

Judiciary Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5449 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING AUTOMATED LICENSE PLATE READER SYSTEMS.

Vote Date: 3/23/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/9/2026

File No.: 536

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Judiciary Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

It's important to ensure that law enforcement and public agencies have clear, responsible guidelines when using modern technologies like automated license plate readers (ALPRs). At the same time, we need strong safeguards to protect people's privacy and constitutional rights. This bill strikes that balance by setting standards for how the technology is used, shared, and retained. It helps the people of Connecticut by promoting responsible use of technology in a way that strengthens public safety while also safeguarding civil liberties. Residents deserve confidence that their data won't be used to target them based on protected characteristics, their lawful activities, or sensitive health-related decisions. These protections help build trust between communities and those who serve them.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

In attempting to strike the right balance for data retention between public safety and individuals' civil liberties, the substitute language outlines a data retention policy of 30 days, with any access to the data beyond an initial 7-day retention only allowed by a warrant. The language also addresses concerns expressed by law enforcement agencies regarding using automated license plate reader systems as a tool with a purpose while maintaining the intent of the data sharing and retention policies of the bill. It also strengthens audit requirements for data that is being retained and ensures public agencies are not liable for malfeasance of companies that contract with them.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Garrett Eucalitto, Commissioner, Department of Transportation: Supports the protection of privacy and responsible data governance but expresses concerns that the definition of automated license plate reader could encompass the Department of Transportation's work zone speed control systems, as well as municipal automated traffic enforcement safety devices, which are distinct from what are commonly referred to as ALPRs. He states that these work zone cameras and municipal enforcement programs are governed by comprehensive, well-established statutory privacy protections and requests that they be excluded from the definition of ALPRs in the bill.

External Affairs, Judicial Branch: While the Judicial Branch does not take any position on the policy underlying the bill, they note that seven days is a short amount of time for data retention and may impact the state's ability to thoroughly investigate cases. They also anticipate a significant increase in the number of warrants and court orders required to retain the data. Finally, they ask that the term "private vendor" be defined.

Ronnell Higgins, Commissioner, Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection: Expresses concerns about the bill while recognizing the importance of safeguards. He argues automated license plate reader technology is a valuable tool for law enforcement to locate stolen vehicles, identify suspects, and respond to public safety threats. However, he raises concerns that certain provisions—such as the seven-day data retention limit, limits on federal access, and restrictions on investigative use—could hinder investigations and homeland security efforts and suggests adjustments to better balance privacy protections with law enforcement needs.

Paula Pearlman, Managing Director and Associate General Counsel, Freedom of Information Commission: Takes no position on the bill but raises concerns about the provision that would make automated license plate reader data confidential under the Freedom of Information Act. She notes there is a strong public interest in oversight of law enforcement's use of ALPR technology and cautions that exempting such data from disclosure could limit transparency and public understanding of how the systems are used.

Deborah Del Prete Sullivan, Legal Counsel, Office of the Chief Public Defender: Generally supports the bill because it attempts to regulate the use of automated license plate reader systems and establish safeguards for the data they generate. However, she raises concerns that the proposal does not address how private software vendors collect, retain, sell, or share the data and urges the legislature to add language closing that gap. While the Office opposes the use of such systems overall, the bill represents a step toward placing needed restrictions on their use.

Michael Shea, Executive Director, Connecticut Airport Authority: Raises concerns about the bill because restrictions on the use of automated license plate reader systems could prevent the Authority from using the technology to efficiently manage airport parking operations. He states that the proposal could place public airport facilities at a competitive disadvantage compared with private off-airport parking operators and requests an exemption for the authority from the bill's definition of a public agency.

Sean Scanlon, CT State Comptroller: Supports the bill because it would establish safeguards preventing automated license plate reader data from being used to track individuals traveling to Connecticut for lawful healthcare services, including reproductive and gender-affirming care. He states that without such guardrails, ALPR data could be accessed by out-of-state actors and used to circumvent Connecticut's existing shield law protections. He argues that the bill would help ensure surveillance technologies do not undermine the state's role as a safe harbor for patients and providers.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Jaclyn Alessio, LCSW, NASWCTMacroSWNet: Supports the bill as a strong privacy guardrail. She supports strong limits on data-sharing, the seven-day retention period, and that data collected by ALPRs not be used for immigration enforcement. She believes that strong transparency and reporting requirements are essential to ensure the bill is working as intended. She asks that a meaningful enforcement mechanism be added to the bill.

