

Department of Legislative Services  
Maryland General Assembly  
2013 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE

Senate Bill 785 (Senator Pipkin, *et al.*)  
Judicial Proceedings

---

Vehicle Laws - Speed Monitoring and Work Zone Speed Control Systems - Repeal

---

This bill repeals the authorization for the use of speed monitoring and work zone speed control systems.

---

Fiscal Summary

**State Effect:** Transportation Trust Fund (TTF) and special fund revenues decrease significantly beginning in FY 2014 from the elimination of civil fines distributed to the State Highway Administration (SHA) for the recovery of costs of operating work zone speed monitoring systems and to the Department of State Police (DSP) for roadside enforcement. TTF expenditures decrease significantly, but to a lesser extent, beginning in FY 2014 from the elimination of the work zone speed control system program administered by SHA. General fund expenditures for DSP increase significantly to replace the revenues provided by work zone speed control system fines. General fund revenues decrease from a reduction in the collection of court costs. District Court caseloads decrease significantly.

**Local Effect:** Local government revenues decrease significantly beginning in FY 2014 from the elimination of speed monitoring system fines for any jurisdiction that operates speed monitoring systems. Expenditures decrease for any jurisdiction that operates speed monitoring systems, which may be partially or fully offset by an increase in expenditures to increase roadside enforcement activities in lieu of automated enforcement.

**Small Business Effect:** Minimal.

---

## Analysis

### Current Law/Background:

#### *Speed Monitoring Systems*

Chapter 15 of 2006 (HB 443 of 2005) authorized the first use of speed monitoring systems in the State, but it only applied to highways in school zones and residential districts in Montgomery County. Chapter 500 of 2009 (SB 277) expanded statewide the authorization for the use of speed monitoring systems in school zones. Chapter 474 of 2010 (HB 1477) authorized the use of speed monitoring systems in Prince George's County on a highway located within the grounds of an institution of higher education or on nearby highways under certain circumstances.

Unless the driver of a motor vehicle received a citation from a police officer at the time of the violation, the owner or driver of the vehicle is subject to a civil penalty if the vehicle is recorded speeding at least 12 miles per hour above the posted speed limit by a speed monitoring system in violation of specified speed restrictions in the Maryland Vehicle Law. The maximum fine for a citation issued by a speed monitoring system operator is \$40. However, a local law enforcement or other designated agency operating the speed monitoring system may mail a warning notice instead of a citation.

Before activating an unmanned stationary speed monitoring system, a local jurisdiction must:

- publish notice of the location on its website and in a newspaper of general circulation in the jurisdiction;
- ensure that each school zone sign indicates that speed monitoring systems are in use in school zones; and
- for a speed monitoring system near an institution of higher education, ensure that all speed limit signs approaching and within the segment of highway on which the speed monitoring system is located include signs that indicate that a speed monitoring system is in use and that are in accordance with the manual and specifications for a uniform system of traffic control devices adopted by SHA.

A speed monitoring system may be placed in a school zone for operation between 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Before a speed monitoring system may be used in a local jurisdiction, its use must be authorized by the governing body by ordinance or resolution adopted after reasonable notice and a public hearing.

As shown in **Exhibit 1**, a number of counties and municipal corporations currently implement speed monitoring systems. The Department of Legislative Services advises  
SB 785/ Page 2

that, as to municipal corporations, the exhibit only reflects municipal corporations that have reported revenues to the Comptroller in fiscal 2012 and, therefore, may not include all municipal corporations that *currently implement* speed monitoring systems. Further, additional jurisdictions may be *considering* the use of speed monitoring systems at this time.

From the fines generated by a speed monitoring system, the relevant jurisdiction may recover the costs of implementing the system and may spend any remaining balance solely for public safety purposes, including for pedestrian safety programs. However, if the balance of revenues after cost recovery for any fiscal year is greater than 10% of the jurisdiction's total revenues, the excess must be remitted to the Comptroller. According to data from the Comptroller, about \$2.2 million was remitted in fiscal 2011 from five municipal corporations, but no money was remitted in fiscal 2012. In addition, 17 municipal corporations and Baltimore City generated speed monitoring system fine revenues of about \$36.3 million, of which about \$21.7 million was retained by local jurisdictions for public safety programs after recovery of the costs of implementing the systems.

