

File No. 130189

Committee Item No. _____

Board Item No. 26

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: _____

Date _____

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date March 5, 2013

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Alisa Miller Date February 28, 2013

Completed by: _____ Date _____

An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 25 pages.
The complete document can be found in the file.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

[Urging the California State Legislature to Pass Senate Bill 219]

Resolution urging the California State Legislature to Pass Senate Bill 219 to permanently extend double fine zones along State Highway Route 1 between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lake Street and State Highway Route 101 between Golden Gate Avenue and Lyon Street.

WHEREAS, the City and County of San Francisco aims to reduce serious or fatal pedestrian accidents by 25 percent in 2016 and by 50 percent in 2021, according to Executive Order 10-03; and

WHEREAS, From 2003 to 2007, Park Presidio Boulevard, 19th Avenue, and Van Ness Avenue were among the deadliest thoroughfares in San Francisco, with 16 pedestrian deaths between them; and

WHEREAS, In 2008, Senate Bill 1419 (SB1419) established a double fine zone along State Highway Route 1 between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lake Street, including Park Presidio Boulevard and 19th Avenue, and Route 101 between Golden Gate Avenue and Lyon Street for a five-year period which expires at the end of 2013; and

WHEREAS, Since the passage of SB1419, the number of pedestrian fatalities along State Highway Routes 1 and 101 has decreased to four instances between 2009 and 2012; and

WHEREAS, State Senator Leland Yee has sponsored legislation, Senate Bill 219, that will remove the 2013 sunset date and permanently extend the double fine zones along these two corridors; now, therefore, be it

1 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
2 hereby urges the California State Legislature to pass Senate Bill 219 before the close of the
3 2013 calendar year.

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee.
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.
- 2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [] inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. [] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. []
- 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).
- 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.
- 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on []

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative

Sponsor(s):

Mar, Yee

Subject:

Urging the California State Legislature to pass Senate Bill 219

The text is listed below or attached:

See attached.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: _____



For Clerk's Use Only:

130189
805

BILL NUMBER: SB 219 INTRODUCED
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY Senator Yee

FEBRUARY 11, 2013

An act to amend Section 97.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, relating to highways.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 219, as introduced, Yee. Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zones. Existing law requires that a state highway segment be designated as a Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone if, among other requirements, the segment is eligible for designation and the Director of Transportation, in consultation with the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol, certifies that the segment of state highway meets specified criteria. Existing law, until January 1, 2014, designates specific segments of State Highway Routes 1 and 101 in the City and County of San Francisco as Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zones, and requires a specified report from the department in that regard to be submitted to appropriate committees of the Legislature by January 1, 2013. Existing law requires fines for specified traffic violations cited in a Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone to be doubled.

This bill would delete the language relating to the report and permanently extend the designation of those specific highway segments as Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zones.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.
State-mandated local program: no.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 97.5 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

97.5. (a) Notwithstanding subdivision (a) of Section 97, the following segments shall be designated as Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zones:

(1) State Highway Route 1 between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lake Street in the City and County of San Francisco.

(2) State Highway Route 101 between Golden Gate Avenue and Lyon Street in the City and County of San Francisco.

~~(b) The department shall conduct a Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone study on the segments identified in subdivision (a) that relates to pedestrian safety and that evaluates the appropriateness of adding additional criteria to subdivision (a) of Section 97 and whether changes or additional criteria should be considered for adoption.~~

~~(1) The study shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following:~~

~~(A) A review of traffic volume, speed, the number and severity of collisions, the number and severity of pedestrian related collisions, and contributing collision factors.~~

~~(B) A before and after study on pedestrian and roadway facilities, including, but not limited to, those facilities that have been~~

~~revised or updated.~~

~~(C) A recommendation on whether the zones described in subdivision (a) should be reauthorized by the Legislature.~~

~~(2) On or before January 1, 2013, the department shall submit its findings from the study in a report to the appropriate committees of the Legislature.~~

~~(e)~~

(b) Subdivisions (e) to (h), inclusive, of Section 97 shall apply to the segments designated as Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zones pursuant to subdivision (a).

~~(d) This section shall remain in effect until January 1, 2014 and as of that date is repealed, unless a later statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2014 deletes or extends that date.~~