Nina Allred, Danbury Unites for Immigrants: Supports the bill because it creates protections for immigrant communities and ensures safe access to public spaces.

Dr. Carina Bandhauer, Professor of Sociology, Western Connecticut State University: Supports the bill as a policy that works to correct wrongs committed by federal immigration enforcement. She relates how recent studies show the current immigration enforcement methods negatively impact all children, not just those of immigrant households, and policies such as this one are needed to curb that negative impact.

Ken Barone, Associate Director, Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy, University of Connecticut: Supports the bill and its inclusion of the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) in developing a standardized reporting form for ALPR systems. He comments that standardized reporting forms will increase transparency, increase public trust, and enable policymakers to assess how ALPRs are being used across the state. He recommends the ALPR report be included in the reporting portal that IMRP is currently developing, to ease the administrative burden on law enforcement.

Emily Byrne, Executive Director, Carmen N. Clarkin, Special Assistant for Strategic Initiatives, Emily Knox, Research and Policy Director, Connecticut Voices for Children: Supports the bill as it creates more privacy and reduces the digital footprint of Connecticut residents. They believe the bill creates a more equitable Connecticut and is in-line with research that shows that the harms created by ALPRs are not distributed equally. They believe that government agencies should not have access to every movement of citizens.

Testimony of Individuals from Congregations Organized for a New Connecticut (CONECT)

John Hanrahan James Manship Susan Nobleman Laura Stern

They each provided testimony in support of this bill, stating that stronger safeguards are needed to regulate the use of automated license plate reader (ALPR) systems and protect residents' privacy and civil rights. They emphasized limiting the collection, retention, and sharing of surveillance data and preventing its use for immigration enforcement. Collectively,

they argued the bill would help ensure Connecticut residents can access services and participate in community life without fear of surveillance or unjust enforcement.

Chelsea Connory, Attorney, Fair Housing Center: Supports the bill because it creates clear protection for what ALPR data can and cannot be used for. She is opposed to surveillance technology being used to track people's movements or build databases of where people should go and states that police departments should not be able to freely share this data with out-of-state or federal entities.

Thomas Connolly, Peoples Center: Supports the bill because it establishes clear limits on how ALPR data can be used and retained. He states that the transparency and reporting requirements will allow the public and lawmakers to ensure these systems are not being abused.

Leticia Cotto, Hartford Deportation Defense: Supports the bill because it regulates the use of ALPR systems and protects the data they gather from being used to criminalize vulnerable communities.

Testimony of Individuals from Connecticut For All

Lindsey Jones Rachel Kohn Azula Luz Heidi Levin Kevin Mills Costanza Segovia Maureen Welch Rachel Wiskind Alyssa Siegel-Miles

They each provided testimony in support of this bill, stating that it would establish clear guardrails on the use of automated license plate reader (ALPR) systems and strengthen privacy protections for Connecticut residents. They emphasized the importance of limiting data retention, restricting the sharing of ALPR data with out-of-state and federal agencies, and preventing the technology from being used for immigration enforcement or to target individuals based on protected characteristics. Collectively, they argued that these protections are necessary to prevent misuse of surveillance technology and to ensure residents can move freely in their communities without fear of being tracked.

Sarah Damon, Danbury Unites for Immigrants: Supports the bill because it curbs the intrusion on privacy created by electronic surveillance.

Jennifer Dayton, Co-Head, League of Women Voters of CT: Supports the bill because it protects civil rights and encourages citizen cooperation with Connecticut law enforcement officers. She states that ALPR technology is capable of large-scale monitoring, violating the First Amendment right to peacefully assemble, violating privacy, and doing all these things indiscriminately. For those reasons, she supports restrictions on the use of ALPR data by non-Connecticut agencies.

