

Los Angeles Speed Safety System Engagement Summary Report

January 2026

Introduction & Overview

LADOT and the project team conducted an extensive stakeholder engagement process to ensure that the Los Angeles Speed Safety System Program design received critical feedback from relevant organizations in Los Angeles. Organizations collaborating with LADOT on this effort represented a wide variety of communities and topic areas, each poised to ensure that the pilot program thoughtfully considered the needs and concerns of their constituents. This document outlines three key areas related to this process:

- (1) The engagement development process, including what is required by legislation, what the stakeholder selection process entailed, and expectation of stakeholders.
- (2) The engagement activities completed as a part of receiving feedback on the program.
- (3) Key takeaways from engagement events and how they informed the development of the Use Policy and Impact Report

Engagement Development Processes

Engagement Requirements

The legislation authorizing this pilot program, Assembly Bill No.645 was codified in Article 3 of the California Vehicle Code (commencing with Section 22425), includes directives to conduct a stakeholder engagement process to collaborate with local organizations that represent the interests of racial equity, privacy protections, and economic justice. The stakeholder engagement process is intended to ensure that the Speed Safety System Draft Use Policy and Draft Impact Report are informed by meaningful input from local stakeholders.

The governing body of the designated jurisdiction shall consult and work collaboratively with relevant local stakeholder organizations, including racial equity, privacy protection, and economic justice groups, in developing the Speed Safety System Use Policy and Speed Safety System Impact Report.

AB 645, Section 22425 (6)(h)(3)

Selection Process

The project team identified stakeholders for this pilot program following the requirements set out in CVC 22425 as well as additional criteria to ensure substantial opportunities for public input. To be considered a candidate for the stakeholder engagement program, organizations had to represent at least one of the following categories:

ATTACHMENT C

- **Racial Equity:** Groups that represent or advocate for communities of color, immigrant populations, or historically marginalized communities (required by CVC 22425).
- **Privacy Protection:** Organizations and experts focused on data security, surveillance oversight, and digital civil liberties (required by CVC 22425).
- **Economic Justice:** Groups representing low-income communities, tenants, workers, or organizations advocating for affordability and equitable access to services (required by CVC 22425).
- **Geographic Representation:** Organizations based in and/or representing residents of neighborhoods located in or adjacent to Safety Corridors.

Through collaborative brainstorming and research, the consultant team, working with LADOT, identified fifty-eight candidate stakeholder organizations using these criteria. The project team then assessed each organization on four factors, detailed in **Table 1**. To align with the format of expected engagement activities, the team set a goal of selecting seven to ten organizations for this process. The scoring process placed greater emphasis on organizations that serve the greater LA area than those who focused on a specific area or neighborhood given the targeted size of the stakeholder group and the citywide nature of the program.

ATTACHMENT C

Table 1: Criteria, descriptions, and scoring involved in selecting stakeholder organizations for engagement.

Criterion	Description	Scoring Basis
CVC 22425 Categories Represented	Organization's mission aligns with one or more of the categories specified in CVC 22425: racial equity, privacy, economic justice	Number of categories the organization is aligned with
Interest & Influence	Organization is known advocate for or opposed to installation of automated safety enforcement (ASE) and/or organization mission is safety-related	Interest in ASE and/or transportation safety
Trust & Relationship	Organization has worked collaboratively and thoughtfully with LADOT or team members on past projects	Whether the organization had successfully collaborated with LADOT on previous projects
Geographic Diversity	Organization covers the greater Los Angeles area and/or mission aligns with at least one relevant key category	Geographic coverage and mission alignment in at least one category.

After scoring, the project team recruited the top thirteen organizations, representing all the categories outlined in CVC 22425. Most of the recruited organizations had a citywide reach with three focusing on South LA and one in the San Fernando Valley. Of the recruited organizations, seven moved forward with participating in this effort and were provided with direct compensation for their time toward the program.

After recruiting these seven organizations, the project team identified a gap in representation for the privacy category, as required by CVC 22425. To address this gap, the project team conducted additional outreach to several privacy-focused organizations to ensure this topic area received appropriate representation in the stakeholder feedback. In response to the additional outreach, representatives of the LA County Public Defenders' Office and the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) Luskin School of Public Affairs agreed to provide feedback on the draft Use Policy and Impact Report. As these institutions are public agencies, no compensation for their time was provided.

The full list of recruited and participating organizations is provided in the Appendix.

ATTACHMENT C

Engagement Expectations

The project team communicated the following roles and responsibilities to stakeholders:

- **Represent the priorities and concerns** of the organization and the community therein.
- **Closely review the project background packet, the draft Use Policy Report, and the draft Impact Report.** The project team requested thoughtful written and verbal feedback.
- **Attend three engagement meetings in November 2025, focused on the Use Policy, Impact Report, and other key project components.** Each meeting was scheduled for 1.5 hours and was available in both virtual and in-person formats.
- **Share information on the Speed Safety System pilot program** within their organization and broader community.

