



Morningside Police Department

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

Daniel J. Franklin
Chief of Police



TO: The Honorable Delegate Luke Clippinger, Chair and
Members of the House Judiciary Committee

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

DATE: February 21, 2025

RE: HB 669 – Law Enforcement Officers – Body-Worn Cameras -Requirements

POSITION: **OPPOSED**

Greetings Chairman Clippinger and the members of the House Judiciary Committee.

I am writing to state my position regarding the proposed legislation in front of the House Judiciary Committee titled HB 669 – Law Enforcement Officers – Body-Worn Cameras -Requirements sponsored by Delegate Williams. As the Chief of Police for the Town of Morningside, I am writing to **STRONGLY OPPOSE** the passage of HB 0669.

HB 669 appears to be taking a large part of the body-worn camera policy adopted by the MPTSC and incorporating it into law. I am deeply concerned with this approach as it doesn't allow future policy changes as technology evolves and changes. By changing policy into law, legislation would be necessary for modifications or changes. In addition, several requirements outlining use in certain situations are quite inflexible. Passing this bill containing those requirements without a minimum of a discussion involving MPTSC and the Maryland Chiefs Association (MCA) and the Maryland Sheriff's Association (MSA) would certainly not serve the best interests of all parties involved.

There is some specific language in this bill that is also very problematic. Obtaining consent from all parties captured on a body-worn camera (BWC) video may not be a possibility since there are often numerous inadvertent captures during an incident. That language reads:

(B) A CUSTODIAN SHALL ALLOW INSPECTION OF A RECORDING MADE WITH THE USE OF A BODY-WORN CAMERA OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER:

(1) IF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY OBTAINS WRITTEN PERMISSION TO DISCLOSE THE RECORDING FROM EACH INDIVIDUAL CAPTURED ON THE RECORDING OR THE INDIVIDUAL'S LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE;

Another example is that this bill establishes a 90-day retention period for BWC videos which contradicts the current laws and policies and also does not support the parameters of the Police Accountability Act since there is no statute of limitations on filing a complaint against a police officer.

As a police administrator, I would also note that the reporting requirements established by this bill would be mostly redundant and repetitive as current policy already establishes the majority of these requirements.

For the reasons previously stated, I take the position of **STRONGLY OPPOSING** HB 0669.

Thank you for your time and consideration.