

EXCESSIVE FINE ENFORCEMENT



RESPONSE TO HCR 204

ISSUED JUNE 6, 2007

**LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR
1600 NORTH THIRD STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 94397
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804-9397**

LEGISLATIVE AUDIT ADVISORY COUNCIL

SENATOR J. "TOM" SCHEDLER, CHAIRMAN
REPRESENTATIVE CEDRIC RICHMOND, VICE CHAIRMAN

SENATOR ROBERT J. BARHAM
SENATOR WILLIE L. MOUNT
SENATOR EDWIN R. MURRAY
SENATOR BEN W. NEVERS, SR.
REPRESENTATIVE RICK FARRAR
REPRESENTATIVE HENRY W. "TANK" POWELL
REPRESENTATIVE T. TAYLOR TOWNSEND
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN J. TRICHE, JR.

LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

STEVE J. THERIOT, CPA

DIRECTOR OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT

DAVID K. GREER, CPA

FOR QUESTIONS RELATED TO THIS PERFORMANCE AUDIT, CONTACT
MICHAEL G. BATTLE, PERFORMANCE AUDIT MANAGER,
AT 225-339-3800.

Under the provisions of state law, this report is a public document. A copy of this report has been submitted to the Governor, to the Attorney General, and to other public officials as required by state law. A copy of this report has been made available for public inspection at the Baton Rouge office of the Legislative Auditor.

This document is produced by the Legislative Auditor, State of Louisiana, Post Office Box 94397, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9397 in accordance with Louisiana Revised Statute 24:513. Eight copies of this public document were produced at an approximate cost of \$63.20. This material was produced in accordance with the standards for state agencies established pursuant to R.S. 43:31. This report is available on the Legislative Auditor's Web site at www.la.state.la.us. When contacting the office, you may refer to Agency ID No. 9726 or Report ID No. 07100854 for additional information.

In compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance relative to this document, or any documents of the Legislative Auditor, please contact Wayne "Skip" Irwin, Director of Administration, at 225-339-3800.



STEVE J. THERIOT, CPA
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

OFFICE OF
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR
STATE OF LOUISIANA
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804-9397

1600 NORTH THIRD STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 94397
TELEPHONE: (225) 339-3800
FACSIMILE: (225) 339-3870

June 6, 2007

The Honorable Donald E. Hines,
President of the Senate
The Honorable Joe R. Salter,
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Dear Senator Hines and Representative Salter:

This report provides the results of our work to address House Concurrent Resolution (HCR) 204 of the 2006 Regular Legislative Session. HCR 204 urges and requests the legislative auditor to perform an in-depth analysis of one or more municipalities with a reputation for excessive speed limit enforcement, with an emphasis on the number of tickets issued for violations and the amount of revenue derived from these tickets. The resolution also suggests that we work together with the Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD). Our office and DOTD cooperated throughout this project.

The report contains our findings, conclusions, and two matters for legislative consideration. Appendix B contains fines and forfeiture rankings for 304 municipalities in Louisiana. Appendix D contains traffic violation convictions reported to the Department of Public Safety for these municipalities. I hope this report will benefit you in your legislative decision-making process.

Sincerely,

Steve J. Theriot, CPA
Legislative Auditor

SJT/dl

EFE07

Executive Summary 3

Introduction

 Audit Initiation and Objectives 5

 Background 5

**Is Evidence Available to Determine Whether Municipalities
in Louisiana Have Excessive Speed Limit Enforcement?**

 Local Municipalities Could Not Provide Sufficient Data for
 Us to Conduct the In-Depth Analysis Requested by HCR 204 9

 We Could Not Use Data From Other Sources (DPS or Supreme Court)
 for Our Analysis Because We Could Not Verify the Data 10

Can Municipal Governments Set Speed Limits on State Highways?

 Municipal Governments Cannot Set Speed Limits on State Highways 15

What Are Some Best Practices for Establishing and Enforcing Speed Limits?

 Louisiana Appears to Use Best Practices When Setting Speed Limits 17

 Other States Have Laws Regarding Enforcement of Speed Limits 17

Appendices

 Appendix A: Scope and Methodology 19

 Appendix B: Fines and Forfeiture Rankings 21

 Appendix C: Survey Results 31

 Appendix D: Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS 69

This page is intentionally blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

We were unable to perform the in-depth analysis on excessive speed limit enforcement requested by House Concurrent Resolution (HCR) 204 of the 2006 Regular Legislative Session because of a lack of data. The following findings describe the problems we had in obtaining data and the best practices we identified regarding the establishment and enforcement of speed limits.

Performance Audit Findings

- **Local municipalities could not provide sufficient data for us to conduct the in-depth analysis requested by HCR 204.** Overall, we were not able to obtain sufficient data from the 39 municipalities we surveyed to perform any meaningful analysis regarding excessive fine enforcement. Municipalities had difficulty providing number of traffic tickets, number of convictions, and amount of revenue to us. They had more difficulty providing these numbers to us broken down by violation type (e.g., speeding).
- **We could not use data from other sources for our analysis because we could not verify the data.** The Department of Public Safety (DPS) and the Louisiana Supreme Court also receive information regarding traffic violation convictions from courts around the state. However, when we compared the data we received to the data received by DPS and the Supreme Court, the discrepancies were so large that we were unable to verify and use the data from DPS and the Supreme Court.
- **Municipal governments cannot set speed limits on state highways.** Louisiana law does not allow municipal governments to establish speed limits on state highways. In addition, municipal governments cannot establish speed limits on non-state highways that exceed speed limits established in state law. The Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) is responsible for setting speed limits on state highways. DOTD can withhold funding from municipalities if it receives a complaint and determines that a local speed limit is not based on a traffic engineering study.
- **Louisiana appears to use best practices when setting speed limits.** We researched other states and national organizations for best practices on setting speed limits and compared them to Louisiana. Louisiana uses similar standards to those used in other states. In addition, Louisiana employs practices that the federal government and several national organizations recommend.
- **Other states have laws regarding enforcement of speed limits.** There are some states that have laws that are commonly referred to as speed trap laws. Louisiana does not appear to have similar laws. These laws take away incentives for local government to participate in excessive enforcement of traffic laws to generate revenue. In addition, these laws prohibit excessive speed enforcement activity.

This page is intentionally blank.

INTRODUCTION

Audit Initiation and Objectives

The Louisiana Legislature passed House Concurrent Resolution (HCR) 204 during the 2006 Regular Legislative Session. This resolution requests the Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) to study speed limits and its enforcement on state and U.S. highways within municipalities. It also urges and requests the legislative auditor to perform an in-depth analysis of one or more municipalities with a reputation for excessive speed limit enforcement. The resolution called for our office to emphasize the number of tickets issued for violations and the amount of revenue derived from these tickets.

We attempted to answer the following objectives during this performance audit:

1. Is evidence available to determine whether municipalities in Louisiana have excessive speed limit enforcement?
2. Can municipal governments set speed limits on state highways?
3. What are some best practices for establishing and enforcing speed limits?

Background

To answer the resolution and our objectives, we needed to determine which municipalities had a reputation for excessive speed limit enforcement. We chose two objective methodologies to select municipalities that might be at risk for excessive speed limit enforcement. From a total of 304 statewide municipalities, we selected the 30 municipalities with the highest percentage of revenue from fines and forfeitures and 30 municipalities with the highest fine and forfeiture revenue per capita. These methodologies gave us a list of 39 unique municipalities because some were on both lists.

Exhibit 1 on the following page lists these 39 municipalities and presents their overall ranking out of the total 304 municipalities. We have ranked the municipalities according to their percent of revenue from fines and forfeitures and fines and forfeitures per capita. The majority of the data in Exhibit 1 is from FY 2005 because FY 2006 financial data was not available. However, we were able to use FY 2006 data for three of the municipalities listed in the table. Appendix B contains the percent of revenue from fines and forfeitures and the fines and forfeitures per capita for all municipalities in the state. The majority of these financial data are from FY 2005.

Exhibit 1 FY 2005 Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita for the 39 Selected Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures*	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population*
1	Anacoco	42.88%	22	\$78.24	67
2	Baskin	87.41%	1	1,719.34	1
3	Bonita	40.09%	30	177.98	21
4	Clarence	41.12%	27	103.39	49
5	Delta	1.32%	8	526.14	6
6	Dodson	78.57%	5	775.81	4
7	Dry Prong	45.68%	19	154.90	27
8	Epps	53.21%	12	157.39	26
9	Eros	48.36%	17	171.15	23
10	Fenton	55.96%	10	100.58	50
11	Ferriday	17.78%	75	146.94	29
12	Fisher	24.58%	53	157.81	25
13	French Settlement	42.06%	25	94.46	57
14	Georgetown	85.33%	4	781.03	3
15	Golden Meadow	24.07%	54	147.83	28
16	Iowa	12.69%	95	145.95	30
17	Lillie	85.59%	3	507.68	7
18	Livonia	41.18%	26	348.86	9
19	Maurice	22.26%	60	191.10	17
20	McNary	50.54%	15	282.41	12
21	Natchez	64.45%	6	142.99	31
22	New Llano	54.90%	11	214.14	15
23	Noble	42.26%	23	54.35	82
24	Pine Prairie	44.77%	20	272.86	13
25	Pollock	29.93%	42	211.47	16
26	Port Barre	46.05%	18	287.95	10
27	Port Vincent	52.46%	13	218.61	14
28	Powhatan	42.09%	24	48.43	93
29	Reeves	41.01%	28	190.36	18
30	Robeline	85.73%	2	1,516.62	2
31	Sicily Island	37.73%	32	183.12	20
32	Sorrento	30.86%	39	176.68	22
33	Tickfaw	40.42%	29	285.80	11
34	Tullos	56.45%	9	125.47	39
35	Turkey Creek	48.93%	16	187.04	19
36	Urania	43.12%	21	111.46	45
37	Vinton	19.87%	67	166.74	24
38	Washington	50.84%	14	370.49	8
39	Woodworth	61.32%	7	705.98	5

***Note:** The rankings above are based on all 304 municipalities (see Appendix B for full list).

Source: Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information obtained from municipalities' annual financial statements and the U.S. Census Bureau.

We surveyed the 39 municipalities to obtain the data needed to perform the in-depth analysis requested by HCR 204. We requested data for fiscal years 2004 through 2006. As shown in Exhibit 2, 77% of the municipalities surveyed responded to our initial survey and 52% responded to the subsequent follow-up survey. In total, we received surveys from 30 municipalities.

Exhibit 2		
Response Rates for Surveyed Municipalities		
Municipality	Initial Survey	Follow-up Survey
Total Received	30	20
% Received	76.92%	51.28%
Total Not Received	9	19
% Not Received	23.08%	48.72%
Source: Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information received from the surveyed municipalities.		

This page is intentionally blank.

IS EVIDENCE AVAILABLE TO DETERMINE WHETHER MUNICIPALITIES IN LOUISIANA HAVE EXCESSIVE SPEED LIMIT ENFORCEMENT?

Local Municipalities Could Not Provide Sufficient Data for Us to Conduct the In-Depth Analysis Requested by HCR 204

The 39 local municipalities we surveyed were unable to collectively provide sufficient data for us to conduct the in-depth analysis requested by the Louisiana Legislature. Municipalities had trouble reporting general traffic fine data as well as more detailed data to us. For example, for FY 2006, 80% of the municipalities were able to provide us the total number of traffic tickets issued, but only 40% were able to provide us the number of convictions. When asked to provide the number of tickets issued by violation type (e.g., speeding), only 50% reported they were able to do so. In addition, although 73% could tell us how much revenue was received in FY 2006 from traffic convictions, only 10% could break that down by violation type. We had similar results with fiscal years 2004 and 2005 (see Appendix C for details).

We attempted to obtain the necessary information for this analysis through a survey (see Appendix C for the survey results) which included multiple contacts with the 39 municipalities and follow-up. We sent surveys via e-mail, postal mail, and fax requesting data for fiscal years 2004 through 2006. At some point during our survey and follow-up process, we contacted 38 of the 39 chosen municipalities by phone (we were unable to reach the 39th municipality despite repeated efforts).

Exhibit 3 demonstrates the problems we had obtaining the necessary data from the municipalities that returned our survey. For example, while many communities were able to report the number of traffic tickets issued, some of the same entities could not provide the number of convictions or the amount of revenue collected for traffic violations only.

Exhibit 3 FY 2006 Survey Results					
Number of tickets issued in FY 2006			Can this number be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide number of tickets issued	24	80.00%	Yes	15	50.00%
Not able to provide number of tickets issued	6	20.00%	Yes with clarification	1	3.33%
			Answered No or did not answer question	14	46.67%
Total	30		Total	30	

Exhibit 3 FY 2006 Survey Results					
Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006			Can this number be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide number of convictions for traffic violations	12	40.00%	Yes	8	26.67%
Not able to provide number of convictions for traffic violations	18	60.00%	Yes with clarification	1	3.33%
			Answered No or did not answer question	21	70.00%
Total	30		Total	30	
Amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006			Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide amount of revenue received from traffic violations	22	73.33%	Yes	3	10.00%
Not able to provide amount of revenue received from traffic violations	8	26.67%	Answered No or did not answer question	27	90.00%
Total	30		Total	30	

Reasons for Data Problems. Many of the municipalities cited similar reasons explaining their inability to provide the requested information. Most explained that their systems, whether manual or electronic, did not allow them to easily pull the requested data. Many municipalities still use manual systems (i.e., tickets in a box or manually logged in notebook) and obtaining the information would have required them to pull the information by hand from each individual citation or entry in the logbook. Most informed us that they had limited resources and such a request would be too burdensome. Others that had electronic systems cited reasons such as the systems did not contain the requested information or they did not know how to pull the data from the system. These types of situations made it difficult for municipalities to report necessary data and prohibited us from conducting any meaningful analysis.

