### Transportation Equity Bill Package

Transportation policies that put low-income people first

**Current transportation investments don’t serve all Californians**

For too long, the vast majority of our state’s transportation funding has gone to highways, leaving millions of vulnerable Californians gasping for air and struggling to get around on unsafe streets and unreliable public transportation

- Transportation investments have not only left people out, they have done harm by building freeways that divide low-income communities of color and worsen air pollution, causing asthma and heart disease.
- Pedestrian and traffic injuries and deaths are higher in low-income neighborhoods, which often lack sidewalks and safe crossings, safe space for biking, and safe routes to bus stops or train stations.
- As lower income families face rent increases and displacement, affordable and reliable transportation alternatives become even more necessary beyond urban centers.

**Equitable transportation benefits everyone**

The Transportation Equity Bill Package will direct transportation resources to communities that have been harmed or left behind by the priorities of the past. Righting these wrongs will improve access to opportunity, transportation choices, and public health for all Californians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>What it does</th>
<th>Why it’s important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AB 1640**  
(E. Garcia):  
Priority funding for transportation in low-income communities | Target 25% of each region’s transportation improvement program (RTIP) funds for projects that provide direct, meaningful benefits to low-income communities. Require Caltrans to develop guidelines for prioritizing investments and how to assess meaningful benefits; and fund the participation of low-income residents in the development of the guidelines, as well as project planning and selection. | Ensuring a fair share of transportation dollars benefit disadvantaged communities and protects them from harm will make a healthier environment and climate and expand access to opportunity, so our economy and society will work better for everyone. This would also begin to help communities emerge from under the burden created by years of inequitable transportation investments, and have a voice in planning future investments. |
| **AB 179**  
(Cervantes):  
More equitable representation on the California Transportation Commission | AB 179 (Cervantes) would restructure the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to ensure environmental justice is represented to promote equitable transportation planning, investments and air quality in California. | The CTC is responsible for the allocation and programming of the majority of transportation investments. The members of this body should represent the needs of communities disproportionately burdened by air pollution from transportation. To make policy decisions on behalf of all Californians, the CTC must reflect the diversity of the state. |
| **AB 17** (Holden):  
Free and reduced-fare transit passes for youth | Provide free or reduced-fare transit passes to low-income California students in middle school, high school, and college. | By helping students get to and stay in school, student transit passes support a well-educated workforce to keep California competitive. Student transit passes reduce traffic congestion and air pollution, improve educational outcomes, and help students and families save money to spend in local economies and get to jobs as well as school. |

**Sponsoring organizations**

- California Bicycle Coalition
- California Pan-Ethnic Health Network
- Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice
- ClimatePlan
- Move LA
- PolicyLink
- Public Advocates
- Student Senate for California Community Colleges
- TransForm

Contact Chanell Fletcher, chanell@climateplanca.org; Joshua Stark, jstark@transformca.org; or Jeanie Ward-Waller, jeanie@calbike.org
WHY CALIFORNIA SHOULD SUPPORT A STATEWIDE STUDENT TRANSIT PASS PROGRAM (AB 17, HOLDEN)

…. Student transit pass programs have been shown to significantly increase student transit ridership and to reduce the cost of an education and the carbon footprint: A study of student transit pass programs at 35 colleges and universities across the U.S. by renown UCLA researcher Donald Shoup and colleagues in 2001 found ridership increased by as much as 70%-200% in the first year, and 2%-10% in subsequent years, and that the cost of getting an education was reduced by $2,000 a year per student (which equates to $2,677 dollars in 2016 due to increases in the cost of living) because transportation expenses were lower.

…. A 2016 study of a student transit pass program in the Minneapolis school district found that not only did student ridership increase but so did overall transit ridership—because service added to accommodate students resulted in better overall service—and the cost was paid for with revenue from the sale of the student passes. Students who used the passes were also more likely to say they would continue to ride transit upon graduation than students who hadn’t used the program. And this study found that the school district’s carbon footprint was reduced: estimated annual emissions were 93% lower for nitrogen oxide, 89% for particulate matter, and 59% for CO2.