Stephanie Deceus, Vice President, District 1199 New England: Overwhelmingly supports the bill as an important step in protecting the people of Connecticut from a federal government intent on terrorizing its communities.

Liz Dupont-Diehl, CT Citizen Action Group: Supports the bill as a correction on the outrageous lack of oversight of powerful surveillance technologies. She states that these

systems are vulnerable to misuse and data breaches and that the very sensitive data they gather is especially dangerous under the current federal overreach.

Brian Donahue, Founder, NOT JUST US: Supports the bill as a measure to prevent the data gathered by ALPR systems from being given to entities which only use that data to harm individuals. He states that drivers abiding by the state's laws should be safe from their information being provided to those who do not need it and asks that there be rules to ensure no misuse of the information that is gathered.

Jill Drew, Steering Committee Director, Vecinos Seguros 2: Supports the bill as a measure to prevent Immigration and Customs Enforcement and other states from violating the privacy of Connecticut residents.

Manuel Estrada, 32BJ SEIU: Supports the bill and the protections for immigrants it creates by preventing the misuse of ALPR data.

Maritza Estremera Jimines, Board of Education Secretary, Bridgeport: Supports the creation of guidelines surround ALPR data and its usage and retention. She states that this policy will protect the people of Connecticut and ensure they can go to work, school, and their places of worship without fear.

Courtney Fontaine, Legislative Policy Associate, Institute for Justice: Supports the creation of guardrails around the data gathered by ALPR systems. She states that these guardrails are important because of the volume of data ALPR systems gather and the potential for misuse with this data.

Peter Fousek, Secretary-Treasurer, CT Tenants Union: Supports the bill.

Sarah Ganong, State Director, Working Families Power: Supports the creation of rules governing how ALPR data can be gathered and retained. She states that this bill places reasonable guardrails on surveillance technology and that the clear limits support privacy of residents. Finally, she asks that meaningful enforcement mechanisms are included in the law.

Carmela Garofalo, Sister, Sisters of Mercy: Supports the bill and its protections for vulnerable populations.

Testimony of Individuals from Greater Hartford Interfaith Action Alliance (GHIAA)

Jim Adams Carol Barry Elaine Betoncourt Linda Bronstein Thomas Buckley Ted Carroll Lisa Lucarelli Chandler Robert Dakers Jocelyn Gardner Spencer Michael Hoyt Rev. Robert Janis Eleta Jones Cynthia Kozak Mary LaPorte Susan Lennon Judith Levy David Liscinsky William Marut Stanley Maticka Patricia McCurdy-Crescimanno Holly McGrath Natalie Mendes Robert Merritt Stephen Mondak Michelle Riordan-Nold Karen Robinson Katherine Salk Elaine Shapiro Sharon Silvestrini Jeffrey Stein Carolyn Stockman Sandra Wood Forand Jane Torrey Leslie Turner Fred Turner Josh Pawelek Lindsay Plath Nancy Wright

They each provided testimony in support of this bill, stating that it would establish important privacy safeguards by limiting how ALPR data can be collected, retained, and shared. Many

emphasized that these protections are necessary to prevent the misuse of surveillance technology and to ensure Connecticut resources are not used to support federal immigration enforcement. They argued that the bill would help protect civil rights and allow residents to access community services without fear of surveillance.

Gus Marks-Hamilton, Campaign Manager, ACLU of Connecticut: Supports the bill because automated license plate reader systems pose significant privacy risks and require strong legal guardrails. He highlights the bill's protections, including limits on data sharing, a seven-day retention period, restrictions on using ALPR data for immigration enforcement or investigations related to reproductive or gender-affirming care, and transparency and accountability measures such as reporting requirements or a private right of action for violations.

Ed Hawthorne, President, Connecticut AFL-CIO: Supports the bill because automated license plate reader systems can enable mass surveillance without clear limits. He is a proponent of the bill's privacy safeguards, including the seven-day data retention limit, restrictions on sharing data with out-of-state and federal agencies, prohibitions on use for immigration enforcement or targeting protected activities, and limits on surveillance near sensitive locations.

