SB 1151: SAFER SCHOOL ZONES
Senator Anthony Cannella

ISSUE
In 1969 almost half of K-8th grade students walked or bicycled to school. Only 13 percent continued this activity in 2009. Many factors including school locations, traffic concerns and the perception of “stranger danger” can deter children from walking to school. However, lack of sidewalks, crosswalks and signal lights in many communities are cited as the biggest barriers to walking and/or biking safely to and from school.

In 2011, California had the nation’s highest fatality rate among child pedestrians aged 4 to 7 years old and the second highest rate among child pedestrians aged 14 years and younger. The risk of pedestrian injury or death is directly related to the lack of walking and biking infrastructure in many California communities.

The Central Valley experiences some of the highest pedestrian fatalities in the state of California. Two students from the 12th Senate District expressed concern for their safety on the streets near their high school. They were the winners of Senator Cannella’s “There Ought to be a Law” contest. Wendi and Natalie identified a serious issue that affects schoolchildren statewide.

BACKGROUND
Highway Safety Corridors, Slow for the Cone Zones, and doubled fines in construction zones are existing models that promote safe driving and protect individuals in sensitive areas. Strangely, school children are not regarded with the same level of priority under current law.

Sixteen states including Washington, Oregon, Arizona, Michigan, Florida, Texas, and Connecticut enforce legislation that holds drivers to a higher standard in school zones. An Oregon Department of Transportation study from 2002 indicated that awareness of increased fines in school zones elevates the perception of the risk of traffic fines, traffic citations, and higher insurance rates. Greater consequence influences the behavior of drivers in school zones.

All revenue generated by the school zone safety fine will be directed to the Active Transportation Program (ATP) administered by the Department of Transportation Division of Local Assistance. ATP’s goals include increasing the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking, enhancing public health, and increasing safety and mobility for non-motorized users, while ensuring the benefits of these programs reach disadvantaged communities. SB 1151 shares these same goals.

The ATP is funded by the State Highway Account, federal Transportation Alternatives Program, and Highway Safety Improvement funds. Funding is not reliant on SB 1151. Allocations are distributed by a competitive grant process. Projects considered have the potential for reducing injuries and fatalities, as well as encouraging increased walking and bicycling, especially among students among many other valuable motivations. These resources will contribute to both infrastructure improvements and non-capital support programs like planning and education for safe routes to school efforts.

Current funding guarantees Safe Routes to Schools grants will be maintained for the next three years, however, designating funds from SB 1151 to safe school zone ventures makes school zone safety a priority for future budget allocations.

AB 1886 (Jackson, 2002) established a pilot program similar to SB 1151 in Alameda, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties. Unique situations in these pilot areas created results that were not statistically significant enough to enact a statewide double fine zone. Various other studies identify that increased fines in addition to other resources such as posted signs or more enforcement, have a positive effect on public safety.

SOLUTION
SB 1151 promotes safer driving in school zones by creating an additional fine equal to the base fine for traffic violations cited in school zones. The fines will contribute to the Active Transportation Program to be used for Safe Routes to Schools and future ventures within the ATP that encourage safety and promote regular physical activity for children as they walk or bike safely to and from school.

Origin: Natalie and Wendi – South Madera High School
Sponsors: Alliance for Community Research and Development (ACRD), Central California Regional Obesity Prevention Program (CCROPP)
Support: California Convergence, Public Health Institute, Latino Coalition for a Healthy California, Alameda County
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Support SB 391 (DeSaulnier) the California Homes and Jobs Act:  
Spur job creation, boost California’s business competitiveness,  
and build affordable homes for Californians

Everyone in California needs a safe and affordable place to call home. Rents and mortgages within the reach of working families are critical to maintaining California’s business competitiveness. Let’s get California building again.

The California Homes and Jobs Act of 2013 will:

✓ Create 29,000 jobs annually, primarily in the beleaguered construction sector.
✓ Help businesses attract and retain the talent that fuels California’s economy.
✓ Generate an estimated $500 million in state investment and leverage an additional $2.78 billion in federal and local funding and bank loans to build affordable homes and create jobs.
✓ Deploy these dollars in California communities through a successful private/public partnership model to build an estimated 10,000 homes each year.
✓ Get California building again to create affordable home options for all Californians.

