SB0381-EPIC-Scott.pdf
Uploaded by: Jeramie Scott
Position: FAV

epic.org

Electronic Privacy Information Center
1519 New Hampshire Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20036, USA

+1 202 483 1140
+1 202 483 1248
@EPICPrivacy
https://epic.org

January 31, 2025

Maryland General Assembly
Senate Committee on Judicial Proceedings
2 East Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Re: Testimony of EPIC on Senate Bill 0381

Dear Chair Smith, Jr., Vice Chair Waldstreicher, and Committee Members,

EPIC writes to urge you to advance S.B.0381, which would require sensible privacy protections when agencies deploy automated traffic enforcement systems like speed cameras and red-light cameras. The time is now to put strong privacy protections in place to ensure traffic enforcement systems are not abused. S.B.0381 would protect Marylanders by ensuring that automated camera systems are used to promote safe driving, not mass surveillance. While other states have enacted similar legislation in patchworks, Maryland has the opportunity to lead the nation by enacting a comprehensive bill that addresses the many ways municipalities might roll out automated traffic camera systems.

The Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC) is a public interest research center established in 1994 to focus public attention on emerging privacy and civil liberties issues.[1] EPIC has long advocated for sensible limits on potentially dangerous surveillance technologies, particularly those which reveal location information.[2] EPIC studies advanced surveillance technologies including traffic enforcement systems and automated license plate readers, the flaws and dangers of these systems, and their impacts on society.[3]

As advocates for privacy and civil liberties, we agree with the core premise of this bill: Data from traffic enforcement cameras should be used for traffic safety, not leveraged for unrelated police activities or exploited by data brokers and bad actors. This bill protects Marylanders by generally limiting access to and use of images and data derived from automated enforcement systems to only traffic enforcement purposes, imposing strong limits on how long that data can be stored, and ensuring that agencies comply with those requirements through an audit process.

S.B. 0381 will be an effective protection for Marylanders because the bill requires four core concepts in data privacy: data minimization, purpose specification, data deletion, and auditing. By requiring cameras to minimize the amount of extraneous information they collect, this bill reduces the possibility that unrelated cars or passengers will be swept up in a system of mass surveillance.

---

[1] EPIC, *About EPIC*, https://epic.org/epic/about.html.
[2] EPIC, *Location Tracking*, https://epic.org/issues/data-protection/location-tracking/;
[3] *See e.g.* EPIC, *Coalition Letter to DEA on unauthorized National License Plate Reader Program* (Mar. 8, 2023), https://epic.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Coalition-Letter-DEA-ALPR-Program-March2023.pdf; *Kansas v. Glover*, 585 U.S. Brief of EPIC as Amicus Curie, (Sept. 6, 2019), https://epic.org/wp-content/uploads/amicus/fourth-amendment/glover/EPIC-Amicus-Kansas-v-Glover.pdf.

And by banning the use of facial recognition and biometric monitoring in automated cameras, the bill further ensures that these systems won't be used to do more than enforce Maryland's traffic laws. The bill further imposes a purpose specification, data can only be accessed for traffic enforcement purposes, not sold or transferred to other agencies where it might be abused. That purpose specification is reinforced through a data deletion requirement that ensures records will only be kept for long enough to substantiate a ticket—less data means less potential for abuse. And finally, all of those protections are enforced by training and auditing requirements, key provisions of any privacy protection.

S.B. 0381 is in line with laws regulating the use of specific automated traffic enforcement systems like those in Pennsylvania[4] and California,[5] but improves on those laws by addressing more types of automated systems and imposing higher data security provisions. This bill won't be the first in the country, but will likely be the most comprehensive.

S.B. 0381 is not a ban on surveillance systems but a pragmatic check to ensure that municipalities don't evade existing regulations by using traffic enforcement as a fig leaf for mass surveillance. Maryland law already imposes some limits on general-purpose automated license plate readers, including a legitimate police use requirement and an audit requirement. MD. Public Safety Code § 3-509. H.B. 1001 prevents end-runs around Maryland's ALPR law and helps ensure that traffic enforcement systems will be deployed for traffic safety purposes.

