

1 [Urging California State Legislators to Amend or Oppose California State Assembly Bill 650
2 (Low) in Recognition of Negative Impact on Local Transportation Services and Consumer
3 Safety Protection]

4 **Resolution urging California state legislators to amend or oppose California State**
5 **Assembly Bill 650 (Low) in recognition of negative impacts on local transportation**
6 **services and consumer safety protection.**

7
8 WHEREAS, California Government Code, Section 53075.5. (a) provides every city or
9 county shall protect the public health, safety, and welfare by adopting an ordinance or
10 resolution in regard to taxicab transportation service which is operated within the jurisdiction of
11 the city or county; and

12 WHEREAS, Pursuant to the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, the San
13 Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) regulates taxicab transportation
14 services in the City; and

15 WHEREAS, The purpose of taxi regulation by the SFMTA is to improve taxi service to
16 the public and to protect the public health and safety while providing such service; and

17 WHEREAS, Assembly Member Evan Low has introduced Assembly Bill 650 (AB 650),
18 which would repeal California Government Code, Section 53075.5 and take away taxi
19 regulation authority from cities and counties and transfer the authority to the California Public
20 Utilities Commission (CPUC), with the exception of taxicab transportation originating in the
21 City and County of San Francisco or San Francisco International Airport; and

22 WHEREAS, AB 650 would exempt the City and County of San Francisco and San
23 Francisco International Airport, and remove fair and consistent safety and security
24 requirements, including standardized drug and alcohol testing requirements that should also
25 be imposed on transportation services in other cities and counties; and

1 WHEREAS, AB 650 would eliminate the ability of cities or counties to regulate taxis
2 according to their perception of the public's needs, priorities and interests; and

3 WHEREAS, The CPUC would inherit taxi regulation everywhere but San Francisco,
4 has shown itself to be ineffective in regulating charter-party carriers (CPCs), including
5 Transportation Network Companies (TNCs), and lacks the capacity to perform adequate
6 enforcement against violations of the laws and rules governing CPCs; and

7 WHEREAS, The CPUC, in its regulation of TNCs, has ignored matters of extreme
8 importance to the City and County of San Francisco, and other cities and counties around the
9 State, particularly the provision of transportation service to the people with disabilities; and

10 WHEREAS, AB 650 would remove any limits on the number of taxis which allow
11 unlimited numbers of vehicles to act commercially with no clean air requirement, and ignore
12 environmental and local congestion management goals; and

13 WHEREAS, AB 650 would result in the de facto deregulation of the taxi industry, which,
14 could negatively impact the quality of taxi service and consumer safety; and

15 WHEREAS, Further amendments to the bill, or amendments to the Taxi Transportation
16 Services Act in future years could eliminate San Francisco's special status and bring it in line
17 with the rest of the state, to the detriment of the public and the City and County of San
18 Francisco; and

19 WHEREAS, In certain parts of the state, taxi companies and drivers that operate in
20 more than one city are forced to obtain multiple permits and pay multiple fees to provide
21 service across municipal boundaries; and

22 WHEREAS, The need for multiple permits can be greatly reduced if not eliminated by
23 providing that counties, rather than cities, shall have the authority to regulate taxi
24 transportation service; and

1 WHEREAS, Local regulation of taxicab transportation services serves vital interests of
2 the public and of the City and County of San Francisco by, among other regulations, requiring
3 minimum liability insurance coverage of \$1,000,000 providing service to the disabled
4 community through the Paratransit Program, limiting taxi charges by setting maximum rates of
5 fare, and restricting greenhouse gas emissions by taxicab color schemes; now, therefore, be it

6 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
7 respectfully urges the California Legislature to amend or oppose AB 650; and, it is

8 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors hereby directs the Clerk of the
9 Board to transmit this resolution to the respective offices of the San Francisco Legislative
10 Delegation and City Lobbyists upon final passage.



City and County of San Francisco

Tails

Resolution

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 160696

Date Passed: June 28, 2016

Resolution urging California state legislators to amend or oppose California State Assembly Bill 650, "Public Utilities Commission: Regulation of Taxicabs," authored by Assembly Member Evan Low, in recognition of negative impacts on local transportation services and consumer safety protection.

June 21, 2016 Board of Supervisors - AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee

Excused: 1 - Mar

June 21, 2016 Board of Supervisors - CONTINUED AS AMENDED

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee

Excused: 1 - Mar

June 28, 2016 Board of Supervisors - AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee

June 28, 2016 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED AS AMENDED

Ayes: 9 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang and Yee

Noes: 2 - Cohen and Wiener

File No. 160696

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED AS AMENDED on 6/28/2016 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Peggy Nevin
for Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Unsigned
Mayor

7/08/16
Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

Peggy Nevin
for Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

7/8/16
Date