

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2021-2022 Regular Session

SB 1079 (Portantino)
Version: March 29, 2022
Hearing Date: May 3, 2022
Fiscal: No
Urgency: No
CK

SUBJECT

Vehicles: sound-activated enforcement devices

DIGEST

This bill authorizes pilot programs in six cities to evaluate the use of sound-activated devices to enforce vehicle noise limit laws.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This bill seeks to address the issue of noise pollution in California cities that is caused by illegally modified or otherwise out of compliance exhaust systems. Following the lead of a handful of cities in other states and countries, this bill authorizes pilot programs in six cities to deploy and evaluate the use of sound-activated devices to capture vehicle noise levels that exceed the legal sound limit set by the Vehicle Code in connection with exhaust systems.

The pilot can extend for five years in the participating cities and a report is required to be compiled and submitted to the Legislature evaluating the effectiveness of the pilot program.

This bill is sponsored by Streets for All. It is supported by various cities and organizations, including the City of Santa Monica and the California Contract Cities Association. It is opposed by Safer Streets LA as well as several privacy and consumer groups, including the Electronic Frontier Foundation. This bill passed out of the Senate Committee on Transportation Committee on a 12 to 1 vote.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

- 1) Requires every motor vehicle equipped with an internal combustion engine and subject to registration to be equipped at all times with an adequate muffler in constant operation and properly maintained to prevent any excessive or unusual noise, and no muffler or exhaust system shall be equipped with a cutout, bypass, or similar device. (Veh. Code § 27150.)
- 2) Prohibits a person from modifying the exhaust system of a motor vehicle in a manner which will amplify or increase the noise emitted by the motor of the vehicle so that the vehicle is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 27150 or exceeds the noise limits established for the type of vehicle in Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 27200). A person is prohibited from operating a motor vehicle with an exhaust system so modified. (Veh. Code § 27151(a).)
- 3) Provides that for the purposes of exhaust systems installed on motor vehicles with a manufacturer's gross vehicle weight rating of less than 6,000 pounds, other than motorcycles, a sound level of 95 dbA or less, when tested in accordance with Society of Automotive Engineers Standard J1492 October 2008, complies with the above requirement. Motor vehicle exhaust systems or parts thereof include, but are not limited to, nonoriginal exhaust equipment. (Veh. Code § 27151(b).)

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes six unnamed cities to conduct a pilot program to evaluate the use of sound-activated enforcement devices to capture vehicle noise levels that exceed the legal sound limit. The bill leaves blank the person or entity that will name the cities authorized to participate.
- 2) Requires the pilot program to abide by the following guidelines:
 - a) must operate from January 1, 2023, to December 31, 2027, inclusive;
 - b) sound-activated enforcement devices must be distributed equally across a participating city and cannot be disproportionately placed in a single area or areas;
 - c) prior to reaching the sound-activated enforcement device, a sign shall be placed to notify motorists of the device's existence;
 - d) prohibits a city from imposing a penalty for a first violation but requires the city to impose a penalty for subsequent violations;
 - e) requires a city to consider a person's ability to pay the penalty and allow payment of the penalty in installments or deferred payment if the person provides satisfactory evidence of an inability to pay the penalty in full;

- f) requires a participating city to adopt regulations allowing a penalty waiver for a low-income motor vehicle owner, as defined; and
 - g) the sound-activated enforcement devices must each undergo an annual calibration check performed by an independent calibration laboratory, which shall issue a signed certificate of calibration. The participating city shall keep the annual certificate of calibration on file.
- 3) Requires that revenues derived from the utilization of a sound-activated enforcement device first be used by the participating city to recover the costs of the program, and may also be used for traffic calming measures, including, but not limited to, bicycle lanes, chicanes, chokers, curb extensions, median islands, raised crosswalks, road diets, roundabouts, speed humps or speed tables, and traffic circles.
 - 4) Requires information collected and maintained by a city using a sound-activated enforcement device to be confidential and to only be used to administer the program. Such information cannot be disclosed to any other persons, including, but not limited to, any other state or federal government agency or official for any other purpose, except as required by state or federal law, court order, or in response to a subpoena in an individual case or proceeding.
 - 5) Requires a participating city to destroy images collected under this pilot program upon the final resolution of the notice of violation.
 - 6) Defines a “sound-activated enforcement system” as an electronic device that utilizes automated equipment that activates when the noise levels have exceeded the legal sound limit and is designed to obtain a clear photograph of a vehicle license plate.
 - 7) Provides that participating cities shall, no later than December 31, 2026, prepare and submit a report to the Legislature evaluating and determining the effectiveness of the pilot program.