Furthermore, this bill reduces incentives to install systems where they could be abused. Traffic enforcement systems should be installed where they can reduce speeding and reckless driving, not where they can capture the most data from the most drivers, regardless of the impact on traffic safety. Confining the use of automated traffic camera data to traffic enforcement reduces the risk of mission creep. Mission creep is a serious threat to privacy, civil liberties, and good government that occurs when an agency expands the use of tools and information beyond the originally stated purpose and justification. More often than not the expansion is done in secret, without public approval, and to circumvent existing oversight and accountability measures. Here there is a risk that without privacy protections, traffic enforcement data will become a new source for mass surveillance, political policing, or over-policing. In other states license plate readers have been abused to track people's presence at protests,[6] monitor houses of worship,[7] and surveil immigrants against the wishes of local communities.[8] That means more police time spent on petty crimes, less

[4] Pennsylvania Title 75 Pa.C.S.A. Vehicles § 3117 regulates red light cameras, requiring that images from those cameras may only be used for traffic enforcement of violations and requiring all images captured be deleted within one year. https://codes.findlaw.com/pa/title-75-pacsa-vehicles/pa-csa-sect-75-3117/.

[5] California Vehicle Code VEH § 40240 regulates car-mounted cameras for enforcing parking violations. The law requires cameras to minimize photographing unrelated cars or pedestrians, limits who can view parking enforcement images, and imposes a 60 day deletion requirement. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=40240.&nodeTreePath=34.1.4&lawCode=VEH

[6] Rebecca Glenberg, *Virginia State Police Used License Plate Readers At Political Rallies*, Built Huge Database, ACLU (Oct. 8, 2013), https://www.aclu.org/news/national-security/virginia-state-police-used-license-plate-readers.

[7] *NYPD defends legality of spying on mosques*, CBS News (Feb. 24, 2012), https://www.cbsnews.com/news/nypd-defends-legality-of-spying-on-mosques/.

[8] Vasudha Talla, *Documents Reveal ICE Using Driver Location Data From Local Police for Deportations*, ACLU (Mar. 13, 2019), https://www.aclu.org/news/immigrants-rights/documents-reveal-ice-using-driver-location-data.

time on meaningful public safety, and increased risks of wrongful arrest. When public safety agencies depart from their basic mission, harms to the public multiply while benefits decline.

Wrongful arrest and prosecution are a serious threat of any traffic enforcement system that lacks proper safeguards. Because these systems surveil the public, they can impact anyone. For example, without safeguards, a system that misreads a license plate can incorrectly alert police to the presence of a wanted person and lead to innocent drivers being wrongfully pulled over, wrongfully arrested, or even wrongfully convicted based on an error in the system. This is not an unlikely scenario given license plate readers widely varying error rates, and field studies showing systems misreading license plates at disturbing rates as high as 37 percent.[9]

The potential harms from license plate readers and other traffic enforcement systems are multiplied when these systems are combined with already inaccurate databases, especially stolen vehicle registries. S.B. 0381 addresses this risk for traffic enforcement cameras by banning agencies from networking their automated ticketing systems with other databases. In one case from 2019, a rental car was mistakenly reported stolen so when Oakland, CA privacy activist Brian Hofer drove by an automated license plate reader with his family, the police were called.[10] Mr. Hofer was pulled over, police approached his car guns drawn, and detained him at length before concluding no crime had been committed. License-plate reader misreads led to the high-stakes wrongful detentions of Mark Molner in Kansas City, Denise Green in San Francisco, and Brittany Gilliam alongside her four young daughters in Aurora, CO.[11] S.B. 0381 minimizes the risk of a wrongful detention or arrest from an automated traffic enforcement system by limiting the use to ticketing. Put simply, under this bill even if an automated traffic camera makes a mistake, the harm is a ticket, not an arrest.

Finally, EPIC encourages the legislature to fund and incentivize surveillance-free public safety interventions like safe-street design alongside any expansions to automated traffic enforcement systems. Well-designed streets and intersections naturally prevent speeding, protect cyclists, and improve the pedestrian experience. Those interventions reduce the need for traffic enforcement systems, and consequently reduce the risk of mass surveillance.

We urge the Committee to advance S.B. 0381 and provide Marylanders with meaningful privacy protections for traffic enforcement systems. Limiting the use of data derived from traffic enforcement can prevent wrongful arrests, harmful over-policing, and the sale of Marylanders' data to data brokers or out-of-state agencies.

---

[9] A trial by the Vallejo Police Department in 2018 found that their stationary license plate readers made a mistake about 37 percent of the time. Jason Potts, *Research in Brief: Assessing the Effectiveness of Automatic License Plate Readers*, Police Chief Magazine (Mar. 2018), https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/2018-08/March%202018%20RIB.pdf. When the Northern California Regional Intelligence Center, a police inter-agency center conducted a review of license plate reader data, they found about at 10 percent error rate across multiple agencies. Lisa Fernandez, Privacy advocate sues CoCo sheriff's deputies after license plate readers target his car stolen, Fox 2 KTVU (Feb. 19, 2019), https://www.ktvu.com/news/privacy-advocate-sues-coco-sheriffs-deputies-after-license-plate-readers-target-his-car-stolen.

