

Government Administration and Elections Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-225 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING FEES FOR COPYING, REVIEWING AND REDACTING RECORDS CREATED BY POLICE BODY-WORN RECORDING EQUIPMENT

Title: AND DASHBOARD CAMERAS.

Vote Date: 3/11/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 2/23/2026

File No.:

***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:

The Government Administration and Elections Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

There has been a growing trend for members of the public to request body-worn and dashboard cameras from law enforcement organizations. Under current law this request is free of charge to the public and relies upon the law enforcement agency to use resources to prepare the video and audio recording suitable for public consumption. This has placed an ever-increasing financial strain on law enforcement agencies to use up resources to process these requests. This bill would seek to strike a balance of recuperating some of the financial resources used in this process while also maintain affordability to the general public and not keep information locked behind a financial barrier.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

William Tong, Attorney General, State of CT

The Office of the Attorney General opposes SB-225, not because of its intent, but because it believes existing law already allows agencies to recover reasonable costs for reviewing and redacting records. The Office is currently seeking a court ruling to clarify this issue and recommends waiting for that decision before passing new legislation.

While acknowledging the burden on law enforcement, the testimony argues that the Freedom of Information Act already balances transparency with cost-sharing and gives agencies discretion to charge fees when appropriate. The Attorney General believes the courts will confirm this interpretation, making the bill unnecessary.

Colleen Murphy, Executive Director & General Counsel, FOI Commission

Ms. Murphy explains that SB-225 would allow law enforcement agencies to charge fees for the labor involved in redacting body camera and dashboard footage. While acknowledging the growing burden of such requests, the FOI Commission emphasizes that any fees must remain reasonable and not create barriers to public access. The Commission worked with the proponents of similar proposals and have made great strides in this regard. The bill includes safeguards, such as prohibiting charges for searching records or attorney review, and limiting labor fees to the lowest-paid qualified employee with a capped rate. Overall, the Commission supports efforts to balance cost recovery with maintaining affordable access to public records.

Debra Sullivan, Legal Counsel Director, Office of the Chief Public Defender

The Office of the Public Defender supports subsection (d) of the statutes that provides a waiver of fees for an FOI request is a member of the Division of Public Defender Services. The Office also supports lines 231-233 which eliminates a search fee.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Neil Dryfe, Chief of Police, CT Police Chiefs Association

Chief Dryfe supports the bill as a way to help police departments manage the growing burden of public records requests for body camera and dashboard footage. While affirming support for the Freedom of Information Act and transparency, he argues that current laws have not kept pace with modern technology. Processing video footage for release to the public is time-consuming and costly, requiring extensive review and redaction, often straining already understaffed departments. The bill is a necessary update, addressing modern, mandated law enforcement equipment, to address these challenges while maintaining public access to records.

Betsy Gara, Executive Director, Connecticut Council of Small Towns

Ms. Gara argues in support of SB-225 as it addresses the growing costs municipalities face when redacting body camera and dashboard footage before public release. Redaction—such as blurring nudity or minors and removing audio—is time-consuming and resource-intensive. The bill would allow agencies to charge a reasonable fee for this work, helping offset the costs of complying with disclosure requirements.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Anonymous 20, 21, 22, 23, and Ann Kat submitted testimony with generic reasons for opposition.

Reported by: Cindy Panioto

Date: 3/25/26