

State Legislation – May 2018

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

Staff is recommending a new support position on Proposition 69, the Transportation Taxes and Fees Lockbox and Appropriations Limit Exemption Amendment. Staff is also recommending two new support positions on Assembly Bill (AB) 2304 (Holden) and AB 2363 (Freidman) and one new oppose position on AB 2989 (Flora), as shown in **Table 1**, which also includes two new bills to watch. **Table 2** provides updates on several bills we have been tracking this session, and **Table 3** indicates the status of bills on which the Board has already taken a position this session.

Table 1. Recommendation for New Positions

Recommended Positions	Proposition or Bill # Author	Title and Description
Support	Prop 69 Legislative Constitutional Amendment on California’s June 5, 2018 ballot	<p>Transportation Taxes and Fees Lockbox and Appropriations Limit Exemption Amendment.</p> <p>Proposition 69 was part of a legislative package that included SB 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2018, which enacted an estimated \$5.2 billion annual increase in transportation-related fee and taxes. Proposition 69 would require that revenue from the diesel sales tax and from the annual Transportation Improvement Fee, both part of SB 1, be dedicated to transportation-related purposes. The revenues from other tax increases in SB 1, including the gasoline excise tax and diesel excise tax, are already constitutionally dedicated to transportation-related purposes.</p>
Support	AB 2304 Holden D	<p>Reduced fare transit pass programs: report.</p> <p>This bill would request that the University of California Institute of Transportation Studies prepare and submit a report to the Governor and specified committees of the Legislature on or before January 1, 2020, that provides an assessment of the reduced fare transit pass programs in California that are administered by a public transit operator, California college or university, or any other entity. The assessment would include how the programs are funded, how much success they have had on increasing transit ridership among the targeted population and impacts on fare box recovery.</p>
Support	AB 2363 Friedman D	<p>Vision Zero Task Force.</p> <p>This bill would require the Secretary of Transportation, on or before January 1, 2019, to establish and convene a state Vision Zero Task Force, which shall include, but is not limited to, representatives from the Department of the California Highway Patrol, the University of California and other academic institutions, local governments, bicycle safety organizations, road safety organizations, and labor organizations. The bill would require the task force to develop a structured, coordinated process for early engagement of all parties to develop policies to reduce traffic fatalities to zero and submit a report of findings to the Legislature by May 15, 2019. The report would include a detailed analysis of specified issues, including the existing process for establishing speed limits and a recommendation as to whether an alternative to the use of the 85th percentile as a method for determining speed limits should be considered.</p>

<p>Watch</p>	<p>AB 2578 Chiu D</p>	<p>Infrastructure financing districts: City and County of San Francisco. This bill would expand the authorization for the creation of waterfront districts by the City and County of San Francisco to include a shoreline protection district (subject to a shoreline protection enhanced financing plan) and expand the types of projects a waterfront district may finance, giving the state a mechanism to contribute to the City’s Seawall Earthquake Safety Program. The district would generate an estimated \$55 million in the first ten years of the program, and an estimated \$250 million over its lifetime. The Port of San Francisco worked closely with the author to advance this bill, and the City’s State Legislation Committee has adopted a support and sponsor position.</p>
<p>Oppose</p>	<p>AB 2989 Flora R</p>	<p>Standup electric scooters. This bill would amend the California Vehicle Code to define a “standup electric scooter” as a 2-wheeled device that has handlebars and a floorboard that is designed to be stood upon while riding, is powered by an electric motor of less than 750 watts, and does not exceed a speed of 20 miles per hour. It would allow standup electric scooters to operate on sidewalks unless a local jurisdiction prohibits it. It would also specify that the standup electric scooters could be parked in the same manner and at the same locations as a bicycle may be parked.</p> <p>The San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution opposing AB 2989 (Flora) on April 24. Both SFMTA and Transportation Authority staff are concerned that the bill allows standup electric scooters to be operated on sidewalks, and may pose a hazard to pedestrians. This would contradict the city’s Vision Zero policy. Furthermore, staff are concerned about the ways these scooters have been parked in the public realm, frequently blocking pedestrian rights-of-way.</p>
<p>Watch</p>	<p>SB 1014 Skinner D</p>	<p>Zero-emission vehicles. This bill would require the California Public Utilities Commission to establish the California Clean Miles Standard and Incentive Program for zero-emission vehicles used by transportation network company (TNC) drivers with the goal to increase the percentage of TNC passenger miles provided by zero-emission vehicles used on behalf of TNCs to 20% by December 31, 2023, 50% by December 31, 2026, and 100% by January 1, 2030. We support setting targets to increase the share of TNC passenger miles provided by zero-emission vehicles, but have concerns about how a potential incentive program might be structured, including where the funding would come from, and how to ensure that the program meets its stated goals. MTC has taken a support and seek amendments position on this bill.</p>