Benjamin Huaracha, Make the Road CT: Supports the bill because it would limit how long ALPR data can be stored, which is important for community safety and preventing digital information from being misused, abused, or misrepresented.

Carmen Lanche, Director, Comunidades Sin Fronteras CT: Supports the bill because automated license plate reader data should not be used for immigration enforcement or to target individuals based on protected characteristics, protest activity, or healthcare decisions. She stresses the need for strict transparency and reporting requirements so the public and lawmakers can monitor how the technology is used.

Dr. Iyanna Liles MD, Vice Chair, Connecticut ACOG: Supports the bill because it protects the privacy of individuals seeking abortion and gender-affirming care by limiting how automated license plate reader data can be stored, accessed, and shared. She argues the bill's safeguards - such as the seven-day retention limit and restrictions on out-of-state access - help prevent the misuse of surveillance data to investigate or criminalize patients seeking legally protected healthcare.

Teran Loeppke, Executive Director, Collaborative Center for Justice: Supports the bill because it places limits on the collection, use, retention, and sharing of data from automated license plate reader systems. He notes the technology can enable widespread surveillance and that the data may be shared with other state or federal agencies, potentially undermining the intent of the Trust Act and state data protection laws.

Johan Lopez, Council Member, City of Norwalk: Supports the bill because modern law enforcement technologies like automated license plate readers must include clear safeguards, oversight, and privacy protections to prevent misuse and ensure their use remains consistent with constitutional rights.

Testimony of Individuals from Make the Road Connecticut

Benjamin Huaracha Daira Marin Mary Elizabeth Smith

They each provided testimony in support of this bill, stating that stronger limits on automated license plate reader (ALPR) systems are necessary to protect privacy and prevent the misuse of surveillance data. They expressed concern that ALPR technology can enable widespread tracking and that the data could be shared with other agencies in ways that harm immigrant communities. Collectively, they argued the bill would help safeguard civil rights and ensure residents can access community spaces and services without fear of surveillance or enforcement actions.

Daira Marin, Make the Road CT: Supports the bill because it strengthens privacy protections and helps ensure immigrant communities can safely access schools, healthcare facilities, places of worship, and other essential services. She also favors maintaining strong guardrails on automated license plate reader data and strengthening protections against unwarranted enforcement actions in sensitive locations.

Eimy Martinez, Political Director, 32BJ SEIU: Supports the bill because it establishes clear rules governing the use of automated license plate reader systems, including limits on data retention and safeguards against misuse. She argues these protections are necessary to prevent mass surveillance and unchecked sharing of location data collected from individuals who are not suspected of wrongdoing.

John McNamara, Ward 4 Alderman and Common Council Majority Leader, New Britain: Supports the bill because it calls for the use of license plate reader technology as a tool to improve traffic safety and reduce speeding and vehicle accidents. He notes these are an important part of New Britain's Vision Zero initiatives in school zones and other high-risk areas.

Josh Michtom, Hartford City Council Member: Supports the bill because Connecticut should establish consistent statewide rules governing license plate reader data to protect residents' privacy. He argues the bill helps prevent federal authorities from using surveillance data to track individuals' movements and ensures the state can protect residents from potential federal overreach.

Sister Maryann Mueller: Supports the bill because it will help protect community safety, individual privacy, and public confidence in government. She specifically supports maintaining strong privacy safeguards in the bill, including the seven-day data retention limit and restrictions on sharing automated license plate reader data with out-of-state or federal agencies.

Cathy Osten, State Senator: Supports the bill because it establishes needed safeguards governing the use of automated license plate reader systems while preserving their value for legitimate law enforcement purposes. She states that the bill promotes transparency and accountability through policies, audits, and reporting requirements. It also helps balance public safety needs with protections for residents' privacy.

Omar Perez, CT Students for a Dream: Supports the bill because safeguards are needed to protect residents' privacy and prevent automated license plate reader data from being used for immigration enforcement or shared with out-of-state or federal agencies without clear

limits. He argues that such protections would help ensure residents can access essential services and move through their communities without fear of surveillance or civil rights violations.

