



AGENDA REPORT

TO: Jestin D. Johnson
City Administrator

FROM: Josh Rowan
Director of Transportation
Acting Director, Public
Works

SUBJECT: Speed Safety Camera System
Contract Award

DATE: May 26, 2025

City Administrator Approval


Jestin Johnson (May 28, 2025 11:10 PDT)

Date: **May 28, 2025**

RECOMMENDATION

Staff Recommends That The City Council Adopt A Resolution Authorizing The City Administrator To Enter Into A Professional Services Agreement With Verra Mobility To Implement And Operate A Speed Safety Camera System Under Assembly Bill 645 For A Six-Year Term Supporting Five Years of Camera Operations In An Amount Not To Exceed Four Million, Eight-Hundred Sixty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$4,865,000); Adopt the Speed Camera Use Policy and Impact Report; Waiving the Arizona Boycott Policy, Resolution 82727 C.M.S.; And Adopting Appropriate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Assembly Bill (AB) 645, a state law passed in October 2023, authorizes Oakland and five other California cities – San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Glendale – to implement and oversee a five-year pilot of automated speed safety cameras. Oakland has identified 18 candidate locations for camera placement based on criteria outlined in AB 645 and the city's High Injury Network. Following a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process, Oakland seeks authority to enter into a six-year professional services agreement with Verra Mobility in an amount not to exceed \$4,865,000 to implement and operate a speed camera system. The City anticipates the start of camera operation before the end of 2025, beginning with a 60-day warning period.

BACKGROUND / LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The [Safe Oakland Streets \(SOS\) Initiative](#) aims to prevent severe and fatal traffic crashes, eliminate injury inequities, and carefully assess and mitigate equity impacts resulting from safety measures. Speeding is a leading cause of serious injuries and fatalities in Oakland. Every week, two Oaklanders, on average, are killed or seriously injured by traffic violence, and these crashes disproportionately impact people of color, seniors, and people with disabilities. Speeding is a primary factor in approximately 1 in 4 traffic collisions that kill or seriously injure Oaklanders. Pedestrians are especially vulnerable to speeding vehicles – while a pedestrian hit by a car

traveling 20 miles per hour (MPH) is 90% likely to survive, a pedestrian hit by a car traveling 40 MPH is only 10% likely to survive.

Speed safety cameras, or SSC, have proven [highly effective](#) at preventing traffic deaths and injuries in cities across the United States and around the world.¹ Some examples include significant reductions of vehicles traveling more than 10 MPH over the posted speed limit in Portland, OR, Washington, DC, and Montgomery County, MD.² SSC have also shown significant injury reductions in New York City and Chicago.³ Both the National Transportation Safety Board and the California State Transportation Agency have acknowledged the effectiveness of SSC in reducing speeding and enhancing road safety. SSCs are also an important supplement to traditional traffic enforcement because they operate 24 hours a day, reduce the potential for harmful interactions between officers and members of the public, and free limited law enforcement resources for other purposes.

Oakland's leadership has supported the multi-year effort to implement SSC through changes to state law. The Mayor and City Council adopted a supportive position for proposed legislation in 2021 (AB 550, Chiu), and the Mayor and Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) adopted support positions in 2022 (AB 2336, Friedman and Ting). In 2023, automated speed enforcement was included on the city's state and federal legislative agenda and supported by the Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission at their April 20, 2023, meeting. City staff presented an overview of camera sites at the July 23, 2024, Public Works and Transportation Committee. Staff also presented the draft Surveillance Use Policy and Impact Report at the August 3, 2024, meeting of the Privacy Advisory Commission, which forwarded a recommendation to the City Council to approve the draft documents.

ANALYSIS AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES

¹ See <https://www.nts.gov/safety/safety-studies/Documents/SS1701.pdf> for a survey of automated speed enforcement in the United States. SSC discussion begins on page 34 (PDF page 46).

² Portland – 94% reduction of vehicles traveling 11 mph or more over the speed limit based on four corridors where PBOT had speed safety cameras installed.

https://www.portland.gov/transportation/news/2023/10/5/pbot-begins-installing-new-safety-cameras-across-portland-milestone?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery.

