TE Committee #4
October 5, 2026
Worksession

M E M O R A N D U M

September 30, 2026

TO: Transportation and Environment Committee

FROM: Ludeen McCartney-Green, Legislative Attorney

SUBJECT: Bill 17-26, Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized – Amendments

PURPOSE: Worksession – to receive a Committee recommendation

Expected Attendees
Dr. Earl Stoddard, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
David McBain, Assistant Chief, Montgomery County Police
Christopher Tippery, Manager, Montgomery County Police
Wade Holland, Vision Zero Coordinator, Office of County Executive

Bill 17-26, Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized – Amendments, is sponsored by the Council President at the request of the County Executive and was introduced on March 17, 2026, and is co-sponsored by Councilmembers Luedtke and Jawando. The Council held a public hearing on June 16, 2026, at 1:30 p.m., with 5 speakers. A worksession of the Transportation and Environment (TE) Committee will be held on October 5, 2026.

Bill 17-26 would:

(1) authorize the use of speed monitoring systems within certain school zones;
(2) authorize the use of speed monitoring systems on certain highways in the County; and
(3) generally amend the law regarding motor vehicles and traffic control.

BACKGROUND

The County Executive has provided the following background information regarding Bill 17-26:

"During the 2025 Maryland General Assembly, House Bill 1173 was passed by the Assembly and signed by the Governor to allow municipalities and local jurisdictions the authority

to use the high-injury network (HIN) crash risk corridors in their highway safety plans, to study and place automated speed monitoring systems. This bill authorizes the County Government to use the authority granted under House Bill 1173."[1] See Legislative Request Report at © 12.

To determine whether a corridor is considered a high-injury crash corridor, use this interactive map of the Vision Zero Action Plan: High Injury Network Montgomery County, MD.

The HIN, identified in the County's Vision Zero 2030 Action Plan, includes roadway corridors with the highest concentration of serious and fatal crashes. According to the County Executive, speed cameras are currently prohibited on 60 of the HIN's 100 miles. Bill 17-26 would remove this restriction and allow speed cameras throughout the HIN. Bill 17-26 would also clarify that speed cameras are allowed in school zones with speed limits over 20 miles per hour.

BILL SPECIFICS

Pursuant to state enabling legislation, Bill 17-26 seeks to amend Chapter 31A-9 of the County Code, which would authorize the placement and use of speed monitoring systems:

(1) in a school zone with a posted speed limit of at least 20 miles per hour; and

(2) on a highway identified as high risk for motor vehicle crashes in a State or County's strategic highway safety plan or vision zero plans. The County's authority does not extend to placing a speed-monitoring system on a controlled-access highway, an expressway, or an interstate highway in the County.[2]

Additionally, the Bill authorizes the County Executive, by executive order, to implement any speed-monitoring measures the Maryland General Assembly subsequently authorizes under Section 21-809 of the Transportation Article, without requiring additional legislative action by the Council. Currently, implementing speed monitoring devices requires legislative action. Lastly, the Bill makes a few technical changes.

SUMMARY OF IMPACT STATEMENTS

Fiscal Impact. The Office of Management and Budget states that it is difficult to calculate the fiscal impact of the new authority to establish speed monitoring systems in High Injury Networks, as the calculation would require knowing how many new systems would be established and where they would be located. OMB notes that while the impact is unknown, "fines collected and related expenditures will increase if the County Executive exercises the new authority to increase the number of speed monitoring systems.

For illustrative purposes, between FY15 and FY24, fines from speed cameras averaged

$177,513 per-camera per year, while expenses averaged $95,344 per-camera

[1] Chapter 590, 2025 Laws of Maryland.
[2] Controlled access highway, expressway, and interstate highway are all defined under Section 20-101 of the Transportation Article of the Maryland Code

per year, for a net average of $82,169 per camera per year. Fines from red light cameras averaged $64,984 per camera per year over that same time frame, and $28,295 in expenses per camera per year, for a net average of $36,689 per camera per year.

Economic Impact. The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) could not determine the economic impact of Bill 17-26**.** Specifically, **OLO states that "The Bill would likely have mixed economic impacts on some County residents.** It would negatively affect drivers who receive fines from these cameras, thereby incurring nondiscretionary household expenses to pay them. However, if newly installed speed cameras prevent vehicle crashes, the Bill would avert crash-related nondiscretionary household expenditures and income losses. It may also reduce costs for other road users from travel delays and excess fuel consumption caused by vehicle crashes. To the extent that the County deploys cameras at scale and achieves a substantial reduction in crashes, other residents could also benefit from lower insurance premiums and other costs linked to crashes." OLO continues that businesses would also likely see mixed impacts, as "newly installed speed cameras prevent crashes, some employers could see lower costs from workplace disruption, overtime, retraining, and fringe benefits associated with employee injuries and fatalities. Health care providers might face reduced demand for emergencies, inpatient, and other crash-related care, along with lower uncompensated or undercompensated care costs. However, if additional speed cameras meaningfully reduce crashes, hospitals, trauma centers, and rehabilitation providers could see lower crash-related revenues, as would vehicle repair shops and related businesses that derive income from collision work."

Racial Equity and Social Justice Impact. **OLO "finds that the anticipated racial equity and social justice (RESJ) impact of Bill 17-26 is indeterminate**. There are several unknown factors to determine how allowing speed cameras throughout the County's High Injury Network (HIN) would impact community members by race and ethnicity and racial and social inequities in the County." OLO offers that if the Council wishes to strengthen the bill, they could consider requiring two policy considerations: (1) "community engagement that prioritizes BIPOC community stakeholders to develop County's Automated Enforcement Plan" and (2) to "[s]tudy and address potential racial disparities in the County's speed camera enforcement."

Climate Assessment. OLO "anticipates **Bill 17-26 will have little to no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change**, as it is authorizing the installation of speed cameras in high-risk crash areas such as school zones, which may encourage more pedestrian travel. However, it is unknown how many cameras would be installed and the impact the cameras would have on residents' choice of transportation." OLO does not offer any climate-related amendments to the bill.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Council held a public hearing on Bill 17-26 on June 16, 2026. The Council also received additional written testimony for the record. Testimony largely supported Bill 17-26.

Assistant Chief Administrative Officer Earl Stoddard testified on behalf of County Executive Marc Elrich in support of Bill 17-26. Mr. Stoddard noted that high-injury network corridors make up about 3% of county roadways but account for 41% of serious and fatal crashes.

Mr. Stoddard also addressed several perceived misconceptions about the bill. He clarified that the legislation would not increase the total number of cameras in the county—which currently includes 76 red light cameras, 38 fixed pole cameras primarily in school zones, 96 portable units, and six trailer units —but would expand the eligible locations where existing cameras can be deployed. He also addressed concerns that the bill is a revenue-generation measure and cited research on the effectiveness of automated speed enforcement.

Others in support argued that automated enforcement provides consistent, round-the-clock coverage that traditional police enforcement cannot and that speed cameras would serve as an effective deterrent while longer-term infrastructure improvements are considered. Maryland Transportation Builders and Materials Association (MTBMA) highlighted the bill's targeted, data-driven approach to high-injury corridors and noted that the Federal Highway Administration has identified speed monitoring systems as a proven safety countermeasure.

Tom Dishler testified in opposition and urged the Council to postpone approval of Bill 17-26 pending further hearings. He raised concerns about transparency and accountability, questioning whether existing cameras have been evaluated for effectiveness before authorizing expansion. Mr. Dishler asked for detailed reporting on tickets issued, revenue generated, and accident outcomes.

ISSUES FOR THE COMMITTEE'S DISCUSSION

1. Effectiveness of existing speed monitoring cameras and the need to expand eligible locations in the County.

The Executive Branch representatives may want to generally discuss the current effectiveness of the automated enforcement (speed monitoring cameras), high-injury network crash corridors included in the County's Vision Zero's action plan or strategic highway safety plan, enforcement (civil citations), challenges of automated enforcement, potential fiscal impact, and revenue generation.

Discussion Point: Whether the Committee supports the Executive Branch in expanding automated enforcement deployment to eligible locations in the County.