We Could Not Use Data From Other Sources (DPS or Supreme Court) for Our Analysis Because We Could Not Verify the Data

The Louisiana Department of Public Safety (DPS) and the Louisiana Supreme Court collect information regarding traffic convictions from courts around the state. We considered using these sources of information to conduct the requested in-depth analysis. However, we could not verify the reliability of this data. As Exhibit 4 on pages 12-13 shows, only seven of the 39 municipalities provided traffic violation convictions to all three sources (the Legislative Auditor’s Office, the DPS, and the Supreme Court). In the seven instances where data was

available from all three sources, the numbers have wide discrepancies. After identifying such discrepancies, we had to conclude that the data is unreliable.

Problems With Data Reported to DPS. We obtained the traffic violation conviction data from DPS to determine if it was complete and if it would enable us to perform any in-depth analysis for the selected municipalities. However, for the majority of the selected municipalities, the information from the DPS database did not match the information reported in the survey. It often appeared that the municipalities were not reporting all of the traffic convictions to DPS. Therefore, we were reluctant to use this data for analysis purposes because its reliability and completeness seemed to be in question.

In addition to the extreme discrepancies in the total number of convictions reported to us versus what was reported to DPS, the breakdown of the convictions is extremely dissimilar (see Appendix D for the breakdown of convictions reported to DPS). For example, the mayor's courts in our sample reported to DPS that 54.91% of the convictions for traffic violations were for written promise violations. However, none of the same courts reported written promise violations when they provided us with a breakdown. These violations are issued when someone fails to appear in court or pay the ticket by mail. This type of conviction results in the suspension of the violator's driver's license.

Louisiana Revised Statute (R.S.) 32:393 requires all courts (including mayor's courts) to report convictions of traffic violations (except for parking violations) to DPS. In addition, the statute requires that the miles per hour in excess of the speed limit be included on the report. The law also requires reporting of such information as the amount of the fine. Although state law requires the courts to report the information to DPS, it does not require DPS to verify what is reported or to enforce the reporting requirements. DPS staff informed us that they are uncertain if anyone has ever checked to verify who is and who is not reporting to the database. During our follow-up survey, we asked the municipalities if they report the data requested to any other entities. All of the municipalities should have responded yes because all courts are required to report traffic convictions to DPS according to R.S. 32:393. However, only 13 of the 20 who responded to our follow-up survey (65%) said they report the information requested in our survey to another entity on a regular basis. Appendix C contains all of the responses as reported on the survey.

Problems With Data Reported to Supreme Court. LA C.Cr.P.Art.887 requires courts to submit \$2.00 (\$1.00 for mayor's courts located in municipalities with a population less than 2,000) for all convictions (including traffic violation convictions) to the Supreme Court for support of the Court Management Information System. The Supreme Court provided us with the monthly reports submitted by the municipalities we selected for analysis. The municipalities base their payments to the Supreme Court on these monthly numbers. After collating this data, we found inconsistencies in the convictions reported via our survey, the convictions reported to DPS, and the traffic convictions reported to the Supreme Court. However, we could not determine why these discrepancies exist and we were unable to determine which data should be used for analysis. For the most part, the numbers reported to the Supreme Court were lower than the numbers reported to our office. An official with the Supreme Court was concerned about the existence of discrepancies between data reported to us and data reported to the Supreme Court.

Exhibit 4 shows the discrepancies between the three sources of data for convictions for traffic violations for the 39 selected municipalities.

Exhibit 4			
Reported Traffic Violation Convictions for FY 2006			
	Data From Survey	Data From DPS	Data From Supreme Court
Municipality	Number of convictions for traffic violations for FY 2006 reported by mayor's courts		
Anacoco	Could not provide	130	342
Baskin	Could not provide	68	Did not provide data to Supreme Court
Bonita	Could not provide	59	291
Clarence	570	104	362
Delta	Could not provide	102	305
Dodson	Could not provide	136	2,187
Dry Prong	Could not provide	50	Did not provide data to Supreme Court
Epps	Did not send in survey	26	Data not available from Supreme Court
Eros	94	12	Did not provide data to Supreme Court
Fenton	Could not provide	9	324
Ferriday	4,737	124	1,675
Fisher	531*	22	272
French Settlement	660 - plead guilty 12 - found not guilty 1 - found guilty	177	Data not available from Supreme Court
Georgetown	Could not provide	0	Did not provide data to Supreme Court
Golden Meadow	Could not provide	215	2,297
Iowa	2,431	259	1,890
Lillie	Could not provide	27	312
Livonia	Could not provide	996	4,740
Maurice	960	41	904
McNary	Could not provide	55	403
Natchez	Could not provide	105	291
New Llano	Did not send in survey	518	1,248
Noble	Did not send in survey	0	57
Pine Prairie	Could not provide	123	977
Pollock	Did not send in survey	80	360
Port Barre	Could not provide	147	1,024
Port Vincent	Did not send in survey	220	884
Powhatan	30	2	20
Reeves	381	15	Per Supreme Court, the municipality claims not to have a mayor's court
Robeline	Did not send in survey	0	Did not provide data to Supreme Court
Sicily Island	321	148	Data was unreliable
Sorrento	Did not send in survey	9	Does not have a mayor's court
Tickfaw	Could not provide	212	945
Tullos	Did not send in survey	25	114

Exhibit 4			
Reported Traffic Violation Convictions for FY 2006			
	Data From Survey	Data From DPS	Data From Supreme Court
Municipality	Number of convictions for traffic violations for FY 2006 reported by mayor's courts		
Turkey Creek	236	14	Did not provide data to Supreme Court
Vinton	Could not provide	20	122
Urania	Could not provide	18	2,265
Washington	Did not send in survey	509	4,167
Woodworth	6,878	1,754	5,050
<p>*Note: Number presented is number of tickets issued. Municipality misunderstood survey question and upon follow-up indicated that convictions closely match number of tickets issued. Those municipalities that are shown as “could not provide” data for our survey could not provide the number of convictions for traffic violations.</p> <p>Source: Compiled by legislative auditor’s staff using information received from the 39 municipalities in the survey, DPS, and the Louisiana Supreme Court.</p>			

Matter for Legislative Consideration 1: The legislature may wish to consider whether state law could be strengthened to ensure that DPS receives accurate traffic violation conviction data from municipalities in a timely and consistent manner. For example, the use of penalties for those municipalities not reporting might encourage a more consistent presentation of data. Also, detailed language in law specifically directing reporting methods for municipalities may help.

This page is intentionally blank.

**CAN MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS SET SPEED LIMITS
ON STATE HIGHWAYS?**

**Municipal Governments Cannot Set Speed Limits on State
Highways**

Louisiana law does not allow municipal governments to establish speed limits on state highways. In addition, municipal governments cannot establish speed limits on non-state highways that exceed speed limits established in state law. Furthermore, DOTD can withhold funding from local governments to encourage speed limit compliance with traffic engineering studies.

Louisiana law determines who is responsible for setting speed limits on highways and roads. R.S. 32:2 states that DOTD supervises and regulates all traffic on all state highways and has the authority to supervise and regulate all traffic on all highways (i.e., streets) within this state. R.S.32:61 establishes statutory speed limits of 70 MPH on interstates and controlled access highways, 65 MPH on other multi-lane divided highways which have partial or no control of access, and 55 MPH on other highways (i.e., streets). The state may increase or decrease speed limits based upon engineering and traffic investigations conducted by DOTD (R.S. 32:63).

According to R.S. 32:41 and 32:42, municipal and parish authorities have the power to establish speed limits and speed zones on highways other than state maintained highways within their corporate limits so long as they are not in excess of the state established maximum speed limits. According to a DOTD official, R.S. 32:235 provides that DOTD can withhold funding from municipalities that do not comply with DOTD's standards for setting speed limits. More specifically, if DOTD receives a complaint against a municipality, it will investigate. If the department finds that the speed limit is not based on a traffic engineering study, it will withhold funding until a study is done and the speed limit is established in accordance with the study.

This page is intentionally blank.

WHAT ARE SOME BEST PRACTICES FOR ESTABLISHING AND ENFORCING SPEED LIMITS?

Louisiana Appears to Use Best Practices When Setting Speed Limits

We researched other states and national organizations for best practices on setting speed limits and compared them to Louisiana. Louisiana seems to use similar standards as those used in other states. Also, Louisiana employs practices that the federal government and several national organizations recommend.

For example, it appears most states set speed limits using engineering studies that incorporate the 85th percentile speed, including Louisiana. Traffic engineers use the 85th percentile speed by monitoring traffic (during non-peak hours) to determine the speed under which 85% of the drivers are traveling. The road speed is then set at that number unless there are other factors to consider. The Transportation Research Board (an independent adviser to the federal government) considers the 85th percentile speed a safe and reasonable speed limit and states that speed limits should be set as close to the 85th percentile as possible.

In addition, states that have adopted the Federal Highway Administration's Manual (FHWA) on Uniform Traffic Control Devices or conform to its standards (a total of 48 states including Louisiana) are supposed to only display speed limit signs after traffic engineering studies have been conducted. Louisiana law (R.S. 32:63) allows DOTD to increase or decrease speed limits based upon engineering and traffic investigations conducted by DOTD. Organizations such as the Transportation Research Board, American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials, and the Institute of Transportation Engineers recommend that speed limits should be established on the basis of traffic engineering studies.

Other information we found from the FHWA states that pace speed, crash history, roadside development, and road design are additional factors that should be considered when establishing a speed limit. In addition, the FHWA recommends that speed limits be reevaluated (e.g., at least once every 5 years) when there have been significant changes in roadway characteristics or surrounding land. Louisiana does not have an official policy regarding the reevaluation of speed limits.

Other States Have Laws Regarding Enforcement of Speed Limits

There are some states that have laws that are commonly referred to as speed trap laws. Louisiana does not appear to have similar laws. These laws commonly take away incentives for local government to participate in excessive enforcement of traffic laws, particularly when that enforcement is for revenue generating purposes instead of public safety purposes. Exhibit 5 contains a summary of the speed limit enforcement laws we found in other states.

Exhibit 5	
Speed Limit Enforcement Laws in Other States	
State	Key Provisions/Description
Alabama	Limits the number of speed limit changes in a mile to 6 and establishes that adjacent limits cannot differ by more than 10 mph.
Arizona	Limits the number of speed limit changes in a mile to 6 and establishes that adjacent limits cannot differ by more than 10 mph.
Arkansas	<p>Municipalities can be investigated for abusing police power.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A finding that the amount of revenue produced by traffic fines exceeds 30% of the municipality’s total expenditures OR more than 50% of the summonses written for speeding are for violations that are 10 mph or less than the posted speed limit indicates an abuse of police power. ▪ Upon determining an abuse of police power, the prosecuting attorney can order that the municipality cease patrolling the highways OR order that fines and court costs received from traffic law violations be paid to a county fund.
California	Defines a speed trap, prohibits officers from using speed traps, and indicates that any evidence of speed gained from a speed trap cannot be used in court.
Missouri	When a municipality receives more than 45% of its revenue from traffic violations on state highways, then revenues in excess of 45% of total annual revenue is to be sent to the Department of Revenue and will be disbursed to the schools in the county.
Oklahoma	Any person can request the commissioner to investigate traffic enforcement of a municipal law enforcement agency whose jurisdiction includes portions of federal aid highways or state highways if they believe the purpose of the enforcement is to generate more than 50% of the revenue needed for the operation of the municipality.
Texas	Municipalities with a population less than 5,000 may only retain fines equal to 30% of the total local revenue from the previous fiscal year. The remaining funds are sent to the comptroller.
Washington	Defines a speed trap and indicates when speed of a vehicle determined by a speed trap can and cannot be used as evidence in court.
Source: Prepared by legislative auditor’s staff using statutes obtained from Westlaw.	

Matter for Legislative Consideration 2: The legislature may wish to conduct an extensive study of speed limit enforcement laws that other states have and determine whether Louisiana could benefit by having similar laws.

Appendix A: Scope and Methodology

We conducted this work to address HCR 204. Our work was conducted under the provisions of Title 24 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended. Although this is not a performance audit, we attempted to follow generally accepted government auditing standards as promulgated by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Audit Scope

HCR 204 of the 2006 Regular Legislative Session directs the legislative auditor to perform an in-depth analysis of one or more municipalities with a reputation for excessive speed limit enforcement. This measure directed us to place emphasis on the number of tickets issued for violations and the amount of revenue derived from these tickets. We selected 39 municipalities that are at a high risk for excessive speed limit enforcement. We then sought data on number of tickets issued, number of convictions, and amount of revenue, all broken down by violation type, for fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006 to conduct the in-depth analysis.

We planned to obtain this information to conduct an in-depth analysis that would further determine if these are municipalities with excessive speed limit enforcement. We wanted to determine if the number of tickets issued and revenue collected were reasonable. We intended to analyze the speeding violations to determine if the communities were “overzealous” in their enforcement of speed limits. For example, one indication might be that a municipal law enforcement agency issued a large number of tickets for speeding less than 5 or 10 miles per hour over the speed limit. However, as stated above, we were unable to obtain data that would allow us to do so.

