



- 5) Prohibits driving a motor vehicle in a bicycle lane on a roadway except to park where parking is permitted, to enter or leave the roadway, or to prepare for a turn. (VEH 21209)
- 6) Prohibits a car from parking on a crosswalk, except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic or in compliance with the directions of a peace officer or official traffic control device. (VEH 22500)

**This bill:**

- 1) Authorizes a local agency to establish an “enhanced curb management system” defined as one or more stationary cameras or sensor devices with designated signage that record images of vehicles for the purpose of enforcing parking violations or automating parking payments.
- 2) Allows the use of an enhanced curb management system in any of the following locations:
  - a) Passenger loading zones.
  - b) Commercial loading zones.
  - c) Smart loading zones.
  - d) Zero-emissions delivery zones.
  - e) Bicycle lanes.
  - f) No stopping zones.
  - g) Crosswalks.
- 3) Requires the governing body of the local agency to adopt a public ordinance or resolution authorizing the use of the enhanced curb management system.
- 4) Authorizes the local agency to automate parking payments by charging vehicles a fee for access to passenger loading zones, commercial loading zones, and smart loading zones.
- 5) Specifies that the local agency must post signage giving clear notice of the enhanced curb management system.

- 6) Allows a notice of parking violation to be served by mail without physical attachment to the vehicle if the violation is detected by an enhanced curb management system.
- 7) Requires the image data from a violation to be reviewed and approved by a peace officer or person authorized to enforce parking laws and requires that the notice of parking violation be mailed to the registered owner of the vehicle no later than 15 calendar days after the date of the violation. The notice must include copies of the image data and information on how to view any image data, the violation details, and the procedure to pay or contest the citation.
- 8) Requires a local agency using the system to conduct a public information campaign for at least 60 days before issuing citations, only issue warning notices for the first 60 days of operation, and report periodically to the Legislature on the system's impact.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) *Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, "Curb space is one of the most valuable and contested pieces of public right-of-way in California's cities. However, local governments currently lack adequate authority and tools to manage modern curb activity effectively. SB 1292 would allow cities to adopt ordinances to help more effectively manage passenger and commercial curb activity in high demand locations."
- 2) *Automated parking enforcement.* Automated parking enforcement utilizes cameras to charge for parking and cite vehicles for parking violations. In California, automated parking technology is primarily used to enforce no-parking requirements in transit-only lanes, transit stops, and bike lanes. Originally, AB 101 (Ma, Chapter 377, Statutes of 2007) authorized San Francisco to establish a pilot program for video enforcement of parking violations in transit-only traffic lanes which expired January 1, 2012. The sunset was initially extended and then removed in 2015. AB 917 (Bloom, Chapter 709, Statutes of 2021) authorized all public transit operators to install automated forward-facing parking control devices on transit vehicles for the purposes of enforcing parking violations occurring in transit-only traffic lanes and at transit stops until January 1, 2027. AB 361 (Ward, Chapter 432, Statutes of 2023) authorized local agencies to install automated forward-facing parking control devices on city-owned or district-owned parking enforcement vehicles for the purpose of video imaging of parking violations occurring in bicycle lanes, until January 1, 2030.

SB 1292 would authorize local agencies to establish an “Enhanced Curb Management System” which is a system of one or more stationary cameras or sensor devices with designated signage that record images of vehicles for the purpose of enforcing parking violations or automating parking payments. The cameras would be permitted in passenger loading zones, commercial loading zones, smart loading zones, zero-emissions delivery zones, bicycle lanes, no stopping zones, and crosswalks.

- 3) *Value of parking spaces.* In dense, urban environments, space is one of the most valuable resources. In order to support a transportation system largely designed for cars, cities have traditionally tried to devote a significant portion of space to parking. Given the high value of this space, cities need mechanisms to make sure those spaces are being used effectively. Cities will often meter valuable spaces in order to incentivize shorter trips and discourage congestion. Illegal on-street parking can increase travel time and congestion. Cities use parking tickets today to reduce congestion in downtown areas, ensure local residents have a place to park, enable people to park near retail stores for a limited period of time, prevent individuals from parking in spaces for emergency vehicles, keep open spots for people with disabilities, and ensure that non-electric vehicles are not parking in spots meant for electric vehicles to charge.
- 4) *Parking revenue.* Revenues from parking enforcement are substantial for many jurisdictions and are used to subsidize important city functions. Many cities generate meaningful revenue from parking enforcement. For example, according to the website for the Los Angeles (LA) City Controller Parking Citations Dashboard, the City of LA issued 1,866,244 parking citations in 2025 which generated \$162.7 million in total fines for the city. The average fine amount was \$87 per citation. 1,168 of these citations were loading zone violations and 1,460 were for parking in a crosswalk. The largest share of tickets, 482,908 specifically, were listed as “no parking/street cleaning violations.”