2. Anticipated RESJ Impacts.

OLO indicated that community members who travel in parts of the HIN where speed cameras could be placed – including those who drive, walk, bike, and roll – could benefit from increased traffic safety in these areas. Several studies, including one conducted in the County, have found that speed cameras reduce crashes, injuries, and deaths. Conversely, community members who drive would also face increased potential speeding fines in these areas.

Per OLO, several questions remain about how Bill 17-26 would affect community members by race and ethnicity and racial and social inequities in the County.

The CE's memo dated August 11, 2026, identifies a few potential HIN candidate corridors where speed monitoring systems would improve road-user safety. This information was not available during OLO's review of RESJ impacts. The Executive Branch may want to discuss with

the Committee any potential RESJ impacts for the corridors identified using the questions raised by OLO:

- How will the locations of the speed cameras be selected? What will be the criteria and prioritization approach?
- Will community members be engaged in this process?
- What are the racial and ethnic demographics of community members in the areas selected for speed cameras?
- Are there existing racial disparities in speed camera enforcement by race and ethnicity? If so, how would the newly placed speed cameras affect these disparities?
- Will newly placed speed cameras be deployed with surveillance technologies like automated license plate readers (ALPRs) that would affect the civil rights and civil liberties of community members?

Discussion point: The Committee may want to have a general discussion about the RESJ impact on areas identified as potential locations for automated enforcement.

3. Whether to authorize the County Executive, by executive order, to deploy a speed monitoring camera system, if the General Assembly subsequently authorizes future enabling legislation under state law.

Currently, under Section 31A-9(b), the County Executive may authorize, by Executive Order, the use of a speed monitoring system for: 1) a highway in a residential district with a posted limit of 35 miles per hour; and 2) a highway in a school zone.

Bill 17-26 would further extend the Executive's authority by allowing the Executive to implement speed monitoring cameras in the County by executive order (no legislative action by the Council would be required under County law) if the Maryland General Assembly passes future enabling legislation. *See* amended lines 29-30 of the Bill, as authorized under Section 21-809 of the Transportation Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, as amended.

In essence, the Bill would allow the CE to activate or implement speed-monitoring cameras in the future without returning to the Council for approval.

Discussion Point: Whether the Committee supports the expanded authority of the CE?

4. Whether to make Bill 17-26 expedited as requested by the County Executive?

The County Executive sent a memo on August 11, 2026, indicating that since state law became effective October 1, 2025, it has begun a partnership with the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) to identify potential corridors for the High Injury Network and Vulnerable Road in the County; in addition, the Department is prepared to issue permits, publish locations on its website, and start enforcement. *See* © 30. For these reasons, the Executive Branch requests that Bill 17-26 be amended to be an expedited bill.

An expedited bill would take effect on the day it is enacted (signed by the Council and the County Executive).

Decision Point: Whether to amend the bill and make it expedited?

Next steps: Whether to recommend for enactment Bill 17-26, as amended?

This packet contains:	Circle #
Bill 17-26	1
County Executive's Memorandum (with enclosures)	4
Fiscal Impact Statement	10
Economic Impact Statement	15
Climate Assessment	24
Racial Equity and Social Justice Impact Statement	27
County Executive Memorandum dated August 11, 2026	30

Bill No. 17-26
Concerning: Motor Vehicles and Traffic-Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized – Amendments
Revised: 3/10/2026 Draft No. 2
Introduced: March 17, 2026
Expires: December 7, 2026
Enacted:
Executive:
Effective:
Sunset Date: None
Ch. ____, Laws of Mont. Co. ____

COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Lead Sponsor: Council President at the Request of the County Executive
Co-Sponsors: Councilmembers Luedtke and Jawando

AN ACT to:

(1) authorize the use of speed monitoring systems within certain school zones;
(2) authorize the use of speed monitoring systems on certain highways in the County; and
(3) generally amend the law regarding motor vehicles and traffic control.

By amending
Montgomery County Code
Chapter 31, Motor Vehicles and Traffic
Section 31-9A

Boldface	*Heading or defined term.*
Underlining	*Added to existing law by original bill.*
[Single boldface brackets**]**	*Deleted from existing law by original bill.*
Double underlining	*Added by amendment.*
[[Double boldface brackets**]]**	*Deleted from existing law or the bill by amendment.*
* * *	*Existing law unaffected by bill.*

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following Act:

Sec. 1. Section 31-9A is amended, as follows:

31-9A. Speed [Monitoring Systems Authorized] monitoring systems authorized; safe routes to school infrastructure review.

(a) *Definitions*. In this Section, the following words have the meanings indicated:

School zone means an area within a half-mile radius of any school established by the State Highway Administration or the County pursuant to the Maryland Transportation Code § 21-803.1.

Speed monitoring system means a device with one or more motor vehicle sensors producing recorded images of motor vehicles traveling at speeds at least 12 miles per hour above the posted speed limit.

Walkshed means a boundary area designated for walking and biking to and from school, as specified by the Montgomery County Board of Education Student Transportation policy. A walkshed distance is dependent on the grade level of a student.

(b) The County Executive may authorize, by Executive Order, the use of a speed monitoring system in the County:

(1) on a highway in a residential district with a maximum posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour**[**, and**]** ;

(2) on a highway in a school zone with a posted speed limit of at least 20 miles per hour**[**.**]**;

(3) on a highway identified in a municipality, county, or state's most recent strategic highway safety plan or vision zero plan as a highway that is at high risk for motor vehicle crashes that result in serious bodily injury or death, except on a controlled access highway, an expressway, or an interstate highway in the county, as

such terms are used and defined under Section 21-101 of the Transportation Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland; and

(4) as authorized under Section 21-809 of the Transportation Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, as amended.

(c) An unmanned stationary speed monitoring system must not be activated for the first time after October 1, 2009, until the Executive publishes notice of the location of the speed monitoring system on the County's website and in a newspaper of general circulation in the County.

* * *

(g) The Department of Transportation must:

(1) complete the safe routes to school infrastructure review within **[**6**]** six months after notification by law enforcement or Montgomery County Public Schools when an injury or fatality has occurred on a County maintained roadway; and

(2) post the contents of the review on the County's website.

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Marc Elrich
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

February 13, 2026

TO: Natali Fani-González, President
Montgomery County Council

FROM: Marc Elrich, County Executive

SUBJECT: Bill XX-26 – 31-9 (A) Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized: Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Review - Revised

I am recommending the enclosed legislation authorizing the County Government to use speed monitoring systems now allowed for use on high crash risk roadways under Maryland Transportation Article Section 21-809(b)(1)(vi), which took effect October 1, 2025.

If you have any questions, please reach out to Wade Holland, Vision Zero Coordinator, at wade.holland@montgomerycountymd.gov or 240-777-2623.

Enclosures: Proposed Bill XX-26
Fiscal Impact Statement – Bill XX-26
Legislative Request Report – Bill XX-26

cc: Richard S. Madaleno, Chief Administrative Officer
Earl Stoddard, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Marc Yamada, Chief, Montgomery County Police Department
Christopher Tippery, Director of Operations, Automated Traffic Enforcement Division, Montgomery County Police Department
Wade Holland, Vision Zero Coordinator
Jennifer Bryant, Director, Office of Management and Budget

Bill No. XX-26
Concerning: Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized; Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Review - Revised
Revised: [date] Draft No. 1
Introduced: [date]
Expires: [18 mos. after intro]
Enacted: [date]
Executive: [date signed]
Effective: [date takes effect]
Sunset Date: [date expires]
Ch. [#], Laws of Mont. Co. [year]

COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: Council President at the Request of the County Executive

AN ACT to:

(1) allow Automated Enforcement (AE) on the High Injury Network (HIN), and
(2) define High Injury Network (HIN).

By amending
Montgomery County Code
Chapter 31, Motor Vehicles and Traffic
Section 31-9A

Boldface	*Heading or defined term.*
Underlining	*Added to existing law by original bill.*
[Single boldface brackets**]**	*Deleted from existing law by original bill.*
Double underlining	*Added by amendment.*
[[Double boldface brackets**]]**	*Deleted from existing law or the bill by amendment.*
* * *	*Existing law unaffected by bill.*

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following Act:

Sec. 1. Section 31-9A is amended, as follows:

Article I. Definitions.

