



AGENDA ITEM 5

STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION - APRIL 2026

(Updated ~~April 8~~ April 13, 2026)

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

Staff are recommending approval of new support positions on State Assembly Bill (AB) 2276 (Soria) and Senate Bill (SB) 1167 (Blakespear) as shown in **Table 1** and have added SB 1246 (Cortese) to the Watch list. Adding bills to the Watch list does not require Board action.

We are also recommending new support positions on Federal House of Representatives (H.R.) 4376 (Mullin (CA-15)) and Senate (S.) 3742 (Markey (D-MA)) as shown in **Table 2**.

Table 3 shows the status of state and federal bills on which the Board has already taken a position or that staff have been monitoring as part of the Watch list.



Table 1. Recommended New State Positions and Additions to Watch List

Recommended Positions	Bill # Author	Title and Summary
<p>Support (Previously Was on Watch List)</p>	<p>AB 2276 Soria D</p>	<p>Vehicles: active intelligent speed assistance devices.</p> <p>This bill, also known as the "Stop Super Speeders Act," would establish a statewide 5-year pilot program requiring drivers convicted of severe speeding-related offenses, including reckless driving and speeding over 100 miles per hour, to install active Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) devices in their vehicles before getting back on the road. These aftermarket devices use location-based technology to actively limit a motor vehicle's speed to posted or preset speed limits. Under the pilot program, courts would order the installation of an ISA device based on the severity and number of the driver's prior convictions, with installation terms increasing for repeat offenders. The bill would require an income-based fee structure.</p> <p>After consulting with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and other interested parties, we are recommending a support position on this bill, which is currently on our watch list. We believe the provisions of the bill could potentially reduce speeding by high-risk drivers on San Francisco's roadways and improve traffic safety.</p> <p><i><u>Update (04/13/2026): This bill has been amended in Committee and would now limit this pilot to seven counties (Los Angeles, San Diego, Fresno, Santa Clara, Shasta, Kern, and San Bernadino). We are disappointed that the bill would no longer apply to San Francisco and appreciate that Assemblymember Haney advocated to include the city/county at the Assembly Public Safety Committee last week. We have reached out to his office to see if there is anything we can do to support his efforts.</u></i></p>



Support	SB 1167 Blakespear D	<p>Vehicles: electric bicycles.</p> <p>This bill would clarify and revise definitions for electric bicycles and other devices and vehicles such as motorized bicycles, mopeds, motor-driven cycles and motorcycles and establish manufacturer and seller requirements prohibiting advertising and sale of devices and vehicles as electric bicycles if they do not meet the state’s definition. The bill would also impose labeling and disclosure requirements on manufacturers and distributors to distinguish electric bicycles from other types of devices and vehicles. It would further require peace officers to include detailed information about electric bicycles, mopeds and motor-driven cycles involved in crashes or injuries when filing incident reports.</p> <p>After consulting with the SFMTA, we are recommending a support position on this bill to address the increasingly common issue of motorized bicycles, mopeds and other devices being advertised and sold to consumers as electric bicycles. The bill would also support data-collection efforts to help San Francisco and other jurisdictions make more informed decisions about regulation of micromobility devices and address safety issues on city streets.</p>
---------	---	---



<p>Added to Watch List</p>	<p>SB 1246 Cortese D</p>	<p>Autonomous vehicles.</p> <p>This bill would implement an array of requirements for commercial autonomous vehicle (AV) operators related to remote driving and emergency response. Among other things, it would require remote assistants, remote drivers, or local incident technicians to be located in the United States and hold a valid California driver’s license as well as require the ratio of remote assistants to be at a minimum ratio of 1 assistant per 3 vehicles. It would require immediate response to all calls and presence on the scene within 10 minutes of a request from a first responder and require any commercial AV obstructing a list of different types of facilities (e.g. travel lanes, crosswalks, transit lanes, bicycle lanes, emergency access routes, fire hydrants) to be removed within 5 minutes if the AV is drivable or within 30 minutes if towing is required, as well as other response provisions. It would require any commercial AV operated without a human driver on a highway to have an emergency steering wheel and manual override systems for steering, driving, and braking. It would require an AV operator to adopt and maintain written emergency response and immobilization procedures as well as guidance and training regarding the manual override systems. Both would have to be approved by the Office of the California Highway Patrol (CHP). CHP and the Office of the State Fire Marshal would be directed to develop uniform guidelines and requirements for the training and written guidance described above. Finally, the bill would require AV operators to maintain and submit specified data to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and the Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) upon request (e.g. information regarding the employment and use of remote assistants and drivers, response times to emergency incidents, immobilizations, obstructions, requests from first responders). DMV and CPUC would have to post summary statistics to their respective websites.</p> <p>At the April 7, 2026 Senate Transportation Committee, there was significant opposition to the bill from industry representatives, in particular to the response time and vehicle override equipment requirements. The bill was passed out of committee, where Senator Cortese indicated his willingness to meet with industry to discuss potential amendments to bill language to see if there was an opportunity to address some of their concerns.</p> <p>We are currently consulting with SFMTA, emergency responders,</p>
--------------------------------	--	---