…. These two studies suggest that student transit passes could help the State of California reach its ambitious GHG reduction goals and equity goals, meantime providing benefits for students, schools, transit agencies, and the general public:

BENEFITS FOR STUDENTS

*College is hard.*

*Getting there shouldn’t make it harder.*

*A statewide program would:*

- Improve student access to education and opportunity
- Lower the cost of an education because students wouldn’t need to own, maintain and park a car
- Make it easier for students from disadvantaged communities—who often need to work at least part-time to pay for their education—to get to jobs as well as school.

BENEFITS FOR SCHOOLS

*Schools are big generators of traffic.*

*A statewide program would:*

- Reduce the student drive-alone mode share
- Reduce the need for schools to build expensive parking structures on campus when the land and money could be used for educational purposes instead
- Reduce parking demand at schools by 400 to 1,000 spaces per campus, according to the UCLA study
- It could be partially funded by small increases in student registration fees; the UCLA study found that 54% to 94% of students approved referenda to increase student fees for passes (the average cost = $30/year).

BENEFITS FOR TRANSIT AGENCIES

*The UCLA study also found that universal student transit pass programs:*

- Increase total transit ridership
- Fill empty seats on bus and rail lines
- Result in improved transit service because of higher demand
- Reduce operating subsidies.

BENEFITS FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC

*Everyone benefits because:*

- Of reduced traffic and car ownership
- Of reduced parking demand
- Of reduced air pollution and GHG emissions
- Students are prompted to make decisions about where to live and work based on the proximity of transit, perhaps creating a lifelong habit of transit use—with the result that California becomes more sustainable.
- An educated workforce will keep California economically competitive.

SUCCESSFUL CALIFORNIA PROGRAMS

Transit ridership is down in California and across the U.S. for reasons that include lower gas prices and transit budget cuts that result in poor service, but transit agencies that foster student ridership through these programs are seeing ridership increases or much smaller declines.

- New programs at Rio Hondo Community College and Pasadena City College in LA County caused ridership to jump from 7% in 2009 to 46% in 2014 at Rio Hondo, and from 11% in 2009 to 47% in 2014 at Pasadena City College.
- As a result of the “Any Line, Any Time” program at Santa Monica College more than 40% of students, faculty and staff arrive on campus by bus.
- UC Berkeley’s Class Pass program resulted in student transit mode share increasing from 6% in 1997 to 27% in 2008, while the student drive-alone share fell from 16% to 7%.
- Student transit pass programs at the University of California at Davis and at Cal State University Sacramento increased annual student transit ridership by 79% and 71% respectively.

IN CONCLUSION

Transit is a key component of a multi-modal transportation system. Transit makes the highway system work more efficiently, which helps the economy work more effectively, which benefits all Californians. And by helping students get to school and stay in school, we are nurturing a well-educated workforce, which will help keep California competitive.
AB 179 (Cervantes)
Promoting Environmental Justice Representation in Transportation Policy

Summary
AB 179 (Cervantes) would restructure the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to ensure environmental justice is represented to promote equitable transportation planning, investments and air quality in California.

Background
The California Transportation Commission (CTC) is tasked with forging a single, unified California transportation policy. The CTC approves and allocates transportation funds to construct highways, passenger rail, active transportation and transit improvements throughout California. The CTC consists of eleven voting members and two non-voting ex-officio members. Nine members are appointed by the Governor, one is appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, and one is appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly. The two ex-officio non-voting members are appointed from the State Senate and Assembly, usually the respective chairs of the transportation policy committee in each house.

Problem
- Currently CTC commissioners are not required to have expertise in transportation, public health, or environmental justice. Understanding the impact of transportation investments on low-income communities of color requires knowledge of transportation policy, and how it relates to public health and environmental justice.

