Date of Hearing: June 22, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
Lori D. Wilson, Chair
SB 1279 (Gonzalez) – As Amended April 15, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 33-6

SUBJECT: City of Long Beach Pacific Coast Highway speed safety system pilot program

SUMMARY: Establishes a speed safety system pilot program that uses up to five cameras until January 1, 2032, on the Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) in the City of Long Beach. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Allows up to five cameras on the highway, and requires enhanced signage to alert drivers of their speed, the speed limit, and the presence of photo enforcement.

2) Allows the program to operate for five years or until January 1, 2032, whichever is earlier.

3) Requires the City of Long Beach to develop uniform guidelines on the screening and issuance of notices of violation and storage of confidential information.

4) Requires the city to administer a public information campaign which identifies the location of the cameras and the timeframe when they will be in use.

5) Allows the program to only issue warning notices during the first 60 days of enforcement, additionally a vehicle's first violation for traveling 11 to 15 miles per hour (mph) over the speed limit shall be a warning notice.

6) Specifies privacy provisions related to the storage and usage of violation records.

7) Provides for the following fines to the owner of the registered vehicle:

    i. $50 for a speed violation from 11 to 15 mph over the posted speed limit.

    ii. $100 for a speed violation from 16 to 25 mph over the posted speed limit;

    iii. $200 for a speed violation of 26 mph or more over the posted speed limit; and,

    iv. $500 for traveling at a speed of 100 mph or greater.

8) The fine is a civil penalty and shall not result in a loss of the driving privilege or in a violation point being assessed against the violator.

9) Requires indigent individuals be offered community service in lieu of the fine, or the fine is reduced by 80%. The fine is reduced by 50% for individuals up to 250% above the federal poverty level.

10) Establishes a process where the registered owner can request a review of the fine by the issuing agency and a hearing on the fine by the issuing agency.

11) Establishes that the photos and administrative records shall be confidential, and that public agencies shall use and allow access to these records only for the purposes of the automated speed enforcement system. Limits on how long records can be retained are established and disclosures to others prohibited.

12) Provides that a person will not be subject to a civil violation if there is proof the vehicle was being used by someone sharing their vehicle in a personal vehicle sharing program or if proof of a copy of a police report indicating the vehicle had been stolen at the time of the violation, in addition to the existing provision for the owner of a rental car.

13) Requires, to the extent feasible, for the speed safety system camera to be angled and focused so as to only capture photographs of speeding violations and not capture identifying images of other drivers, vehicles, or pedestrians.

14) Requires the revenue raised by speed cameras to first be spent on implementing the program and then be spent on traffic-calming measures. Funds not spent within three years are required to be sent to the Active Transportation Program (ATP).

15) Establishes an appeals process for ticketed drivers.

16) Requires the city to report to the Legislature an evaluation of the speed safety system.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Establishes a speed safety system pilot program in the cities of Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Jose, Oakland, Glendale, and San Francisco with the following provisions:

    a) The number of cameras is capped and the trial is limited to five years.

    b) The program must be approved by the local governing body and is subject to substantial public input, notice and warnings.

    c) Violations are a civil penalty with specified fines which may be lowered depending on income.

    d) Fine revenue pays for the operation of the pilot with any extra revenues dedicated to traffic calming measures.

    e) An appeals process and privacy protections are established.

    f) The local governing body must report to the Legislature on the impact of the program. (Vehicle Code Section (VEH) 22425)

2) Establishes a speed safety system pilot program in the City of Malibu which allows for up to five cameras on PCH, requires enhanced signage to alert drivers of their speed, the speed limit, and the presence of video enforcement, and requires the City of Malibu to continue

funding additional patrols by the California Highway Patrol (CHP). The program can operate for five years or until January 1, 2032, whichever is earlier (VEH 22435).

3) Establishes a speed safety system pilot program in work zones on state highways administered by the Department of Transportation (Caltrans). (VEH 22445)

FISCAL EFFECT: According to Senate Appropriations Committee:

- Unknown court workload cost pressures on superior courts to hear and adjudicate appeals of hearing officer determinations that are brought under the provisions of this bill. These costs would be partially offset by the $25 fees for filing appeals. See Staff Comments. (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund).

- Unknown, significant local costs for the City of Long Beach to establish and administer additional automated speed enforcement systems on the PCH, including adopting and amending specified policies and guidelines prior to implementing a program, conducting a public information campaign, identifying sites, installing signage and infrastructure, adjudicating violations, establishing a diversion program for indigent violation recipients, and evaluating and reporting the systems' impacts. Staff notes that any costs incurred by the City of Long Beach to establish and administer an expanded automated speed enforcement system would not be state-reimbursable because those costs would be attributable to a discretionary action, rather than a state mandated local program. In addition, any local costs are likely to be fully offset by revenue gains from civil penalties paid by violators of speed laws in enforcement zones. (local funds)

COMMENTS: According to the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), from 2005-14, crashes in which a law enforcement officer indicated a vehicle's speed was a factor resulting in 112,580 fatalities, representing 31% of all traffic fatalities. NTSB notes that speeding increases the risk of a crash and the severity of injuries.