Last year the City of Long Beach raised parking tickets by \$5 to help backfill a budget shortfall. City officials said the increased revenue will cover eight positions on the city’s Clean Teams, sent to scrub, power wash sidewalks and alleys, and clear homeless encampments. The City of Santa Monica announced in August of last year plans to increase parking rates at most city-owned parking facilities. According to the City, the rate changes are expected to increase parking-related revenue by approximately 17%. Currently, parking revenue represents 6.3% of the City’s total revenue. This additional revenue will be used to cover many of the City’s expenses, including supporting

upgrades, repairs, and maintenance of the city’s 42 parking facilities, and advancing investments in Clean Streets and Safe Neighborhoods.<sup>1</sup>

The City of West Hollywood reported issuing 150,215 parking citations in 2025 and identified parking fines as a significant source of revenue for the city.<sup>2</sup> The City of Inglewood created a Residential permit parking program to “protect Inglewood residential neighborhoods from Sports and Entertainment Venue visitors.” Inglewood estimates that the city issued 84,000 citations in 2025, raised over \$6 million in parking revenue that year, and set a target of issuing 86,000 tickets in 2027.

- 5) *Cost burden.* Parking tickets can impose a disproportionate financial burden on low-income individuals, turning minor infractions into cascading economic hardship. When someone is already struggling to afford basic necessities—such as rent, food, utilities, and gas—even a single ticket can be destabilizing, and multiple fines can quickly become unmanageable. A vehicle’s registration can be withheld and a car can be towed due to unpaid parking tickets, which can effectively strip people of their primary means of transportation. For many, a car is not a luxury but a lifeline—essential for getting to work, attending medical appointments, or ensuring personal safety. In this way, aggressive parking enforcement can deepen existing inequalities and trap vulnerable individuals in a cycle of debt and reduced mobility.
- 6) *Loading zones, smart loading zones, and zero-emissions delivery zones.* A loading zone is a specially marked, signed or designated area for the loading or unloading of vehicles. These zones typically fall into two categories: freight/commercial or passenger loading. Loading zones provide a dedicated area for brief stops preventing delivery trucks and service vehicles from double-parking, which can impede the general flow of traffic and block access to businesses. These zones are intentionally short-term in nature, ensuring the space remains available for a continuous cycle of vehicles needing quick access to the curb. The demand for dedicated loading space has grown as people increasingly rely on delivery and ride-hailing services.

Loading zones often compete directly with regular on-street parking spaces. An on-street parking space can generate thousands of dollars annually in revenue, while many loading zones have little or no fee. Some loading zones are reserved for commercial vehicles and are not shared with vehicles providing food deliveries, e-commerce deliveries, or rideshare pick-up and drop-off activities. According to Automotus, the bill’s sponsor, “[a]s e commerce

---

<sup>1</sup> [santamonica.gov - City Council Approves Parking Rate Changes](https://www.santamonica.gov/city-council/2025-03-10-city-council-approves-parking-rate-changes)

<sup>2</sup> [City of West Hollywood ACFR 2025 - Final.pdf](#)

deliveries, on demand services, ride hailing, and autonomous vehicle activity accelerate, our existing curb regulations have not kept pace. Research shows that commercial curb use now represents a majority of total activity in many cities, much of it occurring without compliance or effective oversight.” In an effort to address these challenges and monetize curb space, this bill would allow cities to use automated technology to enforce and charge for loading zone usage.

Under the program established in SB 1292, cities would also be able to use the camera systems to enforce zero-emissions delivery zones. Zero-emissions delivery zones are growing in popularity as a mechanism to incentivize clean delivery vehicles in high-pollution areas. For example, in 2021 the City of Los Angeles adopted an ordinance to create commercial loading zones exclusively available for zero-emission commercial delivery vehicles.<sup>3</sup>

This bill additionally allows cities to establish, monitor, and charge for smart loading zones. Smart loading zone is a broad term that generally refers to the involvement of technology and data analytics in the planning and management of a loading zone. Cities participating in this program would have the flexibility to establish and define smart loading zones as they see fit.