- In the selection of members for advisory boards and developing public participation strategies for transportation guidelines, there have been various barriers preventing meaningful community engagement. To ensure all Californians are represented in transportation decisions, it is essential to have commissioners who understand the importance of including community representatives from designated environmental justice areas on CTC advisory boards as well as providing an appropriate timeline, translation services, and multiple locations to ensure the transportation guidelines represent all of California.

- Over 80% of nitrogen oxide emissions (NoX), harmful ozone gases, are the direct result of mobile sources. We need commissioners who understand how the intersection between transportation investments and air quality and the disparate impacts and burdens these harmful greenhouse gasses (GHGs) place on California’s most vulnerable communities.

- Current transportation policy continues to elevate single occupancy vehicles, goods movement, and leapfrog development patterns. While these elements play a role in economic growth, it has come at a cost, at times destroying and dividing low-income
communities and communities of color. This is why it is more important than ever to ensure the CTC reflects the diversity of our state.

Solution

Restructure the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to ensure diverse representation that promotes equitable transportation planning, investments and air quality in California:

- One voting member should be required to have background and/or expertise in environmental justice.
- The CTC and Air Resources Board (ARB) should regularly coordinate on transportation policy implementation, especially on inter-agency efforts, either through joint meetings and/or having ARB board members sit on CTC as ex-officio members and vice versa.

Sponsors

- California Pan-Ethnic Health Network (CPEHN)
- Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice (CCAEJ)
- ClimatePlan

Contact

Kimberly Chen
California Pan-Ethnic Health Network (CPEHN)
kchen@cpehn.org
(916) 447-1299

Michele Hasson, MPP
Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice (CCAEJ)
michele.h@ccaej.org
(347) 578-0220

Chanell Fletcher
ClimatePlan
chanell@climateplanca.org
(510) 740-3150

Paco Torres
Office of Assemblymember Sabrina Cervantes
Paco.Torres@asm.ca.gov
(916) 319-2060
Billions of dollars in transportation investments are made each year in California, but they rarely meet the needs of low-income families. In fact, transportation investments in low-income communities too often harm vulnerable residents by subjecting them to unhealthy air or fueling displacement pressures.

California’s recent experience dedicating a share of cap-and-trade auction revenues to benefit disadvantaged communities (SB 535, de León, and AB 1550, Gomez) has shown the value of that model which, by meeting the needs of underserved and overburdened residents and protecting them from harm, have contributed to a healthier environment and climate, and to economic prosperity for all.

This bill would translate some (but not all) of that investment model to a significant source of funding for county transportation projects, the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

**ISSUE**

Transportation is a major determinant of access to opportunity and economic mobility. At the same time, it shapes both the location and the nature of development, whether that be a suburban subdivision accessible to a freeway exit, luxury condominiums a short walk from a rail station, an unincorporated rural community several miles from the nearest school bus stop, or a warehouse district near a port.

In short, transportation creates both benefits (like access to opportunity) and burdens (like exposure to toxic emissions). But these benefits and burdens do not fall equally on all. Different “modes” of transportation are relied upon disproportionately by affluent or low-income people and by people of color; and the burdens of transportation systems fall disproportionately on low-income people of color.

If our transportation investments are going to provide low-income families with affordable, accessible and safe transportation options that protect our most vulnerable residents from pollution and displacement, future transportation investment priorities should include those identified by residents of communities that have been historically displaced by past transportation investments and who continue to bear the burdens of transportation infrastructure, while receiving little to no meaningful benefit.

**BILL SUMMARY**

As of 2020, this bill would require each Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to allocate 25% of its funds to projects that provide direct and meaningful benefits to low-income communities and transit routes.

In preparation for that shift, this bill would require Caltrans to adopt guidelines in cooperation with other state agencies, stakeholders, and community-based organizations and residents. The guidelines (which will build on ARB’s experience with its GGRF Funding Guidelines) will determine the process for prioritizing investments that address the mobility, safety, and health needs of low-income communities, including how to assess meaningful and direct benefits to low-income residents as identified through strong public participation.