[10] Charlie Warzel, *When License-Plate Surveillance Goes Horribly Wrong*, N.Y. Times (Apr. 23, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/23/opinion/when-license-plate-surveillance-goes-horribly-wrong.html.

[11] Jonathan Hofer, *The Pitfalls of Law Enforcement License Plate Readers in California and Safeguards to Protect the Public*, The Independent Institute (Aug. 16, 2022), https://www.independent.org/publications/article.asp?id=14254#s3.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify, please reach out with any questions to EPIC Senior Counsel Jeramie D. Scott at scott@epic.org.

Sincerely,

Jeramie D. Scott
Jeramie D. Scott
EPIC Senior Counsel

AAA Testimony in Support of Testimony in SUPPORT o

Uploaded by: Ragina Ali

Position: FAV

AAA Mid-Atlantic's Testimony in SUPPORT of SB 381
Motor Vehicles - Automated Enforcement Programs - Privacy Protections
Sponsor: Senator Love

- AAA Mid-Atlantic supports SB 381 - Motor Vehicles - Automated Enforcement Programs - Privacy Protections because it will protect the privacy of drivers, who are cited through an automated enforcement camera.

- SB 381 will prohibit "State and local agencies from using a recorded image or associated data from an automated enforcement system without a warrant, subpoena, or court order unless the use is for an appropriate traffic enforcement purpose."

- The bill further provides for proper disposal of the recorded images.

- AAA Mid-Atlantic has been supportive of Maryland's automated speed enforcement systems for two decades, working with the legislature in 2005 to launch Maryland's first pilot program for automated speed enforcement in residential areas and school zones in Montgomery County.

- AAA recognizes the role that automated enforcement can play in improving safety for motorists, pedestrians, and other road users by improving compliance with red lights, speed limits, and other traffic control devices.

- However, AAA believes that automated enforcement must be used as part of a comprehensive traffic safety strategy and that the legitimate privacy rights of individuals must be protected, including the destruction of photos as quickly as practical.

- Automated enforcement programs and the data contained from citations issued through those programs should be "for law enforcement use only" and not be subject to public or Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests in non-criminal cases.

- We support the use of automated enforcement systems that are fair and reasonable, don't undermine or violate the public trust, and are safety-based.

- AAA Mid-Atlantic remains committed to the safety of all road users and believe SB 381 will ensure that the privacy of drivers is protected.

- For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Committee to give **SB 381 a favorable report**.

Contacts:
Ragina C. Ali, AAA Mid-Atlantic
Public and Government Affairs Manager
443.465.5020

Sherrie Sims, GS Proctor & Associates
Senior Associate
410.733.7171

SB 381 - AE Privacy Love testimony.pdf
Uploaded by: Sara Love
Position: FAV

Sara N. Love
Legislative District 16
Montgomery County

Judicial Proceedings Committee

James Senate Office Building
11 Bladen Street, Room 222
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
410-841-3124 · 301-858-3124
800-492-7122 *Ext.* 3124
Sara.Love@senate.state.md.us

THE SENATE OF MARYLAND
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

SB 381 – Motor Vehicles – Automated Enforcement Programs – Privacy Protections

Chair Smith, Vice Chair Waldstreicher, Members of JPR:

SB 381 would put parameters on the use, access and retention of the massive amount of data that is collected from Marylanders through our automated enforcement programs.

Right now in Maryland law we allow a number of different automated enforcement programs:

- School bus cameras
- Red light cameras
- Speed cameras
    - In school zones
    - In work zones
    - In residential areas (Anne Arundel, Montgomery, Prince George's)
    - On certain roads in certain places (e.g. I-83, Rte. 210, Jessup Rd., Oxford Rd.)
- Vehicle heigh monitoring cameras
- Railroad grade crossing cameras
- On buses in dedicated bus lanes
- On stop signs in school zones in Prince George's County
- Montgomery and Prince George's Counties are authorized to use noise cameras

On top of these, each year there are more and more bills seeking to add more and more cameras. That is a lot of data that is collected. However, there is no statewide standard as to who has access to the data, what it can be used for, and how long it is kept. SB 381 would set that standard. With the explosion in surveillance technology, these are important parameters to put in place now.

