

**RAILROADS: VIDEO MONITORS**

**Senate Bill 859 (Substitute H-2)**  
**Addendum to SFA analysis (11-29-00)**

**Sponsor: Sen. Shirley Johnson**  
**Senate Committee: Transportation and**  
**Tourism**  
**House Committee: Transportation**

**ADDENDUM TO SENATE FISCAL AGENCY ANALYSIS OF SB 859 DATED 7-27-00:**

***HOUSE COMMITTEE ACTION:***

The House Transportation Committee adopted a substitute for Senate Bill 859 that differs from the Senate-passed version in the following ways:

-The Senate-passed version of the bill specifies that if there is a fatality at a railroad grade crossing in a city with population of 60,000 or more, the state transportation department would be required to undertake a diagnostic review. The diagnostic review is to be scheduled within 120 days, and if it confirms that warning devices such as flashing lights and gates are needed, the department would be required to order the improvements. The House Transportation Committee retained this provision but added that “the cost of the improvements shall be financed consistent with the financing of similar projects by the state transportation department according to its annual prioritization of grade crossing safety improvements.”

-The committee added language to specify that “any photographs, videotape, or digital images evidencing a violation shall be destroyed 90 days after final disposition of the citation.”

-In addition, the committee amended the Senate-passed version to specify that “the owner of a leased or rental vehicle shall provide the name and address of the person to whom the vehicle was leased or rented at the time of the violation” when the owner of a vehicle has been cited.

-Finally, the Senate-passed version of the bill specifies that the court may issue a warrant for the arrest of a person who failed to appear within the time limit established on the citation. The House committee retained this provision, but added the condition, “if a sworn complaint is filed with the court for that purpose as required for other civil infractions.”

***POSITIONS:***

A representative of the Oakland County Sheriff’s office testified in support of the bill. (11-28-00)

A representative of the Michigan Railroads Association testified in support of the bill. (11-28-00)

00) The Canadian National Railroad Police offered a written statement to support the bill. (11-28-

Analyst: J. Hunault

---

# This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.