The bill does not utilize CalEnviroScreen to identify disadvantaged communities.

The bill will also (subject to the appropriation of funds) provide assistance to low-income residents to engage in the Caltrans process, and to implement Participatory Budgeting. Finally, this bill requires congestion management agencies and regional planning agencies to report on project benefits for low-income communities, and requires Caltrans to include this information in its annual report to the Legislature.

**SUPPORT**

- California Bicycle Coalition
- PolicyLink
- Public Advocates, Inc.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION**

Carlos Gonzalez, Legislative Director
State Capitol, Room 4140
Carlos.Gonzalez@asm.ca.gov
(916) 319-2056
**Objective:** Ensure that regional greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets set under SB 375 achieve statewide climate goals, and prioritize state transportation funds for projects that will put us on track to achieve our statewide climate goals and minimize burdens on low-income communities.

**Solution:** SB 150 requires regional GHG reduction targets to be based on our statewide climate laws such as SB 32 and the Governor’s Executive Order B-30-15. It also requires the Air Resources Board (ARB) to monitor regions’ progress to achieve their GHG reduction targets.

**SUMMARY**

Climate change already has a significant and widespread impact on California’s environment, economy, and people. Our coastline, forestry, agriculture, and fresh water supply already suffer from periods of intense drought. And our residents, particularly low-income communities, are at the front lines of these impacts from climate change. As California continues to lead the nation in efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, it is essential that our regions do their part to help us reduce emissions. Transportation is the single largest emitter of greenhouse gas emissions. Yet, according to the Air Resources Board, if every Californian drove 1.6 miles less a day by 2030, we would reduce enough GHG emissions to meet our state’s climate goals. Regions play an instrumental role in reducing how much we drive and lessening the impacts we all face from climate change.

**BACKGROUND**

In 2008, SB 375 (Steinberg) was passed. This groundbreaking law linked transportation, land use, and housing with the goal of reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. SB 375 requires ARB to set regional greenhouse gas reduction targets for all 18 MPOs in the state. MPOs are then required to create a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) in their Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that contains land use, housing, and transportation strategies that, if implemented, would allow the region to meet its GHG emission reduction targets. In addition to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, these SCSs also provide a host of co-benefits such as improved air quality, increased physical activity, increased access to jobs and education especially for those who do not or cannot afford to drive, and protection of natural and working lands.

The passage of SB 375 has transformed regional planning in a number of ways such as: increased public participation from a diverse set of stakeholders; new and leading planning practices from each region that promote affordable homes close to transit; focusing growth in key areas to protect natural lands; and strong performance targets that better measure transportation projects’ impacts on our environment, public health, and local communities.

While SB 375 has successfully advanced how regions plan for the future, there is still much more that must be done to ensure that the SCSs help us meet our statewide climate and equity goals and ultimately help us alleviate the impacts of climate change.

Specifically, there are two main areas that must be strengthened in SB 375:

1. Currently, there is no requirement that the regional GHG reduction targets be aligned with our statewide climate targets such as SB 32 (Pavley) or the Governor’s Executive Order B-30-15.
2. There is no monitoring to assess the MPOs’ progress to achieving their regional GHG reduction targets. MPOs submit projections every four years to ARB, but there is no mechanism to provide feedback on the progress of their efforts.
SB 150 requires that the regional GHG reduction targets be based on our statewide climate goals, including SB 32 (Pavley), and the Governor’s Executive Order B-30-15. This alignment ensures that regions continue their efforts to meet our ambitious climate goals. If we want to alleviate the impacts of climate change, we will need to work together to meet our goals.

It also requires ARB to monitor the regions’ progress to achieve their GHG reduction targets. Many parts of the state have made significant progress to implement SB 375, however the existing framework has not moved the needle far enough to deliver on our stated goals. ARB would be required to look at vehicles miles traveled so we can see if regional plans and investments are succeeding at building sustainable, equitable communities that reduce the need to drive.