Last session and during the interim Chair Korman and I tried to work with the Chiefs and Sheriffs. We accepted many amendments to address their concerns. To my dismay, I just learned they are still opposed. It is my understanding their position is that they run the program and therefore the data is theirs and they should be able to use it whenever/however they deem appropriate. With all due respect, I disagree. This is data that we as a government have told our citizens is being gathered for a specific purpose – speed, red light, etc. These are not general surveillance cameras. I understand that this data can be useful for other law enforcement purposes, which is why we have language that allows law enforcement to access this data in certain circumstances. But in order for the public to trust us – lawmakers and law enforcement alike – there need to be protections and parameters about how this data is accessed and used.

For the foregoing reasons, I ask for a favorable report on SB 381.

MCPA-MSA_SB 381 Automated Enforcement Programs - P

Uploaded by: Andrea Mansfield

Position: UNF

Maryland Chiefs of Police Association

Maryland Sheriffs' Association

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable William C. Smith, Jr., Chair and
Members of the Environment and Transportation Committee

FROM: Darren Popkin, Executive Director, MCPA-MSA Joint Legislative Committee
Andrea Mansfield, Representative, MCPA-MSA Joint Legislative Committee
Samira Jackson, Representative, MCPA-MSA Joint Legislative Committee

DATE: January 31, 2025

RE: **SB 381 – Motor Vehicles - Automated Enforcement Programs - Privacy Protections**

POSITION: **OPPOSE**

The Maryland Chiefs of Police Association (MCPA) and the Maryland Sheriffs' Association (MSA) **OPPOSE SB 381.** This bill seeks to limit the use of recorded images or other data from automated enforcement programs by state and local enforcement agencies.

Automated enforcement cameras play a crucial role in traffic safety. They are used to deter people from speeding, running red lights, passing stopped school buses, or other traffic safety purposes and to penalize those who violate those laws. The goal is to ensure the safety of all who use our roads be it pedestrians, drivers, or bicyclists.

These cameras are also powerful tools that enhance public safety and aid law enforcement in not only solving crimes but exonerating individuals. Police investigators may use camera recordings and data to identify suspects on the run, track their movements, and reconstruct events. MCPA and MSA opposed similar legislation last year and was pleased to be contacted by the bill Sponsor during the interim to discuss concerns. Although the bill Sponsor accepted several suggested changes that are included in SB 381, MCPA and MSA still have concerns.

Requirement to Seek a Warrant, Subpoena, or Court Order Except in Exigent Circumstances (pg. 5, lines 12-18) – MCPA and MSA appreciates the exigent circumstances exclusion that was included in the bill last session, but is still concerned with the requirement to request a warrant, subpoena, or court order if exigent circumstances do not exist. Situations requiring the use of these data and images vary. What is viewed as exigent circumstances by one individual, may not be by another. This requirement is open to legal interpretation and could significantly hinder law enforcement's ability to investigate and solve crimes.

Further, in many circumstances, law enforcement agencies are the owners of the data. Outside of "exigent circumstances," agencies would be subpoenaing themselves for the data. This would add an unnecessary step in the process and burden limited judicial resources with simple internal data sharing.

Limitation on Retaining Data (pg. 6, lines 1-5) SB 381 allows data captured that constitutes evidence of a violation to be retained for up to 6 months or until the conclusion of any criminal investigation or criminal or civil court action involving the recorded image or associated data.

532 Baltimore Boulevard, Suite 308
Westminster, Maryland 21157
667-314-3216 / 667-314-3236

Investigations are not perfect science. It may not be known immediately that a vehicle was involved in a crime and only after the investigation begins does the officer become aware this data may need to be reviewed. If the data/images are removed and destroyed after the civil fine is paid, the data/image may no longer be available in these circumstances. Law enforcement agencies have policies in place for the retention and destruction of data and images. Placing statutory limitations on these policies is concerning. At the very least, data and images should be authorized to be held for up to one year. This is consistent with the requirement for License Plate Reader data and images and was discussed with the Sponsor during the interim.

SB 381 is entitled "Privacy Protections." Respectfully, there is no reasonable expectation of privacy involved in data captured by automated enforcement systems. Automated enforcement systems only exist on public roads and, "A person traveling in an automobile on public thoroughfares has no reasonable expectation of privacy in his movements from one place to another." *United States v. Knotts*, 460 U.S. 276, 281 (1983). Moreover, an image or video is only created when there is a *violation of safety laws*. There is no, and should not be, any expectation of privacy by those who have violated the State's laws intended to protect all Marylanders.

