



Whose Streets? Our Streets!

Automated Traffic Enforcement Preliminary Recommendations

About our group

Whose Streets? Our Streets! (WSOS) is a BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and People of Color)-focused workgroup, convened in July 2020 by Seattle Neighborhood Greenways. We use a pro-equity, anti-racist framework to review laws and practices related to transportation in Seattle. We are committed to advocating for the specific needs of all street users, but particularly the communities of color whose safety and mobility has historically been restricted by unjust public planning and policies. Since 2022, we have been conducting community outreach and engagement under contract with the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) regarding what it means for BIPOC communities to feel safe while traveling in Seattle. To learn more about us, visit our website: <https://www.our-streets.org/>. You can contact our group by email at wsos@seattlegreenways.org.

Background

Automated speed enforcement has been shown to reduce roadway fatalities and injuries by 20-37% nationwide¹, with Seattle seeing a 71% drop in traffic collisions during hours that cameras are activated in school speed zones². Automated enforcement (henceforth “AE”) cameras – including school zone speeding, red light, intersection blocking, and transit lane enforcement cameras – now issue nearly 200,000 traffic tickets annually in Seattle, about 50 times more than police officers give out in traffic stops³. The City of Seattle plans to double its number of school zone speed enforcement cameras this year⁴, representing a dramatic expansion of the use of punitive ticketing to achieve traffic safety. There are currently 35 speed cameras at 19 schools across the city⁵; a doubling would presumably require the installation of 35 more speed cameras.

¹ National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), “Speed safety camera program planning and operations guide” (January 2023), <https://highways.dot.gov/sites/fhwa.dot.gov/files/Speed%20Safety%20Camera%20Program%20Planning%20and%20Operations%20Guide%202023.pdf>.

² Bradley Topol and Allison Schwartz, “Automated enforcement: Racial Equity Toolkit – preliminary findings” [presentation slides], Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Vision Zero Team (September 22, 2022), <https://drive.google.com/file/d/12ABOJwthsLOgq35xRnr3WVarAfccdinwe/view>.

³ Seattle Municipal Court, “Vehicle infractions issued by infraction type” (accessed May 2023), <https://www.seattle.gov/courts/about/data-and-publications/general-data-reports/vehicle-infractions>.

⁴ Mike Lindblom, “South Seattle council member seeks more walk-bike safety funds,” *Seattle Times* (November 17, 2022), <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/transportation/south-seattle-council-member-seeks-more-walk-bike-safety-funds/>.

⁵ Seattle Police Department, “Automated photo enforcement program - school zone speed cameras” (accessed May 2023), <https://www.seattle.gov/police/community-policing/community-programs/school-zone-enforcement>.

At the same time, a recent SDOT Racial Equity Toolkit (RET) analysis of automated traffic enforcement⁶ has revealed stark racial and economic disparities in the placement and financial impacts of existing AE speed and red light cameras in Seattle. These findings are similar to disparities in AE camera placement and impacts identified in Chicago⁷, Washington, D.C.⁸, and other cities, and speak to an ongoing national conversation regarding whether AE ticketing can be implemented equitably and justly^{9,10,11} given that the least safe roadways tend to run through communities of color due to underinvestment in safe infrastructure¹². In its most recent guidance on AE speed cameras, the U.S. Department of Transportation recognized the importance of these considerations, urging that “local governments who explore or are implementing the use of [speed safety cameras] need to consider equity, civil rights, and civil liberties concerns in all stages, from planning to operation to evaluation”¹³.

Within this context, Whose Streets? Our Streets! has been conducting community engagement and outreach related to automated enforcement in Seattle. Our efforts to date have consisted of: (1) a blog post on our website¹⁴ (“[What’s next for traffic cameras in Seattle?](#)”), (2) an op-ed in the *South Seattle Emerald*¹⁵ (“[Opinion: Seattle’s automated traffic cameras disproportionately target neighborhoods of color](#)”), (3) a community town hall event on automated enforcement (from which we reference learnings from small group discussions and a short paper survey), and (4) a longer online survey. The latter two efforts are described in greater detail below (see section “*Our community engagement to date*”).

Note that our findings and recommendations in this report are preliminary in nature. We plan to continue outreach related to AE impacts and policies at community events throughout the remainder of 2023, and we will update our recommendations according to what we learn.

⁶ Bradley Topol and Allison Schwartz, “Automated enforcement: Racial Equity Toolkit – preliminary findings” (see above).