Engagement Activities

LADOT and the project team asked the original seven participating stakeholders to attend engagement events and provide feedback on key program documents. This section describes the three engagement meetings facilitated by the project team, including the materials reviewed and feedback requested.

Kickoff Meeting – Background and Introduction

The project team launched the engagement process with a virtual kickoff meeting on November 6th, 2025, at 6 PM. The purpose of the meeting was to provide information on several items:

- An introduction to the program’s goals, schedule, and key milestones
- An overview of the details and requirements in CVC 22425
- A detailed explanation of stakeholder engagement expectations
- An opportunity for stakeholders to share concerns and initial feedback on the program and engagement process

Engagement Meetings

Kickoff Meeting

November 6, 2025, 6 PM (Virtual)

Draft Use Policy Meetings

November 11, 2025, 6 PM (Virtual)

November 13, 2025, 3:30 PM

(In-person)

Draft Impact Report Meetings

November 18, 2025, 6 PM (Virtual)

November 20, 2025, 3:30 PM (Virtual)

ATTACHMENT C

Draft Use Policy

The project team held two meetings after the kickoff to review and gather feedback on the draft Use Policy. The meetings were held virtually on November 11, 2025, at 6 PM and in-person on November 13, 2025, at 3:30 PM at LADOT headquarters. These meetings aimed to:

- Review the key elements of the Use Policy
- Collect questions, concerns, and comments on the Use Policy
- Provide additional details on the privacy, equity, and economic justice implications of this project
- Clarify expectations for stakeholders' comprehensive review of the Use Policy

The project team requested stakeholders feedback on the draft Use Policy to LADOT by December 10, 2025.

Draft Impact Report

The final two engagement meetings focused on presenting the draft Impact Report and requesting feedback. The project team conducted these virtual meetings on November 18, 2025, at 6 PM and November 20, 2025, at 3:30 PM. During these sessions, the project team:

- Reviewed key elements of the drafted Impact Report
- Gathered stakeholder questions, concerns, and comments on the Impact Report
- Provided a status update on the development of the Speed Safety Systems Program
- Clarified expectations for stakeholders' comprehensive review of the Impact Report

The project team requested stakeholders' feedback on the draft Impact Report by December 12, 2025.

Key Themes & Takeaways

The project team collected feedback from stakeholder engagement and used it to inform the project's Use Policy and Impact Report. The following sections provide an overview of the key themes and takeaways that stakeholders brought up during this process and how they were used to make updates to the Use Policy and Impact Report.

ATTACHMENT C

Emphasizing Public Transparency

Stakeholders emphasized the need for robust public communication and opportunities for public input throughout the process.

- Stakeholders noted that the public should know why and where cameras are being placed and should be able to weigh in on the selection process. This includes the ability to contest or request a camera installation. Likewise, clear communication about why the methodology prioritizes some sites over others is important if community-requested locations are not selected as pilot locations. LADOT must build trust in the scoring process used for site selection.
- All public facing information should be up to date, easy to navigate, and clearly written. Communications should be kept simple, with minimal use of industry jargon. All public facing information should be translated into multiple languages, including Spanish and other widely spoken languages in Los Angeles.
- The public information campaign about the program should be robust. LADOT should supplement traditional outreach methods (e.g., mailers) with workshops, news and social media announcements, and connections with community organizations to spread the word.
- After completing contract negotiations, LADOT should publicly share all costs associated with the program.

Revisions based on feedback:

- Use Policy:
 - o The project team revised the Use Policy by removing technical jargon and adding footnotes to enhance clarity.
- Impact Report:
 - o In response to stakeholder concerns about specific locations , LADOT and the consultant team revised the initial scoring and weighting method used to prioritize eligible roadway segments for installation of speed safety systems. The project team presented the revised scoring and weighting scheme to the stakeholders that attended the November 20 meeting and informed other stakeholders of this change through follow-up communications. The project team extended the deadline for submitting written comments to accommodate the revised analysis and engage with Council District offices.
 - o The project team added a more detailed description of the Vehicle Enhanced Network (VEN) to the table summarizing the revised scoring and weighting scheme.

ATTACHMENT C

- o Based on stakeholder feedback, the project team revised the site selection process. Each Council District office was asked to select seven locations from among the highest-ranked fourteen locations within each District, with the remaining locations to be selected by the LADOT Vision Zero team in consultation with District engineers.

Address Equity & Privacy Concerns

Stakeholders emphasized the importance of clearly communicating how the program protects individual privacy, especially in light of public concerns around over-policing and government monitoring.

