   Differentiate between zoning districts where dynamic signs are permitted by right, and zoning districts, overlay districts, or special districts where they should only be allowed through the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. A CUP would involve public notification and review and approval by the Planning Commission. Other options would include a design review board or other dispute resolution process.

5. Consider the establishment of minimum distance requirements between electronic outdoor advertising devices in relation to the zoning district or roadway context in which the signs are allowed.

6. Consider size limitations on dynamic signs for zoning districts where they are allowed. This may vary from one district to another.

7. Consider if dynamic signs are allowed independently, or if they must be incorporated into the body of another sign, and therefore become a limited percentage of the overall sign face.

8. Establish a requirement for that all dynamic signs that emit light be equipped with mechanisms that allow brightness to be set at specific nit levels and respond accurately to changing light conditions. The City must establish the authority to disable or turn the device off if it malfunctions in a manner that creates excessive glare or intensity that causes visual interference or blind spots, and require that the device remain inoperable until such time that the owner demonstrates to the appropriate city official that the device is in satisfactory working condition. If such technology is not available, consideration should be give to banning dynamic signs that emit light until such time as the technology allows brightness levels to be precisely controlled.

9. Consider maximum brightness levels that correlate to ambient (day or night condition, lighting of surrounding context) light levels. A maximum daytime and separate nighttime nit/footcandle level should be established. Consider wording that requires the sign to automatically adjust its nit level based on ambient light conditions.

10. Consider a requirement for a written certification from the sign manufacturer that the individual sign's maximum light intensity has been preset not to exceed the maximum daytime illumination levels established by the code, and that the maximum intensity level is protected from end user manipulation by password protected software or other method approved by the appropriate city official.

11. Require sign owners to provide an accurate field method of ensuring that maximum light levels are not exceeded. If such a method cannot technically be provided, consider banning dynamic signs that emit light until such time as the technology is available.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Current Sign Technologies

Appendix A – Current Sign Technologies

Roadside signage has long been used to alert and direct travelers to retail businesses, lodging, attractions and other destinations. Until the 20th century much of this image was "static" in nature, presenting a single image that could only be altered by repainting or otherwise removing an image and replacing it with another. With the advent of motorized travel, signage became more "dynamic" or active in its efforts to attract the traveler's attention as they moved at ever increasing speeds. Initially, motion was created by flashing bulbs or alternating sets of neon tubes.

Today's technologies allow for an increasingly sophisticated display of images that can be manipulated by a few strokes of a keyboard. Simpler forms of signs capable of displaying multiple images include "tri-vision" signs which present a series of images through mechanical rotation of multi-sided vertical strips. The rotation occurs at regular intervals presenting a series of static images. Other forms are electronically produced, allowing for a wide range of colors, messages and images depending on the level of technology, and typically produced by light emitted by the sign face. Basic levels of technology present letters or numbers in a single color of light, such as "time and temperature" signs or gas pricing signs. Many of these signs can present longer images in a scrolling fashion, or can provide simple animations.

Recent advances have introduced a variety of technologies to the outdoor advertising arena. The largest impact has been made with LED signs which offer an inexpensive yet powerful approach that combines full motion, brilliant colors and a readable display. Other technologies are in development, including "digital ink" signs that offer a changeable medium on a surface that looks like a normal vinyl billboard. These signs manipulate ink on the surface, allowing for a dynamic presentation of images without being internally illuminated.

The various sign technologies are referenced by a wide array of terms: "changeable message signs," "electronic billboards," "animated signs." In general, this report focuses on the broad range of signage types which are capable of displaying multiple images through electronic manipulation, which we will refer to as "dynamic" signing. Reference to specific signage types is made when necessary to discussion of specific issues (e.g. the brightness of LED signage).

Appendix B

Outdoor Advertising Sign Brightness Definitions

Appendix B – Outdoor Advertising Sign Brightness Definitions

This appendix defines various technical terms that are used to describe the operational aspects of electronic billboards.

