



RESOLUTION ADOPTING SUPPORT POSITIONS ON ASSEMBLY BILL (AB) 43 (FRIEDMAN), AB 455 (BONTA, WICKS, WIENER), AB 550 (CHIU), AB 917 (BLOOM), AND AB 1238 (TING)

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority approves a set of legislative principles to guide transportation policy advocacy in the sessions of the Federal and State Legislatures; and

WHEREAS, With the assistance of the Transportation Authority's legislative advocate in Sacramento, staff has reviewed pending legislation for the current Legislative Session and analyzed it for consistency with the Transportation Authority's adopted legislative principles and for impacts on transportation funding and program implementation in San Francisco and recommended adopting new support positions on AB 43 (Friedman), AB 455 (Bonta, Wicks, Wiener), AB 550 (Chiu), AB 917 (Bloom) and AB 1238 (Ting), as shown in Attachment 1; and

WHEREAS, AB 550 (Chiu) would authorize the local use of speed safety cameras, which are currently used in 142 communities in the United States and has been shown to have a meaningful safety impact by reducing severe and fatal traffic collisions by as much as 58 percent; and

WHEREAS, The Vision Zero Task Force is supportive of speed safety cameras as a strategy to reduce traffic violence because unsafe speed is one of the most commonly cited factors in traffic fatalities, being reported as a primary or secondary factor in 40% of San Francisco's fatal collisions in 2020; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and the Transportation Authority have made seeking state authorization to implement speed safety cameras a legislative priority for several years; and

WHEREAS, At its March 24, 2021 meeting, the Citizens Advisory



Committee reviewed and adopted a motion of support for a support position on AB 550 (Chiu); and

WHEREAS, At its April 13, 2021 meeting, the Board reviewed and discussed AB 43 (Friedman), AB 455 (Bonta, Wicks, Wiener), AB 550 (Chiu), AB 917 (Bloom) and AB 1238 (Ting); now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby adopts new support positions on AB 43 (Friedman), AB 455 (Bonta, Wicks, Wiener), AB 550 (Chiu), AB 917 (Bloom) and AB 1238 (Ting); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is directed to communicate this position to all relevant parties.

Attachment:

1. State Legislation - April 2021

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**State Legislation - April 2021**

(Updated April 21, 2021, to reflect amendments to AB 550)

To view documents associated with the bill, click the bill number link.

Staff is recommending new support positions on Assembly Bill (AB) 43 (Friedman), AB 455 (Bonta, Wicks, Wiener), AB 550 (Chiu), AB 917 (Bloom) and AB 1238 (Ting), and new watch positions on AB 629 (Chiu) and Senate Bill 735 (Rubio) as show in **Table 1**. The Board does not act on watch positions.

**Table 2** provides an update on AB 117 (Boerner Horvath), on which the Transportation Authority has previously taken a support position.

**Table 3** shows the status of active bills on which the Board has already taken a position.

**Table 1. New Recommended Position**

Recommended Positions	Bill # Author	Title and Update
<p>Support  (Currently Watch)</p>	<p><a href="#">AB 43</a> <a href="#">Friedman</a> D</p>	<p>Traffic safety.</p> <p>The Transportation Authority established a Watch position at its March 23, 2021 meeting, in part due to amendments that were in process. The bill has since been amended. SFMTA worked with the author on these changes and the Mayor’s Office State Legislation Committee adopted a support position on the bill in March.</p> <p>As amended, the bill would provide significant new flexibility for Caltrans and local jurisdictions to establish speed limits that respond to specific localized safety concerns. It would now: allow authorities to consider bicyclist and pedestrian safety when adjusting speed limits; lower the prima facie speed limits to 25 mph on any highway except state highways that are located in a business or residence district; allow the state and local jurisdictions to declare speed limits below 25 mph; extend existing ability to set speed limits without an engineering study to locations approaching a business district; allow local jurisdictions to reduce speed limits below the 85th percentile; and extend the years an engineering study would apply from seven to fourteen.</p> <p>We are recommending revising the position from Watch to Support with these amendments, which will provide significant new tools to make meaningful speed limit adjustments in response to on-the-ground safety conditions in San Francisco. Local speed limit setting flexibility has been a key Vision Zero strategy and was a recommendation by last year’s state Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force.</p>