Methodology

To complete this audit, we performed the following tasks:

- Reviewed Louisiana laws related to establishing speed limits and reporting requirements for traffic violations and convictions
- Identified best practices from other states, national organizations, and the federal government for establishing speed limits and compared that to how Louisiana sets speed limits
- Identified laws in other states related to speed limit enforcement
- Reviewed the most recent financial statements of all municipalities in Louisiana to identify which municipalities might be at a high risk for excessive speed limit enforcement

- Selected the 30 municipalities with the highest percentage of revenue from fines and forfeitures and the 30 municipalities with the highest fine and forfeiture revenue per capita to perform an in-depth analysis
 - Upon combining the two lists of 30 municipalities each, we were left with 39 unique municipalities since some municipalities appeared on both lists
- Provided DOTD with the list of 39 municipalities and communicated with DOTD to obtain information on setting speed limits
- Surveyed the municipalities to obtain information on traffic tickets issued, traffic violation convictions, and revenue received from those convictions for FY 2004 through FY 2006
- Compiled and analyzed survey data received from the municipalities
- Communicated with DPS and Supreme Court officials to determine what traffic conviction data was available
- Obtained and analyzed data from DPS and the Louisiana Supreme Court related to traffic violation convictions
- Communicated with Representative Hollis Downs to ensure that his concerns were addressed and provided him with briefings regarding preliminary report findings
- Conducted other research, analysis, and procedures as needed

APPENDIX B: FINES AND FORFEITURE RANKINGS

Breakdown of Fiscal Years Used to Obtain Fine and Forfeiture Data		
FY Used	Count	Percent
2004	5	1.64%
2005	275	90.46%
2006	23	7.57%
N/A	1	0.33%
Total	304	100.00%
Source: Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information obtained from the municipalities' most recent financial statements.		

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
1	Abbeville	1.57%	221	\$6.35	230
2	Abita Springs	1.91%	213	42.43	100
3	Addis	8.07%	114	59.28	78
4	Albany	5.23%	143	38.53	106
5	Alexandria	1.29%	233	15.85	179
6	Amite	1.42%	227	8.93	214
7	Anacoco	42.88%	22	78.24	67
8	Angie	19.04%	69	97.53	52
9	Arcadia	0.87%	246	7.54	220
10	Arnaudville	1.42%	226	7.61	219
11	Ashland	3.43%	168	3.01	253
12	Athens	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
13	Atlanta	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
14	Baker	4.08%	160	21.52	159
15	Baldwin	1.22%	234	10.69	206
16	Ball	14.56%	86	52.76	85
17	Basile	2.23%	204	5.36	242
18	Baskin	87.41%	1	1,719.34	1
19	Bastrop	3.39%	170	34.25	113
20	Baton Rouge	0.38%	257	7.44	222

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
21	Belcher	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
22	Benton	10.09%	103	\$50.37	90
23	Bernice	5.06%	146	23.29	152
24	Berwick	2.80%	185	23.02	153
25	Bienville	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
26	Blanchard	5.68%	140	9.14	213
27	Bogalusa	0.88%	245	6.56	228
28	Bonita	40.09%	30	177.98	21
29	Bossier City	2.44%	194	33.03	115
30	Boyce	1.36%	230	5.17	243
31	Breaux Bridge	2.37%	197	9.72	210
32	Broussard	3.29%	174	32.71	117
33	Brusly	19.09%	68	115.52	42
34	Bryceland	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
35	Bunkie	0.71%	251	2.98	254
36	Calvin	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
37	Campti	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
38	Cankton	2.55%	191	6.83	224
39	Carencro	6.09%	131	30.59	125
40	Castor	2.13%	207	25.24	142
41	Central	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
42	Chataignier	2.41%	195	5.72	236
43	Chatham	8.51%	112	19.63	162
44	Cheneyville	30.15%	41	130.19	37
45	Choudrant	0.09%	264	0.42	264
46	Church Point	11.45%	98	33.06	114
47	Clarence	41.12%	27	103.39	49
48	Clarks	6.41%	127	3.60	250
49	Clayton	4.18%	158	5.56	238
50	Clinton	14.56%	85	50.54	89

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
51	Colfax	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
52	Collinston	28.96%	44	\$139.83	32
53	Columbia	0.27%	260	8.19	216
54	Converse	1.55%	222	7.93	218
55	Cotton Valley	23.99%	55	44.52	97
56	Cottonport	3.48%	166	10.04	209
57	Coushatta	0.67%	252	3.29	252
58	Covington	1.37%	229	17.50	173
59	Creola	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
60	Crowley	1.29%	232	9.69	211
61	Cullen	8.37%	113	23.35	151
62	Delcambre	6.48%	126	29.19	134
63	Delhi	23.10%	57	122.55	40
64	Delta	61.32%	8	526.14	6
65	Denham Springs	4.94%	148	39.33	104
66	DeQuincy	5.12%	144	29.35	132
67	DeRidder	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
68	Dixie Inn	14.77%	81	136.72	33
69	Dodson	78.57%	5	775.81	4
70	Donaldsonville	0.89%	244	4.92	245
71	Downsville	3.17%	175	11.05	204
72	Doyline	5.69%	139	4.60	246
73	Dry Prong	45.68%	19	154.90	27
74	Dubach	0.48%	254	1.64	260
75	Dubberly	20.62%	64	22.81	155
76	Duson	3.92%	162	31.08	121
77	East Hodge	1.66%	218	0.76	263
78	Edgefield	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
79	Elizabeth	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
80	Elton	14.76%	82	24.82	145
81	Epps	53.21%	12	157.39	26

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
82	Erath	14.53%	87	\$43.85	98
83	Eros	48.36%	17	171.15	23
84	Estherwood	6.11%	130	10.98	205
85	Eunice	4.24%	157	27.21	140
86	Evergreen	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
87	Farmerville	2.21%	205	15.40	184
88	Fenton	55.96%	10	100.58	50
89	Ferriday	17.78%	75	146.94	29
90	Fisher	24.58%	53	157.81	25
91	Florien	20.54%	65	95.12	53
92	Folsom	5.83%	136	58.87	79
93	Fordoche	8.72%	111	16.82	176
94	Forest	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
95	Forest Hill	14.32%	89	105.53	47
96	Franklin	1.59%	220	13.90	194
97	Franklinton	1.01%	238	14.22	191
98	French Settlement	42.06%	25	94.46	57
99	Georgetown	85.33%	4	781.03	3
100	Gibsland	4.69%	151	6.18	232
101	Gilbert	27.45%	50	67.61	74
102	Gilliam	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
103	Glenmora	8.97%	110	91.20	59
104	Golden Meadow	24.07%	54	147.83	28
105	Goldonna	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
106	Gonzales	1.75%	217	24.92	144
107	Grambling	13.16%	92	54.32	83
108	Gramercy	5.77%	137	23.76	148
109	Grand Cane	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
110	Grand Coteau	13.19%	91	67.36	75
111	Grand Isle	1.52%	225	57.40	81
112	Grayson	2.26%	202	7.28	223
113	Greensburg	0.94%	241	8.47	215

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
114	Greenwood	14.60%	84	\$74.17	69
115	Gretna	2.82%	184	32.16	119
116	Grosse Tete	2.45%	193	21.79	158
117	Gueydan	1.52%	224	5.08	244
118	Hall Summit	18.73%	71	18.60	169
119	Hammond	5.52%	141	67.63	73
120	Harahan	7.87%	117	49.77	91
121	Harrisonburg	7.87%	118	15.59	182
122	Haughton	7.95%	115	49.13	92
123	Haynesville	2.37%	198	11.21	203
124	Helfin	32.36%	36	63.74	76
125	Henderson	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
126	Hessmer	26.89%	51	126.72	38
127	Hodge	5.52%	142	79.30	65
128	Homer	2.88%	182	14.71	187
129	Hornbeck	31.60%	38	112.65	44
130	Hosston	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
131	Ida	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
132	Independence	1.99%	211	10.34	207
133	Iota	1.54%	223	4.58	247
134	Iowa	12.69%	95	145.95	30
135	Jackson	9.16%	109	13.58	195
136	Jamestown	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
137	Jean Lafitte	0.15%	263	0.99	262
138	Jeanerette	7.58%	119	35.84	110
139	Jena	4.29%	156	30.42	128
140	Jennings	0.91%	243	6.69	225
141	Jonesboro	4.92%	150	32.63	118
142	Jonesville	11.24%	100	46.92	95
143	Junction City	12.59%	96	15.44	183
144	Kaplan	18.21%	72	13.99	193

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
145	Keachi	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
146	Kenner	2.90%	181	\$27.50	138
147	Kentwood	0.94%	240	6.63	226
148	Kilbourne	3.45%	167	2.44	257
149	Killian	22.11%	61	34.44	111
150	Kinder	9.71%	105	92.56	58
151	Krotz Springs	14.67%	83	78.09	68
152	Lafayette	0.86%	247	12.49	198
153	Lake Arthur	2.39%	196	15.70	181
154	Lake Charles	0.31%	258	3.65	249
155	Lake Providence	30.47%	40	79.65	63
156	LeCompte	13.95%	90	94.68	54
157	Leesville	2.67%	186	27.49	139
158	Leonville	13.15%	93	12.90	197
159	Lillie	85.59%	3	507.68	7
160	Lisbon	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
161	Livingston	15.70%	78	90.73	60
162	Livonia	41.18%	26	348.86	9
163	Lockport	4.18%	159	17.90	171
164	Logansport	9.44%	106	34.33	112
165	Longstreet	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
166	Loreauville	0.04%	265	0.13	265
167	Lucky	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
168	Lutcher	0.77%	249	2.87	256
169	Madisonville	0.92%	242	12.28	200
170	Mamou	11.31%	99	94.58	56
171	Mandeville	1.79%	216	22.22	157
172	Mangham	27.45%	49	99.34	51
173	Mansfield	5.86%	135	24.80	146
174	Mansura	6.22%	129	27.71	137
175	Many	3.87%	163	30.60	124
176	Maringouin	1.21%	235	6.45	229
177	Marion	2.34%	199	12.31	199

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
178	Marksville	2.34%	200	\$14.53	190
179	Martin	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
180	Maurice	22.26%	60	191.10	17
181	McNary	50.54%	15	282.41	12
182	Melville	1.94%	212	5.57	237
183	Mer Rouge	3.33%	172	19.25	166
184	Mermentau	23.45%	56	52.75	86
185	Merryville	28.57%	45	30.18	129
186	Minden	3.06%	179	19.09	167
187	Monroe	1.90%	214	29.59	131
188	Montgomery	16.05%	77	23.49	149
189	Montpelier	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
190	Mooringsport	27.60%	48	53.26	84
191	Moreauville	15.00%	80	41.43	101
192	Morgan City	3.96%	161	30.48	126
193	Morganza	5.92%	133	15.73	180
194	Morse	11.23%	101	22.71	156
195	Mound	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
196	Mount Lebanon	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
197	Napoleonville	3.34%	171	19.83	161
198	Natchez	64.45%	6	142.99	31
199	Natchitoches	0.47%	255	6.01	234
200	New Iberia	2.03%	210	14.71	188
201	New Llano	54.90%	11	214.14	15
202	New Orleans	2.95%	180	39.14	105
203	New Roads	1.06%	237	6.00	235
204	Newellton	4.61%	153	14.96	185
205	Noble	42.26%	23	54.35	82
206	North Hodge	19.98%	66	19.38	165
207	Norwood	27.98%	47	131.55	36
208	Oak Grove	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
209	Oak Ridge	22.71%	59	\$133.57	35
210	Oakdale	6.23%	128	19.57	164
211	Oberlin	7.31%	123	36.02	109
212	Oil City	12.30%	97	43.50	99
213	Olla	21.69%	62	120.36	41
214	Opelousas	1.21%	236	6.14	233
215	Palmetto	2.48%	192	14.54	189
216	Parks	6.88%	125	13.20	196
217	Patterson	7.92%	116	52.75	87
218	Pearl River	15.21%	79	110.51	46
219	Pine Prairie	44.77%	20	272.86	13
220	Pineville	2.25%	203	18.13	170
221	Pioneer	18.89%	70	58.78	80
222	Plain Dealing	3.42%	169	17.32	174
223	Plaquemine	1.81%	215	11.29	202
224	Plaucheville	14.50%	88	79.40	64
225	Pleasant Hill	16.34%	76	30.42	127
226	Pollock	29.93%	42	211.47	16
227	Ponchatoula	4.61%	152	36.88	108
228	Port Allen	0.27%	261	2.92	255
229	Port Barre	46.05%	18	287.95	10
230	Port Vincent	52.46%	13	218.61	14
231	Powhatan	42.09%	24	48.43	93
232	Provencal	32.19%	37	28.89	135
233	Quitman	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
234	Rayne	7.20%	124	30.97	123
235	Rayville	9.41%	107	52.75	88
236	Reeves	41.01%	28	190.36	18
237	Richmond	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
238	Richwood	5.86%	134	22.96	154
239	Ridgecrest	0.85%	248	1.36	261
240	Ringgold	2.30%	201	5.56	239
241	Robeline	85.73%	2	1,516.62	2
242	Rodessa	4.50%	154	5.49	240
243	Rosedale	0.63%	253	3.43	251
244	Roseland	1.60%	219	5.39	241
245	Rosepine	39.52%	31	89.31	61

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
246	Ruston	2.58%	188	\$17.71	172
247	Saline	3.08%	177	7.48	221
248	Sarepta	10.17%	102	25.05	143
249	Scott	3.07%	178	10.22	208
250	Shongaloo	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
251	Shreveport	1.39%	228	16.25	177
252	Sibley	7.53%	122	32.96	116
253	Sicily Island	37.73%	32	183.12	20
254	Sikes	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
255	Simmesport	6.03%	132	17.17	175
256	Simpson	3.82%	165	3.98	248
257	Simsboro	18.04%	73	30.17	130
258	Slaughter	23.01%	58	114.17	43
259	Slidell	2.19%	206	24.04	147
260	Sorrento	30.86%	39	176.68	22
261	South Mansfield	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
262	Spearsville	0.00%	266	NONE	266
263	Springfield	7.53%	121	72.37	70
264	Springhill	2.87%	183	21.47	160
265	St. Francisville	1.01%	239	8.01	217
266	St. Gabriel	3.85%	164	31.83	120
267	St. Joseph	0.45%	256	1.64	259
268	St. Martinville	2.57%	189	9.52	212
269	Stanley	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
270	Sterlington	25.41%	52	133.79	34
271	Stonewall	28.27%	46	62.80	77
272	Sulphur	2.55%	190	23.39	150
273	Sun	29.46%	43	94.65	55
274	Sunset	5.71%	138	28.06	136
275	Tallulah	4.35%	155	16.01	178
276	Tangipahoa	17.86%	74	18.89	168
277	Terrebonne Parish	3.12%	176	29.29	133
278	Thibodaux	0.76%	250	6.63	227

