

# SAFE STREETS ACT OF 2017

## ASSEMBLY BILL 342 (CHIU)

### SUMMARY

---

AB 342 gives local transportation authorities in the City of San Jose and the City and County of San Francisco the authority to install automated speed enforcement (ASE) systems over a five-year pilot period, in order to protect the safety of vulnerable travelers, such as children, the elderly, and bicyclists, in the two municipalities.

### BACKGROUND

---

In response to hundreds of traffic collisions in the region, both San Jose and San Francisco adopted Vision Zero traffic safety initiatives, with the goal to eliminate traffic fatalities and reduce severe injury crashes. Annually in San Francisco, traffic collisions have caused about 30 fatalities and more than 200 severe injuries; and in San Jose, about 50 people have lost their lives and more than 130 have been severely injured due to traffic collisions.

70 percent of these fatal and severe collisions occur on just a handful of streets and roads in San Francisco and 50 percent of fatal collisions occur on just 3 percent of San Jose streets. Many of the streets with the highest incidence of fatal and severe injury crashes are in Communities of Concern, disproportionately impacting these disadvantaged communities.

Unsafe speed is the single highest fault factor in fatal and severe injury collisions in San Jose and San Francisco. As a result, children going to school, pedestrians heading to work, and elderly citizens traveling home are put at risk every day.

In San Francisco, law enforcement issued more than 10,000 citations for speeding, a 44 percent increase compared to the year before. As a result, the total number of fatal and severe injury collisions caused by speed dropped by more than 20 percent in 2014.

While these enforcement efforts help, local transportation planners require additional enforcement tools to combat this public health hazard.

### THE PROBLEM

---

Across the United States, studies have shown that ASE 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 automated speed enforcement systems. Studies have shown that speed is the *leading* factor when determining fault in fatal and severe collisions, yet existing enforcement efforts are not enough. California must provide communities with the worst traffic conditions the option to increase the *expectation* of enforcement.

### THE SOLUTION

---

AB 342 would authorize the use of automated enforcement through a five-year pilot program in the City of San Jose and the City and County of San Francisco.

Specifically, AB 342 creates a very specific list of prerequisites that must be met in order to implement ASE systems in the two localities, including:

1. **Location:** Streets with a documented and demonstrated speeding problem resulting in fatalities and injuries, not freeways.
2. **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.
3. **Citation type:** Similar to a parking citation, no points added to record, and flat max \$100 citation including fees.
4. **Speed:** ASE triggered only at 10 mph over posted speed limit, with a maximum of 1 per day, per vehicle.
5. **Warning phase:** Warnings will be issued for 90 days at the start of the program, before any fines begin.
6. **Privacy:** Images of license plate, citations sent to vehicle owners like a parking ticket, images and records are kept confidential.
7. **Adjudication:** Owners may contest citation similar to a parking ticket.
8. **Equity:** Accommodations for low-income drivers.
9. **Revenue:** program cost recovery and then re-invested into building safe streets.
10. **Camera Calibration:** Regularly inspected and in accordance with manufacturer's instructions or at minimum, once a year by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party lab.
11. **Operation:** Overseen by trained peace officers or other trained city employees.
12. **Oversight:** An evaluation submitted after 5 years assessing safety impacts.

## **Support**

---

San Francisco Mayor Edwin M. Lee (Sponsor)  
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo (Co-Sponsor)  
Association of California Insurance Companies  
UCSF Department of Surgery at Zuckerberg San  
Francisco General Hospital  
Walk San Francisco  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Tenants and Owners Development Corporation  
Alliance for Retired Americans  
CalWalks  
CC Puede  
FDR Dems  
Greater Rincon Hill Community Benefit District  
Independent Living Resource Center San Francisco  
Livable City  
Lower Polk Community Benefit District  
Portola Neighborhood Association  
South Beach / Rincon / Mission Bay Neighborhood  
Association  
Senior & Disability Action  
sf.citi  
San Francisco Bay Area Families for Safe Streets  
SPUR  
Safe Routes to School National Partnership  
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition  
Silicon Valley Independent Living Center  
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association  
The Friends of Monterey Boulevard  
Stop4Aiden  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
Los Angeles Walks  
Shape Up San Francisco Coalition  
San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership

## **Opposition**

---

Peace Officers Research Association of California  
California Association of Highway Patrolmen

## **FOR MORE INFORMATION**

---

Kevin Hefner  
Office of Assemblymember David Chiu  
[Kevin.Hefner@asm.ca.gov](mailto:Kevin.Hefner@asm.ca.gov)