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Recommended Positions	Bill # Author	Title and Update
<p>Support  (Currently Watch)</p>	<p><a href="#">AB 455</a> <a href="#">Bonta</a> D</p> <p>Coauthors: <a href="#">Wicks</a> D <a href="#">Wiener</a> D</p>	<p>Bay Bridge Fast Forward Program.</p> <p>The Transportation Authority established a Watch position at its March 23, 2021 meeting, as staff was still discussing the potential impact of the bill with local and regional partners and waiting to see if any amendments would be forthcoming. Last month, the bill would have established requirements for the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) to identify, plan, and deliver a comprehensive set of operational, transit, and infrastructure investments for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge corridor and would have authorized a pilot program for a transit- and very high occupancy-vehicle lane on the bridge after January 1, 2025 if conditions were still congested.</p> <p>As amended, this bill would simply authorize BATA, in coordination with Caltrans, to designate transit-only lanes on the San Francisco - Oakland Bay Bridge. BATA has already included a study of a transit-only lane on the bridge in its Bay Bridge Forward suite of projects. We believe establishing a regional process to determine whether to implement the lane is a more reasonable approach than mandating one at the state level. We are therefore recommending changing the current Watch position to a Support position at this time.</p>

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Recommended Positions	Bill # Author	Title and Update
Support	<a href="#">AB 550</a> <a href="#">Chiu D</a>	<p>Vehicles: speed safety system pilot program.</p> <p>At the time of the April 13 Board meeting, this bill would have required the Secretary of Transportation to adopt guidelines by July 1, 2022 for the implementation of two types of speed safety system pilots - one for dangerous local streets, and the other for active state or local work zones.</p> <p>Speed detection systems have been shown to reduce the number of severe and fatal collisions by as much as 58% across the United States and have been identified as a critical tool to combat pedestrian fatalities by the city’s Vision Zero Task Force and many other pedestrian safety organizations. Securing authorization for a speed safety camera pilot program has been a top priority for SFMTA and the Transportation Authority for years. Mayor Breed is already on record supporting AB 550. The Transportation Authority’s Citizens Advisory Committee adopted a motion of support to adopt a support position on a prior version of the bill at its March 24 meeting.</p> <p><b>Update 04.21.2021:</b> On April 15, the bill was effectively rewritten to specify a different approach to the implementation of speed safety camera pilots. The amendments are closely modeled off of language in AB 342 (Chiu) from the 2017-18 legislative session. The Transportation Authority adopted a support position on AB 342 at that time. Among other things the bill would now:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit the number of pilots to six jurisdictions, including San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose</li> <li>• Require a participating jurisdiction to approve a Speed Safety System Use Policy and a Speed Safety System Impact Report before implementing the program</li> <li>• Limit where the cameras could be installed, specifically on a high injury network (as defined by Caltrans), or within 2,500 feet of a school, senior zone, public park, or recreational center</li> <li>• Limit the installation to no more than 15% of a jurisdiction’s streets</li> <li>• Require pilots to demonstrate a 25% decrease in violations in the first 18 months and a 50% decrease in people with two or more violations, or the pilot would have to be discontinued</li> <li>• Limit the use of revenues to cost recovery and traffic calming improvements</li> <li>• Prohibit the use of mobile camera units for two years after the initial installation of speed safety cameras</li> </ul> <p>The bill must get out of Assembly Transportation at its Monday April 26 hearing. If it is approved, we expect additional amendments to be introduced. SFMTA is working closely with the author to improve some parts of the language and we still recommend a support position at this time on the amended bill.</p> <p>A revised fact sheet on AB 550 is included as an attachment to this table.</p>