* * *

Article II. Motor Vehicles, Traffic Control and Highways-Generally.

* * *

31-9A. Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized; safe routes to school infrastructure review.

(a) *Definitions*. In this Section, the following words have the meanings indicated:

School zone means an area within a half-mile radius of any school established by the State Highway Administration or the County pursuant to the Maryland Transportation Code § 21-803.1.

Speed monitoring system means a device with one or more motor vehicle sensors producing recorded images of motor vehicles traveling at speeds at least 12 miles per hour above the posted speed limit.

Walkshed means a boundary area designated for walking and biking to and from school as specified by the Montgomery County Board of Education Student Transportation policy. A walkshed distance is dependent on the grade level of a student.

(b) The County Executive may authorize, by Executive Order, the use of a speed monitoring system in the County:

(1) on a highway in a residential district with a maximum posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour, [and]

(2) on a highway in a school zone <u>with a posted speed limit of at least 20 miles per hour</u> [.]<u>,</u>

<u>(3) on a highway identified in the municipality's, county's, or state's most recent strategic highway safety plan or vision zero plan as a</u>

highway that is at high risk for motor vehicle crashes that result in serious bodily injury or death except on a controlled access highway, an expressway, or an interstate highway in the county as such terms are used and defined in Section 21-809 of the Transportation Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, and

(4) pursuant to Section 21-809 of the Transportation Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, as may be amended from time to time.

(c) An unmanned stationary speed monitoring system must not be activated for the first time after October 1, 2009, until the Executive publishes notice of the location of the speed monitoring system on the County's website and in a newspaper of general circulation in the County.

(d) If a speed monitoring system is placed on a highway in a school zone, each sign that designates the school zone must indicate that a speed monitoring system is in use.

(e) *Safe routes to school infrastructure review – required.* Upon notification by law enforcement of a traffic collision involving a pedestrian walking, biking, or using other non-motorized conveyances to or from school, the Department of Transportation must perform a safe route to school infrastructure review of each collision that:

(1) occurs on a County road;

(A) within a school zone; or

(B) within a walkshed, if the collision occurred between 7 a.m. and 9 p.m. on a school instructional day; or

(2) occurs at a school bus stop, upon notification by Montgomery County Public Schools.

(f) *Contents of the safe routes to school infrastructure review.* The review under subsection (e):

(1) must identify:

(A) any deficiencies in engineering, traffic control, and traffic operations;

(B) appropriate corrective actions and crash reduction countermeasures, including a redesign of the road network consistent with the United States Department of Transportation's best practices and the County's Vision Zero program; and

(C) prior collisions in the vicinity; and

(2) may identify changes to safety-related outreach and education programs by the Department, if warranted.

(g) The Department of Transportation must:

(1) complete the safe routes to school infrastructure review within [6] <u>six</u> months after notification by law enforcement or Montgomery County Public Schools when an injury or fatality has occurred on a County maintained roadway; and

(2) post the contents of the review on the County's website.

Approved:

Natali Fani-González, President, County Council Date

Approved:

Marc Elrich, County Executive Date

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Sara Tenenbaum, Clerk of the Council Date

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY

Assistant County Attorney Date 12/10/2025

Fiscal Impact Statement

Office of Management and Budget

Bill XX-26	**Motor Vehicles and Traffic - Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized; Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Review - Revised**
Bill Summary	Bill XX-26 amends the County law pertaining to speed monitoring systems. Currently, the County Executive may authorize a speed monitoring system on roads in residential districts with a maximum speed limit of 35 miles per-hour (MPH) or in school zones. Bill XX-26 amends County law to align with Chapter 590 of the 2025 Maryland legislative session, which allows speed monitoring systems on roads identified as high risk for serious injury or death according to municipal, County, or State highway safety strategic plans (excluding controlled access highways, expressways, or interstate highways).
Fiscal Impact Summary	Bill XX-26 is enabling legislation to give new authority to the County Executive and does not have a fiscal impact, though both fines collected and related expenditures will increase if the County Executive exercises the new authority to increase the number of speed monitoring systems throughout Montgomery County.
Fiscal Impact Analysis	The impact of the County Executive exercising the authority granted under Bill XX-26 is difficult to calculate and depends on how many new speed monitoring systems are established and where they are located. For illustrative purposes, between FY15 and FY24, fines from speed cameras averaged $177,513 per-camera per-year, while expenses averaged $95,344 per-camera per-year, for a net average of $82,169 per-camera per year. Fines from red light cameras averaged $64,984 per-camera per-year over that same time frame, and $28,295 in expenses per-camera per-year, for a net average of $36,689 per-camera per year. To the extent new speed monitoring systems are established with the new authority granted under Bill XX-26, net revenue from fines will likely increase, though how much depends on where the cameras are located and driver behavior in those areas. In addition, the amount of fines attributed to a camera (as well as the related expenses) are the highest in the camera's first few years of operation. Thereafter, drivers adapt their behavior to the road's speed limit and revenue slowly declines.
Staff Impact	The bill is not expected to impact staff time or duties.
Actuarial Analysis	The bill is not expected to impact retiree pension or group insurance costs.
Information Technology Impact	The IT systems of the County Police Department and the Department of Finance support the existing speed monitoring system and are not expected to need any changes or upgrades to manage an expanded system if Bill XX-26 were adopted.
Other Information	

Later actions that may impact revenue or expenditures if future spending is projected	The bill does not authorize future spending.
Ranges of revenue or expenditures that are uncertain or difficult to project	The amount of fines and expenditures resulting from exercising the new authority granted under Bill XX-26 will depend on the number of new speed monitoring systems established throughout the County and the locations where they are deployed. In addition, the State implemented a new fine structure in October 2025, shifting from $40 per-citation (regardless of speed) to a sliding scale up to $425 per-citation for driving 40 MPH or more above the speed limit. Higher fine rates may increase total fines collected, but more drivers may challenge citations in court. When that happens, the fine is paid to the court system rather than the County and the General Fund.
Contributors	Earl P. Stoddard, Office of the County Executive Wade Holland, Office of the County Executive Christopher Tippery, Montgomery County Police Department Dale Phillips, Montgomery County Police Department Richard H. Harris, Office of Management and Budget

LEGISLATIVE REQUEST REPORT

Bill ##-26

Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized: Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Review - Revised

DESCRIPTION: This Bill amends the County Code Chapter 31, Motor Vehicles and Traffic, Section 31-9A to allow Automated Enforcement (AE) on the High Injury Network (HIN) and defines High Injury Network (HIN).

PROBLEM: The County's Vision Zero Action Plan and the State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan identify roadway corridors with a known high risk of serious and fatal crashes or crashes involving non-motorists, respectively. Of the 100 miles identified in the County's plan, 60 miles were prohibited from using a proven safety tool, automated speed enforcement, under State law.

During the 2025 Maryland General Assembly, House Bill 1173 was passed by the Assembly and signed by the Governor to allow municipalities and the County Government in Montgomery County to use the high crash risk corridors in their highway safety plans, to study and place automated speed monitoring systems. This bill authorizes the County Government to use the authority granted under House Bill 1173.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES: 1) Authorize the County to use new authority granted under State law.

2) Provide enhanced safety in known high crash risk areas to advance the Vision Zero goal of eliminating serious and fatal injury crashes

COORDINATION: Department of Police, Office of the County Executive

FISCAL IMPACT: To be requested. [Office of Management and Budget]

ECONOMIC IMPACT: To be requested. [Office of Legislative Oversight]

EVALUATION: To be requested. [N/A as these corridors have not had speed monitoring systems in place] prior to this legislation

EXPERIENCE ELSEWHERE: Montgomery County Police operate speed monitoring systems in designated school zones and certain residential areas currently. An independent evaluation from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety found that Police's existing program had a 39% reduction in the likelihood of an incapacitating or fatal injury on a camera-eligible road.

