



Memorandum

TO: Legislation Committee

DATE: March 3, 2017

FR: Executive Director

W. I. 1131

RE: AB 342 (Chiu): Automated Speed Enforcement Pilot Program (San Francisco and San Jose)

Background

AB 342 (Chiu) would authorize a pilot program granting the City of San Jose and the City and County of San Francisco the option to install automated speed enforcement (ASE) systems over a five-year pilot period in order to improve the safety of their respective local streets and roads, particularly for vulnerable travelers, such as children, the elderly, and bicyclists. The primary goal of ASE is to detect and enforce speeding, the single highest fault factor contributing to crashes and their severity in the two cities.

Recommendation: Support

Discussion

In response to hundreds of traffic collisions in recent years, San Jose and San Francisco each adopted “Vision Zero” traffic safety initiatives, the goals of which are to eliminate traffic fatalities and reduce the number of severe injury collisions. San Francisco has the state’s highest per capita rate of fatal and severe injuries resulting from traffic collisions in large part because the city has so many pedestrians, the most vulnerable road users. The vast majority of these collisions occur on just a handful of streets and roads in San Francisco.

According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS), as of September 2016, 142 jurisdictions in 15 states and the District of Columbia use ASE to supplement traditional law enforcement in enforcing speed limits. The IIHS cited an international study by the Cochrane Collaboration analyzing studies of ASE from various countries found that the presence of ASE reduced the share of vehicles traveling above the speed limit from 14-65 percent and reduced the risk of crashes resulting in injury or fatality from 11-44 percent.ⁱ Despite many strong success stories, California law currently prohibits the use of automated speed enforcement systems.

AB 342 would require the pilot programs to adhere to a number of important provisions, including:

- **Speed:** An ASE violation would be triggered only at 10 mph over posted speed limit, with a maximum of 1 per day, per vehicle.
- **Location:** ASE systems will only be installed on streets with a documented and demonstrated speeding problem resulting in fatalities and injuries. Freeways will not be eligible for ASE systems.
- **Warning phase:** Warnings will be issued for 90 days at the start of the program, before any fines begin.

- **Public Notice:** Signs displaying “Radar Enforced” along ASE enforced corridors and visiting drivers will be notified at major jurisdictional boundaries. Public hearings and information campaign
- **Privacy:** Images of license plate only, citations sent to vehicle owners like a parking ticket, images and records are kept confidential.

AB 342 is consistent with MTC’s 2017 Advocacy Program, which states our support for legislation that would “help achieve Vision Zero — aimed at eliminating all traffic-related serious injuries and fatalities. Support proposals to increase enforcement of traffic laws protecting pedestrians and bicyclists, and where appropriate, pursue new laws to improve safety throughout the transportation network.”

For decades, MTC has sought to encourage bicycling and walking through direct investment in active transportation infrastructure and educational programs, such as Safe Routes to Schools, and policies that encourage greater mixed-use, transit-oriented development. From time to time, MTC has also taken support positions on roadway safety-related legislation, such as double-fine zones near schools and restrictions on hand-held cell phone usage. Staff recommends a support position on AB 342 so the region’s two biggest cities can deploy on a pilot basis a proven tool to reduce speeding and the crashes that result, and thereby make their roads safer for all users.


Positions

Support

See Attached

Oppose

None on file



Steve Heminger

SH: rl

J:\COMMITTEE\Legislation\Meeting Packets\Legis2017\03_Legis_Mar 2017\3c_AB 342_Support.docx

ⁱ [Insurance Institute for Highway Safety Testimony before the Pennsylvania House Transportation Committee, 9/16/16](#), citing: Wilson, C.; Willis, C.; Hendrikz, J.K.; Le Brocque, R.; and Bellamy, N. 2010. Speed cameras for the prevention of road traffic injuries and deaths. The Cochrane Library 2010, Issue 10. Oxfordshire, England: The Cochrane Collaboration.

Automated Speed Enforcement List of Supporters (2/1/17)

City Agencies & Advisory Committees

- Mayor Edwin Lee, SF
- Mayor Sam Liccardo, SJ
- San Francisco Board of Supervisors
- San Jose City Council
- San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board of Commissioners
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
- San Francisco Police Commission
- San Francisco Department of Public Health
- San Francisco Public Health Commission
- City and County of San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee

Public Health Organizations

- San Francisco General Hospital Trauma Center
- San Francisco Medical Society

Traffic Safety Advocates

- Livable City
- San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
- Traffic Safety Coalition
- Walk San Francisco
- Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition

Political Organizations

- FDR Democratic Club of San Francisco
- New Avenues Democratic Club
- San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Statewide Organizations

- California Walks
- California Alliance for Retired Americans

Neighborhood Associations

- CC Puede
- Central City Single-Room Occupancy Collaborative
- Chinatown Transportation Research and Improvement Project
- North of Panhandle Neighborhood Association
- South Beach / Rincon / Mission Bay Neighborhood Association
- Tenants and Owners Development Corporation
- The Friends of Monterey Boulevard
- National Federation of Filipino American Associations
- Balboa Park Station Community Advisory Committee