**SOLUTION**

**SUPPORT**

NRDC (sponsor)
TransForm (sponsor)
ClimatePlan (sponsor)

**CONTACT**

Tina Andolina
Office of Senator Ben Allen
(916) 651-4026, (916) 651-4926 (Fax)
tina.andolina@sen.ca.gov
SB 760: Complete Streets for Active Living
Author: Senator Scott Wiener

BACKGROUND
Caltrans owns and maintains 50,000 lane-miles of the state highway system through the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), which is funded with $2.4B annually. Caltrans adopted Deputy Directive 64 in 2008 and updated it in 2014 to require the Department to consider complete streets in all phases of design, delivery, construction, and rehabilitation on all projects. Caltrans adopted a Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 that includes goals to triple bicycling and double walking by 2020. The Caltrans Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 also includes goals to include complete streets improvements on an increasing number of projects between the years 2015-2020. Despite these policies, Caltrans does not prioritize complete streets. This bill aims to allocate sufficient funding to implement and achieve the goals of the Plan, and include performance measures and reporting requirements related to complete streets for Caltrans. Such a policy will incentivize Caltrans to create complete pedestrian and bikeway networks throughout California and prioritize complete streets so that our roads are accessible and safe for all users.

ISSUE
Many surface streets in cities, towns and suburbs that carry local traffic, (such as Van Ness, Lombard, and 19th Ave in San Francisco) also operate as state highways. Because they are meant to carry traffic quickly through cities, they do not always include sidewalks or bicycle facilities that make it safe to walk and bike along them. At the same time, walking and bicycling trips have doubled between 2000-2012 and constitute nearly 20 percent of all trips in California based on the National Household Travel Survey. A Smart Growth America study found that California as a state ranks at number 17 for pedestrian risk, with 6,616 pedestrian deaths between 2005 and 2014. The report states there has been an increased risk for California pedestrians in the last two years.

Caltrans still prioritizes throughput of car and truck traffic above all other users, such as people on foot attempting to cross the street to access homes and businesses, people bicycling in the corridor, or people riding the bus. Creating complete streets is rarely if ever considered and not prioritized on major rehabilitation and maintenance projects on these roads even though repaving and repairing them is the ideal, most cost-effective time to make complete streets upgrades. Such efforts will ensure that our roads are safer for everyone, including children needing safe routes to school, the elderly and the disabled. Additionally, by creating complete streets, pedestrians and bicyclists are encouraged to lead more active lives by walking and biking in safe passageways. Caltrans should prioritize accessibility and efficiency improvements to move people (not cars).

1 Smart Growth America, Dangerous By Design 2016. https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/dangerous-by-design-2016/
This bill:
1. Changes the order of priorities on the use of State Highway Account funds, the primary source of funds that flow to the SHOPP by prioritizing accessibility improvements for all users of the transportation system to reduce vehicle miles traveled and promote public health. This replaces operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of the state highway as number one priority for Caltrans.
2. Requires that Caltrans explicitly include complete streets improvements in the Asset Management Plan process currently underway, to be completed by 2020, which sets out a new process for managing SHOPP projects, with performance measures and reporting requirements.
3. Adds language to the Government Code defining a process for how complete streets should be incorporated into SHOPP projects through robust engagement with communities and local governments, and provides an opt-out clause where necessary. Caltrans must incorporate this process by Jan. 1 2020.
4. Submits that Until January 1, 2020, or by a time when Caltrans can demonstrate that it is adhering to the new complete streets guidelines, 3% of SHOPP funds from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account shall be used only for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
5. Establishes a Division of Active Transportation within Caltrans to be responsible for adherence to complete streets performance measures.
6. Provides guidance to the Highway Design Manual for choosing appropriate bikeway facilities on roadways of particular size and speed.