The Housing Crisis Isn’t Over for Many Californians
For U.S. military veterans, former foster youth, families with children, people with disabilities, seniors on fixed incomes, Native Americans, and vulnerable Californians, the housing crisis isn’t over. In fact, millions of Californians are caught in the “perfect storm” — mortgages remain out of reach, credit standards have tightened, and the foreclosure crisis has pushed more people into a rental market already suffering from decades of short supply — leading to record-setting rent increases. The most vulnerable, who struggled to make rent before the foreclosure crisis, face even more uncertainty in today’s rental market. They risk joining the 130,000+ Californians who are homeless on any given night.

Building Affordable Homes Is a Business Imperative for California
Business groups including the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, the Orange County Business Council and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group say California needs to increase the supply of housing options affordable to workers, so companies can compete for the talent that drives California’s economy.

By working together to pass SB 391 we can:

• Build safe and affordable single-family homes and apartments for Californians in need, including families, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, and people experiencing homelessness. A safe, secure home is essential for all Californians to live with dignity and safety; it is essential for children to succeed in school and in life.
• **Put Californians back to work.** The California Homes and Jobs Act will put tens of thousands of construction workers back on the job annually so they can provide for their families and boost local economies.

• **Unlock billions in federal, local, and private funds to build homes and create jobs.** The California Homes and Jobs Act would place a small fee on the recordation of real estate related documents — *excluding* home sales — raising $500 million annually for state investment in affordable home production and leveraging an additional $2.78 billion in federal, local, and bank investment in homes and jobs for Californians.

• **Help California’s budget live within its means.** The California Homes and Jobs Act is a sustainable funding source that helps the state live within its means, increasing California’s supply of affordable homes, creating jobs, and spurring economic growth without incurring additional debt. The legislation will put a small ($75) recordation fee on real estate transactions – excluding home sales. This fee will generate an estimated $500 million in state “seed money” each year – without creating new debt — to leverage an additional $2.78 billion in federal and local funding and bank loans annually.

• **Build on California’s proven track record of public/private investment in affordable homes.** Since 2002, state investment through general obligation bonds has built more than 174,000 affordable apartments, for-sale homes, and shelters through successful programs that (1) build apartments affordable to seniors, people with severe disabilities, hardworking families with children, and others (Multifamily Housing Program); (2) assist households on modest budgets in becoming homeowners (CalHOME); and (3) provide stable homes for battered women, homeless mentally ill people, veterans, seniors, and others without a place to live (Multifamily Housing Program-Supportive Housing and Emergency Housing and Assistance Program), and others.

**Action Needed Now**

Without the California Homes and Jobs Act, it’s a certainty that more Californians will become homeless. **For the first time in 30 years, California is facing virtually NO state investment in affordable homes.** Last year alone, California lost more than $1 billion in state investment that is no longer available to leverage federal and local funds and private investment to build affordable places to live.

Without SB 391, tens of thousands will be left without an affordable place to call home, tens of thousands of well-paying construction jobs will disappear, and more California businesses will struggle to attract workers and remain competitive. The time is NOW to invest in homes and jobs for Californians and pass SB 391, the California Homes and Jobs Act.

Visit us online: [www.californiabuildsact.org](http://www.californiabuildsact.org)
Like us on Facebook: [www.facebook.com/CaliforniaHomesandJobsAct](http://www.facebook.com/CaliforniaHomesandJobsAct)
Follow us on Twitter: [@CAHomesandJobs](http://twitter.com/CAHomesandJobs)
Updated: January 31, 2014
Why Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds Should Fund Affordable Homes Near Transit

Affordable TOD Has an Important Role in Reducing GHG

Transportation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions account for 38% of California’s total. Because transportation needs are driven in large part by where people can afford to live, housing affordability affects the sector’s emissions. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) planning process required by SB 375 (Steinberg, 2008) has made integration of housing, land use, and transportation planning a key part of the state’s strategy for reducing auto-related GHG emissions. Ensuring that households of all income levels, especially low-income households who use transit most, are able to live near transit and jobs is crucial to meeting the goals of SB 375 and AB 32.

