

Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) AB 342 (Chiu)



SUMMARY

This measure amends the California Vehicle Code to authorize the use of automated enforcement systems to enforce excessive speeding violations over the posted limit in the City of San Jose and the City and County of San Francisco for a five-year pilot period. The measure sets forth specific parameters for where the technology can be utilized, how the revenue can be used, and how a citation can be contested as well as other requirements. ASE is intended as a traffic safety tool that enhances and complements traditional police enforcement.

BACKGROUND

Annually in San Francisco, traffic collisions have caused about 30 fatalities and over 200 severe injuries; and in San Jose, more than 40 people have lost their lives and approximately 150 have been severely injured in recent years.

<u>Unsafe speed is a primary collision factor in many fatal</u> and severe injury collisions in both cities, and is a <u>fundamental predictor of crash survival</u>. Pedestrians and cyclists are at a heightened risk of injury in speedrelated crashes – studies show that if a pedestrian is hit by a car traveling 40 mph, there is an 80% chance the pedestrian will be killed, but if a driver strikes a pedestrian while traveling 20 mph, there is a 90% chance the pedestrian will survive.

Both San Jose and San Francisco have adopted Vision Zero traffic safety initiatives to build better and safer streets, educate the public on traffic safety, enforce the most dangerous traffic violations, and adopt policy changes in order to eliminate traffic deaths and reduce severe injury collisions. Many of the streets with the highest incidence of fatal and severe injury crashes are in Communities of Concern, disproportionately impacting these disadvantaged communities.

In the United States, 142 communities have installed speed cameras with dramatic results, including:

- A reduction in drivers traveling more than 10 mph over the speed limit
- A reduction in citations issued as drivers change their dangerous driving behaviors
- Most significantly, a reduction in crashes that result in serious injury or death.

Currently, ASE is not allowed in California. The National Transportation Safety Board released a new <u>report</u> in July 2017 recommending states remove barriers to automated speed enforcement, as it is a proven and effective tool to counter excessive speeding.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

This bill would authorize on a pilot basis the use of automated enforcement for excessive speeding violations. The program requirements would include:

- Location: Cameras would only be used on streets with a documented speeding problem resulting in fatalities and injury collisions, and not freeways. In both San Francisco and San Jose, only 5% of city streets would be eligible for ASE. However, 27% of all speed-related injury collisions in San Francisco, and 44% in San Jose, occur on those 5% of eligible streets in each city.
- Public Notice: signs displaying "Radar Enforced" along ASE enforced corridors and at major jurisdictional boundaries, public hearings and information campaign
- 3. **Citation type**: administrative penalty, no points on record, \$100 fee
- 4. **Speed**: ASE triggered at 10 mph over posted speed limit, limit of one citation per day
- 5. **Warning phase**: warnings sent for 90 days before any fines begin
- Privacy: Images redact personally identifiable information, citations sent to vehicle owners like a parking ticket, images and records are confidential
- 7. **Adjudication**: owners may contest ticket similar to a parking ticket
- 8. **Equity:** accommodations for low-income drivers including a payment plan and community service option to pay fines
- 9. **Revenue:** program cost recovery and then reinvested into supporting safe streets
- 10. **Camera calibration**: Regularly inspected and in accordance with manufacturer's instructions or at minimum, once a year by a third 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

Statewide Organizations

- California Police Chiefs Association
- California Walks
- California Bicycle Coalition
- California Alliance for Retired Americans (CARA)

Public Agencies & Advisory Committees

- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- San Francisco County Transportation Authority
- San Francisco County Board of Supervisors
- San Jose City Council
- Office of the Mayor, City and County of SF
- Mayor Sam Liccardo, SJ
- Police Chief William Scott, SF
- Police Chief Eddie Garcia, SJ
- Washington, DC Metropolitan Police Department
- San Jose Senior Citizens Commission
- San Jose Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
- Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District
- Department of Transportation, City of Los Angeles

Health Care Organizations

- San Francisco Health Commission
- San Francisco Medical Society
- San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership
- UCSF Department of Surgery

Community Stakeholders

- San Francisco Bay Area Families for Safe Streets
- San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
- Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
- Walk San Francisco
- Silicon Valley Leadership Group
- Livable City
- CC Puede
- Friends of Monterey Boulevard
- Safe Routes to School National Partnership
- Los Angeles Walks
- SPUR
- Senior & Disability Action
- Independent Living Resource Center San Francisco
- Silicon Valley Independent Living Center
- sf.citi
- Shape Up San Francisco Coalition
- Tenants and Owners Development Corporation
- TransForm
- FDR Democratic Club
- Chinatown Community Development Center
- Stop4Aiden
- Tenants and Owners Development Corporation
- Walk & Bike Mendocino

Neighborhood Associations

- Portola Neighborhood Association
- Lower Polk Community Benefit District
- Greater Rincon Hill Community Benefit District
- Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
- South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association