Stakeholders emphasized that the public should feel secure that:

- LADOT must assure the public that collected data is strictly limited to the confines of the program and secure. Information may not be shared with other government agencies, except under specific legal circumstances that should be clearly defined and shared.
- The selected vendor must have protocols, training, and other safeguards in place to protect collected information as well as capacity to make quick repairs should anything happen to the equipment to jeopardize data collection.
- Messaging should emphasize that the information gathered is limited, not targeted toward any group or neighborhood, and that the program is safety focused, rather than punitive in design.
- LADOT's site selection methodology must avoid disproportionate impacts on disinvested populations. Cameras should not be installed on predominantly low income or disadvantaged areas in ways that may reinforce inequality. The data driven results should have these considerations baked into the process in a way that communities can easily understand. Per CVC 22425, the Impact Report must clearly explain any over representation of deployment in low-income neighborhoods.

Revisions based on feedback:

- Use Policy:
 - o Although the Use Policy was not revised, the project team incorporated this input into the planning for the public education campaign.
- Impact Report:
 - o The revised Use Policy and Impact Report now better reflect stakeholder concerns about data privacy. LADOT emphasized that the technology limits data collection to speed enforcement and includes safeguards to protect individual's rights and/or liberties.
 - o The Impact Report includes more information on program administration, so the public can understand how violations are processed and reviewed.

ATTACHMENT C

- o The project team revised the section of the Impact Report that explains the location selection process.

Appeals

Stakeholders emphasized that individuals receiving citations must clearly understand that the penalties are civil rather than criminal, and must be informed of their rights and responsibilities, including how to appeal. Stakeholders highlighted that the appeals process should be clear, easy to follow, and respect the time and capacity of the community. The appeals system must prioritize fairness and accessibility, providing assurance that unjust penalties will be reviewed and addressed appropriately.

- Stakeholders suggested extending appeal timelines to allow individuals sufficient time to complete all required steps.

Revisions based on feedback:

- Use Policy:
 - o Clarified the description of the appeals process and added detail regarding the initial review and request for administrative hearings.
- Impact Report:
 - o The Impact Report now refers readers to the Use Policy for additional detail on the appeals process.

Continuous Improvement & Oversight

Stakeholders noted that there should be clearly communicated mechanisms to improve the program and address challenges as they arise.

- Stakeholders recommended establishing an external committee to provide oversight and monitoring over the program. Stakeholders also suggested the use of a semi-annual audit of the program.
- LADOT should clearly detail the safeguards designed to detect and address misuse of Program data. For example, LADOT should evaluate program elements including training, deadlines, and information systems.
- Stakeholders stressed that LADOT must maintain sufficient staffing and resources to effectively manage the program and preserve public trust.
- LADOT should include educational materials with all warnings and citations, explaining the program's goals, use of revenue, and general information about progress toward Vision Zero in Los Angeles.

ATTACHMENT C

- Stakeholders recommended that initial program revenue be dedicated to interventions at locations hosting cameras. Following this, LADOT should publicize the process used to identify future locations.

Revisions based on feedback:

- Use Policy:
 - o The Use Policy now includes a provision for the public to raise concerns about program operations and a policy to regularly conduct independent, third-party audits to assess compliance with the Use Policy.
- Impact Report:
 - o The project team did not revise the Impact Report but documented this input to inform future public education efforts.

ATTACHMENT C

Appendix

Stakeholder Organizations

Organization	Location /Reach	Council District	Key Categories	Participated
ACLU SoCal	Southern California	All	Privacy Racial Equity Advocacy	No
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California	Southern California	All	Racial Equity	No
Catalyst California	California	All	Racial Equity	No
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights	Greater LA	All	Racial Equity	No
Community Coalition	South LA	8, 9, 10	Racial Equity Economic Justice	No
Electronic Frontier Foundation	Greater LA	All	Privacy	No
Human Rights Watch	Greater LA	All	Privacy	No
LA County Public Defender's Office	LA County	All	Privacy	Yes
Los Angeles Walks	Greater LA	All	Safety Advocacy	Yes
Pacoima Beautiful	Pacoima	7	Economic Justice Safety	Yes
People for Mobility Justice	Greater LA	All	Racial Equity Economic Justice	No
Prevention Institute	Greater LA	All	Racial Equity	No
Privacy Rights Clearinghouse	Greater LA	All	Privacy	No

ATTACHMENT C

Organization	Location /Reach	Council District	Key Categories	Participated
Streets Are For Everyone (SAFE)	Greater LA	All	Safety Advocacy	Yes
SAFE Families	Greater LA	All	Safety Advocacy	Yes
Streets for All	Greater LA	All	Racial Equity Economic Justice	Yes
TRUST South LA	South Central	9	Economic Justice Safety	Yes
UCLA Center for Policing Equity	Greater LA	All	Privacy Racial Equity	No
UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies	Greater LA	All	Safety Advocacy	No
UCLA Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies	Greater LA	All	Economic Justice Racial Equity	Yes
Vera Institute of Justice	Greater LA	All	Racial Equity	No