The California Department of Housing and Community Development’s (HCD) Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program provides funding for affordable homes near transit. However, funding for the TOD Housing Program will be exhausted by the end of 2013. The Cap-and-Trade Program’s auction proceeds offer an important opportunity to continue this successful GHG reduction program.

Supporting the development and preservation of affordable homes near transit is an integral part of the Sustainable Communities for All proposal for use of cap-and-trade revenue supported by more than 60 organizations. The broad coalition behind the Sustainable Communities for All proposal includes housing, transportation, labor, social equity, public health, and conservation organizations.

California’s Transit Oriented Development Housing Program: A Transformative Program for Reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The California Department of Housing and Community Development Transit Oriented Development Housing Program was initially funded by the passage of Proposition 1C, the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006. Over two funding rounds in 2007 and 2008, HCD awarded $271 million to 27 developments through a competitive process, producing a total of 6,158 TOD homes and leveraging more than $1.6 billion in federal and private capital. Due to high demand and limited funding, HCD was able to fund less than a quarter of the 119 applications it received- a total of over $1.1 billion in proposed TOD. Program funding is nearly expended with remaining funds to be distributed through a third and final funding round this summer unless additional funding is appropriated.

This paper demonstrates how the developments funded by the TOD Housing Program encourage deep GHG reductions and summarizes research supporting the program’s scoring criteria.

The TOD Housing Program funds the development of apartments and condominiums within a ¼ mile of transit, with the specific goals of increasing public transit ridership, minimizing automobile trips, and promoting GHG reductions. HCD selects projects using criteria based on rigorous empirical data and academic research on the best methods of reducing auto use and increasing transit ridership. GHG benefits from affordable TOD are long lasting. They endure for at least 55 years, the life of the program loan.

1 TOD Housing Program Second Round Guidelines, February 2009.
http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/tod/SECOND_ROUND_TOD_HOUSING_PROGRAM_GUIDELINES_FINAL.pdf
HCD’s TOD Housing Program: Designed for GHG and VMT Reduction

All developments funded through the program must be within a quarter mile of a transit station that provides high-quality transit service and meet minimum density levels based on location. Projects are selected using a scoring system based on characteristics deemed necessary for creating successful TOD housing. In the program’s second round, the majority of the total points (220 out of 380) were awarded based on features that reduce GHG and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). All awardees scored maximum points in six out of seven GHG/VMT reduction categories listed below.

- **Consistent with Infill and TOD Objectives of Regional Planning Efforts (30 points):** Developments must be consistent with regional planning efforts, local plans, and specific plans and be located in areas targeted for infill and transit-oriented development. All awardees in the last round scored full points.

- **Quality of Transit System and Transit Station (90 points):** Transit service must offer travel times equal to or better than automobile travel and must provide real-time schedule information to riders. Awardees in the last round scored 66 to 90 points.

- **Access to Services (15 points):** Developments must be located within a half mile of at least ten distinct amenities (grocery stores, schools, parks, etc.) that enable residents to avoid the use of a car to meet basic needs. All awardees in the last round scored full points.

- **Discounted Transit Passes (5 points):** Developments must offer free or discounted transit passes (no more than half of retail cost) to each lower income household for the term of the program loan (55 years). All awardees in the last round scored full points.

- **Innovative Parking Reduction Strategies (25 points):** Developments must feature parking shared between various uses, such as residential and retail (5 points); offer dedicated parking spaces for car-sharing vehicles (5 points); and offer minimal residential parking (10 points). Residents pay for parking separately from monthly rent payments (except where prohibited by federal law) (5 points). All awardees in the last round scored full points.

- **Biking and Walking Friendly Features (25 points):** The main walking route between the transit station and the development must have small street blocks, street lighting after dark, ADA compliant sidewalks, and safe street crossings. The transit station must have waiting areas with seating, lights, shelter, and bicycle facilities. All awardees in the last round scored full points.