COMMENTS

1. A brief history of automated Vehicle Code enforcement

While some counties may have installed automated traffic enforcement systems at an earlier date, legislative authorization for automated enforcement procedures relating to traffic violations began in 1994 with SB 1802 (Rosenthal, Ch. 1216, Stats. 1994). That bill authorized the use of “automated rail crossing enforcement systems” to enforce prohibitions on drivers from passing around or under rail crossings while the gates are closed. (Veh. Code § 22451.) Those systems functioned by photographing the front license plate and the driver of vehicles who proceeded around closed rail crossing gates

in violation of the Vehicle Code provisions. The drivers of photographed vehicles, in turn, received citations for their violations.

In 1995, the Legislature authorized a three-year trial for red light camera enforcement programs. (SB 833, Kopp, Ch. 922, Stats. 1995.) Using similar technology, that program used sensors connected to cameras to take photographs of the front license plate and driver upon entering an intersection on a red light. That program was permanently extended in 1998 by SB 1136 (Kopp, Ch. 54, Stats. 1998).

In 2007, the Legislature authorized a four-year pilot project where San Francisco was authorized to install video cameras on city-owned public transit vehicles for the purpose of video imaging parking violations occurring in transit-only traffic lanes. (AB 101, Ma, Ch. 377, Stats. 2007.) Three years later, the Legislature authorized a five-year statewide pilot project to allow local public agencies to use automated parking enforcement systems for street sweeping-related violations. (AB 2567, Bradford, Ch. 471, Stats. 2010.)

In 2011, the Legislature extended San Francisco's automated transit-only lane enforcement program for an additional year, and required the City and County to provide a report to the Transportation and Judiciary Committees of the Legislature no later than March 1, 2015, describing the effectiveness of the pilot program and its impact on privacy. (AB 1041, Ma, Ch. 325, Stats. 2011.) Following the receipt of that report, San Francisco's transit-only lane enforcement program was permanently extended in AB 1287 (Chiu, Ch. 485, Stats. 2015).

The following year, SB 1051 (Hancock, Ch. 427, Stats. 2016) authorized AC Transit to operate an automated transit-only lane enforcement program similar to San Francisco's with a sunset on January 1, 2022. AC Transit was required to provide to the Transportation, Privacy and Consumer Protection, and Judiciary Committees of the Legislature an evaluation report of the enforcement system's effectiveness, impact on privacy, cost to implement, and generation of revenue, no later than January 1, 2021. (Veh. Code § 40240.5.) Just last year, AB 917 (Bloom, Ch. 709, Stats. 2021) authorized all public transit operators to install these automated forward-facing cameras on transit vehicles for the purposes of enforcing parking violations occurring in transit-only traffic lanes and at transit stops and stations.

Additional legislation, including SB 371 (Caballero, 2019), SB 111 (Newman, 2021), and AB 2084 (Jones-Sawyer, 2022), have been introduced that would allow for automated video traffic enforcement on the outside of school buses. SB 735 (Rubio, 2021) would have authorized local authorities to place "speed photoimaging enforcement devices" to enforce speed limits in school zones. AB 2336 (Friedman, 2022) authorizes a five-year speed safety system pilot program, from 2023 to 2028, in San Jose, Oakland, Los Angeles, Glendale, one unspecified Southern California city, and San Francisco to

enforce speed limits through automated devices on no more than 15 percent of their streets.

2. Introducing sound enforcement

This bill adds to the growing number of avenues where automated enforcement is taking the place of traditional law enforcement. The goal is to address the particular instance of noise pollution, where individuals modify their exhaust systems to unlawfully loud levels. Every motor vehicle equipped with an internal combustion engine and subject to registration must be equipped at all times with an adequate muffler in constant operation and properly maintained to prevent excessive or unusual noise. The law prohibits a muffler or exhaust system to be equipped with a cutout, bypass, or similar device. (Veh. Code § 27150.)

Specifically, the law prohibits a person from modifying the exhaust system of a motor vehicle in a manner which will amplify or increase the noise emitted by the motor of the vehicle so that the vehicle is not in compliance with the above provision or exceeds the noise limits established for the type of vehicle, as specified. A person is prohibited from operating a motor vehicle with an exhaust system so modified. (Veh. Code § 27151(a).) For example, for exhaust systems installed on motor vehicles with a manufacturer's gross vehicle weight rating of less than 6,000 pounds, other than motorcycles, compliance means a sound level of 95 dbA or less. This level is comparable to that of a power mower.

