

Dear Chair Korman and Members of the Committee,

I am Ron Weiss, a founding member of the MD 210 Traffic Safety Committee and a board member of SafeRoadsMD. I respectfully submit this written testimony in support of House Bill 8, the Dangerous Driver Accountability Act, **with the attached amendment titled “Dangerous Driver Abatement Program – Coordination and Enforcement Alignment.”**

HB 8 addresses a real and growing problem in Maryland: a small but dangerous group of repeat offenders whose vehicles are repeatedly captured by automated enforcement systems for high-risk violations such as speeding, red-light running, and school bus and stop-sign violations. A statewide intervention that moves beyond mailing citations and requires accountability is both reasonable and necessary.

I support HB 8 because it is designed as a **behavior-change intervention**, not simply a penalty collection tool. By requiring repeat offenders to complete an approved driver accountability and safety course, and by backing that requirement with escalating consequences for noncompliance, the bill creates a structured pathway toward safer behavior rather than relying on punishment alone.

The **amendment strengthens the bill and improves its defensibility**, without weakening its effectiveness.

First, the amendment clearly states legislative intent: HB 8 is meant to address repeated dangerous driving behavior through education and accountability, and not to duplicate enforcement mechanisms aimed solely at collecting unpaid civil penalties. This clarification is important to avoid confusion with other bills that address different enforcement failures, such as chronic nonpayment in specific corridors.

Second, the amendment aligns HB 8 with the General Assembly’s post-COVID approach to registration enforcement by clarifying that the primary sanction is a **hold at registration renewal**, rather than mid-registration suspension. This reflects lessons learned when breakdowns in tolling and notice systems resulted in sudden, unexpected consequences for drivers who were not acting in bad faith.

Third, the amendment ensures **coordination rather than duplication** when other registration-related enforcement statutes apply. This prevents overlapping or conflicting sanctions and allows HB 8 to complement, rather than compete with, more targeted enforcement tools.

Fourth, the amendment appropriately tightens the “owner not driving” waiver. It preserves due process and sworn-statement protections, but makes clear that repeated

endangerment cannot be avoided through serial affidavits. This balance is essential if HB 8 is to remain credible and effective.

Finally, the amendment enhances legislative oversight by requiring reporting on how HB 8 interacts with other enforcement actions in practice. That transparency will allow the General Assembly to evaluate outcomes and make adjustments if needed.

In short, HB 8, as amended, strikes the right balance. It targets repeat dangerous behavior, preserves fairness, avoids unintended duplication, and maintains meaningful consequences for noncompliance. I urge the Committee to give House Bill 8 a favorable report **with the amendment**.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Weiss

Fort Washington

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE BILL 8

Dangerous Driver Abatement Program – Coordination and Enforcement Alignment

On page 5, in line 19, after “DEATHS” insert “, THROUGH EDUCATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY,”.

On page 5, after line 22, insert the following:

(D) THE PROGRAM IS INTENDED TO ADDRESS REPEATED DANGEROUS DRIVING BEHAVIOR AND MAY NOT BE USED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR, OR DUPLICATE OF, ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS RELATED SOLELY TO THE COLLECTION OF UNPAID CIVIL PENALTIES.

On page 7, in lines 11–13, strike “**SUSPEND THE RENEWAL OF THE REPEAT OFFENDER’S MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION**” and substitute “**PLACE A HOLD ON THE RENEWAL OF THE REPEAT OFFENDER’S MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION AT THE TIME OF RENEWAL**”.

So that § 21–8A–04(b)(1) reads as follows:

(B)(1) IF A REPEAT OFFENDER FAILS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF SUBSECTION (A)(1) OF THIS SECTION, THE ADMINISTRATION SHALL PLACE A HOLD ON THE RENEWAL OF THE REPEAT OFFENDER’S MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION AT THE TIME OF RENEWAL UNTIL THE REPEAT OFFENDER SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETES AN ADMINISTRATION–APPROVED DRIVER ACCOUNTABILITY AND SAFETY COURSE.

On page 7, after line 23, insert the following new subsection to be lettered accordingly:

(F) IF A REPEAT OFFENDER IS SUBJECT TO A REGISTRATION–RELATED SANCTION UNDER ANOTHER PROVISION OF LAW ARISING FROM THE SAME OR SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR AUTOMATED ENFORCEMENT VIOLATIONS, THE ADMINISTRATION SHALL:

(1) COORDINATE NOTICE TO THE OWNER TO AVOID DUPLICATIVE OR CONFLICTING COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS; AND

(2) APPLY SANCTIONS UNDER THIS SUBTITLE **ONLY AFTER** THE OWNER HAS FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISION.

On page 7, in line 32, after “AT THE TIME OF A VIOLATION;” insert the following sentence:

A WAIVER GRANTED UNDER THIS PARAGRAPH MAY NOT BE USED TO AVOID RESPONSIBILITY UNDER THIS SUBTITLE IF THE ADMINISTRATION DETERMINES THAT THE OWNER HAS REPEATEDLY PERMITTED THE MOTOR VEHICLE TO BE OPERATED IN A MANNER THAT ENDANGERS PUBLIC SAFETY.

On page 9, in line 22, after “PRECEDING YEAR,” insert “INCLUDING THE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS WHO WERE ALSO SUBJECT TO REGISTRATION-RELATED ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS UNDER OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW;”.

On page 9, after line 26, insert:

AND A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE ADMINISTRATION COORDINATED ENFORCEMENT AND NOTICE BETWEEN THIS SUBTITLE AND OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF LAW.