⁷ Emily Hopkins and Melissa Sanchez, “Chicago’s ‘race-neutral’ traffic cameras ticket Black and Latino drivers the most,” *ProPublica* (January 11, 2022), <https://www.propublica.org/article/chicagos-race-neutral-traffic-cameras-ticket-black-and-latino-drivers-the-most>.

⁸ Jordan Pascale, “Bowser budget proposal calls for repurposing camera ticket money, new task force to look at equity in fines,” *DCist* (April 5, 2023), <https://dcist.com/story/23/04/05/traffic-camera-taskforce-2/>.

⁹ Maya Fegan, “Speeding into the future: The pitfalls of automated traffic enforcement,” *Berkeley Journal of Criminal Law* (April 15, 2021), <https://www.bjcl.org/blog/speeding-into-the-future-the-pitfalls-of-automated-traffic-enforcement>.

¹⁰ Susannah Parsons, “Can automated speed safety systems advance racial and economic equity?,” San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR) (April 28, 2021), <https://www.spur.org/news/2021-04-28/can-automated-speed-safety-systems-advance-racial-and-economic-equity>.

¹¹ Axel Santana, Carlton T. Mayers II, Ethan Campbell, Caro Jauregui, and Priya Sarathy Jones, “How automated enforcement can perpetuate inequities in transportation” [webinar recording], Transportation Equity Caucus (May 3, 2023), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HPfVn-DQWVw>.

¹² Adam Paul Susaneck, “American road deaths show an alarming racial gap,” *New York Times* (April 26, 2023), <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/04/26/opinion/road-deaths-racial-gap.html>.

¹³ NHTSA and FHWA, “Speed safety camera program planning and operations guide” (see above).

¹⁴ Whose Streets? Our Streets!, “What’s next for traffic cameras in Seattle?” (October 12, 2022), <https://www.our-streets.org/the-real-deal/traffic-cameras>.

¹⁵ Ethan C. Campbell and Nura Ahmed, “Opinion: Seattle’s automated traffic cameras disproportionately target neighborhoods of color,” *South Seattle Emerald* (March 1, 2023), <https://southseattleemerald.com/2023/03/01/opinion-seattles-automated-traffic-cameras-disproportionately-target-neighborhoods-of-color/>.

Our recommendations

Based on the perspectives shared with us by BIPOC and lower-income community members as well as our group's policy research, we urge the City of Seattle to take action to improve its automated enforcement (AE) policies and practices in four critical areas:

1. Mitigate the disproportionate impacts of fines and focus on highest-risk behavior
2. Create an equitable citywide distribution of cameras
3. Develop robust policy to prioritize physical street safety improvements before implementing AE ticketing
4. Address surveillance concerns by documenting, publicizing, and strengthening protections around the use of images and data collected by AE cameras

Recommendation #1: Mitigate the disproportionate impacts of fines and focus on highest-risk behavior

We have heard deep concerns about the cost of AE tickets, and in particular school zone speeding tickets, which are \$237 in Seattle. As a flat fine, these tickets present an unequal burden that disproportionately impacts lower-income community members. One participant shared a personal story: *"I was between jobs and had to pay for my medication, and when I got a school zone speeding ticket, I had to choose between paying the ticket or reducing my medication. A warning would have worked just the same on me."* Others noted that *"if one can't pay, there can be big consequences."* Upon learning that 32% of all AE tickets go unpaid in Seattle (according to SDOT's RET analysis¹⁶), one individual pointed out that *"unpaid tickets aren't even a valid deterrent to speeding."*

Multiple attendees suggested that fines be *"based on the severity of the offense, so higher fines for faster speeding"* or that *"higher fines should reflect a higher amount of responsibility,"* and others spoke up for *"giv[ing] grace to first-time offenders"* (the efficacy of which is supported by SDOT's finding that 95% of drivers never receive a second ticket at the same camera location¹⁷). Realizing the steep barriers to accessing existing alternatives to payment, which include performing community service for around 14 hours at minimum wage to pay off a \$237 ticket, one participant expressed that *"the community service alternative option should be paid at a living wage, not minimum wage."* We heard concerns that both existing and proposed future policies may be inaccessible to certain residents: *"Those who can't speak English... can't access the courts because of a lack of translation services." "Fines should be income-based, but often people need to show paperwork and many folks don't have that documentation. Some folks don't have a job. There shouldn't be too many criteria for one to qualify—it has to be accessible, especially for the undocumented community."*

We wish for Seattle's AE camera programs to offer the maximum possible safety benefit while avoiding unnecessary negative financial impacts on low-income community members. To accomplish this, we envision a recalibration of existing fines and payment alternative options towards a structure

¹⁶ Bradley Topol and Allison Schwartz, "Automated enforcement: Racial Equity Toolkit – preliminary findings" (see above).