- **Serves Households at Lower Income Levels (30 Points):** Developments must provide dedicated units that are affordable to lower income households that are most likely to take transit and less likely to own a car. All awardees in the last round scored full points.

The remaining points are awarded based on the readiness of the project for construction, the amount of additional capital it is able to leverage apart from the program funding, the developer’s track record of successful completion of infill and TOD, and community support for the project.

For the upcoming third funding round, HCD made changes to the program’s scoring criteria that improve the focus on reducing VMT and GHG emissions by adding scoring categories for **Accessibility to Job Centers** and **Consistency with the GHG objectives of local plans and AB 32**, and by increasing the value of other GHG-reducing categories.
Meeting the Sinclair Nexus Test: Understanding the Research

There is a growing body of research linking GHG reductions to affordable homes near transit.

Walkable, Transit-oriented Locations Reduce Driving

According to Reid Ewing and Robert Cervero in their 2010 article, “Travel and the Built Environment: A Meta-Analysis,” the following key characteristics significantly lower residents’ VMT and resulting auto-related GHG emissions: close proximity to frequent, efficient transit — typically within a half mile or less — that connects residents to jobs centers and services; heightened density of residences and/or employment; a mix of uses in the neighborhood, providing local access to shopping, services, and jobs; and a street network that makes it easy and safe to walk or bike to local destinations. HCD’s TOD Housing Program rewards housing developments that incorporate these key characteristics.

Additionally, in the 2007 research paper “Transit Oriented Development’s Ridership Bonus,” Robert Cervero conducted before-and-after surveys of residents who had moved to California TODs from areas with poor transit access. The study found that TOD residents’ daily VMT dropped 42% on average. The Cervero study also showed added benefits for new TOD residents including reduced commute times, lower commute costs, and increased job access.

Low-Income Households Drive Less and Use Transit More, Especially in TOD

While living in TOD homes increases transit ridership among people of all incomes, low-income people demonstrate the highest transit ridership in TOD neighborhoods in California’s four largest metro areas. U.S. Census data on commuting reveals that workers living in transit-accessible neighborhoods and earning less than $25,000 a year take transit, walk, or bike to work at much higher rates than higher earners who also live in these neighborhoods. These results are consistent with national data that show higher transit ridership and lower car ownership and car use on average among low-income households.

The benefits of improved access to transit will decrease overall in neighborhoods if existing residents with low vehicle ownership are displaced. Because transit is a desirable amenity, rents and property values near transit are typically higher on average than for similar homes further from transit. Northeastern University’s Dukakis Center studied 42 neighborhoods with newly improved transit and found that “in some of the newly transit-rich neighborhoods...a new transit station can set in motion a cycle of unintended consequences in which core transit users—such as renters and low-income households—are priced out in favor of higher-income, car-owning residents who are less likely to use public transit for commuting.” For these reasons, investing in affordable TOD is critical to reducing displacement of existing low-income residents from neighborhoods with good transit access.

---

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944361003766766
4 Analysis of ACS data aggregated using the TOD Database, a project of CNT and CTOD and included in California Housing Partnership Corporation, “Building and Preserving Affordable Homes Near Transit: Affordable TOD as a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy”, 2013
On-Site Strategies Can Further Reduce Driving and GHGs

In addition to location and affordability, the transportation demand management strategies included in HCD’s TOD Housing Program scoring criteria further reduce vehicle ownership, trips and GHG.

- **Car Sharing:** 20% of car-sharing households give up one or more vehicles, and on average 34% forgo buying a new car.\(^8\)

- **Free or Discounted Transit Passes:** Whether offered by universities, employers or housing developers, providing free or heavily discounted transit passes leads to much higher transit ridership and lower GHGs. First Community Housing, a developer of affordable apartment homes, provides free transit passes to residents in all its developments. A survey of 1,500 residents\(^9\) found that 64% use a pass more than four times a week and 22% said their passes reduced the number of cars owned in their household.