Billboard Illuminance

Billboard illumination is typically discussed using two terms: illuminance and luminance. Because this section includes some technical jargon, a glossary that further defines terms used in outdoor advertising is provided in Appendix C.

Illuminance: The amount of light that is incident to the surface of an object. This is the method for describing ambient light levels or the amount of light that is projected onto a front-lit sign. This parameter is typically measured in lux (footcandles x meters). For the purposes of dimming, illuminance is discussed to describe the ambient light that hits the photocell.

Luminance: The amount of light that emanates from an internally illuminated sign. This parameter is measured in nits. The nit levels necessary for the sign to be legible vary with the ambient light conditions. On a sunny day, the nit levels must be very high, while at night, the levels must be very low to prevent the image from distorting and to prevent glare.

Billboard Luminance (Brightness)

Luminance is measured in nits (candelas/square meter) and describes how bright the image is. In essence, it is the amount of light that is radiated from the sign divided by the amount of surface area of the sign. No matter how big the sign is, the luminance of the sign is consistent. For example, the brightness of computer monitors is also measured in nits.

The European standard "EN 12966" specifies that at certain ambient light levels, the sign should output a given number of nits. There are different tables for each color due to the properties of how the human eye interprets each color. The color that is most often used to set dimming levels is white.

The FHWA has developed recommended practices for dynamic message signs installed within the roadway right-of-way. The standard is NEMA's TS-4 "Hardware Standards for Dynamic Message Signs (DMS) With NTCIP Requirements." Note that these standards were prepared for message signs deployed within the roadway right-of-way and should not be taken as recommended luminance levels for advertising signs. Table A-1 provides a simplified version of the NEMA TS-4 standard for the color white.

Table A-1 - Luminance Standards

Ambient Light (lux)	Approximate Light	Minimum Luminance (nits)	Maximum Luminance (nits)
40,000	Sunlight	12,400	62,000

10,000	Cloudy	12,400	-
4,000	Overcast	2,200	11,000
400	Sunrise/Sunset	600	3,000
40	Candlelight	250	1,250
less than 4	Moonlight	75	375

Source: NEMA TS-4 (2005)

Billboard Resolution

Billboards require far less resolution than print advertisements. For example, Clear Channel's LED "Digital Outdoor Network" LED bulletin-size (14' x 48') billboards require dimensions of only 208 pixels high by 720 pixels wide. If this image were to be printed at 300 dots per inch (dpi), a typical print resolution, the entire image would be less than 1.7 square inches. Therefore, it is ideal to keep the message on these signs simple and clear because they do not currently allow resolutions similar to printed images.

Dimming

To maintain readability, the brightness of a sign must be adjusted to match ambient light conditions. If this is not done, the image will appear too bright and can even degrade the image quality through a phenomenon called "blooming." If the image blooms, the brightest areas of the image bleed over into darker parts and the image clarity is degraded.

Dimming is typically controlled by a photocell, which measures the ambient light conditions and varies the light output of the sign based on preconfigured settings. As ambient light conditions darken, the photocell senses the decrease and lowers the light output of the sign. Some sign manufacturers do not incorporate photocells in their electronic signs.

Electronic billboard dimming can also be controlled by scheduled dimming according to time of day or manual dimming. On-premise signs may use any of these methods, but most, if not all, off-premise standard size electronic billboards are auto dimmed by photocell. Some signs include user-defined dimming curve capability allowing total control over sign brightness and adjustability to accommodate local brightness ordinances.

Appendix C

Electronic Outdoor Advertising Device
Visual Performance Definitions

Appendix C – Electronic Outdoor Advertising Device Visual Performance Definitions

Conspicuity

Conspicuity is the property that related to the contrast between a sign and its background and its ability to stand out from its surroundings. This is a subjective property that depends on many factors of both the environment and the viewer.