AB 645 (Friedman), Chapter 808, Statutes of 2023 established a speed safety system program in California and authorized the cities of Los Angeles, San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland, Long Beach and Glendale to operate a limited number of speed safety systems for five years, or until January 1, 2032, whichever is sooner. AB 645 explicitly prohibited cities from operating cameras on roads where the California Highway Patrol (CHP) had jurisdiction, and limited camera placement to the city's high injury networks, school zones and streets with a high number of calls for motor vehicle exhibitions of speed and speed contests. SB 1297 (Allen), Chapter 631, Statutes of 2024 created a separate pilot program for the city of Malibu to operate five speed safety systems on the Pacific Coast Highway. AB 289 (Haney) chapter 684**,** Statutes of 2025 authorized Caltrans to implement a 35-camera pilot program in work zones.

Status of Speed Safety System Pilot Programs in California. As of the writing of this analysis, only San Francisco and Oakland are piloting speed cameras. The City of Long Beach has already selected its camera locations.

According to San Franscisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) there has been an 80% drop in the share of drivers traveling 10 mph or more above the posted speed limit after one year of operations. There are roughly 40,000 fewer cases of speeding every day across camera locations. Only 2% of all drivers are now exceeding the posted speed limit by 10 mph or more in areas where speed cameras are present. Before the cameras were installed, the number was 11%

on average. About two-thirds of drivers (65%) who have received a warning or citation did not get another ticket, and 82% of drivers have received two or fewer tickets. In total, the 33 cameras operated by SFMTA issued 163,900 citations and over 553,600 warnings in the first year.

Oakland activated its camera pilot program on January 14, 2026. Between March 15 and April 25, Oakland's cameras issued 82,000 citations and 69,000 warnings. Notably, a single camera location accounted for 8,127 of those tickets.

Speed Safety Systems effectiveness elsewhere. According to The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), a 2010 review of 28 studies of automated speed enforcement (ASE) in the United States, Canada, Europe, Australia, and New Zealand found a lower number of crashes after ASE implementation. These studies reported reductions of 8% to 49% for all crashes and reductions of 11% to 44% for crashes causing serious injuries or fatalities.

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) "Crash-based evaluations from the United States and Canada have also reported safety benefits from speed safety cameras programs in urban areas. Shin et al. (2009) examined effects of a fixed camera enforcement program applied to a 6.5-mile urban freeway section through Scottsdale, Arizona. The speed limit on the enforced freeway was 65 mph; the enforcement trigger was set to 76 mph. Total *target* (off-peak/free-flow) crashes were reduced by an estimated 44 to 54%, injury crashes by 28 to 48%, and property damage only crashes by 46 to 56% during the 9-month program period."

PCH- Long Beach. PCH spans approximately 8.5 miles. Using the Transportation Injury Mapping system, which may have delayed reporting for 2024 and 2025, a total of 29 fatal injuries occurred on PCH, 109 severe injuries, and 1,005 other injuries. 192, or 17%, of the crashes were due to unsafe speed.

According to the author, "For the last two years, six cities throughout California, including Long Beach, have been rolling out a speed camera pilot program, placing speed cameras in areas like high-injury intersections and streets with elevated crash rates. These speed cameras are already making streets safer – since activating speed cameras, San Francisco has seen a 72% decrease in speeding. Unfortunately, current law regulating the pilot program does not allow Long Beach to place speed cameras along the City's portion of Pacific Coast Highway (PCH), where over 20% of the City's speeding-related fatalities occur.

"While the PCH only accounts for 8 miles of Long Beach's 217 miles of high-capacity roadway, it accounts for 39 of its 192 crash fatalities since 2020. That means that 20% of the City's crash fatalities have occurred on less than 1% of its roads. SB 1279 will give the City the authority it needs to place speed cameras along the PCH and make this road safer for the community."

The city of Long Beach, writing in support of this bill, argues "AB 645 authorized a limited pilot program for use of automated speed safety systems in six California cities, including the City of Long Beach, to address excessive speeding on high-injury corridors. However, AB 645 explicitly prohibits speed safety system devices from being operated on any California state routes, including PCH. SB 1279 addresses this limitation by allowing up to 5 speed safety systems along the limited section of PCH within the City's limits.

"The additional speed safety systems authorized by SB 1279 will be subject to the same privacy and equity considerations established by AB 645. The system is designed to capture only the rear

license plate of the violating vehicle and will not record the faces of drivers, passengers, or bystanders. No individual citation information will be shared with the Long Beach Police Department or other enforcement agencies.