Gretchen Raffa, Chief Policy and Advocacy Officer, Planned Parenthood of Southern

New England: Supports the bill because safeguards are needed to prevent automated license plate reader data from being used to track individuals traveling to Connecticut for reproductive or gender-affirming healthcare. She argues that without such protections, out-of-state law enforcement could access surveillance data to circumvent Connecticut's shield laws and target patients, providers, or those assisting them, and that the bill would help protect privacy and access to lawful healthcare services.

Tonishia Signore, Policy Director, She Leads Justice:

Supports the bill because it would establish strong guardrails governing the collection, retention, and sharing of automated license plate reader data. She argues that ALPR systems can collect large amounts of location data about individuals and raise privacy concerns, particularly if shared with out-of-state or federal agencies. She Leads Justice supports provisions such as a seven-day data retention limit, restrictions on data sharing and use, limits on surveillance near sensitive locations, and transparency and enforcement mechanisms to prevent misuse of the technology.

Mary Elizabeth Smith, Co-Deputy Director, Make the Road CT:

Supports the bill because it would place needed guardrails on automated license plate reader technology to prevent it from being used to track people's movements or build databases of where individuals travel, thereby helping protect privacy and civil rights.

Sam Sommers, Assistant Professor of English, University of Connecticut-Waterbury:

Supports the bill because stronger limits on surveillance and enforcement are needed to protect students, educators, and community members from fear related to immigration enforcement. Drawing on her experience as an educator and volunteer assisting individuals in immigration proceedings, she argues that policies such as H.B. 5449 would help ensure schools and community spaces remain safe places where people can learn and access services without fear.

Doris Sugarman, Founder, The Connecticut Forum:

Supports the bill because excessive surveillance undermines civil liberties and existing legal protections. She argues that establishing clear limits on how automated license plate reader data is collected, shared, and used will help protect privacy and prevent misuse of the technology.

Pamela Tassiello, Danbury Unites for Immigrants:

Supports the bill because stronger oversight and limits are needed on how automated license plate reader data is collected, shared, and stored. She argues that widespread collection and sharing of license plate data raises serious privacy concerns and may conflict with Fourth Amendment protections, particularly when the information is shared with federal agencies or used to target certain communities.

Rhett Tock, Adjunct Professor, University of Hartford:

Supports the bill because stronger state protections are needed to safeguard students and communities from surveillance and potential immigration enforcement risks. He expresses concern about a lack of transparency

and the impact of fear and stress on students, particularly international students, and argues that H.B. 5449 would help establish clearer standards and limits on automated license plate reader use, including concerns about data access and security.

Amanda Wallwin, Innocence Project: Supports the bill because it would establish important safeguards governing the use of automated license plate reader systems. She states that misuse or mismanagement of these systems has led to false arrests and wrongful detentions due to plate misidentification, inaccurate data, and deviations from protocol. The bill would help protect civil liberties and reduce the risk of wrongful convictions by limiting law enforcement access to ALPR data to specific investigations and requiring regular deletion of stored data.

William Yeterian, Hartford Deportation Defense: Supports the bill because it includes strong privacy protections governing the collection and storage of automated license plate reader data. He expresses concern that large amounts of driver location data could otherwise be collected and stored without limits, particularly by private companies with limited oversight, which could put immigrant communities and those who assist them at risk. He supports maintaining the bill's seven-day data retention limit, and calls for stronger transparency, reporting requirements, and enforcement mechanisms to ensure the safeguards are effective.

Stacey Zimmerman, SEIU CT State Council: Supports the bill because it establishes needed safeguards on the use of automated license plate reader systems. She states that while data collection can assist public safety, it must be used responsibly and include clear limits to protect individuals' privacy. License plate reader systems collect large amounts of location data about people who are not suspected of wrongdoing. She expresses concerns that without restrictions on how the information is stored, used, or shared, they risk becoming tools of mass surveillance.

Anonymous, 153: Supports the bill because it stops state resources from supporting federal immigration enforcement.

Anonymous, 171: Supports the bill because it places limits on the collection and distribution of individual's license plate numbers, the unrestricted use of which facilitates hunting immigrants or other segments of society.

Anonymous, 255: Supports the bill because it increases transparency and privacy.