Nationwide, speed monitoring systems are a USDOT Federal Highway Administration proven safety countermeasure with crash reductions between 20% and 47% for injury crashes on urban principal arterials, which many HIN corridors are principal arterials.

SOURCE OF INFORMATION: Earl P. Stoddard III, PhD, MPH, CEM, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Office of the County Executive

Wade Holland, Vision Zero Coordinator, Office of the County Executive

Christopher Tippery, Director of Operations, Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit, Montgomery County Police Department

Kimberly Jones, Assistant County Attorney, Office of the County Attorney

Haley M. Roberts, Assistant County Attorney, Office of the County Attorney

APPLICATION WITHIN MUNICIPALITES: For municipalities without a speed monitoring program, the municipal government could enter into an agreement with Montgomery County to provide a speed monitoring system on a high crash corridor.

PENALTIES: Penalties are set by State Law under Transportation Article Section 21-809(c)(2) and as of October 1, 2025 are based on the violator's speed.

Exceeding the Speed Limit by	Civil Penalty
12 to 15 MPH	$40
16 to 19 MPH	$70
20 to 29 MPH	$120
30 to 39 MPH	$230
40 MPH or more	$425

Economic Impact Statement

Montgomery County, Maryland

Bill 17-26, Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized – Amendments

Summary

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates that Bill 17-26 would have an indeterminate impact on overall economic conditions in the County, as measured by the Council's priority economic indicators. The Bill would authorize speed cameras in school zones with speed limits of 20 miles per hour or more and on highways identified by the state or County as high risk for vehicular crashes. To assess its economic impacts, this analysis draws on studies on the economic impacts of vehicle crashes, studies on the impacts of the County's speed monitoring program on driver behavior, and Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Fiscal Impact Statement for the Bill.

The Bill would likely have mixed economic impacts on some County residents. It would negatively affect drivers who receive fines as a result of these cameras, thereby incurring nondiscretionary household expenses to pay these fines. However, if newly installed speed cameras prevent vehicle crashes, the Bill would avert crash-related nondiscretionary household expenditures and income losses. It may also reduce costs for other road users associated with travel delays and excess fuel use caused by vehicle crashes. To the extent that the County deploys cameras at scale and achieves a substantial reduction in crashes, other residents could also benefit from lower insurance premiums and other costs linked to crashes.

Similarly, some local businesses would likely see mixed impacts. If newly installed speed cameras prevent crashes, some employers could see lower costs from workplace disruption, overtime, retraining, and fringe benefits associated with employee injuries and fatalities. Health care providers might face reduced demand for emergency, inpatient, and other care related to crashes, along with lower uncompensated or undercompensated care costs. However, if additional speed cameras meaningfully reduce crashes, hospitals, trauma centers, and rehabilitation providers could see lower crash-related revenues, as would vehicle repair shops and related businesses that derive income from collision work.

Given limited data and several key uncertainties, OLO cannot reliably quantify these effects or determine whether the Bill's net impact on County-wide economic conditions would be positive or negative.

Background and Purpose of Bill 17-26

In April 2025, the Governor signed House Bill 1173 into law, authorizing Montgomery County and local municipalities to use speed monitoring systems (i.e., speed cameras) on highways in the County that are at high risk of vehicular crashes.[1]

[1] Montgomery County Delegation, *Montgomery County – Speed Monitoring Systems – High-Risk Highways MC 17-25*, H.B. 1173, 2025 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Md. 2025), accessed March 27, 2026.

The purpose of Bill 17-26 is to codify the County's new authority granted under state law. It also aims to enhance safety in high crash risk areas as part of the County's Vison Zero objective of eliminating serious and fatal injury crashes.[2] To this end, the Bill would allow speed cameras:

- In school zones with speed limits of 20 miles per hour or more; and
- On highways identified by the state or County as high risk for vehicular crashes.[3]

Additionally, the Bill would authorize the County Executive "to implement future speed-monitoring measures without Council action, if future laws are adopted by the Maryland General Assembly."[4]

The Council introduced Bill 17-26 on behalf of the County Executive on March 17, 2026.

Information Sources, Methodologies, and Assumptions

As required by Section 2-81B of the Montgomery County Code, this Economic Impact Statement evaluates the impacts of Bill 17-26 on residents and private organizations, using the Council's priority economic indicators as the measure. In doing so, it examines whether the Bill would have a net positive or negative impact on overall economic conditions in the County.[5]

In this analysis, OLO draws on cost-of-crash studies that estimate the economic costs generated by motor vehicle crashes for different groups of actors, in particular, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's report, *The Economic and Societal Impact of Motor Vehicle Crashes, 2019 (Revised)*. This study quantifies the lifetime economic costs of one year of crashes in the United States. This approach is consistent with other cost-of-crash analyses conducted by NHTSA, the World Bank, CDC, and similar institutions,[1] which treat motor vehicle crashes as a drag on economic output and social welfare. As such, these studies implicitly assume that the resources devoted to crash-related medical care, repairs, and other expenditures could be more productively used elsewhere in the economy.

While this may hold at a national macroeconomic level, at the local level the economic costs and benefits of policies that aim to prevent social bads like motor vehicle crashes are not necessarily distributed evenly. For this reason, the analysis also considers the revenues and profits that hospitals, vehicle repair businesses, and other private entities receive from crash-related economic activity and how these revenues may influence net economic conditions in the County.

Additionally, this analysis draws on OMB's Fiscal Impact Statement for Bill 17-26. This statement reports that between FY15 and FY24 speed cameras generated average net revenues of about $82,000 per camera per year and red-light cameras about $37,000 per camera per year.

Scope of Analysis: Expanding the use of speed monitoring cameras under this Bill would likely generate additional fine revenue for the County. Rather than creating new economic activity, this additional revenue would function as an internal fiscal transfer: funds collected from motorists through citations would be available to support County services and priorities that would otherwise rely on other revenue sources. As a result, the

[2] See Legislative Request Report in Montgomery County Council, Introduction Staff Report for Bill 17-26, Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized – Amendments, Introduced March 17, 2026.
[3] See Bill 17-26 in Introduction Staff Report.
[4] See Memorandum in Introduction Staff Report.
[5] Montgomery County Code, "Sec. 2-81B, Economic Impact Statements."

overall economic impact of the Bill depends both on the benefits of any additional spending financed by camera revenues and on the economic trade-offs associated with raising those revenues from drivers. Because OLO cannot determine how any additional revenue would be spent, this analysis does not assess the impact of government spending on revenues collected from motorists.

Variables

The economic effects of Bill 17-26 would primarily depend on the following variables:

- Total number of new speed cameras
- Location of new speed cameras
- Driver behavior

Impacts

WORKFORCE ▪ TAXATION POLICY ▪ PROPERTY VALUES ▪ INCOMES ▪ OPERATING COSTS ▪ PRIVATE SECTOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT ▪ ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ▪ COMPETITIVENESS

Economics of Road Safety

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's 2023 report, The Economic and Societal Impact of Motor Vehicle Crashes, 2019 (Revised), estimates the economic cost of motor vehicle crashes in the United States at $339.8 billion in 2019 dollars.

The report treats the economic impacts of crashes as human capital costs, meaning the tangible losses resulting from crashes to crash victims and to society more broadly. These costs include the following categories:

- Medical care (including rehab and follow-up treatment)
- Market productivity (lost wages and benefits)
- Household productivity (lost unpaid work at home)
- Workplace costs (employer disruption, overtime, retraining)
- Legal costs (fees and court costs)
- Insurance administration (claims handling and defense)
- Emergency services (police, fire, EMS)
- Property damage (vehicles, cargo, roadway assets)
- Congestion costs (delay, extra fuel, pollution for uninvolved road users)

Within the $339.8 billion in economic (human capital) crash costs, several categories account for most of the burden, as summarized below:

- Property damage is the largest economic cost, at about $115.3 billion, or 33.9 percent of total costs.