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTACTS

Jeanie Ward-Waller - Policy Director
California Bicycle Coalition
jeanie@calbike.org | 916-399-3211

Bill Sadler - California Senior Policy Manager
Safe Routes to School National Partnership
bill@saferoutespartnership.org | 847-732-4007

Tony Dang - Executive Director
California Walks
tony@californiawalks.org | 510.507.4943

Kula Koenig – Government Relations Director
American Heart Association/American Stroke Association
kula.koenig@heart.org | 916.446.6505

Ann Fryman – Legislative Aide
Senator Scott Wiener
IN BRIEF

AB 805 would reform the consolidated agency San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), as well as the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD), to strengthen the checks and balances within the system and ensure better representation, accountability and transparency.

BACKGROUND

The San Diego Association of Governments functions as the region’s consolidated metropolitan planning organization, regional transportation planning agency, and congestion management agency. In contrast, most areas of the state have these functions split between multiple agencies. This means SANDAG has outsized authority to direct a larger share of transportation funding in San Diego County, while MTS and NCTD are only responsible for the maintenance and operations of the region’s public transit.

In this past election, it was discovered that SANDAG misrepresented the revenue projections that would have been raised through a sales tax increase on the ballot, known as Measure A. News reports revealed that the staff at SANDAG knew these figures were incorrect before the election but failed to alert members of its board of directors of the correct figures and disclosed the rosy projections anyway.

Out-of-date cost estimates were also used in the official long term plans for TransNet, the transportation infrastructure program in San Diego, despite having updated its own figures a year earlier. This enabled SANDAG to obscure an $8.4 billion cost increase facing the projects until after the Measure A tax increase had failed.

THE PROBLEM

The funding and management of San Diego’s transportation resources are controlled by an obscure agency that has very little direct accountability to the public. Votes at the SANDAG and transit boards are not proportionate to the populations of the communities whose voices on transportation issues are delegated to these agencies.

Further, the management of SANDAG resources lack the proper checks-and-balances of an agency responsible for billions of dollars in funding.

SOLUTION

AB 805 would institute a number of reforms. Specifically, AB 805 would:

• Modify the voting structures of SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD to better reflect the populations they serve with proportional representation based on population;

• Raise the profile and accountability of the members of the boards by designating the mayors or mayoral designees to represent their respective cities;

• Allow MTS and NCTD to pursue their own tax increases, subject to voter approval, for use on public transit operations, transit infrastructure, and active transportation;

• Create an Audit Committee with members of the public and the role of independent auditor within SANDAG to perform audits on financial transaction reports, expenditure plans, annual budgets, and revenue forecasts;

• Require SANDAG to report to the Legislature annually on the public transit issues such as the region’s transit needs;

• Require SANDAG’s regional comprehensive plan to address greenhouse gas emission reduction rules adopted by the State Air Resources Board and identify disadvantaged communities; and

• Require SANDAG to adopt internal control guidelines to prevent and detect financial errors and fraud, and develop a process for staff performance reviews.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Laurel Brodzinsky
Office of Asm. Lorena Gonzalez Fletcher
916-319-2080 | laurel.brodzinsky@asm.ca.gov
SUMMARY

AB 342 gives local transportation authorities in the City of San Jose and the City and County of San Francisco the authority to install automated speed enforcement (ASE) systems over a five-year pilot period, in order to protect the safety of vulnerable travelers, such as children, the elderly, and bicyclists, in the two municipalities.

BACKGROUND

In response to hundreds of traffic collisions in the region, both San Jose and San Francisco adopted Vision Zero traffic safety initiatives, with the goal to eliminate traffic fatalities and reduce severe injury crashes. Annually in San Francisco, traffic collisions have caused about 30 fatalities and more than 200 severe injuries; and in San Jose, about 50 people have lost their lives and more than 130 have been severely injured due to traffic collisions.

70 percent of these fatal and severe collisions occur on just a handful of streets and roads in San Francisco and 50 percent of fatal collisions occur on just 3 percent of San Jose streets. Many of the streets with the highest incidence of fatal and severe injury crashes are in Communities of Concern, disproportionately impacting these disadvantaged communities.

Unsafe speed is the single highest fault factor in fatal and severe injury collisions in San Jose and San Francisco. As a result, children going to school, pedestrians heading to work, and elderly citizens traveling home are put at risk every day.