Washington DC, 82% decrease as observed at seven sites selected randomly from 60 targeted enforcement zones in Washington DC, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3141/1830-05?journalCode=trra>

Montgomery County, 64% decrease of vehicles traveling >10MPH over the speed limit. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15389588.2016.1189076>

³ NYC – 17% reduction in total injuries. **USDOT, ITS Joint Program Office. See <https://www.itskrs.its.dot.gov/2021-b01580>

Chicago – over a two-year period, 36 fewer fatal and severe-injury crashes, 68 fewer moderate injury crashes, and 100 fewer minor-injury crashes over a two-year period. See https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/cdot/Red%20Light%20Cameras/2022/Sutton+Tilahun_C_hicago-Camera-Ticket_Exec%20Summary-Final-Jan10.pdf

Below are some of the key provisions of Assembly Bill 645 as they pertain to Oakland.

AB 645:

- Authorizes a city of Oakland’s population size (between 300,000 and 800,000), to install a maximum of 18 speed safety systems;
- Authorizes OakDOT as the city’s department of transportation to operate, maintain, and oversee the program (not OPD);
- Establishes that citations are issued to vehicle owners, not the driver, at the time of citation;
- Directs any excess revenue beyond the cost of program operations to be reinvested into traffic calming and spent within three years of collection.

AB 645 has several provisions related to equity, including:

- A 60-day no-fee warning period once the cameras are turned on;
- Ticket fee reductions between 50% and 80% for low-income populations, based on state definitions, as well as a diversion program;
- Defines penalties under AB-645 as civil penalties, not moving violations (i.e., there is no impact to insurance or points on license);
- Establishes a fine violation structure starting at 11MPH (1-10MPH doesn’t get a ticket) that accounts for income, as detailed in the table below.

Figure 1. Citation structure under AB-645

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Speed Violation AB 645 | Fine | Indigent⁴ | 200% above the poverty level |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|

⁴ An applicant who is receiving public benefits under one or more of the following programs:
(1) Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and State Supplementary Payment (SSP) (Article 5 (commencing with Section 12200) of Chapter 3 of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code).
(2) California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Act (CalWORKs) (Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 11200) of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code) or a federal Tribal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (Tribal TANF) grant program (Section 10553.25 of the Welfare and Institutions Code).
(3) Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Chapter 51 (commencing with Section 2011) of Title 7 of the United States Code) or the California Food Assistance Program (Chapter 10.1 (commencing with Section 18930) of Part 6 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code).
(4) County Relief, General Relief (GR), or General Assistance (GA) (Part 5 (commencing with Section 17000) of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code).
(5) Cash Assistance Program for Aged, Blind, and Disabled Legal Immigrants (CAPI) (Chapter 10.3 (commencing with Section 18937) of Part 6 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code).
(6) In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) (Article 7 (commencing with Section 12300) of Chapter 3 of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code).
(7) Medi-Cal (Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 14000) of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code). OR:
b) An applicant whose monthly income is 125 percent or less of the current poverty guidelines updated periodically in the Federal Register by the United States Department of Health and Human Services under the authority of paragraph (2) of Section 9902 of Title 42 of the United States Code.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0-10 mph | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 11-15 mph | \$50 | \$10 | \$25 |
| 16-25 mph | \$100 | \$20 | \$50 |
| 26 mph and over | \$200 | \$40 | \$100 |
| Speed greater than 100 mph | \$500 | \$100 | \$250 |

Prior to implementing speed cameras, AB 645 requires that cities adopt a Speed Camera Impact Report (**Attachment 1**) and Speed Camera System Use Policy (**Attachment 2**). The Speed Camera Impact Report defines the purpose of the system, how it functions, how it will be paid for, and how the program affects civil liberties. The System Use Policy outlines what data is collected and other key provisions around data security and retention. Each policy must also be formally adopted by the Oakland City Council prior to speed cameras commencing operation.

