

16 March 2026

Josh Sande
Committee Administrator - DFL Caucus
Minnesota House of Representatives

Mr. Sande:

Indivisible Twin Cities supports HF 4205 relating to automated license plate readers. We are opposed to the inappropriate gathering and use of this data. This data is being used by ICE for removal of immigrants, and has even been used in Texas to search for women seeking abortions. This bill would provide for greater restrictions on the gathering and use of this data.

Bill Csajko
Lead, Voting and Democracy Action Team
Indivisible Twin Cities

Copy for:

Rebecca Larson, Indivisible Twin Cities
John Boehler, Policy Counsel, ACLU MN



INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

March 16, 2026

Minnesota House Judiciary, Finance, and Civil Law Committee
Capitol, Room G3
75 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard
St. Paul, MN 55155

Re: Letter in support of HB 4205

Dear Chairs Scott and Liebling, Vice Chairs Hudson and Finke, and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this letter in support of HB 4205. My name is Meagan Forbes, and I am Senior Legislative Counsel at the Institute for Justice (IJ). IJ is a nonprofit organization dedicated to ending abuses of government power and securing constitutional rights. Through our work, we have challenged the often unconstitutional use of Automatic License Plate Readers (ALPRs) and the vast troves of location data they generate. We commend the committee for considering this bill and strongly urge your support.

As the Committee knows, ALPR technology has spread rapidly across Minnesota and the rest of the country, joining a growing array of interlinked surveillance tools that track and record people's movements over time. Unlike red light or speed cameras, ALPRs are not activated by a suspected violation of the law. They instead passively collect data on all motorists who drive by a camera and store that information in cloud-powered, searchable databases that, in some cases, are accessible to law enforcement agencies across the country. Over time, these records can be used to reconstruct where people travel, when they travel, and who they may be traveling with, among other private information. And the government's accessing of this deeply revealing location data without meaningful judicial oversight is a direct violation of the Fourth Amendment's promise that the government cannot track the public movements of law-abiding people without first obtaining a warrant.¹

Minnesota has taken important steps to guard against these risks, and its existing law already contains stronger protections than those found in many other states. But HB 4205 builds on this foundation in three critical ways. First, the bill fortifies one of the most important safeguards against misuse of ALPR technology: meaningful limits on how long the government may retain location data about innocent drivers. Under current law, ALPR data that is not connected to a criminal investigation may be stored for up to 60 days.² This bill would shorten that window dramatically and require that data to be destroyed after 48 hours. Individuals'

¹ See *Carpenter v. United States*, 585 U.S. 296, 310 (2018) (holding that "[a] person does not surrender all Fourth Amendment protection by venturing into the public sphere"); *United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400, 430 (2012) (Alito, J., concurring in judgment).

² Minn. Stat. § 13.824, subd. 3(a) (2024).

sensitive historical location information should not be stored for months “just in case” the government later decides it may be useful.

Second, the bill limits the sharing of ALPR data outside Minnesota. In recent years, many jurisdictions across the country have begun participating in sprawling information-sharing networks that allow law enforcement agencies to look up data collected hundreds or even thousands of miles away. This bill closes that door by making clear that ALPR data cannot be accessed, disseminated, or shared outside the state—including with federal agencies or interstate data networks—unless required by a court order or judicial warrant. Minnesotans’ historical location information should not be quietly funneled into national surveillance systems without judicial oversight.

Third, the proposed amendment to this bill strengthens accountability and transparency in how ALPR systems and the data they collect are used. It requires agencies to maintain detailed audit trails recording when data are entered, accessed, shared, or disseminated. Those records provide an important check on misuse and make it possible to review how the technology is being deployed and whether it is being used for legitimate law enforcement purposes.

IJ respectfully recommends one additional improvement. Section 13.824, subdivision 2(d), currently requires law enforcement to obtain a warrant before using ALPR technology “to monitor or track an individual who is the subject of an active criminal investigation.”³ Clarifying that this requirement applies whenever law enforcement seeks to access ALPR data showing *anyone’s* historical location information—not just those who are being monitored by law enforcement in an active criminal investigation—would strengthen the statute and avoid ambiguity about when judicial approval is required.

Taken together, these reforms would strengthen Minnesota’s existing protections and reinforce the principle that powerful surveillance technologies must come with clear limits. They shorten the time the government may store sensitive location data, prevent the quiet export of that data into nationwide surveillance networks, and ensure that the public can meaningfully evaluate how these systems are used.

Minnesota has long been a national leader in crafting thoughtful guardrails for emerging surveillance technologies. House Bill 4205 continues that tradition by ensuring that ALPR systems remain a narrowly focused investigative tool rather than a mechanism for broad, long-term monitoring of the public. For those reasons, IJ respectfully urges the Committee to support the legislation and to continue strengthening the protections it provides for the privacy and constitutional rights of Minnesotans.