Contrast

Contrast is the property that defines the relationship between the brightness of the brightest color possible to the darkest color possible on a sign. In times when ambient conditions are very bright, such as a sunny day, the darkest color may still be very bright due to the sun's reflection off the sign. In these cases, the lighter colored areas of the billboard's image must be much brighter than the contrasting dark areas.

Legibility

The ability of the driver to read a sign is related to its legibility. Large, legible text allows the driver to read the billboard from varying distances and focus on the driving task. Conversely, with small text the driver is more likely to focus on the sign for a longer period of time and possibly wait until the sign is very close.

State departments of transportation use NEMA's TS-4 document for this criterion. This document specifies many characteristics related to legibility including character height, resolution and color.

Glare

Disability Glare

The first form of glare is disability glare. This occurs when a driver is exposed to a light source so bright that it temporarily blinds the driver, impairing their ability to perform driving tasks. This temporary blindness is brief, but can be dangerous.

Discomfort Glare

Discomfort glare is when a light source is bright enough to distract or encourage the driver to look away from the light, but is not blinding. Discomfort glare is of particular concern in cases where a bright sign is located in the same line of sight as a traffic sign, signal or another vehicle.

Frequency of Change

The frequency of change is determined by the interval of time between sign image changes. The rate of change can usually be adjusted by the owner and operator of the sign. Frequency

of change is highly variable, with some on-premise signs changing faster than once per second. While no standard is generally accepted, local government agencies have used ordinances to limit the frequency to anywhere from 5 seconds to 24 hours.

Interactive signs

Interactive signs change their message based on the person viewing it. For example, the carmaker MINI has installed variable message signs that display a customized message to car owners who have special key dongles containing a radio frequency identification (RFID) chips when the dongle is in close proximity to the sign.

Another example is a microphone system that identifies the radio stations passing drivers are listening to and displays a specific message for that station.

[1] B. Wallace, "Driver Distraction by advertising: genuine risk or urban myth?" Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, Municipal Engineer 156, 2003.

[2] J. Wachtel, and R. Netherton. "Safety and Environmental Design Considerations in the Use of Commercial Electronic Variable-Message Signage. Report No. FHWA-RD-80-051," Washington, D.C., 1980.

[3] A.R. Lauer and J.C. Mcmonagle, "Do Road Signs Affect Accidents?" Eno Transportation Foundation, 1955.

[4] D. Faustman, "A study of the relationship between advertising signs and traffic accidents on U.S. 40 between Vallejo and Davis." San Francisco: California Roadside Council, Report CRC No. 165, 1961.

[5] S. Weiner. "Review of report." Washington, D.C.: Federal Highway Administration, Environmental Design and Control Division, August 1973.

[6] J. Wachtel, and R. Netherton. "Safety and Environmental Design Considerations in the Use of Commercial Electronic Variable-Message Signage. Report No. FHWA-RD-80-051," Washington, D.C., 1980.

[7] D. Crundall et al., "Attraction and Distraction of Attention with Roadside Advertisements," Elsevier, 2006.

[8] D. Beijer and A. Smiley, "Observed Driver Glance Behavior at Roadside Advertising Signs," Transportation Research Record, 2005.

[9] A. Smiley et al., "*Impact of Video Advertising on Driver Fixation Patterns.* Transportation Research Record, 2004.

[10] G. Wachtel, The Veridian Group, "*Video Signs in Seattle – Final Report*." 2001.

[11] J. Wachtel, and R. Netherton. "Safety and Environmental Design Considerations in the Use of Commercial Electronic Variable-Message Signage. Report No. FHWA-RD-80-051," Washington, D.C., 1980.

[12] C. L. Dudek et al., "Impacts of Using Dynamic Features to Display Messages on Changeable Message Signs," Operations Office of Travel Management: Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C., 2005.

[13] "NHTSA Driver Distraction Forum: Summary and Proceedings," <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/pdf/nrd-13/FinalInternetForumReport.pdf>, accessed on February 14, 2007.

[14]"Report of the Road Safety Committee on the Inquiry into Driver Distraction," Parliament of Victoria, Australia, Victoria, Australia, 2006, p. 110.