SB 381 is, as MCPA and MSA understand it, to prevent the misuse of recorded images. MCPA and MSA fully support that goal. Any employee who misuses law enforcement records is already subject to discipline and potential criminal prosecution for misconduct in office. MCPA and MSA would give serious consideration to supporting amendments to SB 381 that target the misuse or abuse of automated enforcement data that is not related to legitimate law enforcement objectives.

Prohibiting the use of automated enforcement camera images and data from law enforcement investigations may jeopardize timely response to crime, place individuals at further risk, and eliminate a means to exonerate individuals. For these reasons, MCPA and MSA **OPPOSE SB 381** and request an **UNFAVORABLE** committee report.

532 Baltimore Boulevard, Suite 308
Westminster, Maryland 21157
667-314-3216 / 667-314-3236

SB0381writtentestimonysigned.pdf
Uploaded by: Daniel Franklin
Position: UNF

Morningside Police Department

6901 Ames Street
Morningside, MD 20746
Phone: 301-736-7400

Daniel J. Franklin
Chief of Police

TO: Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee
The Honorable Senator William C. Smith, Jr. – Chair

FROM: Chief Daniel J. Franklin #0255
Morningside Police Department

RE: Written Testimony Opposing SB 0381
Motor Vehicles - Automated Enforcement Programs - Privacy Protections

DATE: January 30, 2025

Greetings Chairman Smith and the members of the Maryland Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee.

My name is Daniel Franklin, and I am the Chief of Police for the Morningside Police Department in Prince George's County, Maryland. After careful review of SB 0381 sponsored by Senator Love, I am submitting this written testimony **STRONGLY OPPOSING** the passage of the bill.

The Town of Morningside currently operates two automated speed enforcement cameras on Suitland Road near the intersection with Poplar Road within Town limits. The camera system is owned by and deployed in cooperation with Redspeed, LLC, a private corporation under contract to provide the equipment and services of automated speed enforcement to the Town of Morningside.

I believe that continuing to allow Police agencies to access the data captured by automated speed enforcement cameras is very important for investigative purposes, and I can personally speak to two homicide cases that we have been involved in that had very important information discovered from our speed camera captured data. In one case, we were able to identify a carjacked vehicle that contained three suspects who shot and killed an individual on Suitland Road. Those individuals were apprehended almost immediately after we relayed vehicle information captured by our speed camera system to officers in a neighboring sector. Had we not been able to access that data in the time frame that we did, the suspect vehicle is not identified, and the suspects would have continued their crime spree. Those suspects had violently carjacked another vehicle earlier in the day which they lit on fire prior to violently carjacking the vehicle used to commit the homicide mentioned above.

In another case, Officers responded to a motor vehicle collision that turned into a shooting homicide prior to their arrival. I was able to access captured data from the same speed camera system that quickly identified another vehicle containing involved parties that witnesses did not reveal. Because of this discovery, the parties involved were quickly located and the case was able to be solved in short order.

In either case above, there would have been a significant amount of time elapsed prior to Police receiving valuable information which allowed for swift resolution of those cases with no further danger to the public. The captured data was obtained by the automated speed enforcement camera system and confirmed by vehicle registration checks that are conducted every day by Police officers without a warrant or subpoena. The courts have long ruled that "An individual has been held to have a significantly reduced expectation of privacy when

passing along a public way, particularly in a motor vehicle" (People v. Weaver, 2009, 12 NY3d at 436). Using data, video, images, and information captured by automated speed enforcement camera systems is no more invasive than the routine checks conducted by Police in the performance of their everyday duties. The Driver's Privacy Protection Act of 1994 (DPPA) was established to prevent release of a drivers' personal information in many circumstances but has several exceptions which allow release of that information with no further intervention from the Courts or prosecutors. The DPPA asserts "A driver's personal information may be obtained from the department of motor vehicles for any federal, state or local agency use in carrying out its functions; for any state, federal or local proceeding if the proceeding involves a motor vehicle." In the spirit of this act specifically established to protect driver information, the captured data from an automated speed enforcement camera would still be disclosed without any further permission if the data were obtained in any other manner.