Anonymous, 274: Supports the bill because it aids in giving hardworking people peace of mind against government overreach.

Anonymous, 275: Supports the bill because it aids in giving people peace of mind in their daily lives.

Anonymous, 277: Supports the bill because it creates strong privacy guardrails.

Anonymous, 375: Supports the bill because it stops state resources from supporting federal immigration enforcement.

Anonymous, 389: Supports the bill because it imposes strong limits on data sharing, protecting the most vulnerable people in our society.

Anonymous, 398: Supports the bill because it places restrictions on the gathering of license plate information.

Anonymous, 676: Supports the bill because it protects Connecticut communities from Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Anonymous, 683: Supports the bill because of opposition to surveillance and the harm it can cause.

Anonymous, 838: Supports the bill because it provides strong privacy guardrails around the use of Automated License Plate Reader Systems. They believe that these systems can be used to make long-term databases of people's movements and that police departments should not be able to freely share this data with out-of-state or federal agencies. They support prohibitions on data-collection near sensitive locations like healthcare facilities, schools, and community organizations. They also believe in the need for strong transparency and reporting requirements.

Anonymous, Anonymous: Supports the bill because it makes it more difficult for unaccountable federal agents to operate.

Other Testimony: Due to the quantity of testimony received for this bill, it is not possible to provide a written summary for each individual submission. Of the remaining testimonies in opposition to the bill, the following ideas were expressed:

123 expressed their support for this bill.

72 voiced their support for this bill, citing concerns that automated license plate reader (ALPR) systems can create long-term databases of residents' movements, enabling tracking and requiring strict guardrails.

39 voiced their support for this bill, citing that it would close Trust Act loopholes that allow state resources and data to be used for federal immigration enforcement.

46 voiced their support for this bill, citing that it would protect immigrant and other vulnerable communities and preserve access to services and sensitive locations such as schools, healthcare facilities, and houses of worship.

34 voiced their support for this bill, citing that it would protect civil and constitutional rights, including freedom of speech and assembly, due process, religious liberty, and broader civil liberties.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Mona Colwell: Opposes the bill because it will make the job of Immigration and Customs Enforcement more difficult.

Connecticut Police Chiefs Association: They provide general comments on the bill, suggesting increases to the retention period, maintenance of the ability to share data with law-enforcement agencies outside the state, and expansion of when ALPR data can be used from strictly for criminal offenses to also include some civil offenses such as motor vehicle violations. They also ask that ALPR data be immune to Freedom of Information requests.

William Gaffey, Assessor, City of Bridgeport: He asks that an exception to the bill be made for municipal tax assessors, who rely on this technology for tax compliance purposes.

Andrew Fredette: Opposes the bill.

Jeffrey Kestenband, Parliamentarian, Connecticut Criminal Defense Lawyers Association: Opposes the bill because it would permit law enforcement to collect and analyze license plate reader data about individuals' movements without probable cause or a warrant. He contends the technology enables extensive surveillance that could reveal private details about people's lives and may violate Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable searches.

Robert Marconi: Opposes the bill and any laws that allow the automatic reading of plates for use by government or law enforcement.

Donna Murphy, Assessor, City of Danbury: Raises concerns about the bill because restricting automated license plate reader use to law enforcement would prevent municipal assessors from using the technology to identify residents who improperly register vehicles out of state to avoid property taxes. She argues ALPR systems are an effective tool for tax compliance and have helped Danbury add thousands of vehicles to the tax rolls, generating significant revenue and promoting fairness among taxpayers.

Kim Novak: Opposes the bill because it interferes with the ability of law enforcement to keep civilians safe.

Katherine Revello, Connecticut Council on Freedom of Information (CCFOI): Opposes the bill because it would exempt automated license plate reader data from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. She expresses concerns that such an exemption would limit journalists' and the public's ability to monitor how the technology is used and could hinder oversight needed to detect misuse or abuse of ALPR systems.

Anonymous, 242: Opposes the bill because it will expand government overreach.

Anonymous, 414: Opposes the bill because enough legislation has been created.

Reported by: Justin Lamoureux

Date: April 8, 2026