Table 2. Updates on Bills in the 2017-2018 Session

Support / Sponsor	AB 2865 Chiu D	<p>High-occupancy toll lanes: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).</p> <p>If the Board votes to approve a managed lanes (e.g. carpool/transit lane) project on US-101 and I-280 north of the divide in San Francisco, this bill would give the Transportation Authority the option of asking the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to operate the lanes on San Francisco’s behalf. San Mateo has similar authority and the intent is to allow a single, coordinated congestion management approach for the 101 corridor that extends from Santa Clara to San Francisco. Revenues would be spent according to a Board-approved expenditure plan on transportation projects that benefit transit riders, carpoolers, and drivers in the corridor.</p> <p>The Assembly Transportation Committee approved the bill and it was referred to the Assembly Appropriations on April 23. We are currently considering amendments proposed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to authorize its Bay Area Infrastructure Financing Authority to operate managed lanes in San Francisco as another possible option.</p>
-------------------	---	---

Table 3. Bill Status for Active Positions Taken in the 2017-2018 Session¹

Adopted Positions	Bill # Author	Bill Title	Bill Status and Changes Since Last Report ¹ (as of 4/26/18)
Support	AB 1 Frazier D	Transportation funding	Assembly Dead
	AB 17 Holden D	Transit Pass Program: free or reduced-fare transit passes	Vetoed
	AB 87 Ting D	Autonomous vehicles	Referred to Senate Transportation and Housing
	AB 342 Chiu D	Vehicles: automated speed enforcement: five-year pilot program	Assembly Dead
	AB 2865 Chiu D	High-occupancy toll lanes: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).	Referred to Assembly Appropriations
	AB 3059 Bloom D	Go Zone demonstration projects.	Assembly Dead (from Assembly Transportation)
	AB 3124 Bloom D	Vehicles: length limitations: buses: bicycle transportation devices	Amended in Assembly Transportation, referred to Senate Transportation and Housing
	SB 422 Wilk R	Transportation projects: comprehensive development lease agreements: Public Private Partnerships	Senate Dead

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

	SB 760 Wiener D	Bikeways: design guides	Referred to Assembly Transportation
	SB 768 Allen, Wiener D	Transportation projects: comprehensive development lease agreements: Public Private Partnerships	Senate Dead
	SB 1119 Newman D	Low Carbon Transit Operations Program.	Referred to Senate Appropriations
	SB 1376 Hill D	Transportation network companies: accessibility plans	Referred to Senate Appropriations
Support if Amended	SB 936 Allen, Ben D	Office of Planning and Research: Autonomous Vehicles Smart Planning Task Force.	Amended and Referred to Senate Appropriations
Oppose	AB 65 Patterson R	Transportation bond debt service	Assembly Dead
	AB 1756 Brough R	Transportation Funding	Assembly Dead – Failed Passage at Assembly Transportation
	AB 2530 Melendez R	Bonds: Transportation	Assembly Transportation
	AB 2712 Allen, Travis R	Bonds: Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century	Assembly Transportation
	SB 182 Bradford D	Transportation network company: participating drivers: single business license	Chaptered
	SB 423 Cannella R	Indemnity: design professionals	Senate Dead
	SB 493 Hill D	Vehicles: right-turn violations	Assembly Appropriations
	SB 1132 Hill D	Vehicles: right turn violations.	Senate Appropriations Suspense File

¹Under this column, “Chaptered” means the bill is now law.