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Recommended Positions	Bill # Author	Title and Update
Watch	<a href="#">AB 629</a> <a href="#">Chiu D</a>	<p>San Francisco Bay area: public transportation.</p> <p>This bill builds on last year’s AB 2057 (Chiu) in that it is intended to move the Bay Area toward a more connected, coordinated, equitable, and effective regional transit system. Named the Seamless and Resilient Bay Area Transit Act, it would require the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to consult with transit agencies, local jurisdictions, county transportation agencies, and the general public to accomplish a number of mandates, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish and maintain a transit priority network for the San Francisco Bay Area.</li> <li>2. By February 1, 2022, complete an integrated regional transit fare study and by January 1, 2023 complete a report on the progress of implementing the recommendations of the study.</li> <li>3. By July 1, 2023, create a pilot program to implement an accumulator transit pass among multiple operators providing service in at least 3 adjacent counties.</li> <li>4. By July 1, 2024, develop a comprehensive, standardized regional transit mapping and wayfinding system as well as a strategy for deployment and maintenance of the system.</li> <li>5. By January 1, 2024, in partnership with the Department of Transportation and the operators of managed lanes in the San Francisco Bay Area, develop a strategy to ensure the regional managed lanes network supports seamless operation of high-capacity transit.</li> <li>6. Coordinate transit agencies’ route, schedule, and fare data and develop an implementation and funding plan for deployment of real-time information.</li> </ol> <p>It would also direct Bay Area transit agencies to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By July 1, 2025, only use the regional transit mapping and wayfinding system developed by MTC.</li> <li>2. Use open data standards to make available all routes, schedules, and fares in a specified data format and to track actual transmission of real-time information by transit vehicles to ensure that schedule predictions are available.</li> </ol> <p>We are recommending a watch position at this time, as we expect that the bill’s language will change after the regional Blue Ribbon Transit Task Force concludes its work and releases its Action Plan, expected in June/July 2021. This ad hoc group, which includes Assemblymember Chiu, transit operators, and various representatives from transit interest groups, convened in May 2020 to develop a COVID recovery strategy as well strategies to achieve a more connected Bay Area transit system. SFMTA’s Director of Transportation, Jeffrey Tumlin and the city’s MTC Commissioner Nick Josefowitz both serve on the Task Force.</p>

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Recommended Positions	Bill # Author	Title and Update
Support	<a href="#">AB 917 Bloom</a> D	<p>Vehicles: video imaging of parking violations.</p> <p>SFMTA currently has state authority to enforce parking violations in transit-only traffic lanes with automated forward-facing cameras on transit vehicles to enforce violations such as double parking. This bill would extend that authorization to any public transit operator in the state indefinitely. It would also allow enforcement of curbside parking violations at transit stops and stations.</p> <p>We are recommending a Support position on this bill to provide SFMTA with a more effective way to cite vehicles that park in bus stop zones and by doing so, contribute to increased transit reliability and safety for loading/unloading.</p>
Support	<a href="#">AB 1238 Ting</a> D	<p>Pedestrian access.</p> <p>This bill would decriminalize a number of pedestrian activities that are currently prohibited and subject to police citation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crossing a roadway outside of a crosswalk</li> <li>• Crossing a roadway when no cars are present</li> <li>• Stepping off the curb at an intersection during a yellow light</li> <li>• Obeying traffic signals</li> </ul> <p>We understand this bill is likely in reaction to a consistent practice of police stopping and ticketing jaywalkers in Southern California. We are recommending a support position on this bill since it would focus police enforcement of traffic violations on the drivers of vehicles, which are statistically much more frequently at fault for fatalities and severe injuries.</p>
Watch	<a href="#">SB 735 Rubio</a> D	<p>Vehicles: speed safety cameras.</p> <p>Similar to AB 550 (Chiu), this bill would authorize a local authority to use speed safety cameras to enforce speed limits, however only within 2,500 feet of a school where there is an indication that vehicle, pedestrian, or bicycle traffic is substantially generated or influenced by the school. It would be a permanent authorization, not a pilot. The bill would also prescribe requirements for the program, including, among other things, notice to the public, issuance of civil citations, and confidentiality of data as well an appeal process.</p> <p>In general, this bill represents a limited scope authorization of speed safety cameras, while AB 550 would provide broader flexibility that would better correspond to the city's high injury network, including dangerous local roads near schools. We are recommending a Watch position in order to make it clear to legislators what the Transportation Authority's priority is with respect to authorizing these cameras. We will carefully track both pieces of legislation and can return with a recommendation for a Support position if AB 550 looks like it is not going to advance this year.</p>

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Table 2. Notable Updates on Bills in the 2019-2020 Session**