---

**Exhibit 1**  
**Local Speed Monitoring System Enforcement**

<u>County</u>	<u>Municipal Corporation</u>
Baltimore	Bowie
Charles	Brentwood
Howard	Chesapeake Beach
Montgomery	Chevy Chase Village
Prince George's	College Park
Wicomico	Denton
Baltimore City	Forest Heights
	Fruitland
	Hagerstown
	Laurel
	New Carrollton
	Princess Anne
	Riverdale Park
	Rockville
	Salisbury
	Seat Pleasant
	Takoma Park

Source: Comptroller's Office; Department of Legislative Services

## *Work Zone Speed Control Systems*

Chapter 500 of 2009 also authorized State and local law enforcement agencies or their contractors to issue citations or warnings for speeding at least 12 miles per hour above the posted speed limit in highway work zones that are set up on expressways or controlled access highways where the speed limit is 45 miles per hour or greater.

A “work zone” is a segment of a highway identified as a temporary traffic control zone by a traffic control device in conformance with State specifications and where highway construction, repair, maintenance, utility work, or related activities are being performed, regardless of whether workers are present. A work zone speed control system may only be used while being operated by a work zone speed control system operator. The maximum fine for a ticket issued by a work zone speed control system operator is \$40. A conspicuous road sign warning of the use of speed monitoring systems must be placed at a reasonable distance from the work zone.

The Maryland Department of Transportation advises that work zones are inherently dangerous due to obstacles such as concrete barriers, narrowed lanes, and cones, all of which increase the risk of traffic accidents from speeding motorists. In these work zone accidents, about 85% of injuries are to the motorists, and about 15% of those injured are transportation workers according to the Federal Highway Administration. According to the National Work Zone Safety Information Clearinghouse, there were 576 fatalities in highway work zones nationwide in 2010, including 6 in Maryland.

Through fiscal 2012, slightly more than 1 million citations had been generated by work zone speed control systems, according to data from SHA. In fiscal 2012, the State’s Automated Speed Enforcement Program generated just less than \$15 million in revenues, down from about \$18.4 million in fiscal 2011.

## *Recent Media Scrutiny*

A number of bills related to automated enforcement have been introduced in the 2013 legislative session, in part due to recent media scrutiny of speed cameras statewide. The additional scrutiny has centered around two common criticisms of speed cameras: (1) that technical issues and insufficient review of recorded images result in erroneously generated citations; and (2) that the contracts with vendors are structured in such a manner as to establish an incentive to generate more citations and revenues, thereby casting doubt on the integrity of speed cameras as a safety measure.

### *Automated Speed Enforcement Efficacy*

Although a statewide review of speed monitoring programs has not been conducted, a combination of national and international studies and local program evaluations provide some insight into the level of effectiveness of such programs. According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, several studies have documented reductions in crashes in the vicinities of speed cameras, including crashes that result in an injury or fatality. The most recent of these studies was a meta-analysis by the Cochrane Collaboration in 2010, which reviewed 28 individual studies and found reductions of between 8% and 49% for crashes, between 8% and 50% for crashes resulting in injury, and between 11% and 44% for crashes involving fatalities and serious injuries.

Locally, Prince George's County has evaluated its first year of speed monitoring system implementation and found that compliance with speed limits increased, on average, from about 20% of vehicles in certain locations before speed cameras were installed to about 67% after installation. This was based on an assessment of only seven locations, however. In Montgomery County, a 2009 review of its Safe Speed Program revealed that, on average, the number of citations generated by a speed camera decreased 78% between the first and twelfth months of the system's usage and that the average speed of passing vehicles declined by 6%. Finally, an SHA review of its work zone speed monitoring systems revealed that work zone crashes decreased by 11.8% between 2009 and 2011; crashes involving an injury dropped by 16.8%; and the number of annual fatalities fell from nine to three.