[15] A.W. Johnston and B.L. Cole, "Investigations of Distraction By Irrelevant Information," Australian Road Research Board, 1976.

[16] S.G. Klauer et al., "*Impact of Driver Inattention on Near-Crash/Crash Risk: An Analysis Using the 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study Data*," National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2006.

[17] Driver Inattention Is A Major Factor In Serious Traffic Crashes," <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/outreach/traftech/TT243.htm>, accessed on February 14, 2007.

[18] J. Wang, "Role of Driver Inattention in Crashes; New Statistics from the 1995 Crashworthiness Data System, 40th Annual Proceedings, Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine, Vancouver, British Columbia, 1996.

[19] University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center, "The Role of Driver Distraction in Traffic Crashes,"2001.

[20] K. Harder, "The Effectiveness and Safety of Traffic and Non-Traffic Related Messages Presented on Changeable Message Signs (CMS)", Minnesota Department of Transportation, St. Paul, Minnesota, 2003.

[21] "*Decision of the Outdoor Advertising Board in the Matter of John Donnelly & Sons, Permitee, Telespot of New England, Inc., Intervenor, and Department of Public Works, Intervenor, with Respect to Permit Numbered 19260 as Amended*," The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Outdoor Advertising Division, 1976.

[22] Wisconsin Department of Transportation (1994). Milwaukee County Stadium Variable Message Sign Study. Wisconsin, USA: Internal Report, Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

[23] T. Szymkowski, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Interviewed on February 20, 2007.

[24] Federal Highway Administration, "Research Review of Potential Safety Effects of Electronic Billboards on Driver Attention and Distraction," 2001.

[25] G. Davis, FHWA Office of Safety Research and Development, Interviewed on February 23, 2007.

[26] CTC & Associates LLC, "Electronic Billboards and Highway Safety, <"http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/library/research/docs/tsrs/tsrelectronicbillboards.pdf>, accessed on February 14, 2007.

[27] Federal Highway Administration, “Research Review of Potential Safety Effects of Electronic Billboards on Driver Attention and Distraction,” 2001.

[28] “Report of the Road Safety Committee on the Inquiry into Driver Distraction,” Parliament of Victoria, Australia, Victoria, Australia, 2006.

[29] D. Mandelker, A. Bertucci and W. Ewald. “Street Graphics and the Law,” APA Planning Advisory Service, 2004, pp. 51-55.

SRF CONSULTING GROUP, INC.

Transportation • Civil • Structural • Environmental • Planning • Traffic • Landscape Architecture • Parking • Right of Way

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tom Grundhoefer
League of Minnesota Cities

FROM: Karen Sprattler, Senior Associate
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.

DATE: June 21,2007

SUBJECT: DYNAMIC" SIGNAGE: RESEARCH RELATED TO DRIVER DISTRACTION AND ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT

This study was originally commissioned in response to litigation brought by Clear Channel Communications, Inc. in response to actions taken by the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota in regard to the installation of two LED ("light emitting diode") billboards along Interstate 394 and Interstate 494. This study was undertaken to examine issues surrounding the Minnetonka billboards. While the concerns were precipitated by LED billboards in particular, this report examines more broadly "dynamic" display signage. However, this report is not the intended to be a comprehensive study of all issues raised by dynamic signage or other types of billboards,

As the study progressed, additional communities and the League of Minnesota Cities expressed interest in these issues. While it is true that the study was prepared for the City of Minnetonka, it is acknowledged that the many of the findings and conclusions, and the broader discussion of many of the issues of concern may be useful to other communities involved in similar situations.

H:\Projects\5995\Final Report\Study disclaimer 062007 KS.doc

One Carlson Parkway North, Suite 150
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55447-4443
Tel: 763-475-0010 • Fax: 763-475-2429

srfconsulting.com

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Case Plaza, One North Second Street
Fargo, North Dakota 58102-4807
Tel: 701-237-0010 • Fax: 701-237-0017