

Department of Legislative Services
Maryland General Assembly
2026 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE
First Reader

House Bill 1370 (Delegate Hornberger)
Environment and Transportation

Town of Rising Sun - Stop Sign Monitoring Systems - Authorization of Pilot Program

This bill authorizes, for three years, the use of stop sign monitoring systems by the State Highway Administration (SHA) on any State highway in the Town of Rising Sun to record violations of State law requiring obedience to stop signs; existing statutory provisions that apply for other stop sign monitoring systems used in the State generally apply for systems placed in accordance with the bill. However, a stop sign monitoring system may only be used at a location approved by the Cecil County Council. **The bill takes effect July 1, 2026, and terminates June 30, 2029.**

Fiscal Summary

State Effect: Transportation Trust Fund (TTF) expenditures and revenues and general fund revenues increase beginning as early as FY 2027 and likely only through FY 2030, as discussed below. General fund expenditures are not anticipated to be materially affected, as discussed below.

Local Effect: The bill is not anticipated to materially affect local government operations or finances.

Small Business Effect: Potential minimal.

Analysis

Current Law:

Automated Enforcement Systems – Generally

State law authorizes the use of various automated monitoring systems, including traffic control system monitoring systems, speed monitoring systems, stop sign monitoring systems, school bus monitoring systems, vehicle height monitoring systems, and work zone speed control systems. Generally, pursuant to § 21-809(d)(5) of the Transportation Article, a person who receives a citation, may:

- pay the civil penalty, in accordance with the instructions on the citation; or
- elect to stand trial in the District Court for the alleged violation.

With specified exceptions, penalty revenues from automated enforcement systems, including speed monitoring systems, must be paid (1) to the administering State agency or local jurisdiction, in an uncontested case and (2) directly to the District Court (and consequently the general fund) in a case that is contested in District Court.

Required Stops When Approaching a Stop Sign

Unless otherwise directed by a police officer or traffic control signal, the driver of a vehicle approaching a stop sign at an intersection must:

- stop at the near side of the intersection at a clearly marked stop line;
- stop at the near side of the intersection and, if there is no clearly marked stop line, before entering any crosswalk; and
- stop at the near side of an intersection and, if there is no crosswalk, at the nearest point before entering the intersection that gives the driver a view of traffic approaching on the intersecting roadway.

A violation of any of these requirements is a misdemeanor with a maximum \$500 fine. The prepayment penalty is \$90 with one point assessed against the license. If the violation contributes to an accident, the prepayment penalty is \$130 and three points must be assessed against the license.

State Fiscal Effect:

State Highway Administration

TTF expenditures and revenues for SHA increase for administrative costs and prepaid citations beginning as early as fiscal 2027 (and likely only through fiscal 2030) to the extent

that SHA chooses to implement a stop sign monitoring system program pursuant to the bill's authority. (Under the bill, SHA is defined as the relevant "agency" with administrative responsibilities – see § 21-707.1(b)(2)(ii).)

As noted above, for most other automated enforcement systems in use in the State, the controlling agency must receive the revenues when a citation is prepaid and the District Court (*i.e.*, the general fund) must receive the revenues when a citation is contested and the person is subsequently found guilty. However, §7-302 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, which governs the disbursement of automated enforcement system citation revenues, does not include specifications related to the disbursement of stop sign monitoring system citation revenues when a system is controlled by a *State* agency, and this section of law is unamended by the bill. Nevertheless, for purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the disbursement of revenues under the bill is similar to that with most other automated enforcement systems controlled by State agencies (*e.g.*, the TTF receives revenues from uncontested cases and the general fund receives revenues from contested cases).

District Court

To the extent that additional stop sign monitoring systems are installed under the bill's authority, and under the assumptions discussed above, the number of individuals opting for a trial in District Court may also increase. Accordingly, general fund revenues increase, likely minimally, as fine revenues paid by individuals convicted in District Court are paid into the general fund.

It is anticipated that any additional workload resulting from the bill's requirements does not materially affect general fund expenditures for the District Court.

The Judiciary advises that the significant expansion of automated enforcement systems in the State in recent years necessitates an upgrade to its case management system to improve citation intake and payment processing. For locally operated automated enforcement systems, the District Court administers citations and the payment of fines from contested citations only. For automated enforcement systems operated by a State agency, the District Court administers citations and the payment of fines for both contested and uncontested citations. The court currently processes these citations through a manual workflow that has struggled to keep pace with the expansion of automated enforcement systems. The Judiciary estimates the cost of an information technology upgrade to automate the process at approximately \$1.4 million; additional staffing costs may also be incurred.

However, because the Judiciary's need is not exclusively attributable to the bill, but rather due to the general expansion of automated enforcement systems, these costs are not reflected in this analysis.

Additional Information

Recent Prior Introductions: Similar legislation has not been introduced within the last three years.

Designated Cross File: None.

Information Source(s): Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts); Maryland Department of Transportation; Cecil County; Department of Legislative Services

Fiscal Note History: First Reader - March 16, 2026
jg/jkb

Analysis by: Richard L. Duncan

Direct Inquiries to:
(410) 946-5510
(301) 970-5510