Law enforcement has expressed frustration with their ability to enforce such laws:

California Highway Patrol Officer Dan Olivos echoes law enforcement agencies throughout Southern California – including Laguna Beach – when he details the challenges and intricacies of controlling illegal exhaust systems.

First, there's an array of what's OK and what's not, depending on the year a motorcycle was built. Second, what qualifies as a proper muffler is vague.

California vehicle code 27150 states, "Every motor vehicle (shall be) equipped with an adequate muffler in constant operation and properly maintained to prevent any excessive or unusual noise."

But one person's excess is another's pleasure.

Additionally, the California Bureau of Automotive Repair states motorcycles manufactured in or after 2013 must have the federal

Environmental Protection Agency noise emission label. The penalty for no label amounts to a fix-it ticket.

In reality, it's the wild west when it comes to exhaust systems.

Very few officers are trained or have decibel meters and – unlike with radar guns – are left guessing about noise levels.

“What we base our judgment on,” Olivos explains, “is whether it sounds like it should when it comes off the showroom floor.”

Much of the problem is that these hobbyists like to tinker with their vehicles. Some go so far as to modify exhaust systems in a misguided attempt to impress or annoy.

It has gotten so bad in recent years, that California has had to enact laws that prohibit such things as “cutouts,” “bypasses” and something called a “whistle-tip.”¹

This bill allows up to six cities to implement a pilot program to use “sound-activated enforcement devices” to capture vehicle noise levels that exceed the legal sound limit set by Vehicle Code section 27151. The program will run from January 1, 2023, to December 31, 2027, and participating cities are required to submit a report to the Legislature at the end of the program evaluating its effectiveness.

According to the author:

Illegally loud exhaust harms our bodies, can be deafening if you are walking or cycling on a street, and wakes people up from their sleep. While vehicle exhaust noise is limited to 95 decibels, there is no universal means to monitor and enforce this law. Vehicle owners can easily buy and install new exhaust systems or make other modifications to their vehicle that will change the level of sound. SB 1079 will permit 6 cities or counties, to be determined later, to address illegal noise violations in their community by using decibel-measuring tools and noise activated cameras.

A number of cities have written in support of the bill requesting to be among the six authorized to participate in the pilot. The City of Santa Monica writes:

¹ David Whiting, *Illegal mufflers are roaring as loud as airplanes, but law enforcement crackdown is difficult* (June 29, 2018) The Orange County Register, <https://www.ocregister.com/2018/06/29/illegal-mufflers-are-roaring-as-load-as-airplanes-but-law-enforcement-crackdown-is-difficult/>. All internet citations are current as of April 28, 2022.

Noise pollution is an unwanted or disturbing sound that causes adverse reactions for humans and other living creatures. Loud noises in the street can disrupt walking or cycling, but also can cause hearing loss and pose dangers to physical and cognitive health. Exposure to loud sounds has been shown to raise levels of stress hormones, including cortisol, adrenaline, and noradrenaline. Chronically high levels of these hormones can impact heart disease, hypertension, stroke, immune responses, and cognitive functioning.

Under the California Vehicle Code, exhaust noise is limited to 95 decibels (dbA) for vehicles and 80 dbA for motorcycles. However, vehicle owners can install new exhaust systems or make other vehicle modifications that change the level of sound produced by their vehicle. These illegal modifications are accessible and easily installed at any in-home garage, resulting in much louder noise disruptions than would be allowed by law.

SB 1079 will provide cities with an enforcement tool that will help crack down on these noisily modified vehicles and motorcycles that adversely impact our resident's quality of life.

The City of Laguna Beach writes in support:

A majority of loud vehicle noise comes from willful violations of existing Vehicle Code that makes it a crime to modify the exhaust system of a vehicle for the purpose of increasing or amplifying noise emitted by the vehicle. The City has previously partnered with neighboring cities to educate the public and conduct joint enforcement exercises to reduce loud vehicle noise. Allowing local jurisdictions to create, operate, and manage their own sound-activated enforcement device program would help address loud vehicle noise issues.

The author points to examples in New York, Knoxville, and Paris where similar devices are being used and Toronto and Philadelphia where they are being considered.