In San Francisco, law enforcement issued more than 10,000 citations for speeding, a 44 percent increase compared to the year before. As a result, the total number of fatal and severe injury collisions caused by speed dropped by more than 20 percent in 2014.

While these enforcement efforts help, local transportation planners require additional enforcement tools to combat this public health hazard.

THE PROBLEM

Across the United States, studies have shown that ASE systems reduce the number of severe and fatal collisions by as much as 58 percent. Despite an established history, California law currently prohibits the use of automated speed enforcement systems. Studies have shown that speed is the leading factor when determining fault in fatal and severe collisions, yet existing enforcement efforts are not enough. California must provide communities with the worst traffic conditions the option to increase the expectation of enforcement.

THE SOLUTION

AB 342 would authorize the use of automated enforcement through a five-year pilot program in the City of San Jose and the City and County of San Francisco. Specifically, AB 342 creates a very specific list of prerequisites that must be met in order to implement ASE systems in the two localities, including:

1. **Location**: Streets who meet criteria based on statewide collision data published by Caltrans, prohibited on freeways.
2. **Public Notice**: Signs displaying “Radar Enforced” along ASE enforced corridors and major jurisdictional boundaries. Public hearings and information campaign.
3. **Citation type**: Similar to a parking citation, no points added to record, and flat max $100 citation including fees.
4. **Speed**: ASE triggered only at 10 mph over posted speed limit, with a maximum of 1 per day, per vehicle.
5. **Warning phase**: Warnings will be issued for 90 days at the start of the program, before any fines begin.
6. **Privacy**: Rear vehicle imaging only, citations sent to vehicle owners like a parking ticket, images and records are kept confidential.
7. **Adjudication**: Owners may contest citation similar to a parking ticket with initial reviews, administrative, and court hearings.
8. **Equity**: Accommodations for low-income drivers, with fines reduced by 80%.
9. **Revenue**: Program cost recovery and then re-invested into improving roadway traffic safety.
10. **Camera Calibration**: Regularly inspected and in accordance with manufacturer’s instructions or at minimum, once a year by a 3rd party lab.
11. **Operation**: Overseen by trained peace officers or other trained city employees.
12. **Oversight**: An evaluation submitted after 5 years assessing safety impacts.
Support
San Francisco Mayor Edwin M. Lee (Sponsor)
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo (Co-Sponsor)
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Association of California Insurance Companies
California Police Chiefs Association
Chinatown Community Development Center
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
UCSF Department of Surgery at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital
Walk San Francisco
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
City of Los Angeles
City of Santa Ana
City of Coronado
Tenants and Owners Development Corporation
Alliance for Retired Americans
CalWalks
CC Puede
FDR Dems
Greater Rincon Hill Community Benefit District
Independent Living Resource Center San Francisco
Livable City
Lower Polk Community Benefit District
Portola Neighborhood Association
South Beach / Rincon / Mission Bay Neighborhood Association
Senior & Disability Action
sf.citi
San Francisco Bay Area Families for Safe Streets
San Francisco Medical Society
SPUR
Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
Silicon Valley Independent Living Center
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
The Friends of Monterey Boulevard
Transform
Stop4Aiden
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Los Angeles Walks
Shape Up San Francisco Coalition
San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership
Golden Gate Bridge Highway Transportation District

Opposition
Peace Officers Research Association of California
California Association of Highway Patrolmen
Western States Trucking Association
Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
Automobile Club of Southern California
AAA of Northern California
Association of Deputy District Attorneys
California Code Enforcement Officers
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California College and University Police Chiefs Association
California Narcotic Officers Association
East Area Progressive Democrats
Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association
Los Angeles Police Protective League
Riverside Sheriffs Association
Safer Streets L.A.
Western Center on Law & Poverty

FOR MORE INFORMATION
Kevin Hefner
Office of Assemblymember David Chiu
Kevin.Hefner@asm.ca.gov