		<p>and others on the provisions of the bill, which could potentially address some of the major concerns stemming from the December 20, 2025 PG&E outage that immobilized significant numbers of AVs across San Francisco. We may bring a recommendation to act on a position to a future meeting.</p>
--	--	---

Table 2. Recommended New Federal Positions

Recommended Positions	Bill # Author	Title and Summary
Support	<p>H.R. 4376 Mullin (CA-15)</p> <p>S. 3742 Markey (MA)</p>	<p>AV Safety Data Act.</p> <p>This bill, under consideration in both the U.S. House and Senate, would require the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to mandate the reporting of AV vehicle miles traveled, unplanned stoppages, and injuries involving human drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists by AVs.</p> <p>We have been working with Representative Kevin Mullin’s staff on the legislative language and appreciate his introduction of the AV Safety Data Act in the House of Representatives in July 2025. The bill would codify and improve upon the data that the federal government collects. Initiating collection of information on vehicle miles traveled in particular will allow us to better understand the magnitude of driving occurring, a key data point needed to analyze the impact of these vehicles on our roads. While the bills are not expected to advance this year, we will continue working at the federal level to educate legislators about the need to address the issue and suggest incorporating the concept into broader AV legislation (such as the SELF DRIVE Act currently under discussion) or into the bill reauthorizing the federal transportation spending bill.</p>



Table 3. Bill Status for 2025-26 State and Federal Legislative Sessions

Below are updates for the bills for which the Transportation Authority has taken a position or identified as a bill to watch in Year 2 of the legislative session. Updates to bills since the Board’s last legislative update are italicized.

State Bills

Adopted Positions / Monitoring Status	Bill # Author	Bill Title and Description	Update to Bill Status ¹ (as of 04/08/2026)
Support	AB 1421 Wilson D	Vehicles: Road Usage Charge Technical Advisory Committee. Requires the California Transportation Commission and California State Transportation Agency to prepare research and recommendations related to a mileage-based road user charge system by January 1, 2027.	<i>Senate Rules</i>
	AB 1837 Gonzalez D	Video imaging of parking violations. Lifts the January 1, 2027 sunset for authorization for public transit operators to use camera enforcement technology on buses to enforce parking violations in transit-only lanes and at transit stops.	<i>Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection</i>
	AB 2308 Haney D	Redevelopment: successor agency debt: City and County of San Francisco. Authorizes extension of Net Tax Increment (NTI) pledge for formerly state-owned parcels around the Salesforce Transit Center.	<i>Assembly Local Government</i>
On Watch List	AB 2276 Soria D	Vehicles: active intelligent speed assistance devices. Establishes a statewide 5-year pilot program requiring drivers convicted of severe speeding-related offenses to install active Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) devices in their vehicles.	<i>Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection</i>



	<p>SB 1411 Stern D</p> <p>Co-authors: Allen D Durazo D Gonzalez D</p>	<p>Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: funding conditions: high-speed rail.</p> <p>Allows the use of cap-and-invest funds outside this initial Merced to Bakersfield segment for activities that maximize the efficiency of delivering the California High-Speed Rail project.</p>	<p><i>Senate Transportation</i></p>
--	---	--	---

¹Under 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. Bill status at a House’s “Desk” means it is pending referral to a Committee, and “Two Year Bill” means the bill didn’t meet its statutory deadlines but is eligible to proceed in the second year of the two-year session.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

- Attachment 1 - Resolution

ATTACHMENT 1



**San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority**

BD041426

RESOLUTION NO. 26-XX

RESOLUTION ADOPTING SUPPORT POSITIONS ON STATE ASSEMBLY BILL (AB) 2276 (SORIA), STATE SENATE BILL (SB) 1167 (BLAKESPEAR), FEDERAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (H.R.) 4376 (MULLIN (CA-15)), AND SENATE (S.) 3742 (MARKEY (D-MA))

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 and federal legislative advocates, staff has reviewed pending legislation for the current Legislative Sessions and analyzed it for consistency with the Transportation Authority's adopted advocacy principles and for impacts on transportation funding and program implementation in San Francisco and recommended adopting support positions on State Assembly Bill (AB) 2276 (Soria), State Senate Bill (SB) 1167, Federal House of Representatives (H.R.) 4375 (Mullin (CA-15)), and Senate (S.) 3742 (Markey (D-MA)), as shown in Attachment 1; and

WHEREAS, At its April 14, 2026 meeting, the Board reviewed and discussed AB 2275, SB 1167, H.R. 4375, and S. 3743; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby adopts support positions on AB 2275, SB 1167, H.R. 4375, and S. 3743; and be it further

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

Attachment:

1. State and Federal Legislation - April 2026