- **Bicycle Supportive Features:** Bicycle commuting reduces VMT. Many low-income residents ride bikes but can face barriers to using them as replacements for car travel. Designing bike parking into affordable home developments and improving the surrounding bicycle infrastructure can help encourage cycling and capture these GHG reduction benefits.\(^10\)

Low-Income Families Living in Urban Areas Own Far Fewer Cars than in Suburban Areas

A 2011 study of parking at 34 affordable home sites in San Diego\(^11\) found that those located in “core urban” areas that were walkable and had good transit access had just one vehicle for every ten households (0.1 per household), compared to 1.3 vehicles per household in suburban areas.

The same study concluded that minimum parking requirements hurt lower-income households, by increasing costs and reducing housing density, and thus potential transit riders.

Cervero and Arrington’s study on TOD found that average vehicle ownership for TOD residential development was approximately 1.1 vehicles per unit – half the 2.2 parking spaces per unit that many cities require, even near transit.\(^12\) Inappropriately high parking requirements for TOD inflate costs and decrease the supply of units. **The TOD Housing Program incentivizes reduced parking requirements by rewarding developments that build less parking.**

Affordable TOD: A Successful GHG Reduction and Equity Strategy

HCD’s TOD Housing Program provides an innovative approach to achieve maximum long-term GHG benefits and serve the economic, public health, and environmental interests of California’s most disadvantaged communities and households. Built on solid academic research, it incorporates proven GHG/VMT reduction features. **In the face of solid evidence and significant need, we recommend appropriating Cap-and-Trade auction proceeds efficiently and effectively through HCD’s TOD Housing Program.**

---


What if we could reduce air pollution, improve health and save money?

We can! Exhaust from cars and trucks pollutes our air and contributes to climate change. Dirty air from vehicles makes tens of thousands of Californians sick, and costs us billions in avoidable health costs. Dependence on oil means Californians have no place to turn when gas prices rise. Transitioning to cleaner and more efficient cars, trucks and buses will benefit every Californian.

Campaign Goals

Our campaign aims to place one million light, medium, and heavy-duty electric vehicles on California's roads over the next 10 years and ensure that all Californians, especially lower-income households in communities most impacted by air pollution, benefit from zero tailpipe emissions.

Targeting Pollution

Four in ten Californians, more than in any other state, live close enough to a freeway or busy road that they may be at increased risk of asthma, cancer and other health hazards. Nearly twice as many Californians die from traffic pollution as from motor vehicle accidents. Accelerating the replacement of gasoline cars and dirty diesel trucks and buses with zero emission vehicles is critical to cleaning up the air in communities historically exposed to a disproportionate share of pollution.

Reducing the Cost of Filling Up

The average household spends $2,756 on gasoline and motor oil annually, straining family budgets and hitting lower income households especially hard. Between 2005 and 2010, the average per capita expenditure on transportation fuels doubled relative to the previous six years, as the price of a barrel of oil jumped. Unlike gasoline prices, which fluctuate with the global oil market, the price of electricity is stable because it comes from a diverse, largely domestic supply and is carefully regulated by the state’s Public Utilities Commission. Driving on electricity in California is equivalent to paying only one dollar-per-gallon in a gasoline vehicle. If the average American household were to drive on electricity, it would save over $2,000 annually, reducing its fuel bill by more than two thirds.

How We'll Do It

The Charge Ahead California campaign promotes policies to necessary to achieve long-term air quality and climate goals and ensure Californians disproportionately impacted by air pollution benefit from cleaner vehicles. Current policies and incentives have given California a head-start, but transforming the market to benefit all Californians will take sustained, long-term commitment.

California can improve the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP) and the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP) to stimulate sales of zero-emission cars, trucks, and buses, drive economies of scale that reduce costs and eliminate incentives as we transition to a sustainable market.