- Productivity losses are nearly as large as property damage: lost market productivity (wages and benefits) totals $75.5 billion (22.2 percent), and household productivity loss adds $30.8 billion (9.1 percent), combining to roughly $106 billion (about 31 percent of all economic costs).
- Medical care is a significant but secondary component, with $30.9 billion in present and future medical expenses, accounting for 9.1 percent of the total.
- Congestion costs—travel delay, added fuel use, and increased greenhouse gases and criteria pollutants—amount to $36.0 billion, or 10.6 percent of total economic costs.
- The remaining categories are smaller in aggregate: insurance administration ($29.5 billion, 8.7 percent), legal costs ($16.7 billion, 4.9 percent), workplace costs ($3.8 billion, 1.1 percent), and emergency services ($1.3 billion, 0.4 percent).

The report also identifies the private and societal actors who bear the economic costs of motor vehicle crashes.

- Crash victims and their families and households directly experience injury, death, pain, disability, and loss of household production, and bear out-of-pocket costs via uncovered medical expenses, lost income, and uncompensated time.
- Employers incur workplace disruption, overtime, retraining, and fringe benefit costs tied to employee injury and death, while health care providers and systems deliver emergency, inpatient, rehabilitation, and long-term care and may absorb uncompensated or undercompensated care costs.
- Private insurers and employer benefit providers—auto, health, disability, and life insurers, including employer sponsored plans—finance a large share of crash costs through liability, collision, medical payments, health coverage, disability benefits, and life insurance.
- Other road users (uninvolved motorists and travelers) bear congestion related costs such as travel delay, excess fuel use, and pollution, even though they are not in the crash.
- Society at large, including taxpayers, ultimately bears both economic and quality-of-life components of crash harm through insurance premiums, consumer prices, and taxes that fund federal, state, and local crash-related spending

In its source-of-payment analysis, the report groups these actors into four primary payer categories: “Self” (individual crash victims and their households), “Insurer” (private insurers and employer benefit providers), “Other” (third party private actors such as uninvolved motorists, charities, and health care providers), and “Government” (federal, state, and local programs). Costs borne by employers and health systems are not reported as a standalone payer column; instead, they are reflected indirectly in the insurer and other categories.

- Individual crash victims and their households (“Self”) bear almost a quarter of all economic crash costs, including large losses in both market and household productivity.
- Private insurers and employer benefit providers (“Insurer”) bear over half the total cost, which is concentrated in medical care, market productivity losses, property damage, legal costs, and insurance administration.
- Third-party private actors (“Other”) pay roughly 14 percent of the total cost, mainly in the areas of congestion costs and workplace impacts.

Table 1. Distribution of 2019 Economic (Human Capital) Crash Costs by Payer and Cost Category (millions of 2019 dollars)

Category	Self	Insurer	Other	Government (Federal, State, Local)	Total	% Total
Medical Care	$3,245	$14,925	$309	$12,422	$30,900	9.1%
Market Productivity	$23,122	$28,416	$9,087	$14,834	$75,459	22.2%
Household Productivity	$20,646	$10,170	.	.	$30,816	9.1%
Workplace Costs	.	.	$3,267	$528	$3,795	1.1%
Legal Costs	.	$16,698	.	.	$16,698	4.9%
Insurance Administration	.	$29,127	.	$414	$29,540	8.7%
Emergency Services	.	.	.	$1,348	$1,348	0.4%
Property Damage	$32,144	$83,153	.	.	$115,297	33.9%
Congestion Costs	.	.	$35,954	.	$35,954	10.6%
Total	**$79,157**	**$182,489**	**$48,617**	**$29,546**	**$339,809**	**100.0%**
% Total	**23.29%**	**53.70%**	**14.31%**	**8.69%**	**100.0%**	

Residents

OLO anticipates that Bill 17-26 would have mixed economic impacts on some County residents.

Negative Impacts

By authorizing speed cameras in certain school zones and on designated highways, the Bill would negatively affect drivers who receive fines as a result of these cameras. According to OMB, the state has adopted a new sliding fine schedule that ranges from the previous flat $40 up to $425 for driving 40 miles per hour or more over the speed limit. Residents who otherwise would not have been fined without the new cameras would incur nondiscretionary household expenses to pay these fines. Residents who choose to contest citations in court may also incur court and travel expenses, as well as lost wages for those paid on an hourly basis. All else being equal, these costs would result in one-time reductions (or recurring reductions for repeat offenders) in household income.

Positive Impacts

Whether the Bill would affect other residents depends on the extent to which it reduces crashes. As shown in **Table A1** in the Appendix, three impact evaluations of Montgomery County's automated speed enforcement program have found that it has reduced **high-end** speeding and lowered the risk of serious vehicle crashes. Based on these studies, it is likely that installing speed cameras in certain school zones and on designated highways would reduce speeding and potentially decrease the likelihood of crashes.

If newly installed speed cameras prevent vehicle crashes, the Bill would avert out-of-pocket costs from uncovered medical expenses, lost income, and uncompensated time for crash victims and their households. In doing so, the Bill would mitigate crash-related nondiscretionary household expenditures and income losses.

Additionally, the Bill could reduce costs for other road users associated with travel delays and excess fuel use caused by vehicle crashes. To the extent that the County deploys cameras at scale and achieves a substantial reduction in crashes, other residents could also benefit from lower insurance premiums and other costs linked to crashes.

Beyond these potential impacts, the Bill is unlikely to affect other residents in terms of the Council's other priority economic indicators.

Businesses, Non-Profits, Other Private Organizations

OLO anticipates that Bill 17-26 would have mixed impacts on certain private organizations in the County.

If newly installed speed cameras prevent crashes, some employers could see lower costs from workplace disruption, overtime, retraining, and fringe benefits associated with employee injuries and fatalities. Health care providers might face reduced demand for emergency, inpatient, and other care related to crashes, along with lower uncompensated or undercompensated care costs.

However, if additional speed cameras meaningfully reduce crashes, hospitals, trauma centers, and rehabilitation providers could see lower crash-related revenues, as would vehicle repair shops and related businesses that derive income from collision work.

At the same time, the resources that households, insurers, and employers no longer spend on crash-related medical care, repairs, and lost productivity would remain available for other types of local consumption and investment, potentially supporting different sectors of the County's economy. Because these gains and losses would not be distributed evenly across industries, the net local business impact of the Bill would depend on the size of the crash reduction and the relative economic importance of crash-dependent sectors compared to the sectors that benefit from redirected spending.

Beyond these potential impacts, OLO does not anticipate that the Bill would affect other private organizations in terms of the Council's other priority indicators.

Net Impact

OLO anticipates that Bill 17-26 would have an indeterminate impact on overall economic conditions in the County. As summarized in Table 2, the Bill would likely have mixed economic effects on both residents and businesses. Given limited data and several key uncertainties, OLO cannot reliably quantify these effects or determine whether the Bill's net impact on County-wide economic conditions would be positive or negative.

It is important to note that some of the Bill's economic effects would accrue to entities based outside the County, which limits how much related activity recirculates in the local economy. In particular, Vitronic has served as the County's prime contractor for automated traffic enforcement since September 2025 under a direct, end-toend- agreement that replaced the prior conduentoperated model using Vitronic- equipment. Apart from a small number of professional implementation and management positions that may be based in

Rockville,[6] Vitronic maintains no substantial office, facility, or workforce in the County. As a result, most speed camera payments flow to a nonlocal vendor rather than supporting local businesses.

Additionally, private insurers and employer benefit providers that currently finance a large share of crash costs through auto, health, disability, and life coverage could see reduced claims and payouts if crashes decline, lowering their crash-related expenditures over time. Many of these entities are headquartered or primarily based outside the County.