Figure 2. Speed Camera Impact Report Summary

| State Law Specification | OakDOT's Response |
|--|--|
| What is the purpose of the system? | To enforce speed limits 24/7 at 18 locations to slow vehicle speeds |
| How does the system work? | Fixed camera system with radar to detect speeding violations, mailed notices of violation with messaging and fines |
| How much will this cost, and where is the money coming from? | OakDOT's Operating Budget will fund the program, with outside grants as available. The cost of staff labor and contract could be up to \$1.75 million annually (see Fiscal Impact section for additional detail) |
| How will this program affect civil rights, and how will those rights be safeguarded? | Minimal (or positive) impacts to civil rights: Unbiased enforcement reduces exposure to discrimination; focus on license plate number minimizes the collection of personally identifiable information |

Figure 3. Privacy Provisions & System Use Policy Summary

| State Law Specification | OakDOT's Response |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
|-------------------------|-------------------|

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| What data is collected? | Rear license plate images for speeding vehicles only. No video or facial recognition is allowed. |
| Who can access the data? | Individuals in authorized City of Oakland job classifications and those specifically authorized by the vendor to provide technical support. All data collected is confidential and will be maintained in compliance with applicable laws, including but not limited to AB-645 and the Oakland Municipal Code. |
| Who is the data shared with? | No one outside of OakDOT (without a court order). System security and data compliance will be monitored by internal safeguards and vendor-maintained industry standard practices for data management. |
| Where is the data stored? | Locally & on the Software As a Service (SAAS) platform |

Site Selection

OakDOT based its speed camera site selection off the specifications in AB 645. The chart below explains the agency’s response to the bill’s criteria.

Figure 4. Speed camera site selection

| State Law Specification | OakDOT’s Response |
|--|---|
| Cameras shall be located on a high-injury street, a school zone street, or a street with documented speed racing | All proposed camera locations are on the high-injury network ; additionally, several proposed locations are adjacent to schools and in locations with speed-related collisions |
| Cameras cannot be located on state highways, freeways, or expressways | All cameras will be located on city-owned streets . This restriction primarily excludes freeways and segments of International and San Pablo Blvd owned by Caltrans. |
| Cameras should be located in areas that are “geographically and socioeconomically diverse” | Camera locations will be spread throughout Oakland , with at least 1 camera per City Council district |
| To keep a camera location after 18 months, there must be measurable reductions in speeding behavior | Proposed camera locations are prioritized in locations with vehicle speeds exceeding 10 MPH over the speed limit. |

Building off state law as specified above, OakDOT initiated its site selection process with the [2024 High Injury Network](#) (HIN), or street segments in Oakland with the highest density of fatal and severe collisions. The HIN is determined based on three separate mode-specific HINs: pedestrian, bicyclist, and motor vehicle. Creating separate HINs allows the pedestrian and

bicyclist crash networks to be analyzed distinct from the motorist network, which might otherwise dominate the map. For speed camera site selection, the agency prioritized camera placement on streets with two or three overlapping modes. As another prioritization factor, OakDOT also identified street segments with high concentrations of serious and fatal injuries, with speed as a primary factor.

Following this analysis, OakDOT collected data at 43 potential locations for speed cameras in the form of 72-hour tube counts to collect traffic speeds and volumes. These 43 locations were narrowed down to 18 proposed locations based on the following criteria:

- Number and percentage of daily vehicles traveling greater than 10 MPH over the speed limit;
- Proximity to sensitive land uses (i.e, schools, senior centers, parks, commercial districts, uncontrolled crosswalks);
- Geography (i.e., avoiding concentrating too many cameras in one neighborhood as per AB 645 requirements);
- Planned capital projects; and
- Initial technical review for installation feasibility.