Adopted Positions	Bill # Author	Title and Update
Support	<a href="#">AB 117</a> <a href="#">Boerner</a> <a href="#">Horvath</a> D	<p>Air Quality Improvement Program: electric bicycles.</p> <p>In March, when the Transportation Authority adopted a support position on the bill, it would have created a \$10 million electric bicycle rebate program. Based on Board input, we approached the author to convey the Transportation Authority's support for the bill and request that 1) rebates are scaled so that lower income purchasers get bigger rebates than higher income purchasers and 2) income determinations be made using local median income instead of statewide median income. Mark Watts, our Sacramento advocate, subsequently met with the author's staff to discuss the request and testified on behalf of the Transportation Authority at the bill's hearing at the Assembly Transportation Committee on April 5, 2021.</p> <p>Recent amendments established goals that include prioritizing funding for individuals from low-income households and restricting eligibility to individuals and households with incomes below the maximum limits established in the existing Clean Vehicle Rebate Project. Presently the income cap above which households are ineligible to receive vehicle rebates are \$150,000 for single income tax filers, \$204,000 for head-of-household filers, and \$300,000 for joint filers. However, the \$10 million appropriation in cap and trade funds was also removed from the legislation, so a fund source would now have to be identified to implement the program.</p>

**Table 3. Bill Status for Active Positions Taken in the 2021-22 Session**

Updates to bills since the last Board meeting are italicized.

Adopted Positions	Bill # Author	Bill Title	Update to Bill Status <sup>1</sup> (as of 3/30/2021)
Support	<a href="#">AB 117</a> <a href="#">Boerner</a> <a href="#">Horvath</a> D	Air Quality Improvement Program: electric bicycles.	<i>Assembly Transportation</i>
	<a href="#">AB 1499</a> <a href="#">Daly</a> D	Transportation: design-build: highways.	<i>Assembly Transportation</i>
Oppose	<a href="#">AB 5</a> <a href="#">Fong</a> R	Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: High Speed Rail Authority: K-12 education: transfer and loan.	<i>Assembly Transportation</i>

<sup>1</sup>Under this column, "Chaptered" means the bill is now law, "Dead" means the bill is no longer viable this session, and "Enrolled" means it has passed both Houses of the Legislature. "Two-year" bills have not met the required legislative deadlines and will not be moving forward this session but can be reconsidered in the second year of the session which begins in December 2021. Bill status at a House's "Desk" means it is pending referral to a Committee.



# ASSEMBLY BILL 550 (CHIU)

## SAFE STREETS ACT OF 2021

### SUMMARY

---

Assembly Bill 550 protects the safety of vulnerable travelers on California roads by giving the cities of Los Angeles, Oakland, San Francisco, San Jose, and two additional southern California cities the option of piloting speed safety systems on sensitive or dangerous local streets.

### BACKGROUND

---

From 2005 to 2014, 363,606 Americans [were killed](#) in instances of traffic violence nationwide. Of those, 112,580 people – 31 percent – were killed in speeding-related incidents. California is no exception to the scourge of speeding fatalities: over 1,000 Californians have [died](#) in speed-related traffic collisions every year for the past five years.

Jurisdictions suffering from high levels of avoidable fatal and severe collisions are desperate for additional tools to bring the number of traffic deaths down to zero. Vision Zero traffic safety initiatives underway in these localities have made some progress, but these efforts to date have not brought about the necessary reductions in injuries and deaths.

Many streets with high numbers of fatal and severe crashes – otherwise known as a High Injury Network – are in regionally identified Communities of Concern. A high percentage of households with minority or low-income status, seniors, people with limited English proficiency, and people with disabilities reside in these communities and are disproportionately impacted by speeding. Children going to school, pedestrians and cyclists heading to work, and seniors attending to errands are at risk every day.

Traffic safety efforts have historically focused on a traditional law enforcement response to speeding and other dangerous driver behaviors, as well as education and engineering efforts. However, these traditional enforcement methods have had a well-documented disparate impact on communities of color, and implicit or explicit racial bias in police traffic stops puts drivers of color at risk. Jurisdictions

around the state are seeking alternatives to traditional enforcement mechanisms that will protect public safety while being responsive to community concerns.

### THE PROBLEM

---

Across the United States, numerous peer-reviewed [studies](#) have shown that speed detection 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 these systems.

Studies have shown that speed is the *leading* factor when determining fault in fatal and severe collisions, yet existing efforts have not led to the reduction in speed and traffic violence needed to save lives and make communities safe. California must provide communities with the option to pilot this public safety tool in order to create the expectation of regular speed checking on the most dangerous streets, and in workzones where traffic work crews are in dangerous proximity to fast-moving vehicles.