Table 2. Summary of Anticipated Resident and Business Impacts

Resident or Business	Specific impacted group	Anticipated economic impact
Resident	Drivers who receive speed camera citations	Face higher nondiscretionary expenses from fines and possible court, travel, and lost wage costs, reducing household income for affected residents.
Resident	Households of potential crash victims	May avoid uncovered medical expenses, lost income, and uncompensated time if fewer crashes occur.
Resident	Other road users (uninvolved travelers)	Could experience fewer delay, fuel, and related costs associated with crash-induced congestion in high-risk corridors.
Resident	Insured residents generally	May benefit over time from lower insurance premiums and other crash-linked costs if the Bill meaningfully reduces crashes.
Business	Employers with commuting or driving workers	Could see reduced workplace disruption, overtime, retraining, and other costs associated with employee crash injuries and fatalities.
Business	Health care providers (hospitals, trauma centers, rehab)	May face lower crash-related service demand and revenues if crashes decline, alongside reduced uncompensated or undercompensated care.
Business	Vehicle repair and collision-related firms	Could experience reduced revenues from collision work if crash frequency falls in camera-covered areas.
Business	Other local goods and service providers	May gain from household, insurer, and employer spending redirected from crash-related medical care, repairs, and lost productivity into other local consumption and investment.

[6] VITRONIC Machine Vision North America, "Sr. Client Implementation Manager – Automated Traffic Enforcement"; "Field Service Managers – Automated Traffic Enforcement"; and "Senior Project Manager – Traffic Safety," LinkedIn job postings.

Discussion Items

Not applicable

Caveats

Two caveats to the economic impact analysis conducted here should be noted. First, predicting the economic impacts of legislation is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, the multitude of causes of economic outcomes, economic shocks, uncertainty, and other factors. Second, the analysis performed here is intended to *inform* the legislative process, not determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the Bill under consideration.

Contributions

Stephen Roblin, PhD (OLO) prepared this report.

Appendix

Table A1. Summary of Montgomery County Automated Speed Enforcement Impact Evaluations

Study	Scope (time/geography)	Speed and safety findings	Methodology
Retting & Farmer (2008), "Evaluation of automated speed enforcement in Montgomery County, Maryland"	Approximately 6 months before vs. 6 months after program launch in 2007, on Montgomery County residential streets (≤35 mph) and school zones, with comparison roads in a nearby jurisdiction without cameras.	Proportion of drivers traveling >10 mph over the limit declined about 70% at locations with both warning signs and active cameras, 39% at locations with warning signs only, and 16% even on residential streets with neither signs nor cameras (spillover); study focused on speeding, not crash outcomes.	Quasi-experimental before–after study with comparison group: spot speed measurements at camera, signed-only, and no-treatment sites in Montgomery County and in a non-camera comparison community; supplemented by telephone surveys of driver attitudes and awareness.
Hu & McCartt (2016), "Effects of automated speed enforcement in Montgomery County, Maryland, on vehicle speeds, public opinion, and crashes"	Roughly 7.5 years after program start (data 2004–2013), camera-eligible roads and spillover roads in Montgomery County, with comparison roads in Fairfax and Arlington counties, Virginia.	Cameras associated with a 10% reduction in mean speeds and a 59–62% reduction in the likelihood a vehicle was traveling >10 mph over the limit at camera sites; overall, the program in its modified form (including the 2009 state law change and 2012 corridor approach) was associated with a 39% reduction in the likelihood that a crash on camera-eligible/spillover roads resulted in an incapacitating or fatal injury, with cameras alone associated with about a 19% reduction.	Quasi-experimental longitudinal study: compared changes in speeds at camera sites to control sites in Virginia; used logistic regression on 2004–2013 crash data to estimate program effects on the probability that a crash involved an incapacitating or fatal injury, using Fairfax County crashes on similar roads as controls; included driver surveys on awareness and support.
Romer, Trombka & Downie (2009), "Evaluation of Montgomery County's Safe Speed Program"	First year after camera activation, within one-half mile of speed camera sites in Montgomery County, using the prior four years at the same locations as baseline.	Average vehicle speeds at camera sites declined about 6% (e.g., about 2.4 mph at 40 mph); the share of vehicles exceeding the speed limit was cut roughly in half, with the share 11+ mph over the limit falling from about 2% to less than 1%; reported collisions within one-half mile of camera sites fell from an average of 462 per year to 329 (28% decline), and reported injury or fatal collisions fell from 206 to 126 (39% decline), while property-damage-only collisions dropped about 19%.	Before–after evaluation using County crash records and speed data: compared four-year pre-camera averages to the first year post-activation within a half-mile radius of fixed camera sites; analyzed changes in speed distributions and in total, injury/fatal, and property-damage-only collisions near camera locations.

Climate Assessment

Office of Legislative Oversight

BILL 17-26: MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC – SPEED MONITORING SYSTEMS AUTHORIZED - AMENDMENTS

SUMMARY

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 17-26 will have little to no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change as it is authorizing the installation of speed cameras in high risk crash areas such as school zones which may encourage more pedestrian travel. However, it is unknown how many cameras would be installed and the impact the cameras would have on residents' choice of transportation.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF BILL 17-26

In April 2025, the Governor signed House Bill 1173 into law. This authorized Montgomery County and local municipalities to use speed monitoring systems (i.e., speed cameras) on highways in the County that are at high risk of vehicular crashes.[1]

The purpose of Bill 17-26 is to codify the County's new authority granted under state law. It also aims to enhance safety in high crash risk areas as part of the County's Vison Zero objective of eliminating serious and fatal injury crashes.[2] To this end, the Bill would allow speed cameras:

- In school zones with speed limits of 20 miles per hour or more, and
- On highways identified by the state or County as high risk for vehicular crashes.[3]

Additionally, the Bill would authorize the County Executive "to implement future speed-monitoring measures without Council action, if future laws are adopted by the Maryland General Assembly."[4]

The Council introduced Bill 17-26 on behalf of the County Executive on March 17, 2026.

ANTICIPATED IMPACTS

As the Bill would allow the County to place speed monitoring cameras in school zones, this may encourage more students and parents to walk and bike to school, rather than drive in personal vehicles. However, it is unknown if:

- A significant number of students who live within a walking and/or biking radius to their school would choose to walk or bike if cameras were installed; and
- How many cameras will be installed due to this legislation.

While Vision Zero is a strategy focused on eliminating traffic fatalities and severe injuries, complementary goals include creating safer infrastructure and conditions for non-vehicle travel (walking, biking, etc.).[5] Actions encouraging more pedestrian and biking transportation can lead to lower greenhouse gas emissions associated with transportation in a jurisdiction.[6] In the United States, transportation is the largest source of direct greenhouse gas emissions, accounting for about 29% of all emissions.[7] In Montgomery County, transportation accounts for 42% of the entire County's greenhouse gas emissions.[8]

As the Bill would authorize the installation of speed cameras in high risk crash areas such as school zones, it may encourage more pedestrian and non-vehicle travel in those areas. However, it is unknown how many cameras would be installed and what the impact the cameras would have on residents' choice of transportation. For these reasons, OLO anticipates Bill 17-26 would have little to no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change, including the reduction and/or sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions and community climate resilience.

RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

The Climate Assessment Act requires OLO to offer recommendations, such as amendments or other measures to mitigate any anticipated negative climate impacts.[9] OLO does not offer recommendations or amendments as Bill 17-26 is likely to have little to no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change, including the reduction and/or sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions and community climate resilience.

CAVEATS

OLO notes two caveats to this climate assessment. First, predicting the impacts of legislation upon climate change is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, uncertainty, and the broad, global nature of climate change. Second, the analysis performed here is intended to inform the legislative process, not determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the bill under consideration.

PURPOSE OF CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS

The purpose of the Climate Assessments is to evaluate the anticipated impact of legislation on the County's contribution to addressing climate change. These climate assessments will provide the Council with a more thorough understanding of the potential climate impacts and implications of proposed legislation, at the County level. The scope of the Climate Assessments is limited to the County's contribution to addressing climate change, specifically upon the County's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and how actions suggested by legislation could help increase the County's community climate resilience.

While co-benefits such as health and cost savings may be discussed, the focus is on how proposed County bills may impact GHG emissions and community resilience.

CONTRIBUTIONS

OLO staffer Kaitlyn Simmons drafted this assessment.