Figure 6. List of automated speed enforcement locations

| Location (Main Street) | Location (Cross Streets) | Speed Limit | 85th Percentile Speed | Number of Daily Vehicles >10 MPH Over Posted Limit | % of Daily Vehicles > 10 MPH Over Posted Limit | Additional Reasoning for SSC |
|------------------------|---|-------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| 73rd Avenue | Between Fresno and Krause | 35 MPH | 41 MPH | 1,514 | 6.2% | High observed speed from vehicles adjacent to Markham Elementary and Eastmont Transit Center |
| 7th St. | Between Adeline St and Linden St | 30 MPH | 39 MPH | 1,760 | 14.6% | Speeding from vehicles traveling to and from freeways; uncontrolled crossings, proximity to As-Salam Mosque |
| 7th St. | Between Broadway and Franklin Streets | 20 MPH | 27 MPH | 662 | 5.2% | Concentration of seniors, children, and pedestrians in Chinatown |
| 98th Avenue | Between Blake Drive and Gould Street | 30 MPH | 37 MPH | 1,340 | 6.6% | Proximity to speed related injury collisions; speeding observed from vehicles traveling to and from I-880 |
| 98th Avenue | Between Cherry and Birch | 30 MPH | 34 MPH | 469 | 3.10% | Adjacent to Elmhurst United Middle School; proximity to speed related injury collisions |
| Bancroft Ave | Between 86th Ave and Auseon Ave | 30 MPH | 38 MPH | 1,247 | 8.10% | Uncontrolled crosswalks; proximity to schools, churches |
| Bancroft Ave | Between 65th and 66th | 30 MPH | 34 MPH | 266 | 2.90% | Uncontrolled crosswalks; proximity to schools, churches |
| Broadway | Between 26th and 27th St | 20 MPH | 27 MPH | 1,136 | 9.20% | Concentration of speed related injury collisions; concentration of pedestrians on Broadway commercial corridor |
| Claremont Avenue | Hillegass Avenue and College Avenue | 3030 MPH | 37 MPH | 636 | 5.8% | Vehicles speeding to and from SR 24; new addition (2024) to High Injury Network |
| Foothill Blvd | Between Irving and 24th | 25 MPH | 29 MPH | 252 | 2.87% | Proximity to speed related collisions; uncontrolled crosswalks |
| Foothill Blvd. | Between 19th and 20th | 30 MPH | 33 MPH | 203 | 2.8% | Proximity to speed related collisions; uncontrolled crosswalks; proximity to San Antonio Recreation Area |
| Fruitvale Avenue | Between Galindo Street and Logan Street | 25 MPH | 30 MPH | 458 | 3.60% | Uncontrolled crosswalks; proximity to schools, churches |
| Hegenberger Road | Between Spencer and Hawley | 40 MPH | 57 MPH | 10,029 | 43% | Freeway-like segment with four travel lanes in each direction; proximity to speed-related injury collisions |
| International Blvd | Between 40th and 41 st | 25 MPH | 29 MPH | 767 | 4.9% | High observed speeding from vehicles illegally using the transit lane; concentration of speed-related injury collisions |
| MacArthur Blvd. | Between Green Acre Road and Enos Ave | 30 MPH | 38 MPH | 667 | 8.0% | High observed speeds from vehicles traveling to and from I-580, long section of MacArthur without a traffic signal |

| Location (Main Street) | Location (Cross Streets) | Speed Limit | 85th Percentile Speed | Number of Daily Vehicles >10 MPH Over Posted Limit | % of Daily Vehicles > 10 MPH Over Posted Limit | Additional Reasoning for SSC |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| MLK Jr. Way | Between 42nd and 43rd | 30 MPH | 37 MPH | 540 | 7.43% | High observed speeds with two travel lanes in each direction, uncontrolled crosswalks |
| San Pablo Avenue | Between Athens and Sycamore | 25 MPH | 32 MPH | 585 | 6.72% | Concentration of speed related injury collisions; uncontrolled crosswalks |
| West Grand | Between Chestnut and Linden | 30 MPH | 39 MPH | 1,538 | 11.7% | High observed speeds from vehicles traveling to and from freeways; preschool on the block |

Request for Proposals (RFP) and Evaluation Process

On December 24, 2024, Oakland released a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking professional services to implement and operate a Parking & Citation Management System (PCMS), an Automated Speed Safety Camera System (SSC), and Related Solutions & Services. Vendors had the option of bidding on one or several of the RFP components. The RFP closed on February 21, 2025.

Oakland received two proposals for the speed camera portion of the RFP:

- Verra Mobility: \$4,860,000 for a five-year operation period (six-year contract term), or \$4,500 per camera per month of operation
- Elovate: \$8,975,412 for a five-year operation period (six-year contract term), or \$8,311 per camera per month of operation

Staff rated proposals based on the criteria outlined in the RFP, including experience, technical specifications, oral/solution demonstration (interviews), and cost. The availability analysis conducted by the Department of Workforce and Employment Standards (DWES) set local business enterprise/small local business enterprise (LBE/SLBE) participation to 0%, given the lack of local firms providing these highly specialized and technical systems. However, the evaluation criteria allowed a small number of bonus points for LBE/SLBE participation from subconsultants.