¹⁷ Ibid.

that would maintain the deterrent effect of AE cameras while reducing ancillary harm associated with overly punitive ticketing.

We recommend that the City of Seattle:

- A. Issue mailed warnings for all first-time violations at each camera location
- B. Reduce the penalties for automated speeding tickets to a low starting value that increases according to the severity of the violation (e.g., \$50 for going 6-10 mph over the speed limit, \$100 for going 11-15 mph over, \$200 for going 16-20 mph over, etc., similar to California's proposed AE pilot legislation, AB 645¹⁸)
- C. Reduce the penalties for all automated enforcement tickets for people with low household incomes as determined by enrollment in a wide variety of existing government financial assistance or benefits programs (similar to California's AB 645¹⁹), with verification occurring automatically without a requirement to provide documentation
- D. Explore vehicle impoundment for egregious repeat offenders (but not escalation of fines, which likely has limited deterrent effect), such that enforcement is focused on drivers whose risky behavior is highly negligent and most likely to cause future traffic deaths^{20,21,22}
- E. Expand alternative options for payment and increase the wage paid for community service
- F. Ensure that translations and translation/interpretation services are made available at all stages of ticket issuance and processing, and that information on how to access court interpretation services²³ is provided at ticket issuance
- G. Initiate a study on future tiered civil penalties based on income or ability to pay in Seattle, with a focus on examining existing barriers to implementation

Recommendation #2: Create an equitable citywide distribution of cameras

We have heard intense frustration with the existing situation of “double jeopardy,” in which communities of color experience the highest levels of roadway speeding, collisions, injuries, and death due to the design of arterials like Rainier Ave S, MLK Jr Way S, and Lake City Way, among others, and then are penalized for poor roadway design by speed cameras that require drivers to slow to 20 mph on roadways designed for higher speeds. SDOT's analysis showed that Seattle's AE cameras have been disproportionately placed in lower-income communities with more people of color (65%) compared to whiter, more affluent communities (18%). This can likely be attributed to the prioritization of unsafe roads during camera placement. As one town hall attendee expressed,

¹⁸ California Assembly Committee on Transportation, “Assembly Bill (AB) 645 bill analysis” (April 14, 2023), https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB645.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Angie Schmitt, “What can cities do about the most dangerous drivers?,” *Bloomberg CityLab* (April 4, 2023), <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-04-04/how-cities-can-get-the-very-worst-drivers-off-the-streets>.

²¹ Luz Lazo and Emily Davies, “6 million D.C. traffic tickets are unpaid. The worst drivers avoid consequences for years,” *Washington Post* (May 2, 2023), <https://archive.is/EG5SA>.

²² Ryan Calder et al., “Re: Urgent action needed on traffic violence in Washington, D.C.” [letter], multiple organizations, <https://www.dropbox.com/s/r0r2oaby8byluz/>.

²³ Seattle Municipal Court, “Interpreter services” (accessed May 2023), <https://www.seattle.gov/courts/programs-and-services/interpreter-services>.

“What’s really unfair is that the streets in Black and brown communities are the most dangerous. The majority of people killed and injured are in District 2.”

The overriding sentiment we heard during our town hall was that *“the city doesn’t care about communities of color”* and that *“there appears to be a racial bias in camera placement.”* Solutions offered ranged from removing cameras in areas disproportionately impacted – for example, *“cameras should be taken away from Rainier Ave S”* or *“some cameras should be taken from the South End and equally dispersed throughout the city”* – to balancing the citywide distribution by focusing camera placement on areas with fewer existing cameras yet a need for speed enforcement, particularly dense neighborhoods like Downtown, Capitol Hill, Uptown, and South Lake Union. One participant said: *“There are speeders everywhere – in Ballard, in Laurelhurst, in Loyal Heights. Why target communities of color? If the city is going to put cameras in, they better be everywhere.”*

We recommend that the City of Seattle:

- H. Set a goal of a balanced citywide distribution of AE speed and red light cameras (both a uniform geographic allocation, e.g., between Seattle’s seven City Council districts, and a uniform allocation based on demographics and socioeconomic factors, e.g., across the five quintiles of Seattle OPCD’s Race and Social Equity Index²⁴)
- I. Prioritize areas of higher advantage according to an up-to-date version of OPCD’s RSE Index) when placing additional AE speed and red light cameras, until a balanced distribution has been reached (see Item H above)
- J. Avoid placing further AE speed and red light cameras on roadways within Seattle’s highest-disadvantage communities (as determined by the bottom two quintiles of OPCD’s RSE Index), unless those roadway segments have site-specific plans developed and funded for future robust traffic calming improvements that will be constructed within a reasonably short timeframe (e.g., 2 years)

Recommendation #3: Develop robust policy to prioritize physical street safety improvements before implementing AE ticketing

With an average of 28 people killed and 180 people seriously injured on Seattle’s roads each year²⁵, there is an urgent need to boldly transform how our streets are designed to create true safety²⁶. Many online survey respondents acknowledged this, but still highlighted the safety benefits of AE for their potential utility as a stopgap measure while waiting for physical safety improvements. For example: *“[A camera is] not a replacement for safer street redesign, but it can be deployed much faster, is self-funding, and is shown to alter behavior with proper awareness, signage, and first-violation warnings.”* *“When the city has made the physical changes, the camera can be removed and placed somewhere else.”*

²⁴ Seattle Office of Planning & Community Development (OPCD), “Race and social equity index” (accessed May 2023), <https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/SDOT/NSF/Race%20and%20Social%20Equity%20Map.pdf>.

²⁵ Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), “Vision Zero top-to-bottom review – Overview: Momentum-building actions and recommendations” (February 2023), <https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/SDOT/VisionZero/SDOT-Vision-Zero-TopToBottomReview-Overview.pdf>.

²⁶ Seattle Neighborhood Greenways, “Seattle Greenways offers their own 90-day review of SDOT’s Vision Zero safe streets campaign,” *The Urbanist* (November 4, 2022), <https://www.theurbanist.org/2022/11/04/seattle-greenways-offers-their-own-90-day-review-of-sdots-vision-zero-safe-streets-campaign/>.

While AE cameras do offer significant safety benefits, school zone speed cameras are only turned on for part of the day and no AE ticket is as effective as permanent, self-enforcing physical changes for reducing speeds and curbing dangerous driving behavior. We heard this sentiment echoed loud and clear by community members in our town hall and surveys, who told us that *“we have to focus on root causes, not punishment after the fact,” “surveillance and punishment [are] not a permanent solution,” “there’s gotta be a better way than penalizing folks financially,”* and *“SDOT doesn’t give enough thought about how to slow vehicles down.”* As one town hall attendee stated, *“The goal is to get people to go slower. Cameras can only be so effective. Street redesign is more important.”* Online survey participants also highlighted the dire need for safer street infrastructure in Seattle’s South End: *“We need safer streets all over Seattle but especially in South Seattle where traffic related deaths are highest. But not [with] traffic cameras, that would further punish those communities for poor design. We need to spend our money on better design and pedestrianization of our streets.”* Another wrote: *“Ultimately, we should not have a fine/penalty based system, and the path toward that future is street redesign.”* With this community feedback in mind, we ask the City of Seattle to craft effective policy that will prevent the use of AE ticketing as a first-resort safety intervention before alternative options have been tried.

We recommend that the City of Seattle:

- K. Develop, test, and evaluate an innovative “menu” of rapidly-deployable, inexpensive spot physical traffic calming options (e.g., rapid-build lane reduction treatments, lane narrowing, speed cushions, etc.) that can offer equivalent or superior safety benefits to a single AE speed camera
- L. Strengthen SDOT’s stated commitment that “speed zone cameras are a tool [to] turn to after other engineering interventions have not resulted in slower speeds”²⁷ by creating policy to guarantee that location-specific spot traffic calming measures (see above) are actually deployed and tested for efficacy prior to any new AE speed camera placement
- M. Set a removal timeline (e.g., 4 years) for every new AE speed camera placement, with continued use of the camera past the sunset date conditional on (1) construction of new physical traffic calming improvements at the camera location, and (2) a demonstrated lack of efficacy of those improvements in reducing speeding

Recommendation #4: Address surveillance concerns by documenting, publicizing, and strengthening protections around the use of images and data collected by AE cameras