[1] Montgomery County Delegation, *Montgomery County – Speed Monitoring Systems – High-Risk Highways MC 17-25*, H.B. 1173, 2025 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Md. 2025), accessed March 27, 2026,
[2] See Legislative Request Report in Montgomery County Council, Introduction Staff Report for Bill 17-26, Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized – Amendments, Introduced March 17, 2026.
[3] See Bill 17-26 in Introduction Staff Report.
[4] See Memorandum in Introduction Staff Report.
[5] Vision Zero Network, Core Elements for Vision Zero Communities, November 2018.
[6] Millard-Ball, A., et. al., Global health and climate benefits from walking and cycling infrastructure, Proc Natl Acad Sci, June 17, 2025; Smart Growth America, Complete Streets are a climate solution, September 15, 2023.
[7] U.S. EPA, Transportation Sector Emissions, Accessed 4/12/2026.
[8] Montgomery County Government, Montgomery County Climate Action Plan, June 2021
[9] Bill 3-22, Legislative Branch – Climate Assessments – Required, Montgomery County Council, Effective date October 24, 2022

Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) Impact Statement

Office of Legislative Oversight

BILL 17-26: MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC - SPEED MONITORING SYSTEMS AUTHORIZED - AMENDMENTS

SUMMARY

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) finds the anticipated racial equity and social justice (RESJ) impact of Bill 17-26 is indeterminate. There are several unknown factors to determine how allowing speed cameras throughout the County's High Injury Network (HIN) would impact community members by race and ethnicity and racial and social inequities in the County.

PURPOSE OF RESJ IMPACT STATEMENTS

RESJ impact statements (RESJIS) evaluate the anticipated impact of legislation on racial equity and social justice in the County. RESJ is a **process** that focuses on centering the needs, leadership, and power of Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC) and communities with low incomes. RESJ is also a **goal** of eliminating racial and social inequities. Applying a RESJ lens is essential to achieve RESJ.[1] This involves seeing, thinking, and working differently to address the racial and social inequities that cause racial and social disparities.[2]

PURPOSE OF BILL 17-26

In April 2025, the Governor signed House Bill 1173 into law. This authorized Montgomery County and local municipalities to use speed monitoring systems (i.e., speed cameras) on highways in the County that are at high risk of vehicular crashes.[3]

The purpose of Bill 17-26 is to codify the County's new authority granted under state law. It also aims to enhance safety in high crash risk areas as part of the County's Vison Zero objective of eliminating serious and fatal injury crashes.[4] To this end, the Bill would allow speed cameras:[5]

- In school zones with speed limits of 20 miles per hour or more; and
- On highways identified by the state or County as high risk for vehicular crashes.

Additionally, the Bill would authorize the County Executive "to implement future speed-monitoring measures without Council action, if future laws are adopted by the Maryland General Assembly."[6]

The Council introduced Bill 17-26 on behalf of the County Executive on March 17, 2026.

This RESJIS builds on those for the following Bills:

- Bill 11-23, Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Traffic Signals, Devices, and Automated Enforcement Plan, published in March 2023;[7]
- Bill 14-24, Vehicle Noise Abatement Monitoring – Pilot Program, published in August 2024;[8] and
- Bill 28-25, Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Parking in Bikeways – Prohibited, published in September 2025.[9]

Please refer to these RESJISs for background on vision zero, civil fines, traffic safety and racial equity.

ANTICIPATED RESJ IMPACTS

The HIN, which is identified in the County's Vision Zero 2030 Action Plan, are roadway corridors in the County with the highest concentration of serious and fatal crashes.[10] According to the County Executive, 60 of 100 miles of the HIN are currently not allowed to have speed cameras.[11] Bill 17-26 would remove this restriction and allow speed cameras to be placed throughout the HIN. Bill 17-26 would also clarify that speed cameras are allowed in school zones with speed limits over 20 miles per hour. Note, speed cameras are already allowed in school zones.

To consider the anticipated impact of Bill 17-26 on RESJ in the County, OLO recommends the consideration of two related questions:

- Who would primarily benefit or be burdened by this bill?
- What racial and social inequities could passage of this bill weaken or strengthen?

Community members who travel in parts of the HIN where speed cameras could be placed – including those who drive, walk, bike, and roll – could benefit from increased traffic safety in these areas. Several studies, including one conducted in the County,[12] have found speed cameras are effective in reducing injuries and deaths from crashes.[13] Conversely, community members who drive would also be burdened by the increased potential for speeding fines in these areas.

There are several unanswered questions for determining how Bill 17-26 would impact community members by race and ethnicity and racial and social inequities in the County. Some of these are listed next. Of note, OLO drew some of these questions from previous Racial Equity Impact Assessments (REIAs) that analyzed funding for traffic safety signals:[14]

- How will the locations of the speed cameras be selected? What will be the criteria and prioritization approach? Will community members be engaged in this process?
- What are the racial and ethnic demographics of community members in the areas selected for speed cameras?
- Are there existing racial disparities in speed camera enforcement by race and ethnicity? If there are, how would the newly placed speed cameras impact these disparities?
- Will newly placed speed cameras be deployed with surveillance technologies like automated license plate readers (ALPRs)[15] that would affect the civil rights and civil liberties of community members?

Given these unanswered questions, OLO finds the anticipated impact of Bill 17-26 is indeterminate.

RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

The County's RESJ Act requires OLO to consider whether to recommend amendments to bills that could reduce racial and social inequities and advance RESJ.[16] OLO finds the anticipated impact of Bill 17-26 is indeterminate. As such, OLO does not offer recommended amendments. However, should the Council seek to improve the RESJ impact of this Bill, OLO offers two policy options for Council consideration:

- **Require community engagement that prioritizes BIPOC community stakeholders to develop County's Automated Enforcement Plan.** The County's Automated Enforcement Plan explains the plan, goals, and strategies to increase automated enforcement programs in the County. The plan must be updated by the County Executive and resubmitted to the Council annually.[17] The Council could require community engagement for the plan that prioritizes engagement with BIPOC stakeholders. This would help ensure the plan to deploy more speed cameras in the HIN minimizes harm to BIPOC communities and advances RESJ.
- **Study and address potential racial disparities in the County's speed camera enforcement.** Studies in other jurisdictions have shown that Black communities are overburdened by automated traffic enforcement.[18,19,20] This can worsen existing racial disparities in fines and civic debt.[21] The Council could commission a study to understand potential racial disparities in the County's speed camera enforcement. This could be used to inform efforts to locate speed cameras and other traffic safety investments in a way that minimizes harm and maximizes safety to BIPOC communities.

CAVEATS

Two caveats to this RESJIS should be noted. First, predicting the impact of bills on RESJ is challenging due to data limitations, uncertainty, and other factors. Second, this RESJIS is intended to inform the Council's decision-making process rather than determine it. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the bill under consideration.

---

[1] Definition of racial equity and social justice adopted from M. Gamblin et al., "Applying Racial Equity to U.S. Federal Nutrition Programs," Bread for the World and Racial Equity Tools.
[2] Ibid.
[3] House Bill 1173, Maryland General Assembly, Signed into Law May 13, 2025.
[4] Legislative Request Report, Introduction Staff Report for Bill 17-26, Montgomery County Council, Introduced March 17, 2026, pg. (12).
[5] Introduction Staff Report for Bill 17-26, pg. 2.
[6] Ibid.
[7] RESJIS for Bill 11-23, Office of Legislative Oversight, March 21, 2023.
[8] RESJIS for Bill 14-24, Office of Legislative Oversight, August 27, 2024.
[9] RESJIS for Bill 28-25, Office of Legislative Oversight, September 10, 2025.
[10] Supporting Data Analysis for the Vision Zero 2030 Action Plan, Vision Zero Montgomery County, July 2021, pg. 5.
[11] Legislative Request Report, Introduction Staff Report for Bill 17-26, pg. (12).
[12] "Speed cameras reduce injury crashes in Maryland county, IIHS study shows," Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, October 1, 2015.
[13] J. Gao, et al, "Assessing the impact of fixed speed cameras on speeding behavior and crashes: A longitudinal study in New York City," Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives, March 2025.
[14] Racial Equity Impact Assessment Supplemental Appropriate #24-25, Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice, November 1, 2023.
[15] Automated License Plate Readers, Electronic Frontier Foundation.
[16] Bill 27-19, Administration – Human Rights – Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice – Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee – Established, Montgomery County Council.
[17] Montgomery County Code Sec. 31-9D.
[18] W. Farrell, "Predominantly black neighborhoods in D.C. bear the brunt of automated traffic enforcement," Fines and Fees Justice Center, June 28, 2018.
[19] P. Solman, "Why automated speed cameras disproportionately affect Black and brown drivers," PBS News, July 8, 2023.
[20] W. Xu, et al., "The racial composition of road users, traffic citations, and police stops," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, June 3, 2024.
[21] RESJIS for Bill 14-24, pg. 2.