**State Fiscal Effect:** A reliable estimate of the decrease in TTF and special fund revenues cannot be made due to uncertainty regarding the number of paid future work zone speed control system citations. As noted above, about \$18.4 million was collected in fiscal 2011 from the payment of citations generated by work zone speed control systems, and about \$15.0 million was collected in fiscal 2012. As anticipated, revenues have decreased as compliance has increased. However, the rate of the decrease in revenues in the future is uncertain without additional enforcement history of automated work zone speed control systems.

Additionally, a reliable estimate of the net revenues that are distributed to DSP for roadside enforcement cannot be made due to uncertainty regarding future costs of operating and administering the State's work zone speed control system program. However, work zone speed control systems generated net revenues of about \$13.9 million in fiscal 2011 and about \$8.0 million in fiscal 2012, after SHA recovered costs of about \$4.5 million in fiscal 2011 and \$7.0 million in fiscal 2012.

*For illustrative purposes only*, if work zone speed control system revenues remain constant in fiscal 2013, revenues decrease at the same rate between fiscal 2013 and 2014

as between fiscal 2011 and 2012, and program expenditures remain constant, then net revenues of about \$5.2 million would be distributed to DSP in the absence of the bill, but are eliminated under the bill.

TTF revenues also decrease significantly, but to a lesser extent, from the reduction in fees collected from individuals seeking to remove an administrative flag placed on their vehicle's registration for refusal to pay speed monitoring or work zone speed control system fines. General fund expenditures also likely increase significantly to replace the special funds from work zone speed control enforcement in order to maintain current levels of roadside enforcement resources.

District Court caseloads decrease significantly due to the elimination of speed monitoring and work zone speed control system trials. The District Court advises that this reduction is likely to have a significant impact on its operations, though not necessarily a significant impact on expenditures. General fund revenues decrease from fewer court costs paid following speed monitoring or work zone speed control system trials. The District Court further advises that there were 17,931 speed monitoring or work zone speed control system trials in fiscal 2012.

**Local Fiscal Effect:** Local government revenues and expenditures decrease significantly beginning in fiscal 2014, with the decrease in revenues generally exceeding the decrease in expenditures for most jurisdictions that operate speed monitoring systems. As noted above, 17 municipal corporations and Baltimore City generated speed monitoring system fine revenues of about \$36.3 million in fiscal 2012, of which about \$21.7 million was retained by local jurisdictions for public safety programs after recovery of the costs of implementing the systems.

This does not include revenues or expenditures from several counties that also implement speed monitoring programs. For example, Baltimore County advises that speed monitoring generated net revenues of more than \$600,000 in fiscal 2012, Baltimore City estimates that net revenues may decrease by roughly \$7 million annually under the bill, and Montgomery County estimates net revenues of about \$5.8 million in fiscal 2014, declining in future years. Howard County speed monitoring system expenditures exceeded revenues in fiscal 2012, although it is unclear to what extent this will continue in future years.

Thus, statewide, net revenues for local roadside enforcement activities from the operation of speed monitoring systems may decrease by more than \$30 million in fiscal 2014, although this decrease is likely smaller in future years as ongoing revenues from speed monitoring tend to decline over time.

Local government expenditures may increase for any jurisdiction that increases the level of resources for roadside enforcement activities following elimination of automated speed enforcement.

---

### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** None.

**Cross File:** HB 251 (Delegate Smigiel, *et al.*) - Environmental Matters.

**Information Source(s):** Caroline, Howard, and Montgomery counties; the cities of Baltimore and Rockville; Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts); Department of State Police; Maryland Department of Transportation; Comptroller's Office; National Work Zone Safety Information Clearinghouse; Federal Highway Administration; Insurance Institute for Highway Safety; Cochrane Collaboration; Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - February 18, 2013  
ncs/ljm

---

Analysis by: Evan M. Isaacson

Direct Inquiries to:  
(410) 946-5510  
(301) 970-5510