STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES
60 State Street, Wethersfield, CT 06161
http://ct.gov/dmv

Testimony of Department of Motor Vehicles Commissioner Melody A. Currey
Transportation Committee Public Hearing
February 14, 2011

Proposed H.B. 6178
AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE USE OF TRAFFIC CAMERAS BY MUNICIPALITIES

Proposed H.B. 6179
AN ACT AUTHORIZING MUNICIPALITIES TO OPERATE INTERSECTION SAFETY CAMERA SYSTEMS

Proposed S.B. 706
AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL INTERSECTION SAFETY SYSTEMS

Proposed S.B. 822 ✓
AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE USE OF PHOTOGRAPHIC TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGY

The Department of Motor Vehicles appreciates the opportunity to provide its thoughts on these proposed bills. There are several issues of concern to the agency.

The first issue pertains to the fact that over the years, primarily as a revenue enhancement, Connecticut has issued the same registration plate number multiple times. This is because there are 44 different class codes for vehicle registrations, a number of which could use the same plate number. While the most common are passenger plates, there are myriad others, such as combinations, commercials, motorcycles, campers and livery to name just a few. Unless there is an adequate way for these systems to read and identify the actual type of plate on the vehicle in question, there will be problems. Typically, these systems default to the passenger plate and the owner of record for that plate is the one sent the infraction notice. Thus, a person may receive this notice even though it was not in fact his/her vehicle involved. We have seen multiple instances of this problem in areas in which this technology has been installed such as New York City. The onus is then on an innocent person to correct this problem. This often involves interaction with DMV, even though our role in the process was nothing more than providing registry information.

With resources at a premium and several large IT initiatives underway, DMV is concerned about what would be required on our part to help enable this program. If there are significant programming and/or other requirements on DMV's part, it is unrealistic to assume that changes can be accomplished with currently available resources. There are proposals to split revenues generated by this program between the municipalities and the State's General Fund. However, those will not address the

issue of DMV's resources since its primary funding source is the Special Transportation Fund.

The DMV is concerned about the confidentiality of personal data related to registration information. Those issues would have to be carefully reviewed to ensure that appropriate safeguards are maintained.

DMV questions the capabilities of its current technology systems to support such a program. While we expect the new systems that are being built as part of DMV's Modernization Project will be real-time and will have the capability to allow for programming and other changes to address issues that arise, these new systems will not be available for at least another year.

Finally, bills 706 and 6179 authorize the passage of ordinances for a violation captured on a camera system, and that violation is required to be posted to the operator's driver history. The DMV has no system in place through which it would be able to receive and post ordinance violations, and for the reasons previously stated, does not have the resources or technology to build such a system.