In our town hall, some participants expressed that AE cameras were undesirable or unacceptable due to their nature as a surveillance technology. For BIPOC communities in particular, state-sanctioned surveillance can evoke visceral fears associated with past abuses, loss of privacy, and over-policing. These fears are compounded by the knowledge that AE cameras have been disproportionately placed within communities of color in Seattle. For example, individuals shared that *“cameras represent a breach in trust between community and government”* and that *“we don’t want surveillance, an oppressive presence.”* Most fears centered around the uncomfortable perception of being surveilled: *“Surveillance may be based on perception and not necessarily fact, but it ties into gentrification and the feeling of being watched in your own community.”* *“Surveillance has a psychological effect on the people*

²⁷ Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), “2021 school speed zone camera annual report” (November 2022), http://clerk.seattle.gov/~CFS/CF_322496.pdf.

being surveilled – it’s not just how the images get used.” When specific concerns were raised, they tended to involve a lack of transparency over data privacy protections and questions about what entities and individuals have access to data collected by AE cameras: ***“Surveillance is scary, especially not knowing who has access to the images.” “People don’t know or trust everything the government is doing.”***

These concerns remain despite a Washington state law that prohibits the use of AE cameras for purposes other than traffic enforcement. The efficacy of this present prohibition was tested in 2022 when Seattle police were unable to use images from a nearby AE camera to identify a driver who was the likely perpetrator of a hit-and-run collision that killed a bicyclist near the West Seattle Bridge²⁸. That said, this strong protection is not guaranteed in the future. A proposed state bill to allow police to use AE camera images for any purpose with a court warrant (Senate Bill 5722) failed to pass during the 2023 legislative session²⁹, but nonetheless validated community concerns that use Seattle’s AE camera network may eventually be expanded to include police investigative purposes. One town hall attendee shared their fear, for example, that AE cameras ***“could find evidence of some other event, or lead to misidentification.”*** It is unclear whether a Seattle city ordinance could prevent the use of AE cameras from being expanded if legislation similar to SB 5722 passes at the state level in the future.

At present, city policy excludes AE cameras from being formally classified as a surveillance technology due to their use “solely to record traffic violations”³⁰. This has meant that AE programs have not been required to undergo the city’s Surveillance Ordinance review, a rigorous process that involves research, documentation, and community engagement around data privacy and access. These city reviews result in the issuance of a formal Surveillance Impact Report containing a “civil liberties and privacy assessment.” In the absence of such a review, it appears that the City of Seattle has not publicly released any detailed information around data privacy and access protections for its AE programs^{31,32}.

We recommend that the City of Seattle:

- N.** Respond to community concerns and uncertainties around the privacy of images and data collected by AE cameras by either (1) formally re-classifying AE cameras as a surveillance technology and facilitating their review through the city’s established Surveillance Ordinance process, or (2) documenting and releasing detailed information about AE camera data privacy and access independent of the city’s Surveillance Ordinance review process

²⁸ David Kroman, “Charges filed in hit-and-run death of bicyclist near West Seattle,” *Seattle Times* (January 4, 2023), <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/law-justice/charges-filed-in-hit-and-run-death-of-bicyclist-near-west-seattle/>

²⁹ Washington State Legislature, “SB 5722 - 2023-24: Concerning photographs, microphotographs, and electronic images from traffic safety cameras and toll systems” (accessed May 2023), <https://app.leg.wa.gov/billssummary?BillNumber=5722&Initiative=false&Year=2023>.

³⁰ City of Seattle, “Revised master list of surveillance technologies” (December 2019), <https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/Tech/Privacy/12-2019%20Revised%20Master%20List%20of%20Surveillance%20Technologies.pdf>.

³¹ Seattle Police Department, “Automated photo enforcement program - school zone speed cameras” (see above).

³² Seattle Police Department, “Automated photo enforcement program - red light cameras” (accessed May 2023), <https://www.seattle.gov/police/community-policing/community-programs/red-light-cameras>.

- O. Clarify to community members what would occur in Seattle if state legislation similar to SB 5722³³ authorized the use of AE cameras for law enforcement purposes unrelated to traffic enforcement, and explore the feasibility of a city “trigger” ordinance that would locally halt any state-authorized expansion of AE data access pending a review of AE under the city’s Surveillance Ordinance

Community perspectives

In our outreach and survey efforts to date, we have observed broad, cross-demographic support for three broad areas of improvement to Seattle’s AE program, though opinions differ on specific policy options:

1. Reducing disproportionate financial impacts to low-income residents from AE ticketing (see Recommendation #1 above)
2. Prioritizing safe street design – particularly traffic calming – over enforcement measures (see Recommendation #3 above)
3. Ensuring that all revenue is directed towards funding safer street infrastructure (including from red light cameras, which currently contribute to the City of Seattle’s general fund)

Divergent views, however, exist in community attitudes towards the proposed expansion of AE cameras in Seattle, strategies for placement of cameras, and the validity of AE ticketing itself as a solution for traffic safety.

