

Department of Legislative Services
Maryland General Assembly
2025 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE
Enrolled - Revised

Senate Bill 338

(Baltimore County Senators)

Judicial Proceedings

Environment and Transportation

Baltimore County - Speed Monitoring Systems - Interstate 695 and Interstate 83

This bill authorizes the State Highway Administration (SHA) to place and use up to six speed monitoring systems (speed cameras) on Interstate 83 in Baltimore County and eight speed monitoring systems on Interstate 695 in Baltimore County, subject to certain requirements and limitations. Fines collected from the speed cameras must be remitted to the Comptroller for distribution to SHA, to then be used to (1) recover SHA's administrative costs to implement and administer the speed camera program and (2) assist in covering the cost of roadway and safety improvements on Interstate 695 and Interstate 83 in Baltimore County. Fines distributed pursuant to the bill's authorization are supplemental to (and not intended to take the place of) funding that would otherwise be appropriated for the same purposes. **The bill terminates June 30, 2030.**

Fiscal Summary

State Effect: To the extent speed cameras are placed as authorized, Transportation Trust Fund (TTF) revenues increase, potentially significantly, from FY 2026 through 2030; TTF expenditures increase correspondingly for administrative costs and for roadway and safety improvements. General fund expenditures increase by approximately \$12,200 in FY 2026 only for reprogramming.

Local Effect: Although Baltimore County may benefit from the roadway and safety improvements on Interstate 695 and Interstate 83, local finances are not directly affected.

Small Business Effect: Potential minimal.

Analysis

Bill Summary: The bill incorporates the authorization for SHA to place and use speed cameras on Interstate 695 or Interstate 83 in Baltimore County within current statutory provisions governing the use of speed cameras in specified locations throughout the State. Notably, and consistent with the requirements governing most other speed cameras used in the State:

- before activating a speed camera, SHA must take specified steps to notify the general public of the placement of the speed camera;
- SHA must ensure there is specified signage notifying motorists that a speed camera is in use;
- SHA must designate an official or employee to investigate and respond to questions and concerns about the speed camera program, as specified;
- speed cameras used by SHA must undergo an annual calibration check, as specified; and
- SHA must report certain information annually to the Maryland Police Training and Standards Commission for inclusion in the commission's annual report to the Governor and the General Assembly on speed cameras in the State.

The bill includes additional specifications that apply exclusively to SHA and speed cameras placed and used by SHA under the authority granted by the bill. Notably, the bill:

- requires the speed cameras to be used only at locations SHA identifies as being at high risk for motor vehicle crashes that result in death or serious bodily injury;
- prohibits the placement and use of a speed camera within five miles of another speed camera operating in the same direction;
- requires SHA, for the first 30 days that a speed camera is in use, to mail warning notices instead of citations for violations recorded by the camera; and
- requires SHA to submit a report on the speed camera program to the Governor and the General Assembly by June 1, 2029.

The report must include specified information about the program, including citations issued, the amount of revenues collected, how the revenues have been used, and whether there have been any measurable improvements to driver awareness and safety.

Additionally, the bill establishes a maximum civil penalty of \$40 for a violation recorded by a speed camera on Interstate 695 or Interstate 83 in Baltimore County. The bill includes a contingency provision to ensure that the maximum civil penalty of \$40 applies even if certain legislation to increase the maximum civil penalty that may be imposed for a violation recorded by a speed camera throughout the State is enacted.

Current Law: State law authorizes the use of various automated monitoring systems, including traffic control system monitoring systems, speed monitoring systems, school bus monitoring systems, vehicle height monitoring systems, and work zone speed control systems.

Speed monitoring systems must be authorized in a local jurisdiction by the governing body of the jurisdiction (but only after reasonable notice and a public hearing). Before activating a speed monitoring system, a local jurisdiction must publish notice of the location of the speed monitoring system on its website and in a newspaper of general circulation in the jurisdiction. In addition, the jurisdiction must also ensure that each sign that designates a school zone is proximate to a sign that (1) indicates that speed monitoring systems are in use in the school zone and (2) conforms with specified traffic control device standards adopted by SHA. Similar requirements apply to speed cameras established on Maryland Route 210 (Indian Head Highway), grounds of institutions of higher education in Prince George's County, Interstate 83 in Baltimore City, Maryland Route 175 in Anne Arundel County (Jessup Road) between the Maryland Route 175/295 interchange and the Anne Arundel County-Howard County line, and at the intersection of Maryland Route 333 (Oxford Road) and Bonfield Avenue in Talbot County.

An authorizing ordinance or resolution adopted by the governing body of a local jurisdiction must establish certain procedures related to the movement or placement of speed monitoring systems. Specifically, if a jurisdiction moves (or places) a mobile (or stationary) speed monitoring system to (or at) a new location, the jurisdiction may not issue a citation for a violation recorded by that speed monitoring system (1) until signage is installed, as specified and (2) for at least the first 15 calendar days after the signage is installed.

Generally, 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.

State Expenditures: Assuming SHA uses the authorization to place the additional speed cameras on Interstate 695 and Interstate 83 in Baltimore County, TTF expenditures increase, as early as fiscal 2026.

The exact cost to place the speed cameras and related signage depends on a number of factors (*e.g.*, the total number of cameras placed and how many are routinely active, how often the cameras are moved, etc.). For comparison purposes, administrative costs (including equipment and personnel) for SHA and the Department of State Police to operate the State's work zone speed control system totaled about \$6.7 million and

\$1.2 million, respectively, in fiscal 2023. Expenditures under the bill are likely significantly less than those amounts, as the speed monitoring systems authorized by the bill are limited to 14. Based on preliminary information from SHA, administrative costs for the program could total *as much as* \$600,000 annually, which includes personnel costs associated with two additional program managers.

In addition, TTF expenditures increase for roadway and safety improvements, after a portion of the revenues is retained by SHA for cost recovery, as authorized under the bill. SHA may incur costs to complete the report required by the bill; however, any such impact cannot be reliably estimated at this time.

The increase in District Court caseloads can likely be handled with existing resources until the bill terminates. In fiscal 2026 only, general fund expenditures increase by \$12,208 for reprogramming for the Judiciary.

State Revenues: The amount of citation revenues that may be received as a result of the new speed monitoring systems cannot be determined without actual experience under the bill and depends on factors such as the exact locations where the cameras are placed, the traffic volume at such locations, the extent to which driver behavior changes, etc. For context, in fiscal 2023, citation revenues for the State's work zone speed control systems totaled \$9.7 million.

Fine revenues collected for *contested* citations in the District Court accrue to the general fund under other automated enforcement systems; however, the District Court must remit all fine revenues collected under the bill to the Comptroller for subsequent distribution to SHA. Thus, based on revenues received under the State's work zone monitoring system program, TTF revenues may increase significantly from fiscal 2026 through 2030, assuming cameras are installed pursuant to the bill's authorization.

Additional Information

Recent Prior Introductions: Similar legislation has been introduced within the last three years. See SB 1067 and HB 1502 of 2024.

Designated Cross File: HB 978 (Baltimore County Delegation) - Environment and Transportation.

Information Source(s): Department of State Police; Maryland Department of Transportation; Comptroller's Office; Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts); Baltimore County; Department of Legislative Services

Fiscal Note History:
rh/jkb

First Reader - January 27, 2025

Third Reader - March 20, 2025

Revised - Amendment(s) - March 20, 2025

Enrolled - May 7, 2025

Revised - Amendment(s) - May 7, 2025

Analysis by: Richard L. Duncan

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