
February 19, 2026

The Honorable Marc Korman
Chair, Environment and Transportation Committee
250 Taylor House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Re: Letter of Information – House Bill 668 – St. Mary’s County – Prohibition on Standing in Inherently Dangerous Highway

Dear Chair Korman and Committee Members:

The Maryland Department of Transportation takes no position on House Bill 668 and offers the following letter of information for the Committee’s consideration.

HB 668 prohibits a person in St. Mary’s County from standing in a roadway, a shoulder, a median divider, or an intersection determined to be “inherently dangerous” and prohibits a police officer from issuing citations for violations unless the location has signs installed prohibiting standing.

The State Highway Administration (SHA) understands that a person standing in a roadway poses various risks and recognizes that this is a serious public safety challenge. Soliciting in roadways, median dividers, and intersections is already prohibited in several jurisdictions under Maryland Transportation Article § 21-507. Adding St. Mary’s County to this section is a more direct means to achieve the goals of this legislation.

The SHA is unclear on the type of signage required by the bill. It should be noted that “No Solicitation” signs are not covered or regulated by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) as required by the bill. “No Solicitation” signs are not traffic control devices designed to regulate vehicle or pedestrian traffic on streets and highways. Further, signage reading “No Peds” or “No Standing” may not be appropriate and would cause confusion for highway users if pedestrian amenities (crosswalks, Accessible Pedestrian Signals, Countdown Pedestrian Signals) are present at the location. Furthermore, the installation of additional signage could reduce motorists’ focus on critical regulatory, warning, and guide signs.

The SHA requests additional clarification to ensure that the installation of this signage is the responsibility of the local jurisdiction. SHA is concerned that the ambiguity over the signage funding could lead to disputes about the signage being the County’s responsibility. To the extent that the responsibility is on the County and the County submits permit requests for installation of signage on State-owned right-of-way, the SHA will incur additional expenditures for the review, right-of-way evaluation, and issuance of the appropriate permit. If the intent of the bill is for SHA to install signage, it should be noted that SHA is not currently funded to design, fabricate and install the subject signage. Therefore, SHA would incur unfunded costs.

The Honorable Marc Korman
Page Two

The SHA also notes that language used in the proposed legislation, "inherently dangerous", is ambiguous and could have unintended complications on roadway safety. At certain locations, the crash data may not support the assumption that the road is "inherently dangerous". Therefore, it is unclear how a determination would be made in compliance with state and federal traffic engineering guidance and best practices.

The Maryland Department of Transportation respectfully requests the Committee consider this information during their deliberations of House Bill 668.

Respectfully submitted,

April Moeller
Director
Office of Government Affairs
Maryland State Highway Administration
410-210-5780

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