"Automated enforcement systems like those authorized by AB 645 are a critical tool in advancing local Safe Streets and Vision Zero goals, as speed is the most significant factor in determining the severity of a crash. Data from the National Traffic Speeds Survey, administered by the U.S. Department of Transpiration, shows that at 20 miles per hour (MPH), there is only a 13% likelihood of a pedestrian fatality or severe injury, compared to 40% at 30 MPH and 73% at 40 MPH. By encouraging reduced speeds, automated enforcement directly lowers the risk of death and life-altering injuries, particularly for pedestrians and bicyclists who are most vulnerable and prevalent on this highly urbanized segment of the highway. Automated speed enforcement systems also utilize warning and speed feedback signage to focus on prevention rather than punishment, creating safer streets for all users, and ensuring more consistent compliance with speed limits than traditional enforcement methods alone.

"This approach also allows valuable law enforcement resources to be dedicated to higher-priority safety needs, while providing an equitable and transparent alternative to discretionary traffic stops."

The National Motorist Association, *writing in opposition to this bill*, argues "The Speed Ticketing Camera Pilot Program authorized under AB-645 resulted from extensive negotiations over multiple legislative sessions. The agreement set forth a maximum number of six participant cities, each allotted a specific number of camera installations. Numerous stakeholder groups negotiated in good faith with the bill's author, Assemblymember Friedman, to determine the number of cities and cameras authorized to participate in the pilot program. Parties to these negotiations relied on the terms of these agreements when deciding how to expend their efforts during the legislative process. Before the pilot program even began, legislators approved an expansion of the pilot program to PCH in Malibu. Now legislators are attempting to add another city to the pilot program. One may ask, "What is the harm of adding an additional city at this time?" The answer is simple – agreements negotiated in good faith must be honored."

Committee concerns. This bill is modeled after SB 1297 (Allen), which authorized five speed safety systems on PCH in Malibu. However, the characteristics of this eight mile stretch of PCH in Long Beach are more akin city streets and the speed limit is primarily 35 mph. SB 1297 was tailored to a 21-mile stretch of highway more akin to a freeway, while AB 645 was geared towards city streets.

By modeling this bill after SB 1297 instead of AB 645, this bill lacks several of the restrictions that were placed on cities. AB 645 placed time restrictions on when school zone speed limits could be enforced and required flashing beacons to indicate the school zone speed limit was in effect. This bill lacks those considerations. AB 645 required cameras to be placed in areas that were part of a city's high injury network, school zones or areas with a high concentration of calls related to speed contests and motor vehicles exhibition of speed. This bill places no such restrictions. AB 645 permitted Long Beach to use 18 cameras throughout the entire city. This bill would permit Long Beach to concentrate five additional cameras on one 8.5 mile stretch of road, effectively permitting a speed camera every 1.5 miles (compared to ever 4.2 miles on PCH in Malibu).

Long Beach was unable to place any of its 18 cameras on PCH because of a provision of AB 645 that restricted the use of cameras on state routes.

Long Beach has not even begun to test the speed cameras authorized by AB 645. The Legislature should wait for data to come back on the existing pilot programs before expanding the use of cameras in a jurisdiction already authorized to use speed cameras.

At the same time, the committee recognizes that PCH poses unique challenges to the city of Long Beach. The committee recommends modifying the pilot program established by AB 645 to permit Long Beach to place cameras on PCH instead of creating an entirely separate pilot program within a city that is already authorized to pilot speed cameras. In addition, the committee recommends allowing Long Beach to have two additional cameras for PCH, in line with the density of cameras permitted under the Malibu pilot program.

Therefore, the committee recommends the following amendment:

Strike sections 2-4 of the bill and replace with the following:

VEH 22425 (e)**(1)** A speed safety system shall not be operated on any California state route, as defined in Section 231 of the Streets and Highways Code, including all freeways and expressways, United States highways, interstate highways, or any public road in unincorporated areas of any county where the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol has full responsibility and primary jurisdiction for the administration and enforcement of the laws, and for the investigation of traffic accidents, pursuant to Section 2400.

(e)(2) Notwithstanding (e)(1), the City of Long Beach may use speed safety systems on the Pacific Coast Highway.

(b)(3) In addition to the number of speed safety systems permitted under (b)(2), the city of Long Beach may have two additional speed safety systems on Pacific Coast Highway.

Previous legislation. AB 289 (Haney) Chapter 684, Statutes of 2025), authorized Caltrans to establish a five-year work zone speed safety pilot program to enforce speeding violations in highway maintenance and construction work zones using speed safety systems.

SB 1297 (Allen) Chapter 631, Statutes of 2024, authorized the City of Malibu to establish a speed safety system pilot program of up to five cameras on PCH.

AB 645 (Friedman) Chapter 808, Statutes of 2023, established a speed safety system pilot program in six specified cities.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah
Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Auto Club of Southern California
Bike Long Beach
California Bicycle Coalition
Car-Lite Long Beach

City of Long Beach
City of Signal Hill
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
Streets are for Everyone (SAFE) (ORG)
Streets for All (UNREG)

Opposition

National Motorists Association

Analysis Prepared by: David Sforza / TRANS. / (916) 319-2093