At the conclusion of the evaluation process, staff recommend awarding the contract to Verra Mobility under the following rationale:

- Depth of experience globally
- Experience implementing a program under AB 645 criteria as the implementing partner for San Francisco
- Cost competitiveness
- Partnership with local subconsultants and a community-based organization

Since Verra Mobility is headquartered in Arizona, award of the contract will require a waiver of the Arizona Boycott Policy, Resolution 82727 C.M.S., passed in 2010 in opposition to State Bill 1070. Resolution 82727 C.M.S. urges "City Departments...to the extent practicable, and in instances where this is no significant additional cost to the City or conflict with the law, to refrain from entering into any new or amended contracts to purchase goods or services from any company that is headquartered in Arizona." In this case, staff believe a waiver justified given the significant additional cost of selecting another vendor, as well as the highly technical and specialized nature of the procurement.

Should the City Council decide not to award the contract to Verra Mobility due to Resolution 82727 C.M.S. or other factors, implementation of Assembly Bill 645, along with its life-saving benefits, would be delayed and potentially jeopardized. Moreover, the City would need to use additional transportation revenue that would otherwise go towards other transportation improvements in Oakland.

Project Schedule

The next steps towards implementing speed safety cameras are as follows:

- Award a vendor contract, adopt the impact report and use policy, and take other necessary actions (June 2025)
- Initiate a broad public outreach campaign in advance of program start (summer/fall 2025)
- Install camera equipment at 18 locations (summer/fall 2025)
- Begin camera operation with a 60-day warning period (fall/winter 2025)

Speed cameras support the following citywide priorities:

Holistic community safety: SSC have improved transportation safety for users of all modes (walking, rolling, biking, driving, etc.) where implemented in other cities, and are likely to have similar impacts in Oakland.

Vibrant, sustainable infrastructure: By slowing traffic on Oakland streets, SSC may encourage more people to use sustainable modes such as walking and biking.

Responsive, trustworthy government: SSC responds to a well-documented need for improved traffic safety on Oakland streets. They also provide a method of traffic enforcement that minimizes interaction with law enforcement personnel.

FISCAL IMPACT

The City recommends moving forward with the contract bid from Verra Mobility of \$4,860,000 for a five-year operation period (six-year contract term), or \$4,500 per camera per month of operation. Monthly camera costs become payable once the sixty-day warning period commences, and cease after the 60th month of operation. Oakland has secured \$2.7M to support the recommended contract cost from a grant from the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (Alameda CTC) Capital Improvement Program (\$2M from Fund 2214, Project 1007571), P1007571 with matching funds from Alameda County CTC direct local distributions (\$700,000 from Fund 2219, Project 1007571). Additional operations funding for three new positions to support citation processing is programmed in the proposed Fiscal Year 2025-2027 biennial budget.

The remaining \$2.16M in funding to support contract costs and program operations is anticipated to come from citation revenue. This revenue will be placed in Oakland's Traffic Safety Fund (Fund 2416). Surplus revenue must be dedicated to traffic calming improvements as per AB 645. Since this is a new program, actual revenue cannot be determined at this time. Should revenue be insufficient to cover the remaining \$2.16M in contract costs, the City will reallocate revenue from other transportation capital and operating sources; seek additional grant funding; or pause the program as an item of last resort.

PUBLIC OUTREACH / INTEREST

The development of AB 645 and prior bills related to automated speed enforcement included extensive public outreach and engagement with the public and stakeholders concerned with traffic violence throughout California. Oakland specific outreach included consultation with the Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission, the Privacy Advisory Commission, and various advocacy groups.