For all the reasons that I have listed above, I respectfully request your consideration of my position of **STRONGLY OPPOSING** the passage of SB 0381.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Chief Dl J. Fr · #0255

Chief Daniel J. Franklin #0255
Morningside Police Department

Maryland State Police Position Paper SB0381.pdf
Uploaded by: Owen Traynor
Position: INFO

State of Maryland
Department of State Police

Government Affairs Unit
Annapolis Office (410) 260-6100

POSITION ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION

DATE: **January 31, 2025**

BILL NUMBER: **Senate Bill 381** **POSITION: Letter of Information**

BILL TITLE: **Motor Vehicles – Automated Enforcement Programs – Privacy Protections**

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

This legislation restricts the use of recorded images captured by automated enforcement systems to use only for an appropriate traffic enforcement purpose. Prohibits state and local agencies from using a recorded image or associated data from an automated enforcement system without a warrant, subpoena, or court order unless the use is for an appropriate traffic enforcement purpose. Furthermore, the bill requires an agency to immediately remove from its records and destroy any recorded image or associated data captured under the automated program that does not constitute evidence of a violation.

Currently, the Department of State Police (DSP) works with our partners at the Maryland Department of Transportation for the collection of images collected by a Work Zone Speed Camera System. DSP is responsible for the review and approval of civil citations issued for violations. Several counties have various automated enforcement programs such as speed enforcement, school bus violation enforcement and red light enforcement.

In 2024, Governor Moore proposed the Maryland Road Worker Protection Act of 2024, HB 513, that passed and was signed into law. The bill provides for enhanced penalties for second or subsequent speeding violations within a work zone. Senate Bill 381 undoes what the bill had accomplished. This legislation requires a recorded image or associated data captured under a program that constitutes evidence of a violation may be retained only for up to 6 months or until the conclusion of any criminal investigation or criminal or civil court action involving the recorded image or associated data, which will remove the record of a previous violation for purposes of the enhanced penalty.

Senate Bill 381, mandates that images can only be used for traffic enforcement, thereby restricting a valid means used by law enforcement to identify vehicles used in crimes or other offenses. Operationally, these cameras capture vehicle make and tag information. It also captures the location of the violation. By restricting retention of the data, a person accused of a crime is prohibited from obtaining photos from any of these programs that could exonerate them at a later time.

The Maryland Department of State Police respectfully requests that the Committee consider this information when deliberating Senate Bill 381.

SB0381 - MVA - LOI - Motor Vehicles - Automated En

Uploaded by: Patricia Westervelt

Position: INFO

January 31, 2025

The Honorable William C. Smith, Jr.
Chair, Senate Judicial Proceedings
2 East, Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: Letter of Information – Senate Bill 381 – Motor Vehicles - Automated Enforcement Programs - Privacy Protections

Dear Chair Smith and Committee Members:

The Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) takes no position on Senate Bill 381 but offers the following information for the Committee's consideration.

SB 381 would enact privacy protections for motorists who are photographed or recorded via automated traffic enforcement (AE) systems, which includes speed and red-light running cameras. The legislation proposes conditions around the management, access to, use, and destruction of records for captured images and video from AE devices.

With the increasing reliance on AE systems to enforce vehicle laws, citations written by law enforcement have decreased significantly over the past several years. Vehicle records and traffic violations, such as captured vehicle speeds, are maintained by each jurisdiction or its vendor. While the State can track certain metrics with written citations, the State does not maintain an independent, single repository for AE citations. The only information submitted to the Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) is unpaid citations to flag a vehicle's registration, as Maryland's privacy laws prohibits the sharing of AE data with the MVA and, consequently, the Maryland Highway Safety Office (MHSO).[1]

SB 381 applies to recorded images captured by AE systems in work zones operated by the State Highway Administration (SHA). Currently, the SHA receives customer service requests beyond six months that require Work Zone AE citation information. Copies of outstanding citations are requested from individuals who lost the original citation and have now received a flag on their vehicle registration. Data is also requested to provide proof from the SHA that the AE citation has been paid. In addition, if the SHA determines that a refund is appropriate after payment, the citation data to support this would not be available if the SHA is required to purge the information in six months as required by SB 381.

Maryland law prohibits the renewal of vehicle registration with an outstanding traffic violation. Individuals renewing registration are often alerted to outstanding citations. Given that the MVA

[1] The MHSO oversees Vision Zero, the goal of zero roadway deaths in Maryland by 2030.

offers a two-year registration option to make sure no necessary images are lost to resolve pending disputes, MDOT recommends a minimum period of two and a half years for record-keeping. Additionally, the bill text should accommodate for a timeline that supports the full resolution of violator debts.

The Maryland Department of Transportation respectfully requests that the Committee consider this information when deliberating Senate Bill 381.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Mickler
Director of Government Affairs
Maryland Department of Transportation
410-865-1090