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Marc Elrich
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

August 11, 2026

TO: Councilmember Evan Glass, Chair
Transportation & Environment Committee

FROM: Marc Elrich, County Executive

SUBJECT: Request to Amend Bill 17-26 - Motor Vehicles and Traffic – Speed Monitoring Systems Authorized – Amendments to an Expedited Bill

Bill 17-26 would authorize the Montgomery County Police (MCPD) to place speed monitoring systems on identified high crash risk corridors as permitted under Maryland Transportation Article Section 21-809(b)(1)(vi), which went into effect October 1, 2025. Bill 17-26 was introduced by the County Council on March 17, 2026, public hearing held June 16, 2026, and a committee work session scheduled for October 5, 2026.

Since the effective date of the State Law, MCPD partnered with the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) to identify candidate High Injury Network and Vulnerable Road User corridors where speed monitoring systems would benefit the safety of all road users. The candidate corridors are enclosed. MCPD and SHA are ready to issue permits, publish the locations in a newspaper and MCPD's website, and start enforcement upon passage of Bill 17-26.

Given the County and State are ready to start enforcement and the critical safety needs on these high crash risk roadways, I request Bill 17-26 be amended to be expedited to address critical safety needs and advance our shared Vision Zero goal.

Enclosures: Candidate High Injury Network and Vulnerable Road User Corridors for Speed Monitoring Systems

cc: Kate Stewart, Councilmember, Transportation & Environment Committee
Marilyn Balcombe, Councilmember, Transportation & Environment Committee
Natali Fani-González, Council President, Montgomery County Council
Tommy Heyboer, Chief of Staff to the Council President, Montgomery County Council
Craig Howard, Executive Director, Montgomery County Council

Ludeen McCartney-Green, Legislative Attorney, Montgomery County Council
Richard S. Madaleno, Chief Administrative Officer
Earl Stoddard, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Tricia Swanson, Director of Strategic Partnerships
Wade Holland, Vision Zero Coordinator, Office of the County Executive
Marc Yamada, Chief, Montgomery County Police
J. David Reed, Captain, Montgomery County Police
Christopher Tippery, Manager, Montgomery County Police

Automated Speed Enforcement for High Injury Network (HIN) and Vulnerable Road User (VRU) Corridors on State Highways in Montgomery County

MD 586 – Veirs Mill Road

Connecticut Avenue to Twinbrook Parkway (SHA VRU Corridor)

12000 block of Veirs Mill Road

12100 block of Veirs Mill Road

12200 block of Veirs Mill Road

12300 block of Veirs Mill Road

12400 block of Veirs Mill Road

12500 block of Veirs Mill Road

12600 block of Veirs Mill Road

12700 block of Veirs Mill Road

12800 block of Veirs Mill Road

12900 block of Veirs Mill Road

13000 block of Veirs Mill Road

13100 block of Veirs Mill Road

13200 block of Veirs Mill Road

US 29 – Georgia Avenue

Thayer Ave to Burlington Ave/13th St (HIN corridor)

8200 block of Georgia Avenue

8100 block of Georgia Avenue

8000 block of Georgia Avenue

MD 97 – Georgia Avenue

Forest Glen Rd to Bel Pre Road (HIN corridor)

9800 block of Georgia Avenue

9900 block of Georgia Avenue

10000 block of Georgia Avenue

10100 block of Georgia Avenue

10200 block of Georgia Avenue

10300 block of Georgia Avenue

10400 block of Georgia Avenue

10500 block of Georgia Avenue

10600 block of Georgia Avenue

10700 block of Georgia Avenue

10800 block of Georgia Avenue

10900 block of Georgia Avenue

11100 block of Georgia Avenue

11200 block of Georgia Avenue

11300 block of Georgia Avenue

11400 block of Georgia Avenue

11500 block of Georgia Avenue

11600 block of Georgia Avenue

11700 block of Georgia Avenue

11800 block of Georgia Avenue

11900 block of Georgia Avenue

12000 block of Georgia Avenue

12100 block of Georgia Avenue

12200 block of Georgia Avenue

12300 block of Georgia Avenue

12400 block of Georgia Avenue

12500 block of Georgia Avenue

12600 block of Georgia Avenue

12700 block of Georgia Avenue

12800 block of Georgia Avenue

12900 block of Georgia Avenue

13000 block of Georgia Avenue

13100 block of Georgia Avenue

13200 block of Georgia Avenue

13300 block of Georgia Avenue

13400 block of Georgia Avenue

13500 block of Georgia Avenue

13600 block of Georgia Avenue

13700 block of Georgia Avenue

13800 block of Georgia Avenue

13900 block of Georgia Avenue

14000 block of Georgia Avenue

14100 block of Georgia Avenue

14200 block of Georgia Avenue

14300 block of Georgia Avenue

MD 117 Clopper Road

Cinnamon Drive to Stoneridge Drive (HIN corridor)

12700 block of Clopper Road

12600 block of Clopper Road

12500 block of Clopper Road

12400 block of Clopper Road

12300 block of Clopper Road

12200 block of Clopper Road

12100 block of Clopper Road

12000 block of Clopper Road

11900 block of Clopper Road

11800 block of Clopper Road

11700 block of Clopper Road

MD 124 Montgomery Village Avenue

Christopher Avenue to Midcounty Highway (SHA VRU Corridor)

18400 block of Montgomery Village Avenue

MD 124 Midcounty Highway

Montgomery Village Avenue to Goshen Road (SHA VRU Corridor)

9200 block of Midcounty Highway

9100 block of Midcounty Highway

MD 193 University Boulevard E

Capital Beltway to Piney Branch Road (SHA VRU Corridor)

200 block of University Blvd E

300 block of University Blvd E

400 block of University Blvd E

500 block of University Blvd E

600 block of University Blvd E

MD 198 Spencerville Road

Peach Orchard Road to Old Columbia Pike (HIN corridor)

2400 block of Spencerville Road

2500 block of Spencerville Road

2600 block of Spencerville Road

2700 block of Spencerville Road

2800 block of Spencerville Road

2900 block of Spencerville Road

3000 block of Spencerville Road

3100 block of Spencerville Road

3200 block of Spencerville Road

3300 block of Spencerville Road

3400 block of Spencerville Road

3500 block of Spencerville Road

MD 320 Piney Branch Road

Flower Avenue to University Boulevard E (HIN Corridor)

8500 block of Piney Branch Road

8600 block of Piney Branch Road

8700 block of Piney Branch Road

MD 355 Frederick Road

Middlebrook Road to Game Preserve Road/City of Gaithersburg Line (HIN Corridor)

19800 block of Frederick Road

19700 block of Frederick Road

19600 block of Frederick Road

19500 block of Frederick Road

19400 block of Frederick Road

19300 block of Frederick Road

19200 block of Frederick Road

19100 block of Frederick Road

19000 block of Frederick Road

18900 block of Frederick Road

18800 block of Frederick Road

MD 650 New Hampshire Avenue

Powder Mill Road to Fox St/County Line (HIN corridor)

10100 block of New Hampshire Avenue

10000 block of New Hampshire Avenue

9900 block of New Hampshire Avenue

9800 block of New Hampshire Avenue

9700 block of New Hampshire Avenue

9600 block of New Hampshire Avenue

9500 block of New Hampshire Avenue

9400 block of New Hampshire Avenue

9300 block of New Hampshire Avenue