

Communication from Public

Name: Ernesto

Date Submitted: 02/12/2026 02:39 AM

Council File No: 23-1168

Comments for Public Posting: I'm writing as a resident of Los Angeles County, California, to submit formal opposition to the proposed implementation of the Speed Safety System Pilot Program under Assembly Bill 645 (AB 645). While I recognize the City's commitment to improving traffic safety and reducing serious injuries and fatalities, I believe this automated enforcement approach raises significant concerns regarding effectiveness, equity, privacy, evidentiary reliability, and long-term fiscal implications. These issues warrant careful reconsideration before proceeding with deployment. Automated enforcement systems have historically demonstrated limited long-term impact on driver behavior without complementary engineering and education measures. Concerns also exist about disproportionate impacts on lower-income communities, potential privacy implications from widespread surveillance, and the perception that the program prioritizes revenue generation over holistic safety solutions. I respectfully urge the City Council and LADOT to:

- Prioritize alternative, evidence-based traffic calming strategies, such as roadway redesign, enhanced signage, increased visible police enforcement in high-risk areas, and targeted community safety education programs.
- Conduct a more comprehensive evaluation of potential legal and privacy concerns posed by such a surveillance system
- Extend robust public engagement beyond the current review period to ensure diverse input, particularly from those who may be most affected by citations.

Los Angeles residents deserve traffic safety measures that are equitable, legally sound, and demonstrably effective. I appreciate your consideration of these concerns and would welcome any opportunity to discuss them further. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Communication from Public

Name: Carlo Lim
Date Submitted: 02/12/2026 07:39 AM
Council File No: 23-1168
Comments for Public Posting: These cameras should be illegal. Combined with the slower and slower speed limits being set this is extortion. I understand this comment is pointless and you people will just do whatever you want to us. And you wonder why the people don't trust the government. We did not vote for this! Ban speeding cameras now!

Communication from Public

Name: Navajo

Date Submitted: 02/12/2026 07:40 AM

Council File No: 23-1168

Comments for Public Posting: Normally I do not get involved in activism beyond voting, however, I'm making an exception. The City of Los Angeles is rolling out speed cameras this year, and yesterday the City Council opened a 30-day feedback window. I am taking advantage of this opportunity for encouraging our elected officials to install speed cameras in Griffith Park. Assembly Bill 645 specifically lists "Park Zones" as a priority category. Griffith Park is one of the most visited municipal parks in the country (second only to Central Park)—with significant "vulnerable road users" (kids, hikers, and bikers)—my personal experience in the park is also why I'm reaching out. I have been working in Griffith Park for over 13 years. As a horse wrangler taking horseback riding tours of tourists, Boys and Girls Club youth, kids learning to ride, celebrities, sweethearts going on date night rides to Viva Cantina, and families. I spent every day worrying about being ran over by speeding motorists in Oak Canyon behind the LA Zoo on Griffith Park Dr. To cross the road by the mulch compost site requires going over the road at the top of the hill, which is a blind spot for motorists driving up Oak Canyon from Travel Town. During crossing I would ride my horse farther up the road from the trail crossing to use my horse as a blockade. I cannot tell you how many times cars would fly over the hill and require screeching to a stop realizing the road was filled with horses. Fortunately, the city closed Oak Canyon to vehicle traffic, but this hasn't stopped the speeding. Motorists trying to avoid freeway traffic speed through Zoo Dr and Chrystal Springs Dr. I've seen motorists speed through the crosswalk between the Autry Museum and the LA Zoo, which has stop signs. I've also seen law abiding motorists like myself harassed and tailgated by motorists angry at others for driving the speed limit. After working as a horse wrangler my outdoor adventure skills went to work as the challenge course director at Griffith Park Boys Camp. During our nine weeks of summer camp every week includes a hike. This involves utilizing walking trails along Griffith Park Dr in the evening and at night. The good news is Griffith Park Dr is closed to through traffic and evening hours are not as busy to vehicle traffic. However, every year it is a camp tradition at the end of the summer to hike the entire camp to Mineral Wells at lunchtime for a picnic and flag football game. We have no choice but to use