Percent of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures and Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population for All 304 Louisiana Municipalities					
	Municipality	% of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Rank - % of Revenue From Fines and Forfeitures	Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population	Rank - Fines and Forfeitures Per Capita Population
279	Tickfaw	40.42%	29	\$285.80	11
280	Tullos	56.45%	9	125.47	39
281	Turkey Creek	48.93%	16	187.04	19
282	Urania	43.12%	21	111.46	45
283	Varnado	35.27%	34	78.47	66
284	Vidalia	0.29%	259	12.07	201
285	Vienna	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A	No Data on Fines and Forfeitures	N/A
286	Ville Platte	5.10%	145	31.00	122
287	Vinton	19.87%	67	166.74	24
288	Vivian	2.61%	187	19.58	163
289	Walker	13.07%	94	87.48	62
290	Washington	50.84%	14	370.49	8
291	Waterproof	37.00%	33	71.64	71
292	Welsh	3.33%	173	14.12	192
293	West Monroe	2.13%	208	39.38	103
294	Westlake	5.00%	147	70.29	72
295	Westwego	9.72%	104	103.40	48
296	White Castle	4.92%	149	26.77	141
297	Wilson	32.87%	35	46.98	94
298	Winnfield	0.26%	262	1.77	258
299	Winnsboro	2.10%	209	14.84	186
300	Wisner	20.99%	63	44.59	96
301	Woodworth	61.32%	7	705.98	5
302	Youngsville	9.31%	108	37.70	107
303	Zachary	1.32%	231	6.30	231
304	Zwolle	7.58%	120	41.37	102

Source: Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information obtained from the municipalities' most recent financial statements (see the "Breakdown of Fiscal Years Used to Obtain Fine and Forfeiture Data" table on page 21 for details) and from the 2005 population estimates published by the U.S. Census Bureau.

APPENDIX C: SURVEY RESULTS

Summary of Survey Results for the 30 Municipalities That Responded FY 2004 Data					
Number of tickets issued in FY 2004			Can this number be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide number of tickets issued	23	76.67%	Yes	13	43.33%
Not able to provide number of tickets issued	7	23.33%	Yes with clarification	1	3.33%
			Answered No or did not answer question	16	53.33%
Total	30		Total	30	
Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004			Can this number be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide number of convictions for traffic violations	12	40.00%	Yes	8	26.67%
Not able to provide number of convictions for traffic violations	18	60.00%	Yes with clarification	1	3.33%
			Answered No or did not answer question	21	70.00%
Total	30		Total	30	
Amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004			Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide amount of revenue received from traffic violations	23	76.67%	Yes	4	13.33%
Not able to provide amount of revenue received from traffic violations	7	23.33%	Answered No or did not answer question	26	86.67%
Total	30		Total	30	

Summary of Survey Results for the 30 Municipalities That Responded FY 2005 Data					
Number of tickets issued in FY 2005			Can this number be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide number of tickets issued	24	80.00%	Yes	14	46.67%
Not able to provide number of tickets issued	6	20.00%	Yes with clarification	1	3.33%
			Answered No or did not answer question	15	50.00%
Total	30		Total	30	
Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2005			Can this number be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide number of convictions for traffic violations	12	40.00%	Yes	8	26.67%
Not able to provide number of convictions for traffic violations	18	60.00%	Yes with clarification	1	3.33%
			Answered No or did not answer question	21	70.00%
Total	30		Total	30	
Amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005			Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?		
Able to provide amount of revenue received from traffic violations	23	76.67%	Yes	3	10.00%
Not able to provide amount of revenue received from traffic violations	7	23.33%	Answered No or did not answer question	27	90.00%
Total	30		Total	30	

Detailed Survey Page Guide	
Municipality	Pages
Anacoco	34-36
Baskin	34-36
Bonita	34-36
Clarence	34-36
Delta	34-36
Dodson	38-40
Dry Prong	38-40
Epps	38-40
Eros	38-40
Fenton	38-40
Ferriday	42-44
Fisher	42-44
French Settlement	42-44
Georgetown	42-44
Golden Meadow	42-44
Iowa	46-49
Lillie	46-49
Livonia	46-49
Maurice	46-49
McNary	46-49
Natchez	50-52
New Llano	50-52
Noble	50-52
Pine Prairie	50-52
Pollock	50-52
Port Barre	54-56
Port Vincent	54-56
Powhatan	54-56
Reeves	54-56
Robeline	54-56
Sicily Island	58-60
Sorrento	58-60
Tickfaw	58-60
Tullos	58-60
Turkey Creek	58-60
Urania	62-64
Vinton	62-64
Washington	62-64
Woodworth	62-64

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Anacoco	Baskin	Bonita	Clarence	Delta
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.	Does your municipality record traffic tickets issued by the local municipal law enforcement agency and fines collected by the mayor's court manually or electronically?	Electronic	Both	Both	Both	Manually
2.	Please indicate what information you will not be able to provide and why.	Unable to provide the information because the computer system is very basic	Did not answer	Did not answer	Did not answer	Tickets are manually logged in a log book and highlighted when paid in full. Revenue amounts can and do reflect fines from as far back as 1993 on suspended drivers license.
3.	What fiscal year does your municipality operate on?	Did not answer	July 1 - June 30	July 1 - June 30	July 1 - June 30	July 1 - June 30
4.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	1,944	Did not answer	640	843
4a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	Yes	Did not answer	Yes	Yes
5.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	1,979	Did not answer	565	758
5a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	Yes	Did not answer	Yes	Yes
6.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	1,829	Did not answer	816	919
6a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	Yes	Did not answer	Yes	Yes

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Anacoco	Baskin	Bonita	Clarence	Delta
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	N/A	Did not answer	581	Did not answer
7a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	N/A	Did not answer	Yes	Did not answer
8.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	N/A	Did not answer	493	Did not answer
8a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	N/A	Did not answer	Yes	Did not answer
9.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	N/A	Did not answer	570	Did not answer
9a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	N/A	Did not answer	Yes	Did not answer
10.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	\$285,945.12	Did not answer	\$66,383.00	\$85,484.24
10a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	Yes	No
11.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	\$310,075.07	Did not answer	\$60,494.50	\$103,459.84
11a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	Yes	No

LOUISIANA MUNICIPALITIES

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Anacoco	Baskin	Bonita	Clarence	Delta
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	\$242,996.66	Did not answer	\$74,395.50	\$123,423.49
12a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	Yes	No
13.	How many employees does this municipal law enforcement agency have?	Did not answer	6	3	3 (1 elected chief, 1 asst. chief, 1 sec)	2
13a.	Number of full-time employees:	Did not answer	3	2	2 (chief, asst. chief)	1
13b.	Number of part-time employees:	Did not answer	3	1	1 (sec)	1
13c.	Number of administrative positions:	Did not answer	2	1	1	2 (mayor and clerk)
13d.	Number of law enforcement positions (i.e. officers):	Did not answer	3	2	2	2
14.	Where are violations of municipal traffic ordinances referred?	Did not answer	Mayor's Court	Did not answer	Mayor's Court	Mayor's Court
15.	Were any violations of municipal traffic ordinances directly referred (i.e. not on appeal) to the district court?	Did not answer	Yes	Did not answer	No	No
15a.	If yes, how many for FY 2004, FY 2005, FY 2006?	Did not answer	2004 - 5 2005 - 3 2006 - 1	Did not answer	N/A	Did not answer

This page is intentionally blank.

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Dodson	Dry Prong	Epps	Eros	Fenton
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
1.	Does your municipality record traffic tickets issued by the local municipal law enforcement agency and fines collected by the mayor's court manually or electronically?	Both	Both		Manually	Electronic as of 3/1/06, Manual prior
2.	Please indicate what information you will not be able to provide and why.	Some	Did not answer		Did not answer	Burdensome to breakdown by violation type since everything is manual prior to 3/1/06
3.	What fiscal year does your municipality operate on?	July 1 - June 30	July 1 - June 30		Jan 1 - Dec 31	June 1 - May 31
4.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	2,888	Did not answer		138	452
4a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	No		N/A	No
5.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	2,797	Did not answer		318	339
5a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	No		N/A	No
6.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	1,756	Did not answer		123	353
6a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	No		N/A	No
7.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	Did not answer		115	N/A
7a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	No		N/A	No

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Dodson	Dry Prong	Epps	Eros	Fenton
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
8.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	Did not answer		262	N/A
8a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	No		N/A	No
9.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	Did not answer		94	N/A
9a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	No		N/A	No
10.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	Did not answer		Did not answer	\$47,299.00
10a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	No		Did not answer	No
11.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	Did not answer		Did not answer	\$38,021.00
11a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	Did not answer		Did not answer	No
12.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Did not answer	Did not answer		Did not answer	\$45,051.00
12a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	Did not answer	No		Did not answer	No

LOUISIANA MUNICIPALITIES

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Dodson	Dry Prong	Epps	Eros	Fenton
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
13.	How many employees does this municipal law enforcement agency have?	3	1		1	3
13a.	Number of full-time employees:	2	1		Did not answer	2
13b.	Number of part-time employees:	1	0		Did not answer	1
13c.	Number of administrative positions:	2	1		Chief of police and mayor	1
13d.	Number of law enforcement positions (i.e. officers):	3	1		Did not answer	2
14.	Where are violations of municipal traffic ordinances referred?	Did not answer	Did not answer		Did not answer	Mayor's Court
15.	Were any violations of municipal traffic ordinances directly referred (i.e. not on appeal) to the district court?	No	No		Did not answer	No
15a.	If yes, how many for FY 2004, FY 2005, FY 2006?	Did not answer	Did not answer		Did not answer	N/A

This page is intentionally blank.

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Ferriday	Fisher	French Settlement	Georgetown	Golden Meadow
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.	Does your municipality record traffic tickets issued by the local municipal law enforcement agency and fines collected by the mayor's court manually or electronically?	Electronic	Manually	Both	Manually	Both
2.	Please indicate what information you will not be able to provide and why.	Burdensome to break down everything any further since it would have to be done manually even though we have a computer system.	Did not answer	We had to manually pull the information, break it down by counting. This took days to calculate by municipal employees of Mayor's court and Mayor (Note: information was provided).	Questions not answered are due to the fact that we have a manual system and limited staff. It would be very time consuming and difficult to get the answers to our questions.	Did not answer
3.	What fiscal year does your municipality operate on?	July 1 - June 30	July 1 - June 30	Jan 1 - Dec 31	July 1 - June 30	Did not answer
4.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	1,353	593	434	2,220	2,056
4a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Did not answer	No
5.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	5,642	321	644	2,336	3,407
5a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Did not answer	No
6.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	6,958	531	678	1,969	2,591
6a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Did not answer	No

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Ferriday	Fisher	French Settlement	Georgetown	Golden Meadow
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	836	593*	430	Did not answer	Did not answer
7a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Did not answer	Did not answer
8.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	4,153	321*	639	Did not answer	Did not answer
8a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Did not answer	Did not answer
9.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	4,737	531*	661	Did not answer	Did not answer
9a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Did not answer	Did not answer
10.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$128,405.00	\$67,767.00	\$62,082.00	\$217,482.00	\$224,777.00 (Fines and forfeitures)
10a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No	No	Yes	Did not answer	Did not answer
11.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$560,195.00	\$46,188.19	\$91,402.00	\$244,462.00	\$317,085.00 (Fines and Forfeitures)
11a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No	No	Yes	Did not answer	Did not answer
12.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$572,941.00	\$48,218.50	\$93,537.00	Could not provide	Did not answer
12a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No	No	Yes	Did not answer	Did not answer

LOUISIANA MUNICIPALITIES

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Ferriday	Fisher	French Settlement	Georgetown	Golden Meadow
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13.	How many employees does this municipal law enforcement agency have?	20	6	2 (1 employee, 1 elected)	3	Did not answer
13a.	Number of full-time employees:	19	0	2 (1 employee, 1 elected)	1	4
13b.	Number of part-time employees:	1	6	0	2	0
13c.	Number of administrative positions:	8	2	1 elected, chief of police	Did not answer	2
13d.	Number of law enforcement positions (i.e. officers):	11	4	1 officer	Did not answer	2
14.	Where are violations of municipal traffic ordinances referred?	Mayor's Court	Did not answer question appropriately	Mayor's Court	Did not answer	Did not answer question appropriately
15.	Were any violations of municipal traffic ordinances directly referred (i.e. not on appeal) to the district court?	No	No	Yes (All DWIs)	Did not answer	N/A
15a.	If yes, how many for FY 2004, FY 2005, FY 2006?	None	N/A	2004 - 7 2005 - 4 2006 - 4	Did not answer	Did not answer

* Misunderstood question in initial survey. Provided number of convictions in follow-up survey.

This page is intentionally blank.