- 7) *Monetizing the curb.* California’s existing automated enforcement authorizations allow local jurisdictions to cite vehicles for violations—such as speeding, running a red light, or parking in a bus lane. In all these cases, the driver of the vehicle has presumably broken the law. In contrast, this bill allows automated enforcement for revenue generation (monetization). Thus, a camera in this program can photograph a license plate and issue a fee (as opposed to a fine) to the vehicle’s owner for pulling up to a curb, even if the driver was always in full compliance with the law. These cameras can be used essentially as automated parking meters. On the one hand, this may offer convenience for parkers who would not need to pay at a meter or on an app and may potentially allow them to only pay for the actual time they spent in the parking space. On the other hand, cities may be financially incentivized to monetize as many curbs as possible. Heavy enforcement may exacerbate affordability challenges many drivers already contend with. Additionally, the cameras do not offer a cash option, which may impact those without access to banking services.

SB 1292 would specifically allow cities to use these cameras to charge vehicles a fee for access to passenger loading zones, commercial loading zones, and smart loading zones. Last year, Philadelphia launched Smart Loading Zones in 22 Center City locations, using Automotus’ (the sponsor of SB 1292)

---

<sup>3</sup> [21-0147 \(CFMS\)](#)

camera-based enforcement technology to manage curb space. Drivers registered for the CurbPass system pay 10 cents per minute (up to one hour) instead of receiving citations. Unregistered vehicles or those exceeding the one-hour limit face a \$51 fine after three minutes, while double parking results in a \$76 ticket.

- 8) *Enforcing “no stopping” and other parking violations.* In addition to loading zone management, this bill would allow cities to use cameras to enforce parking prohibitions in no stopping zones, crosswalks, and bike lanes. No stopping zones are typically used at locations where the prohibition would reduce the risk of collisions or where parking would unduly interfere with the movement of traffic. These include areas with narrow roadway width or restricted visibility at intersections for pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

It is illegal in California to park in a bike lane unless parking is explicitly permitted. This restriction improves safety for bicyclists, though concerns have been raised about rampant noncompliance with the law. California law also prohibits stopping or parking on a crosswalk, except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic or in compliance with the directions of a peace officer or official traffic control device. Although automated enforcement may be able to more aggressively penalize illegal and unsafe parking, it also may not be able to account for some of the nuances in the law, such as a driver parking on a crosswalk at the direction of a peace officer.

- 9) *A ticket in the mail, not on the windshield.* Current law generally requires parking tickets to be physically placed on a vehicle. This bill instead authorizes citations generated from the cameras to be mailed directly to the registered vehicle owner—a process that ensures enforcement without requiring a physical officer to issue a ticket. The bill or citation would have to be mailed within 15 days of the violation. This means that a driver could potentially not know that they received a fine or fee for over two weeks which may erode their ability to collect evidence to contest a ticket. For example, currently, if a driver receives a ticket for parking in a no parking spot, but the sign was fully obscured, they can contest the ticket. The driver would see the ticket on their windshield and presumably collect photographic evidence to submit to the parking authority. Under this bill, a driver would not know they received the ticket until it arrives in the mail, limiting their ability to contest the ticket. Furthermore, as mentioned previously, cars can park in typically illegal places under specific circumstances, such as at the direction of a peace officer. A driver who receives an automated ticket under these conditions may also struggle to contest the violation.

In order to address some of the due process concerns with automated enforcement, this bill requires that before mailing a notice of parking violation, the image data must be reviewed and approved by a peace officer or person authorized to enforce parking laws. The reviewer must verify that the vehicle was in violation of the parking regulation based on the image data.

- 10) *Privacy.* Opponents of automated enforcement broadly raise concerns about increased surveillance within daily life and the erosion of data privacy. Unlike speed cameras, stationary parking cameras typically capture far more than just a specific vehicle's license plate. They shoot images down a street, capturing the curb activity of a section of roadway and sidewalk. Moreover, the sponsor of the bill, Automotus, provides the camera technology and the associated payment and invoicing technology, called CurbPass. Drivers seeking to park in a "managed" parking spot, must register with CurbPass and input their payment information. In order to mitigate data misuse concerns, this bill only allows image data collected by the system to be retained for 60 days after final disposition of a citation, six months after a paid session in a passenger loading zone, commercial loading zone, or smart loading zone, or 30 days after the image was recorded if a citation is not issued or a fee is charged.
- 11) *Amendments.* In order to improve the accountability and oversight of the enhanced curb management system program, the author has agreed to the following amendments to be taken in the Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee:
  - a) *Limit participation in the program to the following six cities: Los Angeles, Santa Monica, West Hollywood, Long Beach, Inglewood, and San Diego.*
  - b) *Sunset the use of the system in 2032, or after five years, whichever is first.*
  - c) *Require the designated jurisdiction that used a system to, on or before March 1 of the fifth year in which the system has been implemented, submit to its governing body and the transportation committees of the Legislature, consistent with Section 9795 of the Government Code, an evaluation of the system in their respective jurisdictions to determine the system's impact on safety, loading zone activity, and the system's economic impact on the communities where the system is utilized. The report shall be made available on the internet website of the jurisdiction and shall include all of the following information:*
    - i. *The number of notices of automated parking fees and the number of violations issued under the program by month and year, the locations*