In our community town hall and online survey, we observe that BIPOC and lower-income individuals – the focus audience for our outreach efforts – tend to favor: (1) a cessation of AE camera expansion or a removal of cameras, particularly on roadways within communities of color; (2) a distribution of cameras that yields uniform ticketing across geography and/or demographics; and (3) the use of AE as a strategy of last resort, rather than an integral traffic safety measure.

In contrast, respondents to our online survey who indicated that they are white and/or able to afford to pay a \$237 automated speeding ticket have shared strong support for: (1) an expansion of AE cameras citywide; (2) placement of cameras based on speeding or collision data, even if it results in disproportionate ticketing within communities of color; and (3) the use of AE as an integral traffic safety measure, albeit paired with safer street infrastructure.

That said, we want to acknowledge that no community is a monolith and all communities likely hold a diversity of views regarding AE policies³⁴. Additional outreach towards BIPOC and low-income residents is needed as the City of Seattle charts a path forward for its automated traffic enforcement program that upholds its stated commitment to both design a transportation system that is “safe regardless of one’s age, ability, location, income, language, race and/or how [one] choose[s] to get

³³ Washington State Legislature, “SB 5722 - 2023-24” (see above).

³⁴ We are not aware of any citywide surveys that have rigorously measured sentiments related to AE across a representative sample of Seattle residents, with the exception of a public attitudes survey conducted in 2010 around the deployment of a single pilot AE speed camera (which did not release cross-tabulations by demographic categories): Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC), “Automated speed enforcement pilot project evaluation” (January 2011), http://wtsc.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2015/03/Automated-Speed-Enforcement-Pilot_2011.pdf.

around” while “creat[ing] a new system of community safety that is not penal in nature... rather than criminalizing or perpetuating cycles of racial inequities experienced by BIPOC populations”³⁵.

Our community engagement to date

On March 14, 2023, WSOS hosted an evening community town hall on automated traffic camera enforcement at Rainier Arts Center in the Columbia City neighborhood of Seattle. The event was advertised in our *South Seattle Emerald* op-ed, through WSOS social media accounts (Instagram and Facebook), and using door hang tags and flyers distributed throughout the neighborhood surrounding Rainier Arts Center. Approximately 55 attendees participated in a program that included a brief presentation on AE policies in Seattle, highlighting preliminary findings from SDOT’s Racial Equity Toolkit analysis of AE. This was followed by one hour of small group discussions at six tables, moderated by WSOS members. Notes were collected and transcribed, including by SDOT staff in attendance. Free dinner and childcare were provided at the event. Key group discussion topics were:

1. *Is traffic camera enforcement the right approach to creating traffic safety?*
2. *How should the city set ticket fines and alternatives? Should first-time violations receive warnings? Where should the ticket revenue go?*
3. *Should the city expand its traffic camera program? If so, where should additional cameras be placed?*
4. *What surveillance concerns do these cameras raise, and how should they be addressed?*
5. *What type of community engagement do you expect from SDOT on this issue and others?*

Additionally, a short anonymous paper survey was distributed at the community town hall event on March 14, 2023. We received 17 responses, of which 82% of survey respondents identified as people of color (i.e., within non-white or multiple racial or ethnic groups) and 75% of survey respondents selected a household income bracket under Seattle’s approximate median household income of \$100,000. The plurality of respondents reported living in South Seattle zip codes. Together, these indicate that our town hall reached its intended audience of BIPOC and lower-income community members primarily from South Seattle.

Lastly, we conducted an online [Google Form survey](#), which was publicized on WSOS social media accounts in conjunction with our AE blog post, then again in our *South Seattle Emerald* op-ed. We have received 119 survey responses from October 2022 to present, 40 of which are from respondents belonging to one or both of two groups: (1) respondents who reported they could not afford to pay a \$237 automated speeding ticket, and (2) people of color. Due to our group’s focus on BIPOC residents of Seattle and those most impacted by enforcement, we have centered our analysis efforts on this subset of respondents.

While we reference preliminary qualitative conclusions from both surveys in this report, we have opted to release quantitative analyses at a later date after conducting further community outreach and assessment.

³⁵ Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), “Transportation Equity Framework – Part I: Values & strategies” (April 2022), pp. 18 and 23, https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/SDOT/TransportationEquity/TransportationEquity_Framework_Report_41422.pdf.