We will also propose a package of policies to provide tangible benefits in disadvantaged communities that may include: 1) electric car sharing and the deployment of charging infrastructure in multi-unit dwellings; 2) increasing consumer access to electric vehicle financing options that can help families immediately realize lower combined monthly auto payment and fuel costs; 3) combining incentives for the scrapping of old clunkers with incentives for new or used electric-drive vehicles; and 4) providing vouchers for transit and electric car sharing as an alternative to vouchers for replacement vehicles.
Electric Vehicles Provide Environmental, Health and Economic Benefits to All Californians

Cleaning the Air and Fighting Climate Change

To meet California’s air quality and greenhouse gas goals, the state’s transportation sector needs to be largely converted to zero emission vehicles. In particular, to attain ozone standards required by federal law, NOx emissions in the South Coast Air Basin must be cut by 80 percent by 2023, and by almost 90 percent by 2032; this will require that virtually all light, medium, and heavy-duty vehicles in the region be zero emission.

Accelerating this transition will yield tremendous benefits to all Californians. According to estimates by the American Lung Association, a 100 percent electric fleet in California running on electricity that is one-third renewable would avoid: $13 billion in health, climate, and other societal damages annually, 10,000 asthma attacks every year and 275 tons of criteria pollutants every day. Those benefits will only increase as California increases the share of its electricity generated from renewables.

Economic Growth and 100,000 New Jobs

Californians spend $70 billion on gasoline and diesel annually, $40 billion of which leaves the state in payments to oil companies and foreign oil producing countries. The use of electricity as a transportation fuel can help keep those dollars in the state, stimulating the economy and insulating family budgets from gas price spikes.

Powering California’s cars, trucks and buses with electricity instead of oil would help grow the state’s economy, creating up to 100,000 additional jobs by 2030. Money saved at the pump by charging up on electricity stays California, creating 16 times more jobs than money spent on gasoline. All households benefit because these potential jobs are spread across California’s diverse economy, largely in sectors that cannot be outsourced, with lower and middle-income households, those most in need of the additional income, standing to benefit the most.

The production and sale of electric cars, trucks, and buses also creates jobs in California, at companies such as EVI (Stockton), Boulder EV (Chatsworth), Complete Coach Works (Riverside), El Dorado National (Riverside), BYD (Lancaster), Altec (Dixon), Vision Industries (Long Beach), Transpower (Poway), Quantum (Lake Forest) and Tesla (Fremont).

California’s Light, Medium, and Heavy-Duty Incentive Programs Work

Roughly a third of the nation’s 140,000 electric cars have been purchased in California, thanks largely to the CVRP. Once the Chevrolet Volt became eligible for the CVRP rebate and HOV lane access, sales quadrupled. For commercial trucks and buses, HVIP rebates have changed the calculus for fleet managers, who generally require a three-year payback period before investing in more efficient vehicles. Incentives in other states that are not as well designed have failed to move the market; three-quarters of all of the nation’s electric trucks have been deployed in California.

What We’re Up Against

The oil industry is fighting hard against their requirements under Californian’s clean energy and climate law (AB 32). Our campaign aims to put clean cars in the hands of everyday people and break Big Oil’s monopoly on transportation fuels.

Transportation is the single largest source of greenhouse gas pollution in California, accounting for 38 percent of emissions. Polluter funds from AB 32, designated to reduce emissions, will be significant, but are currently at risk from oil industry-led attacks. A small fraction of those proceeds would be sufficient to fund the package of policies supported by Charge Ahead California.

1 Tony Barboza, One-fifth of U.S. lives near roads with higher air pollution, study says, Los Angeles Times, October 2, 2013.
2 3,726 annual premature deaths in California due to PM 2.5 and 209 from ozone (Fabio Caiazzo et al., Air pollution and early deaths in the United States, Atmospheric Environment, 2013) compared to 3,081 traffic fatalities (Selected Detail Within Leading Causes Of Death By Sex And Race/Ethnic, California Department of Public Health).
4 Ibid.
5 American Lung Association in California, The Road to Clean Air, Appendix B.
7 Alternative Fuels Data Center, Per Capita Energy Expenditures By Sector.
9 Assuming EV efficiency of 0.35 kWh/mi, PG&E’s off-peak EV rate of $0.098/kWh, and a 28 mile-per-gallon conventional car.
10 Same assumptions as previous footnote compared to $3.680/gallon gasoline (Energy Information Agency, Retail Gasoline and Diesel Prices).