parts of Griffith Park Dr to hike to our destination since it's impractical to carpool 50+ campers in our two camp minivans to a location under a quarter mile away. I am appalled at how motorists share the road with us, meaning a huge group of children and city employees. For this reason I drive our camp pickup with the emergency roof lights flashing to halt traffic when we cross the road, and to follow behind the group to keep vehicles from speeding passed us as if we're nothing more than a frustrating inconvenience. The only time I'm not harassed for driving the speed limit in the park is when I'm driving the city orange colored camp pick-up. I guess due to it looking like a potential speed enforcement vehicle. I constantly see motorists speed around bicyclists. I've seen parents using the park to teach their children to ride bikes, kids with training wheels, and motorists speed by them veering into the other lane on double yellow lines. Or if there's oncoming traffic the motorists won't even change lanes, and pass by the bikes closer than state law permits. Every time I see kids playing ball on the park lawns I cringe when I see their soccer ball roll into the road and a kid darts out to fetch it. I've been honked at for stopping or driving slow for nearby kids. The playground near the carousel has stop signs that cars ignore and speed passed to get through the intersection before pedestrians with kids begin crossing.

Communication from Public

Name: Daniel Green

Date Submitted: 02/12/2026 08:02 AM

Council File No: 23-1168

Comments for Public Posting: For the LADOT Speed Safety program, please consider adding a camera on Westwood between Wilshire and Santa Monica. As illustrated by the recent tragic crash at 99 Ranch, this is a long straight stretch where I frequently observe drivers trying to beat traffic lights by driving dangerous speeds. Please also consider adding a camera on Hilgard Ave between Sunset and Westholme. And while you're at it, the pedestrian "beg buttons" on the NE and SE sides of Hilgard and Westholme are completely inaccessible to pedestrians with mobility devises, because they are several feet from the sidewalk

Communication from Public

Name: Ian Rose

Date Submitted: 02/12/2026 08:04 AM

Council File No: 23-1168

Comments for Public Posting: I'm strongly in favor of the Speed Safety System pilot, and would love to have **more** speed cameras in my neighborhood. This should also be paired with widespread decreases in speed limits. LA has the climate and geography to be a walking city, but the epidemic of reckless driving make the far more difficult than it should be. Speeding, inattentive drivers are by far the most likely thing to injure me and my family as we live our lives.

Communication from Public

Name: Brian Park
Date Submitted: 02/12/2026 08:42 AM
Council File No: 23-1168

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed installation of speed cameras in Los Angeles. This policy is being presented as a safety measure, but in practice it addresses the wrong problem and risks eroding public trust while placing an unfair burden on everyday residents. Los Angeles has a road design problem, not a “people are trying to drive dangerously” problem. The city has built wide, straight, multi-lane arterials such as La Tijera, Sepulveda, Pico, Olympic, and La Cienega that naturally encourage higher driving speeds. Instead of redesigning these roads to make them safer, the city is choosing to install cameras and fine residents for driving in the manner these roads were engineered to be driven. This approach punishes drivers for responding to road conditions that the city itself created. Speed cameras do nothing to stop the behaviors that actually cause serious crashes in Los Angeles, including distracted driving, DUI, reckless weaving, and street racing. Those issues require visible enforcement, thoughtful road design, and targeted safety improvements. Cameras, by contrast, primarily ticket otherwise safe drivers commuting along major corridors. This will disproportionately impact working people who rely on these routes every day. Los Angeles previously removed red-light cameras after public backlash over fairness and trust. Reintroducing automated enforcement under a different name risks repeating the same mistake. If safety is truly the priority, the city should invest in road redesign, traffic calming measures, and visible policing — solutions proven to reduce speeds and improve safety without turning residents into revenue sources. I urge the Council to reconsider this proposal and focus on strategies that address the root causes of traffic injuries and fatalities rather than relying on automated ticketing that functions more like a commuter tax than a meaningful public safety solution.