To meet the provisions of AB 645, Oakland is required to “consult and work collaboratively with relevant local stakeholder organizations, including racial equity, privacy protection, and economic justice groups.” During 2024, Oakland staff briefed City Council, along with several commissions, on the speed camera program, including the Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission, the Privacy Advisory Commission, the Mayor's Commission on Aging, and the Commission on Persons with Disabilities. City staff also met with several community and advocacy groups, including Bike East Bay, Transport Oakland, Trybe, Communities for Care for Lower Prescott, the Anti-Police Terror Project, the Traffic Violence Rapid Response Group, and the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project. Some of the key themes and feedback that emerged from these sessions included:

- Support for implementation, along with urgency to begin the program as soon as possible
- A desire to expand the pilot program beyond the 18 locations authorized for Oakland by AB-645
- Concerns around obscured license plates, stolen vehicles, and people not paying citations
- A preference for engineering projects over speed cameras, with several participants urging the department to pursue both
- Desire to see program data as soon as possible

OakDOT will implement a public information campaign about SSC in advance of program rollout. Finally, OakDOT is required to complete several steps prior to March 1 of the fifth year in which the system has been implemented, including data on program implementation, a summary of costs and revenues, and a racial and economic equity impact analysis developed in collaboration with local stakeholder groups. This analysis will inform the potential continuation and/or expansion of the program beyond the fifth year. Beyond AB-645 requirements, Oakland is committed to publishing an interim report 18 months following implementation, in addition to sharing data at periodic intervals regarding the program.

COORDINATION

OakDOT is actively coordinating the rollout of speed safety cameras with internal and external stakeholders, including:

- The Parking and Mobility Division within OakDOT on a combined Request for Proposals for parking citation management and speed safety cameras to be released this summer;
- The Safe Streets Division within OakDOT to identify parallel investments that can increase the impact of speed cameras (e.g., citywide signage, signal retiming on other corridors, etc.);

- The Safe Oakland Streets (SOS) core team, including the Department of Race and Equity (DRE), the Oakland Police Department (OPD) and the City Administrator's Office (CAO);
- The Oakland Public Library and Department of Public Works on potential fine diversion programs (e.g., community service); and
- AB 645 pilot cities – San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Long Beach through monthly calls and frequent check-ins.

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

Economic: Speed-related collisions have tremendous economic costs at the individual and societal levels. Reducing collisions helps to minimize the burdens on individuals (car repair, healthcare costs) and the city (lawsuits).

Environmental: Speeding vehicles disincentivize people from using non-motorized modes, such as walking and biking, due to perceptions around safety. Speeding and the energy required to accelerate/decelerate from higher speeds are also typically less environmentally efficient than traveling at slower speeds.

Race & Equity: Given the distribution of Oakland's High Injury Network, people with color are disproportionately impacted by speeding drivers. AB-645 contains several provisions that address race and equity, including a 60-day no-fee warning period once the cameras are turned on; ticket fee reductions between 50% and 80% for low-income populations, as well as a diversion program; civil rather than criminal penalties; a fine violation structure starting at 11MPH (1-10MPH doesn't get a ticket); and requirements to consult with racial and economic justice groups both prior to and after implementation.

AB-645 also includes an appeals process whereby people can contest notices of violation within 30 days of receiving a notice of violation. If recipients do not agree with the city's initial response, they may request an administrative hearing conducted in accordance with written procedures established by the Department of Transportation (similar to the process for contesting a parking citation). Phone assistance will be available in English, Spanish, Cantonese, and Mandarin.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

Speed camera project implementation is categorically exempt from CEQA per CA Code of Regs, Title 14, Article 19, Section 15301(c), minor alterations of existing streets, sidewalks, gutters, bicycle and pedestrian trails, and similar facilities.

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Staff Recommends That The City Council Adopt A Resolution Authorizing The City Administrator To Enter Into A Professional Services Agreement With Verra Mobility To Implement And Operate A Speed Safety Camera System Under Assembly Bill 645 For A Six-

Year Term Supporting Five Years of Camera Operations In An Amount Not To Exceed Four Million, Eight-Hundred Sixty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$4,865,000; Adopt the Speed Camera Use Policy and Impact Report; Waiving the Arizona Boycott Policy, Resolution 82727 C.M.S.; And Adopting Appropriate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings.

For questions regarding this report, please contact Craig Raphael, Project Manager I, at craphael@oaklandca.gov or 510-238-7229.

Respectfully submitted,


Josh Rowan (May 27, 2025 10:03 PDT)

Josh Rowan
Director, Department of Transportation
Acting Director, Department of Public Works

Reviewed by:
Jamie Parks, Assistant Director

Prepared by:
Craig Raphael, Project Manager I
Funding Strategy Team

Attachments (2):

- 1) Speed Camera Impact Report
- 2) Speed Camera Use Policy