LOUISIANA MUNICIPALITIES

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Iowa	Lillie	Livonia	Maurice	McNary
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1.	Does your municipality record traffic tickets issued by the local municipal law enforcement agency and fines collected by the mayor's court manually or electronically?	Electronic	Manually	Electronic	Electronic as of March 2004	Manually
2.	Please indicate what information you will not be able to provide and why.	Cannot break down violations by actual charges and computer system doesn't allow pulling up tickets that were referred to district court (it rarely happens). That would have to be done manually. Cannot provide revenue breakdown by violation type.	Did not answer	Did not answer	Computer system does not allow for a break down of violations.	Very difficult, if not impossible to provide the information that is requested
3.	What fiscal year does your municipality operate on?	July 1 - June 30	July 1 - June 30	Jan 1 - Dec 31	July 1 - June 30	Did not answer
4.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	2,056	508	5,345	424	Did not answer
4a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes, but only by traffic, parking, misdemeanor and local - which includes more than just traffic tickets	Yes	Yes	No	Did not answer
5.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	3,247	500	5,904	1,168	Did not answer

Detailed Survey Responses						
Municipality	Iowa	Lillie	Livonia	Maurice	McNary	
Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
5a. Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes, but only by traffic, parking, misdemeanor and local - which includes more than just traffic tickets	Yes	Yes	No	Did not answer	
6. Number of tickets issued in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	2,421	528	6,613	1,035	Did not answer	
6a. Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes, but only by traffic, parking, misdemeanor and local - which includes more than just traffic tickets	Yes	Yes	No	Did not answer	
7. Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	2,056	Did not answer	Did not answer	320	Did not answer	
7a. Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes, but only by traffic, parking, misdemeanor and local - which includes more than just traffic tickets	Did not answer	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	
8. Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	3,089	Did not answer	Did not answer	1,020	Did not answer	
8a. Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes, but only by traffic, parking, misdemeanor and local - which includes more than just traffic tickets	Did not answer	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	

LOUISIANA MUNICIPALITIES

Detailed Survey Responses						
Municipality	Iowa	Lillie	Livonia	Maurice	McNary	
Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
9. Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	2,431	Did not answer	Did not answer	960	Did not answer	
9a. Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes, but only by traffic, parking, misdemeanor and local - which includes more than just traffic tickets	Did not answer	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	
10. Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$162,365.00	\$61,464.50	\$458,775.55	\$36,844.00	Did not answer	
10a. Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	N/A	No	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	
11. Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$263,891.89	\$61,583.00	\$487,051.10	\$140,393.00	Did not answer	
11a. Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	N/A	No	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	
12. Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$217,226.01	\$60,764.00	\$551,196.49	\$118,869.00	Did not answer	
12a. Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	N/A	No	Did not answer	No	Did not answer	
13. How many employees does this municipal law enforcement agency have?	16	5	Did not answer	5	Did not answer	
13a. Number of full-time employees:	13	Did not answer	8	4	Did not answer	
13b. Number of part-time employees:	3	4	4	Did not answer	Did not answer	
13c. Number of administrative positions:	5	2	1	1	Did not answer	
13d. Number of law enforcement positions (i.e. officers):	10	3	Did not answer	4	Did not answer	

Detailed Survey Responses						
Municipality	Iowa	Lillie	Livonia	Maurice	McNary	
Survey Received	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
14.	Where are violations of municipal traffic ordinances referred?	Mayor's Court	Did not answer	Mayor's Court	Mayor's Court (Magistrate)	Did not answer
15.	Were any violations of municipal traffic ordinances directly referred (i.e. not on appeal) to the district court?	Yes	No	Did not answer	Yes	Did not answer
15a.	If yes, how many for FY 2004, FY 2005, FY 2006?	N/A	Did not answer	Did not answer	2004 - 1 2005 - 2 2006 - 1	Did not answer

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Natchez	New Llano	Noble	Pine Prairie	Pollock
	Survey Received	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
1.	Does your municipality record traffic tickets issued by the local municipal law enforcement agency and fines collected by the mayor's court manually or electronically?	Electronic			Manually	
2.	Please indicate what information you will not be able to provide and why.	Started using new software in FY 2005. Cannot provide # of tickets for FY 2004 and limited # of tickets for FY 2005			Too burdensome to provide number of tickets issued, number of convictions, and breakdown by violation.	
3.	What fiscal year does your municipality operate on?	July 1 - June 30			Jan 1 - Dec 31	
4.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Old software - cannot provide			Cannot provide	
4a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No			No	
5.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	42			Cannot provide	
5a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes			No	
6.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	554			Cannot provide	
6a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes			No	
7.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Cannot provide			Cannot provide	
7a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No			No	

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Natchez	New Llano	Noble	Pine Prairie	Pollock
	Survey Received	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
8.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Cannot provide			Cannot provide	
8a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No			No	
9.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Cannot provide			Cannot provide	
9a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No			No	
10.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$87,671.75			\$190,840.00	
10a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No			No	
11.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$85,724.82			\$330,434.00	
11a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No			No	
12.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$83,216.55			\$348,000.00	
12a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No			No	
13.	How many employees does this municipal law enforcement agency have?	3			5	
13a.	Number of full-time employees:	3			4	
13b.	Number of part-time employees:	0			1	
13c.	Number of administrative positions:	1			2	

LOUISIANA MUNICIPALITIES

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Natchez	New Llano	Noble	Pine Prairie	Pollock
	Survey Received	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
13d.	Number of law enforcement positions (i.e. officers):	Did not answer			4	
14.	Where are violations of municipal traffic ordinances referred?	Mayor's Court			Mayor's Court	
15.	Were any violations of municipal traffic ordinances directly referred (i.e. not on appeal) to the district court?	No			Yes	
15a.	If yes, how many for FY 2004, FY 2005, FY 2006?	Did not answer			Cannot manually go back and find	

This page is intentionally blank.

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Port Barre	Port Vincent	Powhatan	Reeves	Robeline
	Survey Received	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
1.	Does your municipality record traffic tickets issued by the local municipal law enforcement agency and fines collected by the mayor's court manually or electronically?	Manually for 2004 & 2005, electronic as of 2006		Manually	Both	
2.	Please indicate what information you will not be able to provide and why.	Would be burdensome to provide numbers by violation type - would have to be done manually by going through each citation for FY 2004 and FY 2005		Did not answer	Did not answer	
3.	What fiscal year does your municipality operate on?	Oct 1 - Sept 30		July 1 - June 30	July 1 - June 30	
4.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	3,270		79	105	
4a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No		Yes	Yes	
5.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	4,496		51	130	
5a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No		Yes	Yes	
6.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	6,325		37	386	
6a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	Yes		Yes	Yes	
7.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Cannot provide		49	94	

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Port Barre	Port Vincent	Powhatan	Reeves	Robeline
	Survey Received	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
7a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	N/A		Yes	Yes	
8.	Number of convictions for traffic violations for municipal ordinances for FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Cannot provide		38	119	
8a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	N/A		Yes	Yes	
9.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	Information is in computer - not sure how to retrieve it. Not accurate - would have to get by manually going through citations - too burdensome		30	381	
9a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	N/A		Yes	Yes	
10.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$418,204.00		\$6,519.00	\$9,543.00	
10a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No		Yes	No	
11.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$667,471.00		\$7,484.00	\$12,368.00	
11a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No		Yes	No	
12.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$750,266.00		\$6,627.00	\$39,976.00	
12a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No		Yes	No	

Detailed Survey Responses						
Municipality	Port Barre	Port Vincent	Powhatan	Reeves	Robeline	
Survey Received	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
13.	How many employees does this municipal law enforcement agency have?	13		1 elected official chief	4	
13a.	Number of full-time employees:	12		Did not answer	1	
13b.	Number of part-time employees:	1		Did not answer	3	
13c.	Number of administrative positions:	1		Did not answer	2	
13d.	Number of law enforcement positions (i.e. officers):	8		Did not answer	2	
14.	Where are violations of municipal traffic ordinances referred?	Mayor's Magistrate Court		Mayor's Court	Mayor's Court	
15.	Were any violations of municipal traffic ordinances directly referred (i.e. not on appeal) to the district court?	Yes		No	No	
15a.	If yes, how many for FY 2004, FY 2005, FY 2006?	Burdensome - would have to manually go through records		Did not answer	Did not answer	

This page is intentionally blank.

Detailed Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Sicity Island	Sorrento	Tickfaw	Tullos	Turkey Creek
	Survey Received	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
1.	Does your municipality record traffic tickets issued by the local municipal law enforcement agency and fines collected by the mayor's court manually or electronically?	Did not answer question appropriately		Both		Manually
2.	Please indicate what information you will not be able to provide and why.	Did not answer		Some of the requested information (convictions and revenue by violation type) cannot be pulled due to the program and must be pulled manually, this will be too timely and is not cost effective.		Did not answer
3.	What fiscal year does your municipality operate on?	July 1 - June 30		July 1 - June 30		July 1 - June 30
4.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	724		1,393		636
4a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No		Yes		Yes
5.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	591		1,588		723
5a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No		Yes		Yes
6.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	321		2,680		399
6a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No		Yes		Yes

Detailed Survey Responses						
Municipality	Sicily Island	Sorrento	Tickfaw	Tullos	Turkey Creek	
Survey Received	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
7. Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	724		No		636	
7a. Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No		No		Yes	
8. Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	591		See #2		723	
8a. Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No		No		Yes	
9. Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	321		See #2		236	
9a. Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No		No		Yes	
10. Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$83,726.50		\$156,804.00		\$49,890.00	
10a. Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No		No		Yes	
11. Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$201,108.50		\$238,422.00		\$66,775.00	
11a. Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No		No		Did not answer	
12. Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$88,023.50		\$278,155.00		\$66,752.00	
12a. Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No		No		Did not answer	

LOUISIANA MUNICIPALITIES

Detailed Survey Responses						
Municipality	Sicity Island	Sorrento	Tickfaw	Tullos	Turkey Creek	
Survey Received	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
13. How many employees does this municipal law enforcement agency have?	3		7		1	
13a. Number of full-time employees:	2		6		1	
13b. Number of part-time employees:	1		1		0	
13c. Number of administrative positions:	1		1		Did not answer	
13d. Number of law enforcement positions (i.e. officers):	2		7		Did not answer	
14. Where are violations of municipal traffic ordinances referred?	Yes		Mayor's Court		Yes	
15. Were any violations of municipal traffic ordinances directly referred (i.e. not on appeal) to the district court?	No		No		No	
15a. If yes, how many for FY 2004, FY 2005, FY 2006?	Did not answer		N/A		Did not answer	

This page is intentionally blank.

Detailed Survey Responses					
	Municipality	Urania	Vinton	Washington	Woodworth
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
1.	Does your municipality record traffic tickets issued by the local municipal law enforcement agency and fines collected by the mayor's court manually or electronically?	Electronic	Both		Electronic
2.	Please indicate what information you will not be able to provide and why.	Computer program does not allow reports to be generated by violation; system does not allow reports of convictions or revenue by violation	Did not answer		Did not answer
3.	What fiscal year does your municipality operate on?	July 1 - June 30	Oct 1 - Sept 30		June 1 - May 31
4.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	N/A	4,004		6,220
4a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	No		Yes
5.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	N/A	4,521		5,858
5a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	No		Yes
6.	Number of tickets issued in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	N/A	3,546		7,696
6a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	No		Yes
7.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	N/A	N/A		5,949
7a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	N/A		Yes

Detailed Survey Responses					
	Municipality	Urania	Vinton	Washington	Woodworth
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
8.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	N/A	N/A		5,409
8a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	N/A		Yes
9.	Number of convictions for traffic violations of municipal ordinances for FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	N/A	N/A		6,878
9a.	Can this number be broken down by violation type?	No	N/A		Yes
10.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2004 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$89,407.24	\$529,071.36		\$812,644.62
10a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No	No		No
11.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2005 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$92,659.07	\$544,087.57		\$818,262.66
11a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No	No		No
12.	Please provide the amount of revenue received from traffic violations in FY 2006 (see question #3 for timeframe).	\$75,778.38	\$548,463.66		\$1,017,418.58
12a.	Can this revenue be broken down by violation type?	No	No		No
13.	How many employees does this municipal law enforcement agency have?	3	15		7
13a.	Number of full-time employees:	1	15		7
13b.	Number of part-time employees:	2	0		0
13c.	Number of administrative positions:	Did not answer	5		2

Detailed Survey Responses					
	Municipality	Urania	Vinton	Washington	Woodworth
	Survey Received	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
13d.	Number of law enforcement positions (i.e. officers):	Did not answer	10		5
14.	Where are violations of municipal traffic ordinances referred?	Town hall	Mayor's Court		Woodworth Municipal Court (mayor's)
15.	Were any violations of municipal traffic ordinances directly referred (i.e. not on appeal) to the district court?	Did not answer	N/A		No
15a.	If yes, how many for FY 2004, FY 2005, FY 2006?	Did not answer	N/A		Did not answer

This page is intentionally blank.