- where violations occurred, and the number of vehicles with two or more violations in a monthly period and a yearly period.*
- ii. The number of fees paid, violations paid, the number of delinquent violations and fees, and the number of violations contested. For the violations contested, the report shall indicate the number of notices that were dismissed.*
  - iii. The costs associated with implementation and operation of the systems, and revenues collected by each jurisdiction.*
  - iv. A racial and economic equity impact analysis, developed in collaboration with local racial justice and economic equity stakeholder groups. The analysis shall include the amount of fees charged to and the number of notices of violations issued to indigent individuals, individuals of up to 250 percent above the poverty line, and issued to each ZIP Code.*
- d) Specify that the system shall collect only the minimum image data reasonably necessary to identify a vehicle license plate.*
- e) Require to the extent technologically feasible, the system shall automatically obscure or blur portions of an image that do not depict the license plate or vehicle necessary for enforcement.*
- f) Establish that state or local public agency, or any contracted vendor operating the system, shall not cooperate with or provide image data to any individual, agency, or department from another state or to a federal agency, except where disclosure is required by federal law, or a warrant issued by a court of competent jurisdiction.*
- g) Specify that failure to comply with the above data sharing restrictions will result in excess revenue from the program being reverted to the Active Transportation Program, to be allocated by the California Transportation Commission.*
- h) Require a local jurisdiction that wants to opt into the Enhanced Curb Management Program adopt the following elements as part of a resolution or ordinance:*
- i. Enhanced Curb Management Use Policy before entering into an agreement regarding camera-based parking enforcement specifically authorized under SB 1292 (Richardson), purchasing or leasing equipment for an enhanced curb management program or implementing such a program.*

- ii. *The Enhanced Curb Management Use Policy element of that local ordinance or resolution shall set forth the specific purpose of the system, the uses that are authorized, the rules and processes requirement to be followed by employees and contractors of the designated jurisdiction administering the system prior to its use, and the uses of the equipment or data collected that are prohibited.*
  - iii. *The policy shall identify the data or information that can be collected by the Enhanced Curb Management System and the individuals who can access or use the collected information, and the rules and processes related to the access, transfer, and use or use of the information.*
  - iv. *The policy shall also include provisions for protecting data from unauthorized access, data retention, public access, third-party data sharing, training, auditing, and oversight to ensure compliance with the Enhanced Curb Management Policy.*
  - v. *The Enhanced Curb Management Use policy, as an element of the local ordinance or resolution, shall be made available for public review, including, but not limited to, by posting it on the designated jurisdiction's internet website at least 30 calendar days prior to adoption by the governing body of the designated jurisdiction.*
- i) *The governing body of the designated jurisdiction also shall deliver an Enhanced Curb Management Impact Report after implementing a program. The Enhanced Curb Management Impact Report shall include all of the following information:*
- i. *Assessment of impact of the Enhanced Curb Management System on civil liberties and civil rights and any recommendations to improve ways to safeguard those public rights.*
  - ii. *Description of the Enhanced Curb Management System and it was demonstrated.*
  - iii. *Fiscal costs for the Enhanced Curb Management System, including program establishment costs, projected ongoing costs, and program funding.*
  - iv. *If deployment locations of systems were in predominantly in low-income neighborhoods.*
  - v. *Locations where the system was deployed and data for these locations.*
  - vi. *The Enhanced Curb Management System Impact Report shall be made available for public review at least 30 calendar days prior to adoption by the governing body at a public hearing.*