Sincerely,

Meagan Forbes
Institute for Justice
mforbes@ij.org
www.ij.org

³ Minn. Stat. § 13.824, subd. 2(d) (2024).

I, Kelsey McFarlane, declare as follows:

1. I am a resident of Afton in Washington County, Minnesota. I have lived there for ten years.
2. I am 37 years old.
3. I work as a Physician Assistant.
4. I make the following declaration based on personal knowledge.
5. I have been concerned about the actions of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agents (together, “federal agents”) in my community and across the state.
6. I have observed federal agents coming and going from the Residence Inn and Courtyard by Marriott Hotels in Woodbury (collectively, “Marriott Hotels”) since early January 2026.
7. On February 13, 2026, I had seen a suggestion in a community message group suggesting someone check to see if there were fewer vehicles belonging to federal agents parked at the Marriott Hotels now that the federal government announced that operation Metro Surge would be ending.
8. I am often driving in between patient visits, and I had an errand nearby. At or around 10:25 a.m., I drove through the parking lot of the Marriot Hotels off of Radio Drive in Woodbury to document any vehicles I saw that belonged to federal agents.
9. When I arrived, I saw two white SUVs parked next to each other, talking through the windows. One was a white Jeep Wagoneer with California license plates with the

number 9MIR172, it also had a disability placard. The other SUV was a white GMC Suburban with a Minnesota license plate SJK067. I drove around, pulled down another lane, and parked my car. I parked two rows away from the vehicles in an area behind them, so I could document their license plates.

10. The white Jeep Wagoneer then backed up and pulled into the spot next to the passenger side of my car. In the car there were three individuals dressed in plain clothes in a variety of tan and greens that I associate with military style clothing. They were unmasked and were not wearing tactical gear like vests.
11. I asked them if they would be leaving soon. They told me I needed to leave because the area around the hotel was not public and was occupied by the government and I was not allowed to be there.
12. I asked who they were, and in response they began berating me and speaking in harsh aggressive tones. They called me a bitch and told me to “get the fuck out.”
13. At one point an agent said, “you guys are so annoying with your whistles.”
14. A female agent got out of the car and approached my passenger side window to take my photo. At some point she walked behind my car, I assume to photograph my license plate.
15. She looked in my car and saw my child’s empty car seat and told me that I should be supporting them if I was a mother because they were picking up a lot of child molesters.
16. The other white SUV backed up and pulled along my driver’s side, so the vehicles were on both sides of me. I got scared that I was surrounded.

17. I decided to drive away from the interaction and went to my next destination. When I got out of my car, I found that someone had put stickers on the back of my car that read, “Trump 2028.” I assume the female agent who walked behind my car had put them there.
18. I made a report with the Woodbury Police concerning the interaction, and expressed concerns that they had gotten my address from my license plates. The police told me I could call 911 if there was anyone in my neighborhood that wasn’t supposed to be there.
19. Later that evening at or around 7:30 p.m., I looked out from my house and saw a car parked at the end of my driveway with its lights on. I live at the end of a very long driveway coming off of a cul-de-sac.
20. I watched as multiple cars began to park around my cul-de-sac.
21. I didn’t know what was happening, and I was terrified, believing that federal agents had potentially gathered outside my home. I have two young kids, and I was worried what would happen. I called 911 as the police recommended.
22. Meanwhile, I opened my local chats and discovered that someone claiming to be the “landlord” at my address had made a report that ICE was active at my address and requested that observers come and document the interaction. This was a false report.
23. The vehicles that had gathered were observers not federal agents.
24. I explained to the observers that there were no federal agents present and the observers left. I also explained to the police what had happened when they appeared in response to my 911 call.

25. I believe that the ICE agents I had interacted with earlier used my license plate information to find my address and make a false report with the intention of sending observers to my house in an attempt to scare me after I observed them earlier that day.
26. When all the vehicles showed up it scared all of us including my husband and kids, we didn't know if they were federal agents, and if so what they might do.
27. Afterwards, I have been worried that federal agents may show up at my house or retaliate in some way. My husband ordered security cameras after the interaction so we can observe vehicles outside our driveway or anyone who approaches our home.
28. After the interaction, I decided not to go back to the Marriott Hotels' parking lot, but I have continued to check vehicles with out of state plates as I go about my daily business. I did not think that simply documenting a license plate would result in agents approaching my vehicle, talking aggressively to me, putting Trump stickers on my car, and making false reports of ICE activity at my house.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed on March 16, 2026 in Washington County, Minnesota.



Kelsey McFarlane