Follow-up Survey Responses

	Municipality	Follow-up Survey Response received?	1. Do you report any of the information requested in our survey to any entity on a regular basis?	1a. Do you report the number of tickets issued to any entity? If so, to whom and how often?	1b. Do you report the disposition (i.e. convictions) of those tickets to any entity? If so, to whom and how often?	1c. Do you report the amount of fines, court costs and/or fees collected to any entity? If so, to whom and how often?
1	Anacoco	Yes	Yes	Did not answer	Yes - number of tickets paid each month is reported to LCLE, CMIS (Treasurer), and Central LA Juvenile Detention along with a check	Did not answer
2	Baskin	Yes	Yes - Auditor, LCLE, CMIS	No	No	No
3	Bonita	Yes	Yes	Yes - CPA annually and mayor's court monthly	Yes - CPA annually, mayor's court monthly, DPS monthly	Yes - CPA annually, town clerk weekly, DPS monthly
4	Clarence	Yes	No	No	No	No
5	Delta	Yes	Yes	Yes	Monthly - DPS	Yes
6	Dodson	No				
7	Dry Prong	No				
8	Epps	No				
9	Eros	No				
10	Fenton	Yes	Yes - DPS and the different court cost agencies	Court cost agencies, monthly	Only moving violations to the DPS	Only court cost agencies, monthly
11	Ferriday	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
12	Fisher	Yes (conducted via phone)	Yes	Tried to do it years ago to DPS; mail was returned undeliverable	Yes - see court costs breakdown in original survey for list (Ware Youth Center, LCLE, CMIS, Crime Victims, Head Trauma/Spinal Cord)	Yes - auditor
13	French Settlement	No				
14	Georgetown	Yes	There are other state agencies paid out of fines collected each month	Only collected are reported	Judicial Administrator, Supreme Court - CMIS, LCLE, Central LA Detention Center	Yes - Supreme Court Judicial Administrator, LCLE, Office of Gov., Central LA Juvenile Detention Center
15	Golden Meadow	No				
16	Iowa	Yes	Yes (monthly)	State - monthly	Yes - OMV/DPS monthly	Yes - LCLE
17	Lillie	No				
18	Livonia	Yes	No	Yes - town of Livonia, monthly	Yes - Office of Motor Vehicles Microfilm and Research Center every 2 months	Yes - Town of Livonia monthly

Follow-up Survey Responses						
	Municipality	Follow-up Survey Response received?	1. Do you report any of the information requested in our survey to any entity on a regular basis?	1a. Do you report the number of tickets issued to any entity? If so, to whom and how often?	1b. Do you report the disposition (i.e. convictions) of those tickets to any entity? If so, to whom and how often?	1c. Do you report the amount of fines, court costs and/or fees collected to any entity? If so, to whom and how often?
19	Maurice	Yes	Yes	No	Yes - LCLE, Crime Victims Reparations and CMIS	Yes - LCLE, Crime Victims Reparations and CMIS
20	McNary	No				
21	Natchez	Yes (conducted via phone)	Yes	No	CMIS, LCLE, places required by Act 562	No
22	New Llano	No				
23	Noble	No				
24	Pine Prairie	Yes	No	No	Did not answer	CMIS monthly, LCLE
25	Pollock	No				
26	Port Barre	Yes	No	No	No	No
27	Port Vincent	No				
28	Powhatan	Yes	Yes	No	Yes - Ware Youth Center - \$7.50, LCLE - \$2, CMIS - \$1 monthly	Did not answer
29	Reeves	Yes	Yes	Yes - city court, once a month	No	Yes - city court, once a month
30	Robeline	No				
31	Sicily Island	Yes	Yes - Myles Hopkins	No	No	Yes - Silas Simmons
32	Sorrento	No				
33	Tickfaw	Yes	Yes	No	Yes as required by LA Acts 832, 562, 250, 654, 587, and Art 887	No
34	Tullos	No				
35	Turkey Creek	No				
36	Urania	No				
37	Vinton	No				
38	Washington	No				
39	Woodworth	Yes	No	No	Yes - DMV, Monthly	Yes - DMV, Monthly

This page is intentionally blank.