- j) *Revenues derived from any program utilizing an enhanced curb management system shall first be used to recover program costs. Program costs include, but are not limited to, the installation of camera enforcement systems, the adjudication of violations, and reporting requirements, as specified in this section.*
  - k) *Local jurisdictions that elect to participate in enhanced curb management programs as authorized by this section shall maintain their existing commitment of local funds for curbside parking enforcement and shall annually expend not less than the annual average of expenditures for local curbside parking enforcement during the 2023–24, 2024–25, and 2025–26 fiscal years. For purposes of this subdivision, in calculating average expenditures on curbside parking enforcement, restricted funds that may not be available on an ongoing basis, including those from voter-approved bond issuances or tax measures, shall not be included.*
  - l) *Any excess revenue shall be used for parking management measures within three years of the end of the fiscal year in which the excess revenue was received. If parking management measures are not planned or constructed after the third year, excess revenue shall revert to the Active Transportation Program established pursuant to Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 2380) of the Streets and Highways Code, to be allocated by the California Transportation Commission pursuant to Section 2381 of the Streets and Highways Code.*
  - m) *Clarify that the image data collected by the system must be destroyed after the expiration of the timelines established in this program.*
  - n) *Clarify that enhanced curb management systems shall not authorize charging a fee for access to commercial loading zones, but may be used for the enforcement of parking violations in commercial loading zones.*
  - o) *Authorize a recipient of a parking citation under this program to utilize an affidavit of non-liability.*
- 12) *Double Referral.* This bill has been double referred to the Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee.

**RELATED/PREVIOUS LEGISLATION:**

**AB 1837 (Mark González, 2026)** – This bill would make permanent a previously authorized pilot program that allows transit agencies to enforce parking violations in transit-only lanes and at transit stops using video images.

**SB 532 (Wiener, Chapter 858, Statutes of 2024)** – Authorized local authorities in the City and County of San Francisco, the City of Long Beach, or the City of Santa Monica to require payment of parking fees with a mobile device under specified conditions for five years or until January 1, 2033, whichever is sooner.

**SB 1487 (Glazer, 2024)** – Would have prohibited a late payment penalty for a parking violation from exceeding 30% of the original penalty and would extend the time to pay a parking violation before additional penalties accrue. *This bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.*

**AB 361 (Ward, Chapter 432, Statutes of 2023)** – Authorizes a local agency to install an automated forward facing parking control device on city-owned or district-owned parking enforcement vehicles for the purpose of video imaging or parking violations occurring in bicycle lanes, until January 1, 2030.

**AB 917 (Bloom, Chapter 709, Statutes of 2021)** – Authorized all public transit operators to install automated forward-facing parking control devices on transit vehicles for the purposes of enforcing parking violations occurring in transit-only traffic lanes and at transit stops until January 1, 2027.

**SB 1051 (Hancock, Chapter 427, Statutes of 2016)** – Authorized a pilot program for video enforcement of parking violations in transit-only traffic lanes.

**AB 1287 (Chiu, Chapter 485, Statutes of 2015)** – Removed the sunset on the authority of San Francisco’s pilot program for video enforcement of parking violations in transit-only traffic lanes.

**SB 1388 (Desaulnier, Chapter 70, Statutes of 2012)** – Authorized local authorities to use, but not require, mobile payments for parking.

**AB 1041 (Ma, Chapter 325, Statutes of 2011)** – Extended the sunset on the authority of San Francisco’s pilot program for video enforcement of parking violations in transit-only traffic lanes to January 1, 2016.

**AB 101 (Ma, Chapter 377, Statutes of 2007)** – Authorized San Francisco to establish a pilot program for video enforcement of parking violations in transit-only traffic lanes which expired January 1, 2012.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Appropriation: No    Fiscal Com.: No    Local: No

**POSITIONS:** (Communicated to the committee before noon on Wednesday, April 8, 2026.)

**SUPPORT:**

Automotus (Sponsor)  
Streets for All (Sponsor)  
California Contract Cities Association  
California Mobility and Parking Association  
City of Norwalk  
City of Pico Rivera  
Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator  
Norwalk; City of  
Santa Monica; City of  
Streets are for Everyone (SAFE) (ORG)

**OPPOSITION:**

Oakland Privacy

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** Writing in support, Automotus writes, “Curb space has become one of the most strained and valuable components of the public right-of-way in California’s communities. As e commerce deliveries, on demand services, ride hailing, and autonomous vehicle activity accelerate, our existing curb regulations have not kept pace. Research shows that commercial curb use now represents a majority of total activity in many cities, much of it occurring without compliance or effective oversight...SB 1292 offers a modern, locally controlled solution. By enabling jurisdictions to adopt enhanced curb management systems—with human review, due process protections, and strict limitations on data use—this bill provides a thoughtful, measured approach that aligns with California’s existing automated enforcement framework.”

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** Writing in opposition, Oakland Privacy states, “To capture entire crosswalks, cameras will have to be bi-directional and obviously will capture images of people passing through the crosswalk as pedestrians on a regular basis. Unlike other pilot programs approved by the Legislature, this program has no expiration date and no limit on the number of cameras. This potentially could result in multiple cameras at every traffic

intersection or a gauntlet that ensnares not only automobile drivers, but every pedestrian. This seems far beyond the goals of the bill as expressed in the legislative findings.”

**-- END --**