### THE SOLUTION

---

AB 550 authorizes six speed safety pilots, informed by consultation with local stakeholder groups, in the cities of Los Angeles, Oakland, San Francisco, San Jose, and two more southern California cities.

Pilot programs must comply with the following specific requirements in order to operate:

- **Program Operation:** Must be operated by a jurisdiction's transportation department or similar administrative agency, not law enforcement.
- **Area Limitations:** Speed safety systems may only be operated on a jurisdiction's High Injury Network or within a half-mile of schools, senior zones, public parks, or recreation centers.
- **Privacy Protections:** Jurisdiction must adopt a policy setting out clear restrictions on the

use of data and provisions to protect, retain, and ultimately destroy that data. Data from a system cannot be used for any other purpose or disclosed to any other person or agency except as required by law or in response to a court order or subpoena.

- **Facial Recognition Ban:** Jurisdictions are prohibited from using facial recognition technology in a program.
- **Signage, Notice, and Warning Period:** Jurisdictions must clearly identify the presence of the speed safety system with signage, must administer a public information campaign for 30 days prior to the system becoming operational, and must issue warning notices rather than citations for the first 30 days of enforcement.
- **Citation Type:** Citations are civil in nature, not criminal, and shall not result in a point on a driver's record. Citations shall only be issued to drivers traveling at least 11 miles per hour over the posted speed limit.
- **Fine Amount:** The penalty amount is capped at \$50 for violations between 11-15mph over the limit, \$100 for violations between 15-25mph over, and \$200 for violations 25mph over. Vehicles going 100mph or more will receive a fine of \$500.
- **Adjudication:** Jurisdictions must provide for a hearing and administrative appeal process for contesting citations.
- **Equity:** Jurisdictions must offer a low-income driver diversion program with specified alternative remedies in lieu of payment and reduced fines for qualifying individuals.
- **Thresholds for Continued Operation:** Systems may not be operated past the first 18 months of installation unless specific speed reduction thresholds are met.
- **Oversight and Evaluation:** Each jurisdiction must submit a report and evaluation to their governing body two years after the start of the program and at the program conclusion must provide an evaluation to the Legislature. Reports must include a specific

analysis of racial equity and financial impacts of programs developed in collaboration with stakeholder groups.

- **Sunset:** The Act and any authorized programs sunset on January 1, 2027.

## SUPPORT

---

City of Los Angeles (cosponsor)  
City of Oakland (cosponsor)  
City of San Francisco (cosponsor)  
City of San José (cosponsor)  
Walk San Francisco (cosponsor)  
Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety  
Associated General Contractors of California  
Association of Bay Area Governments  
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association  
Bike Bakersfield  
California City Transportation Initiative (CaCTI)  
CC Puede  
Chinatown Community Development Center  
Chinatown TRIP  
City of Alameda  
City of Berkeley  
City of Fremont  
City of Hayward  
City of Palm Springs  
City of Sacramento  
Conor Lynch Foundation  
East Cut Community Benefit District  
India Basin Neighborhood Association  
Japantown Task Force  
League of California Cities (Cal Cities)  
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired  
Livable City  
Lower Haight Merchants & Neighbors Association  
Marin County Bicycle Coalition  
Mayor Libby Schaaf, City of Oakland  
Mayor London Breed, City and County of San Francisco  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
National Association of City Transportation Officials  
National Safety Council  
Richmond Family Transportation Network  
San Francisco Bay Area Families for Safe Streets  
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
San Francisco Community Radio/KXSF  
San Francisco Marin Medical Society  
Self-Help for the Elderly

Senior & Disability Action  
Slow Down Napa  
South Beach-Rincon-Mission Bay Neighborhood  
Association  
Southern California Families for Safe Streets  
Spin  
SPUR  
Streets for All  
Sylvia Bingham Fund  
Tenderloin Community Benefit District  
The Arc San Francisco  
Vision Zero Network  
Walk Bike Berkeley

---

**FOR MORE INFORMATION**

Nicole Restmeyer | Legislative Aide  
Office of Assemblymember David Chiu  
[Nicole.Restmeyer@asm.ca.gov](mailto:Nicole.Restmeyer@asm.ca.gov)