APPENDIX D: TRAFFIC VIOLATION CONVICTIONS REPORTED TO DPS

Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for Fiscal Year 2006

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI ¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY) ²	% Improper Following ³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation ⁴	% Signs ⁵	% Speeding ⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
1	Abbeville	City	187	8.56%	0.00%	4.81%	0.00%	5.35%	0.00%	9.09%	1.60%	13.90%	7.49%	4.28%	33.69%	11.23%
2	Abbeville	Judicial	89	5.62%	0.00%	8.99%	0.00%	0.00%	1.12%	0.00%	0.00%	4.49%	20.22%	0.00%	51.69%	7.87%
3	Abita Springs	Mayors	210	2.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.81%	2.38%	4.76%	0.95%	9.52%	43.81%	2.38%	21.43%	8.10%
4	Addis	Mayors	302	1.99%	0.00%	0.00%	0.33%	0.99%	0.33%	0.99%	0.33%	6.95%	52.98%	4.30%	27.81%	2.98%
5	Albany	Mayors	8	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
6	Alexandria	City	1,341	1.12%	0.00%	7.98%	0.60%	2.01%	2.54%	10.66%	0.60%	3.13%	2.24%	4.55%	57.79%	6.79%
7	Alexandria	Judicial	3,206	0.00%	0.00%	1.25%	0.00%	2.87%	0.90%	0.03%	2.18%	0.03%	54.27%	0.03%	36.12%	2.31%
8	Amite	Judicial	2,442	4.05%	0.00%	0.74%	0.37%	1.92%	1.97%	20.52%	0.66%	1.84%	32.80%	2.42%	28.95%	3.77%
9	Amite	Mayors	30	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%	3.33%	10.00%	0.00%	10.00%	43.33%	6.67%	13.33%	3.33%
10	Anacoco	Mayors	130	1.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.92%	0.77%	3.85%	60.77%	1.54%	23.08%	1.54%
11	Angie	Mayors	10	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
12	Arcadia	Judicial	881	3.75%	0.00%	0.34%	2.04%	0.11%	0.57%	0.11%	0.00%	1.02%	65.49%	0.00%	24.97%	1.59%
13	Arcadia	Mayors	6	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
14	Arnaudville	Mayors	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
15	Baker	City	552	1.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.81%	1.99%	0.00%	0.18%	13.77%	65.22%	0.00%	10.51%	4.89%
16	Baldwin	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
17	Ball	Mayors	374	0.80%	0.00%	0.00%	1.07%	0.27%	0.53%	23.53%	0.00%	1.60%	46.79%	0.80%	24.33%	0.27%
18	Baskin	Mayors	68	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
19	Bastrop	City	357	3.36%	0.00%	2.52%	0.28%	13.17%	9.24%	0.56%	0.28%	4.48%	8.12%	2.24%	48.46%	7.28%
20	Bastrop	Judicial	537	2.42%	0.19%	0.19%	0.93%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	45.62%	1.12%	48.42%	0.74%
21	Baton Rouge	City	53,014	0.71%	3.01%	0.12%	0.48%	1.21%	0.68%	9.42%	0.09%	9.75%	13.84%	0.07%	53.57%	7.05%
22	Baton Rouge	Judicial	5,658	3.78%	4.81%	3.69%	0.14%	2.58%	1.43%	23.19%	0.14%	9.72%	30.81%	0.71%	14.55%	4.45%
23	Baton Rouge	Juvenile	11	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
24	Benton	Judicial	2,039	4.27%	0.05%	7.06%	0.88%	1.77%	1.42%	33.06%	0.20%	1.13%	34.77%	1.57%	9.22%	4.61%
25	Benton	Mayors	196	0.51%	1.02%	0.00%	1.02%	0.00%	0.00%	1.53%	0.00%	1.02%	49.49%	2.55%	41.84%	1.02%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
26	Bernice	Mayors	21	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
27	Berwick	Mayors	161	12.42%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.45%	0.62%	0.62%	0.62%	3.73%	29.19%	1.24%	36.02%	8.07%
28	Blanchard	Mayors	164	1.22%	0.00%	0.00%	1.22%	1.22%	0.00%	1.83%	0.00%	0.61%	50.61%	1.22%	40.24%	1.83%
29	Bogalusa	City	544	1.84%	0.00%	2.02%	0.18%	6.43%	0.74%	53.31%	0.00%	4.23%	14.52%	6.43%	7.72%	2.57%
30	Bonita	Mayors	59	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.86%	0.00%	0.00%	74.58%	0.00%	13.56%	0.00%
31	Bossier City	City	527	0.95%	28.08%	13.28%	6.07%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	2.85%	1.71%	3.42%	33.21%	8.54%	1.71%
32	Breaux Bridge	Juvenile	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
33	Breaux Bridge	City	155	9.03%	0.00%	21.94%	0.65%	6.45%	3.87%	5.81%	0.65%	11.61%	10.97%	1.29%	19.35%	8.39%
34	Broussard	Mayors	868	8.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.58%	7.95%	0.00%	0.23%	24.31%	44.47%	0.46%	6.45%	7.49%
35	Brusly	Mayors	808	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	5.94%	0.00%	0.50%	21.41%	0.62%	71.16%	0.12%
36	Cameron	Judicial	311	3.22%	0.00%	9.00%	0.32%	2.25%	0.32%	0.00%	0.32%	0.64%	77.17%	0.96%	0.00%	5.79%
37	Cameron	Mayors	23	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	73.91%	4.35%	0.00%	8.70%
38	Campiti	Mayors	27	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
39	Carencro	Mayors	74	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
40	Chalmette	Judicial	2	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
41	Chatham	Mayors	117	0.00%	0.00%	1.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.27%	0.00%	1.71%	57.26%	8.55%	26.50%	0.00%
42	Cheneyville	Mayors	44	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.27%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	70.45%	0.00%	22.73%	0.00%
43	Church Point	Mayors	17	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
44	Clarence	Mayors	104	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.38%	0.00%	1.92%	15.38%	0.00%	66.35%	0.96%
45	Clinton	Judicial	336	1.49%	0.30%	0.00%	0.30%	0.89%	0.00%	12.80%	0.30%	0.00%	36.01%	0.89%	42.86%	4.17%
46	Clinton	Mayors	91	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.10%	0.00%	1.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.49%	1.10%	82.42%	8.79%
47	Colfax	Judicial	551	1.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.45%	0.91%	29.58%	0.00%	0.36%	39.20%	1.27%	23.41%	2.18%
48	Colfax	Mayors	15	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%	0.00%	86.67%	0.00%
49	Collinston	Mayors	26	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	92.31%	0.00%
50	Columbia	Judicial	288	4.51%	0.00%	0.00%	0.69%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.69%	0.00%	83.33%	0.35%	9.38%	1.04%
51	Columbia	Mayors	3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
52	Convent	Judicial	1,325	4.53%	0.00%	1.81%	3.40%	1.28%	0.00%	14.49%	0.83%	1.36%	44.98%	3.70%	15.55%	8.08%
53	Convent	Mayors	14	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	35.71%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	0.00%	21.43%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
54	Converse	Mayors	3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
55	Coushatta	Judicial	6	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	16.67%
56	Coushatta	Mayors	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
57	Covington	Judicial	12,118	5.34%	0.01%	1.86%	5.26%	1.22%	3.86%	12.75%	0.01%	3.82%	28.88%	0.45%	31.72%	4.83%
58	Covington	Mayors	604	12.58%	0.17%	0.50%	0.17%	10.10%	0.50%	12.09%	0.66%	11.75%	19.21%	1.82%	23.18%	7.28%
59	Crowley	City	373	12.87%	0.27%	0.54%	0.00%	8.58%	0.27%	9.12%	0.27%	8.04%	20.91%	0.27%	30.03%	8.85%
60	Crowley	Judicial	1,168	7.71%	0.00%	4.88%	0.17%	2.23%	0.68%	22.00%	0.60%	1.28%	23.46%	0.68%	31.76%	4.54%
61	Cullen	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
62	Delcambre	Mayors	18	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
63	Delhi	Mayors	39	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
64	Delta	Mayors	102	1.96%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	35.29%	0.98%	60.78%	0.98%
65	Denham Springs	City	4,662	4.27%	0.13%	0.21%	4.63%	2.12%	1.31%	19.43%	0.41%	7.04%	25.59%	1.09%	29.92%	3.84%
66	Deridder	City	96	5.21%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%	6.25%	12.50%	0.00%	7.29%	36.46%	0.00%	25.00%	3.13%
67	Deridder	Judicial	1,780	2.30%	0.00%	6.91%	0.96%	2.08%	1.29%	20.11%	0.17%	2.53%	26.80%	2.53%	30.62%	3.71%
68	Dixie Inn	Mayors	63	1.59%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.59%	46.03%	3.17%	31.75%	12.70%
69	Dodson	Mayors	136	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
70	Donaldsonville	Judicial	569	1.05%	0.18%	15.29%	0.53%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.70%	79.96%	1.93%
71	Donaldsonville	Parish	207	6.28%	0.00%	0.97%	0.00%	7.25%	1.45%	0.48%	0.97%	22.71%	48.79%	0.00%	3.86%	7.25%
72	Doyline	Mayors	12	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	91.67%	0.00%
73	Dry Prong	Mayors	50	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
74	Dubberly	Mayors	3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
75	Duson	Mayors	18	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
76	East Hodge	Mayors	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
77	Edgard	Judicial	608	2.96%	0.00%	1.81%	0.99%	2.47%	0.66%	9.54%	0.33%	2.14%	43.75%	0.66%	31.91%	2.80%
78	Elton	Mayors	11	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
79	Epps	Mayors	26	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
80	Erath	Mayors	100	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%	99.00%	0.00%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
81	Eros	Mayors	12	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
82	Eunice	City	187	10.70%	0.00%	24.06%	0.00%	8.56%	3.74%	0.53%	0.53%	6.42%	8.02%	9.63%	11.23%	16.58%
83	Eunice	Juvenile	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
84	Farmerville	Judicial	79	27.85%	0.00%	6.33%	6.33%	2.53%	0.00%	1.27%	3.80%	3.80%	1.27%	8.86%	1.27%	36.71%
85	Farmerville	Mayors	87	2.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.30%	2.30%	17.24%	3.45%	3.45%	44.83%	4.60%	14.94%	4.60%
86	Fenton	Mayors	9	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
87	Ferriday	Mayors	124	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
88	Fisher	Mayors	22	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	95.45%	4.55%
89	Florien	Mayors	67	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
90	Folsom	Mayors	39	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	2.56%	38.46%	28.21%	15.38%	2.56%
91	Fordoche	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
92	Forest	Mayors	9	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	88.89%	0.00%
93	Forest Hill	Mayors	39	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	56.41%	2.56%	41.03%	0.00%
94	Fort Polk	US District	194	3.61%	0.00%	2.06%	0.00%	4.12%	1.03%	3.09%	0.52%	2.58%	61.34%	0.52%	13.92%	7.22%
95	Franklin	City	584	5.65%	0.00%	1.88%	0.51%	2.91%	1.88%	3.25%	0.34%	4.62%	32.53%	8.90%	33.05%	4.45%
96	Franklin	Judicial	1,251	3.52%	0.00%	8.23%	0.24%	2.48%	0.96%	3.28%	0.24%	2.80%	42.29%	4.40%	28.54%	3.04%
97	Franklinton	Judicial	266	5.26%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.75%	0.00%	53.38%	0.38%	1.88%	17.29%	0.75%	8.65%	4.51%
98	Franklinton	Mayors	78	5.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.38%	2.56%	32.05%	0.00%	3.85%	17.95%	15.38%	2.56%	5.13%
99	French Settlement	Mayors	177	1.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.56%	0.00%	0.56%	1.69%	1.13%	0.56%	74.58%	0.56%	15.82%	3.39%
100	Georgetown	Mayors	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
101	Gilbert	Mayors	37	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%	97.30%	0.00%
102	Glenmora	Mayors	27	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	3.70%	74.07%	0.00%
103	Golden Meadow	Mayors	215	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.47%	0.47%	0.00%	0.93%	0.00%	0.00%	9.77%	1.40%	86.98%	0.00%
104	Gonzales	Parish	3,038	8.39%	0.00%	0.13%	0.00%	3.00%	2.07%	0.03%	1.02%	8.62%	56.55%	0.00%	14.65%	5.53%
105	Grambling	Mayors	234	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
106	Gramercy	Mayors	94	1.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.06%	0.00%	97.87%	0.00%
107	Grand Coteau	Mayors	128	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
108	Grand Isle	Mayors	39	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
109	Greensburg	Judicial	2	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
110	Greensburg	Mayors	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	92.86%	7.14%
111	Greenwood	Mayors	285	0.35%	1.05%	0.70%	0.35%	2.11%	1.05%	6.67%	0.00%	3.51%	45.26%	3.16%	32.63%	3.16%
112	Gretna	Judicial	12	16.67%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	8.33%	8.33%
113	Gretna	Juvenile	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
114	Gretna	Parish	2,394	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	0.04%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	99.79%	0.04%
115	Grosse Tete	Mayors	43	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.33%	20.93%	0.00%	69.77%	6.98%
116	Gueydan	Mayors	47	6.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.26%	0.00%	10.64%	0.00%	4.26%	23.40%	0.00%	44.68%	6.38%
117	Hahnville	Judicial	4,337	1.27%	0.00%	0.51%	0.14%	1.36%	0.67%	3.53%	0.02%	1.64%	35.32%	0.92%	53.17%	1.45%
118	Hahnville	Mayors	35	2.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.86%	0.00%	2.86%	34.29%	5.71%	45.71%	5.71%
119	Hall Summit	Mayors	8	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	87.50%	0.00%
120	Hammond	City	3,878	3.74%	0.05%	1.24%	9.62%	3.56%	1.65%	0.00%	0.80%	13.07%	13.80%	1.01%	45.44%	6.03%
121	Harrisonburg	Judicial	152	3.29%	0.00%	5.92%	0.00%	0.66%	0.00%	51.97%	0.00%	0.66%	34.21%	0.00%	0.66%	2.63%
122	Harrisonburg	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
123	Haughton	Mayors	20	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
124	Haynesville	Mayors	11	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	90.91%	0.00%
125	Heflin	Mayors	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	21.43%	0.00%	35.71%	0.00%	7.14%	14.29%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%
126	Henderson	Mayors	212	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
127	Hessmer	Mayors	116	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
128	Hodge	Mayors	70	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	1.43%	0.00%	97.14%	0.00%
129	Homer	Judicial	1,052	1.52%	0.00%	0.57%	0.00%	0.67%	0.19%	16.83%	0.19%	0.00%	62.45%	2.09%	12.36%	3.14%
130	Homer	Mayors	39	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.56%	2.56%	0.00%	0.00%	2.56%	2.56%	89.74%	0.00%
131	Hornbeck	Mayors	13	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
132	Hosston	Mayors	3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
133	Houma	City	1,156	2.42%	1.82%	2.85%	0.26%	8.13%	6.14%	8.82%	0.17%	14.27%	14.88%	2.25%	27.34%	10.64%
134	Houma	Judicial	1,118	0.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.98%	1.16%	0.09%	0.00%	4.20%	5.28%	0.00%	86.14%	1.70%
135	Houma	Juvenile	5	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
136	Independence	Mayors	110	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.82%	98.18%	0.00%
137	Iota	Mayors	13	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
138	Iowa	Mayors	259	3.47%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.54%	0.77%	0.39%	0.00%	2.32%	55.60%	1.93%	29.34%	4.63%
139	Jackson	Mayors	56	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.79%	0.00%	96.43%	1.79%
140	Jean Lafitte	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
141	Jeanerette	City	583	1.54%	0.00%	2.92%	0.34%	2.06%	0.34%	0.00%	0.00%	0.86%	75.99%	0.17%	14.24%	1.54%
142	Jena	Judicial	213	1.88%	0.47%	0.00%	0.47%	1.41%	0.00%	25.82%	0.00%	0.00%	36.62%	0.47%	30.99%	1.88%
143	Jena	Mayors	182	2.20%	0.00%	0.00%	1.10%	3.85%	2.75%	31.87%	0.00%	3.85%	21.98%	4.95%	23.08%	4.40%
144	Jennings	City	508	2.76%	0.00%	2.36%	0.20%	0.98%	0.79%	18.50%	0.20%	2.17%	41.73%	0.79%	25.79%	3.74%
145	Jennings	Judicial	1,182	0.68%	0.00%	5.84%	0.17%	0.25%	0.51%	15.82%	0.00%	0.51%	32.32%	0.17%	42.05%	1.69%
146	Jonesboro	Judicial	197	6.09%	0.00%	0.51%	0.00%	1.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.51%	0.51%	42.64%	1.52%	42.13%	5.08%
147	Jonesboro	Mayors	97	3.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.19%	1.03%	6.19%	1.03%	3.09%	43.30%	9.28%	24.74%	2.06%
148	Jonesville	Mayors	26	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
149	Kaplan	City	57	7.02%	0.00%	12.28%	0.00%	3.51%	0.00%	0.00%	1.75%	5.26%	7.02%	1.75%	52.63%	8.77%
150	Kenner	Mayors	1,659	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.06%	0.06%	0.00%	99.58%	0.06%
151	Kentwood	Mayors	92	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.78%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	4.35%	29.35%	13.04%	20.65%	18.48%
152	Killian	Mayors	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	7.14%	35.71%	7.14%	35.71%	0.00%
153	Kinder	Mayors	145	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
154	Krotz Springs	Mayors	403	2.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%	0.74%	0.00%	0.99%	0.00%	0.00%	67.00%	4.47%	22.33%	1.74%
155	Lafayette	City	1,816	1.54%	2.75%	1.54%	0.11%	0.99%	0.55%	0.39%	0.22%	1.87%	0.83%	0.00%	84.31%	4.90%
156	Lafayette	Judicial	4,682	11.36%	0.36%	2.01%	0.70%	4.46%	1.24%	16.10%	0.62%	8.37%	19.69%	0.45%	27.87%	6.75%
157	Lake Arthur	Mayors	488	1.84%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.71%	0.41%	19.47%	0.20%	2.87%	44.88%	1.84%	19.88%	3.89%
158	Lake Charles	City	14,575	3.86%	0.01%	0.04%	1.81%	2.44%	0.33%	15.41%	0.14%	5.90%	5.86%	0.00%	61.89%	2.31%
159	Lake Charles	Judicial	3,905	2.56%	0.00%	3.23%	0.13%	1.82%	1.36%	34.90%	1.90%	2.74%	12.96%	0.38%	30.88%	7.14%
160	Lake Providence	Judicial	26	0.00%	0.00%	11.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	19.23%	0.00%	0.00%	34.62%	3.85%	26.92%	3.85%
161	Lake Providence	Mayors	199	0.50%	0.00%	0.50%	0.50%	2.51%	0.00%	7.54%	0.50%	1.51%	32.16%	4.02%	48.74%	1.51%
162	LaPlace	Mayors	32	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	3.13%	6.25%	0.00%	3.13%	65.63%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%
163	Lecompte	Mayors	5	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI ¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY) ²	% Improper Following ³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation ⁴	% Signs ⁵	% Speeding ⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
164	Leesville	City	612	4.58%	0.00%	14.38%	0.33%	8.01%	3.92%	12.42%	3.76%	11.60%	30.39%	2.45%	0.98%	7.19%
165	Leesville	Judicial	1,777	1.69%	0.00%	4.11%	0.28%	0.90%	0.39%	25.72%	0.11%	0.96%	35.96%	2.25%	25.89%	1.74%
166	Leonville	Mayors	25	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
167	Lillie	Mayors	27	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
168	Livingston	Judicial	97	18.56%	0.00%	7.22%	7.22%	2.06%	0.00%	1.03%	3.09%	4.12%	37.11%	12.37%	3.09%	4.12%
169	Livingston	Mayors	338	2.07%	0.00%	1.18%	0.89%	1.48%	1.18%	0.89%	0.30%	0.30%	66.86%	5.92%	17.16%	1.78%
170	Livonia	Mayors	996	0.80%	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.00%	0.10%	0.20%	0.00%	0.50%	37.15%	0.40%	60.34%	0.30%
171	Logansport	Mayors	5	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
172	Lutcher	Mayors	1	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
173	Madisonville	Mayors	97	2.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.03%	8.25%	0.00%	15.46%	31.96%	2.06%	32.99%	6.19%
174	Mamou	Mayors	10	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
175	Mandeville	Mayors	473	7.82%	0.85%	0.21%	0.00%	3.59%	0.85%	34.88%	0.00%	2.33%	16.91%	2.96%	26.43%	3.17%
176	Mangham	Mayors	25	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	84.00%	0.00%	16.00%	0.00%
177	Mansfield	Judicial	944	1.27%	0.00%	3.50%	0.21%	0.21%	0.00%	0.11%	0.11%	0.00%	41.10%	0.64%	52.01%	0.85%
178	Mansfield	Mayors	150	1.33%	0.00%	0.67%	0.00%	4.67%	0.00%	32.67%	0.00%	6.00%	40.00%	4.67%	4.00%	6.00%
179	Many	Judicial	600	1.17%	0.00%	4.00%	2.33%	0.50%	0.00%	40.50%	0.00%	0.83%	43.00%	2.17%	2.50%	3.00%
180	Many	Mayors	41	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	39.02%	0.00%	0.00%	36.59%	0.00%	24.39%	0.00%
181	Maringouin	Mayors	3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
182	Marion	Mayors	6	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%
183	Marksville	City	25	8.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%	36.00%	0.00%	12.00%	20.00%	8.00%	0.00%	8.00%
184	Marksville	Judicial	995	4.82%	0.00%	5.83%	0.00%	0.60%	0.50%	51.76%	0.50%	0.70%	13.67%	3.02%	16.08%	2.51%
185	Maurice	Mayors	41	2.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	95.12%	2.44%	0.00%	0.00%
186	McNary	Mayors	55	1.82%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	0.00%	16.36%	1.82%
187	Melville	Mayors	3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
188	Mer Rouge	Mayors	22	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	40.91%	0.00%	36.36%	18.18%
189	Mermentau	Mayors	41	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
190	Metairie	Parish	3,371	0.12%	0.00%	3.06%	0.00%	0.50%	0.09%	0.47%	0.50%	0.33%	3.95%	0.00%	90.12%	0.86%
191	Minden	City	358	6.42%	0.00%	16.76%	0.56%	10.61%	1.40%	3.91%	0.28%	9.78%	17.88%	7.54%	2.23%	22.63%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
192	Minden	Judicial	263	15.59%	0.00%	30.42%	5.70%	3.04%	0.00%	10.65%	1.14%	3.42%	13.31%	6.08%	2.28%	8.37%
193	Monroe	City	1,893	4.75%	1.11%	0.48%	0.05%	17.64%	10.30%	0.00%	0.05%	9.14%	5.60%	0.05%	34.65%	16.16%
194	Monroe	Judicial	5,361	4.50%	0.56%	0.24%	0.93%	1.19%	0.00%	0.17%	0.17%	2.20%	70.57%	0.30%	16.53%	2.65%
195	Montgomery	Mayors	8	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	87.50%	0.00%
196	Montpelier	Mayors	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
197	Mooringsport	Mayors	46	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.17%	6.52%	17.39%	71.74%	0.00%
198	Morgan City	City	412	10.44%	0.00%	10.19%	0.97%	15.78%	2.67%	2.43%	0.73%	6.07%	11.89%	6.07%	19.90%	12.86%
199	Morganza	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
200	Napoleonville	Judicial	650	1.54%	0.00%	2.15%	0.15%	1.69%	0.77%	12.31%	0.00%	0.46%	19.69%	1.85%	56.92%	2.46%
201	Napoleonville	Mayors	9	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%
202	Natchez	Mayors	105	0.95%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.90%	0.00%	0.00%	97.14%	0.00%
203	Natchitoches	City	555	2.34%	0.00%	4.50%	0.36%	4.50%	0.36%	32.43%	0.00%	13.15%	35.86%	1.08%	0.54%	4.86%
204	Natchitoches	Judicial	82	3.66%	0.00%	8.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.98%	0.00%	23.17%	53.66%
205	New Iberia	City	1,039	10.97%	0.00%	5.10%	0.10%	11.84%	12.42%	2.21%	1.44%	15.40%	10.59%	1.54%	11.45%	16.94%
206	New Iberia	Judicial	2,112	4.69%	0.00%	1.09%	0.14%	2.13%	0.99%	23.20%	0.09%	2.98%	34.42%	0.19%	27.84%	2.23%
207	New Llano	Mayors	518	2.90%	0.00%	0.58%	1.16%	4.83%	0.97%	6.18%	0.39%	0.97%	55.41%	3.67%	17.57%	5.41%
208	New Orleans	City	54	0.00%	0.00%	53.70%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%	9.26%	16.67%
209	New Orleans	Judicial	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
210	New Orleans	US District	2	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
211	New Roads	Judicial	158	5.70%	0.00%	7.59%	0.00%	0.63%	0.63%	20.89%	0.63%	0.63%	53.16%	1.27%	5.06%	3.80%
212	New Roads	Mayors	9	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%
213	Newellton	Mayors	7	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	85.71%	0.00%
214	Noble	Mayors	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
215	Norwood	Mayors	23	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
216	Oak Grove	Judicial	102	10.78%	0.00%	4.90%	0.98%	2.94%	0.00%	11.76%	1.96%	1.96%	42.16%	4.90%	9.80%	7.84%
217	Oak Grove	Mayors	13	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	30.77%	61.54%	0.00%
218	Oakdale	City	143	2.80%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.78%	2.80%	2.10%	0.00%	2.80%	23.78%	0.00%	44.06%	4.90%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
219	Oberlin	Judicial	482	3.94%	0.00%	1.45%	1.24%	0.21%	0.21%	0.00%	0.21%	0.21%	87.55%	1.45%	0.83%	2.70%
220	Oberlin	Mayors	124	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
221	Oil City	Mayors	115	0.00%	0.87%	0.00%	0.00%	0.87%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	51.30%	2.61%	42.61%	1.74%
222	Olla	Mayors	242	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.24%	0.41%	2.48%	0.00%	1.65%	44.21%	2.48%	46.69%	0.83%
223	Opelousas	City	571	4.20%	0.00%	2.98%	0.53%	7.71%	2.63%	1.40%	0.18%	7.01%	10.86%	0.70%	55.52%	6.30%
224	Opelousas	Judicial	2,407	1.45%	0.00%	2.29%	0.04%	0.71%	0.46%	7.44%	0.00%	0.71%	31.99%	0.04%	53.76%	1.12%
225	Patterson	Mayors	329	0.91%	0.00%	0.00%	1.22%	0.91%	0.00%	0.30%	0.30%	2.74%	51.67%	7.29%	30.70%	3.95%
226	Pearl River	Mayors	255	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.96%	0.00%	1.57%	0.39%	1.57%	38.82%	3.14%	42.35%	3.53%
227	Pine Prairie	Mayors	123	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.25%	0.81%	0.81%	15.45%	0.81%	78.86%	0.00%
228	Pineville	City	901	1.78%	0.00%	0.33%	0.11%	1.89%	0.33%	36.63%	0.11%	4.88%	10.43%	0.22%	40.40%	2.89%
229	Plain Dealing	Mayors	13	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
230	Plaquemine	City	214	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.47%	9.81%	0.00%	89.25%	0.47%
231	Plaquemine	Judicial	753	1.46%	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%	0.53%	0.13%	2.26%	0.13%	1.73%	41.30%	0.66%	48.47%	2.92%
232	Pleasant Hill	Mayors	29	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.34%	0.00%	0.00%	68.97%	0.00%	17.24%	3.45%
233	Point A La Hache	Judicial	623	1.61%	0.00%	0.64%	0.32%	0.96%	0.32%	0.64%	0.48%	3.53%	59.23%	2.25%	27.61%	2.41%
234	Pollock	Mayors	80	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.50%	12.50%	63.75%	0.00%
235	Ponchatoula	City	38	2.63%	0.00%	2.63%	0.00%	13.16%	0.00%	15.79%	0.00%	2.63%	31.58%	2.63%	28.95%	0.00%
236	Port Allen	City	755	1.46%	0.00%	0.13%	0.66%	3.58%	0.13%	9.40%	0.00%	5.03%	22.25%	1.85%	49.54%	5.96%
237	Port Allen	Judicial	913	3.07%	0.22%	0.22%	0.00%	1.97%	0.99%	51.04%	0.00%	2.52%	30.23%	0.00%	5.04%	4.71%
238	Port Barre	Mayors	147	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
239	Port Vincent	Mayors	220	2.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	2.27%	0.00%	3.64%	38.18%	6.82%	43.18%	3.18%
240	Powhatan	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
241	Provencal	Mayors	11	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
242	Rayne	City	97	6.19%	0.00%	8.25%	0.00%	4.12%	0.00%	0.00%	1.03%	6.19%	56.70%	6.19%	0.00%	11.34%
243	Rayville	Judicial	393	7.12%	0.00%	8.40%	0.51%	0.25%	0.00%	0.51%	0.00%	0.25%	60.81%	1.27%	19.34%	1.53%
244	Rayville	Mayors	117	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.42%	0.85%	1.71%	0.00%	4.27%	30.77%	0.00%	54.70%	4.27%
245	Reeves	Mayors	15	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
246	Robeline	Mayors	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
247	Rodessa	Mayors	5	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%
248	Rosedale	Mayors	4	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
249	Roseland	Mayors	32	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	93.75%	3.13%
250	Rosepine	Mayors	215	0.47%	0.00%	0.47%	0.00%	0.93%	0.00%	6.05%	0.00%	0.47%	8.84%	3.26%	79.53%	0.00%
251	Ruston	City	644	0.16%	0.00%	9.16%	0.16%	4.35%	0.16%	21.43%	0.00%	10.56%	17.24%	1.71%	29.97%	5.12%
252	Ruston	Judicial	506	7.71%	0.00%	1.98%	1.58%	0.79%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	1.38%	33.60%	1.38%	48.42%	2.96%
253	Sarepta	Mayors	17	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	0.00%	94.12%	0.00%
254	Scott	Mayors	162	8.64%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.64%	0.62%	1.23%	1.23%	3.70%	10.49%	0.62%	59.88%	4.94%
255	Shreveport	City	15,231	1.07%	0.72%	1.69%	0.06%	1.05%	0.41%	9.34%	2.00%	4.67%	19.28%	3.07%	54.74%	1.91%
256	Shreveport	Judicial	2,636	1.18%	0.08%	9.14%	0.49%	2.47%	0.68%	29.48%	0.53%	3.03%	23.48%	1.93%	23.67%	3.83%
257	Shreveport	US District	12	8.33%	0.00%	58.33%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%
258	Sibley	Mayors	221	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90%	0.45%	0.45%	0.00%	6.79%	53.85%	1.36%	35.29%	0.90%
259	Sicily Island	Mayors	148	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%	0.00%	98.65%	0.00%
260	Simmesport	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
261	Simsboro	Mayors	4	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
262	Slaughter	Mayors	46	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
263	Slidell	City	202	4.95%	0.00%	7.43%	7.43%	15.84%	8.42%	0.00%	8.91%	10.40%	14.36%	1.98%	0.00%	20.30%
264	Sorrento	Parish	9	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
265	Springfield	Mayors	104	0.96%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.92%	0.96%	3.85%	0.00%	1.92%	20.19%	3.85%	66.35%	0.00%
266	Springhill	City	181	3.87%	0.00%	4.42%	0.00%	0.55%	0.00%	4.42%	0.00%	11.60%	69.06%	1.10%	0.00%	4.97%
267	St. Bernard	Mayors	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
268	St. Francisville	Judicial	176	6.25%	0.00%	0.57%	1.14%	1.70%	0.00%	10.80%	0.57%	0.00%	51.70%	0.57%	22.16%	4.55%
269	St. Francisville	Mayors	34	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.94%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	97.06%	0.00%
270	St. Gabriel	Mayors	317	1.58%	0.00%	0.00%	0.32%	0.00%	0.63%	9.15%	0.00%	0.95%	35.65%	0.32%	48.58%	2.84%
271	St. Joseph	Judicial	310	0.00%	0.32%	0.32%	0.32%	0.32%	0.00%	12.26%	0.00%	0.32%	51.61%	0.00%	33.23%	1.29%
272	St. Joseph	Mayors	46	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.70%	0.00%	0.00%	54.35%	4.35%	30.43%	2.17%

**Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for
Fiscal Year 2006**

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY)²	% Improper Following³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation⁴	% Signs⁵	% Speeding⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
273	St. Martinville	Judicial	1,254	4.31%	0.00%	5.26%	1.04%	0.88%	1.52%	20.89%	0.40%	0.64%	23.68%	0.88%	37.72%	2.79%
274	St. Martinville	Mayors	30	3.33%	0.00%	23.33%	3.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	56.67%	6.67%
275	Sterlington	Mayors	599	0.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%	0.83%	0.33%	6.01%	0.00%	7.68%	38.23%	1.50%	43.41%	1.34%
276	Stonewall	Juvenile	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
277	Stonewall	Mayors	80	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
278	Sulphur	City	95	7.37%	0.00%	36.84%	0.00%	1.05%	0.00%	0.00%	6.32%	2.11%	3.16%	18.95%	2.11%	22.11%
279	Sun	Mayors	25	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
280	Sunset	Mayors	154	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
281	Tallulah	Judicial	449	0.67%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	1.34%	0.00%	12.92%	0.00%	0.45%	42.09%	0.00%	41.43%	0.89%
282	Tallulah	Mayors	80	2.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.75%	1.25%	1.25%	0.00%	2.50%	8.75%	2.50%	56.25%	11.25%
283	Tangipahoa	Mayors	45	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.22%	95.56%	2.22%
284	Thibodaux	City	363	3.03%	0.00%	0.28%	0.28%	4.13%	1.65%	9.37%	0.55%	2.48%	6.61%	1.93%	61.71%	7.99%
285	Thibodaux	Judicial	1,129	5.76%	0.00%	1.86%	0.00%	1.42%	0.89%	15.41%	0.09%	1.68%	13.82%	0.27%	54.92%	3.90%
286	Tickfaw	Mayors	212	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
287	Tullos	Mayors	25	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
288	Turkey Creek	Mayors	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
289	Urania	Mayors	20	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
290	Varnado	Mayors	75	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
291	Vidalia	City	165	1.21%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%	3.64%	0.61%	3.64%	0.00%	2.42%	7.88%	5.45%	71.52%	3.03%
292	Vidalia	Judicial	28	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.57%	3.57%
293	Ville Platte	City	141	6.38%	0.00%	5.67%	2.13%	7.09%	2.13%	23.40%	0.71%	7.80%	16.31%	7.09%	11.35%	9.93%
294	Ville Platte	Judicial	294	4.08%	0.00%	9.18%	0.34%	1.02%	0.34%	43.20%	0.68%	0.34%	9.52%	2.72%	24.83%	3.74%
295	Ville Platte	Juvenile	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
296	Vinton	Mayors	18	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
297	Vivian	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
298	Walker	Mayors	1,121	0.89%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	0.62%	0.18%	0.80%	0.09%	0.18%	13.29%	0.89%	80.91%	2.05%
299	Washington	Mayors	509	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	99.80%	0.00%
300	Waterproof	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%

Traffic Violation Convictions Reported to DPS by Louisiana Courts for Fiscal Year 2006

	Court Location	Court Type	Total Violations Reported	% Careless Driving	% Driver's Course (Art. 892.1)	% DWI ¹	% Expired or No License	% Failure to Yield (FTY) ²	% Improper Following ³	% No Seatbelt	% Reckless Operation ⁴	% Signs ⁵	% Speeding ⁶	% Violation of Revocation	% Written Promise	% All Other Violations
301	Welsh	Mayors	1,118	0.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.27%	0.00%	0.36%	48.84%	0.27%	49.91%	0.09%
302	West Monroe	City	1,790	6.54%	0.06%	1.01%	0.50%	5.36%	1.62%	36.09%	0.28%	7.09%	32.35%	4.19%	0.00%	4.92%
303	Westlake	Mayors	406	2.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.19%	3.69%	6.40%	0.00%	17.98%	57.14%	0.25%	5.42%	2.71%
304	Westwego	Mayors	3,111	0.48%	0.23%	0.00%	0.06%	2.67%	0.45%	0.71%	0.03%	11.70%	47.16%	0.06%	34.94%	1.51%
305	White Castle	Mayors	55	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
306	Wilson	Mayors	29	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
307	Winnfield	City	69	0.00%	0.00%	1.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	98.55%	0.00%
308	Winnfield	Judicial	92	4.35%	0.00%	0.00%	3.26%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.87%	0.00%	69.57%	9.78%
309	Winnsboro	City	33	9.09%	0.00%	3.03%	0.00%	12.12%	0.00%	3.03%	0.00%	18.18%	36.36%	12.12%	0.00%	6.06%
310	Winnsboro	Judicial	92	6.52%	0.00%	17.39%	0.00%	1.09%	0.00%	26.09%	0.00%	1.09%	17.39%	6.52%	19.57%	4.35%
311	Wisner	Mayors	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
312	Woodworth	Mayors	1,754	1.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.34%	0.34%	0.00%	9.12%	0.00%	1.03%	56.33%	1.88%	28.51%	1.20%
313	Youngsville	Mayors	44	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
314	Zachary	City	127	0.79%	18.90%	13.39%	0.00%	4.72%	0.00%	0.00%	1.57%	18.90%	38.58%	3.15%	0.00%	0.00%

Source: Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information obtained from DPS.

¹ May include the following violations: DWI, DWI First Offense, DWI Second Offense, DWI Third Offense, DWI Fourth or Subsequent Offense, DWI 894 Acquittal

² May include the following violations: Failure to Yield, Failure to Yield/School Bus, Failure to Yield to Emergency Vehicle, FTY Right-of-Way at Stop Sign, FTY Right-of-Way at Crosswalk

³ May include the following violations: Following too Closely, Following Improperly, Failure to Allow Overtaking, Following Emergency Vehicle Unlawfully

⁴ May include the following violations: Reckless Operation, Reckless Driving, Reckless Care/Neglegent Driving

⁵ May include the following violations: Fail to Obey Stop Sign, Fail to Obey Traffic Sign, Fail to Obey Yield Sign, Fail to Obey Railroad Gates/Signs/Signal

⁶ May include the following violations: Speed, Speed Excess of Posted Maximum, Speed too Fast for Conditions, Speeding in a School Zone, Erratic Speed, 1-5 > Speed Limit, 5-10>Speed Limit, etc.