3. Concerns with this iteration of automated enforcement

This Committee has previously expressed a series of concerns whenever automated traffic enforcement programs are sought to be implemented and has sought to build in protections when such enforcement is deemed appropriate. These concerns involve the privacy implications of such methods and the issues of fairness and equity inherent in the program, especially when such enforcement creates a revenue stream for a governmental entity. Whenever automation is involved, ensuring due process is afforded to ticketed residents is critical. In all instances, this Committee has urged

caution and any further extension of automated enforcement should be thoughtful, incremental, and with thorough reporting requirements.

a. The fundamental right to privacy

The California Constitution provides that all people have inalienable rights, including the right to pursue and obtain privacy. (Cal. Const., art. I, Sec. 1.) This Committee has previously expressed concern about the privacy implications of using automated enforcement, especially when continuous surveillance is an element of said enforcement.

The bill does provide some privacy protections. Information collected and maintained by a city using a sound-activated enforcement device is deemed confidential. The bill includes use limitations, authorizing the data to only be used to administer the program. Further disclosure is prohibited, including to other state and federal government agencies and officials for any other purpose. The only exception is where it is required by state or federal law, court order, or in response to a subpoena in an individual case or proceeding. Retention is limited and all images collected must be destroyed upon the final resolution of the notice of violation.

These are certainly crucial baseline protections for this systematic data collection. However, the programs will inherently be surveilling these communities. While the exact technology is not spelled out in the bill, the technology used elsewhere involves a continually running video feed. The bill does not provide for how these cameras should be situated or whether they need to limit their focus to avoid continually capturing more than the vehicles they are seeking to monitor. These issues have been raised in the context of automated license plate readers as well.

Although disclosure is limited, it is not implausible that these feeds could be subjected to regular subpoenas seeking their footage. The author may wish to consider adding in protections for exactly how long video footage can be kept.

In addition, while the provision making data confidential helps protect individuals' privacy, it may impair the transparency of the program. A number of groups in opposition highlight the need for transparency into these programs.

Safer Streets LA asserts that "the bill makes all information captured by the systems confidential, even administrative data such as how many people are being ticketed and at what sound levels etc. This bill ensures there will be *zero* government transparency and accountability."

Similarly, the Electronic Frontier Foundation writes:

[W]hile SB 1079 purports to limit the use of this technology in various ways, we see no obvious way in which misuse or abuse of the technology would be detectable or enforced. Not only is there no enforcement of these limits in SB 1079, we worry that the confidentiality requirement of proposed Vehicle C. § 27150.4 (c) would make it very easy for government to withhold its knowledge of such abuses from the public.

b. Equity, fairness, and basic due process

The bill attempts to address concerns regarding equity and fairness with a number of provisions.

First, sound-activated enforcement devices are required to be distributed equally across a participating city and not disproportionately placed in a single area or areas. The aim is to avoid exacerbating the issue of overly policed and punished communities. However, Oakland Privacy argues that while such provisions are critical they need to be bolstered in order to ensure they are effectuated in practice:

This is an important measure for economic equity, but without a public use policy, how will we know what a local jurisdiction's interpretation of "equally" works out to in practice? It is likely not every street in a jurisdiction will be equipped, and the choices about where to place this equipment and when should be explained, justified and be subject to public feedback. We point to last year's AB 550 as a similar measure that included use policy creation by the jurisdiction and believe the requirement for a public use policy should be a part of this proposal. The use policy should provide the jurisdiction's plan for compliance with all of the requirements listed in AB 1079, along with customary information about data retention, storage and security, including vendor policies.

Relatedly, the impact of these systems is consistently and disproportionately felt by lower income communities. The bill does provide for this to be taken into consideration through the requirement that a city consider a person's ability to pay the penalty and allow payment of the penalty in installments or deferred payment if the person provides satisfactory evidence of an inability to pay the penalty in full. In addition, participating cities are required to adopt regulations allowing a penalty waiver for low-income motor vehicle owners. But the exact details of what this must entail are left vague.

With regard to fairness and adequate due process, automated enforcement needs to have a high level of certainty in its determination that the relevant law has been broken, there must be a clear and effective process for appealing such determinations, and the

public must have sufficient notice and be subject to reasonable penalties. On these last points, focus must arguably be on promoting roadway safety, as the creation of a new stream for revenue generation might affect the fairness and equity of a program. Here the bill provides that a sign must be placed to notify motorists of the sound-activated device's existence prior to reaching the sound-activated enforcement device. However, some concerns have been raised about the lack of specificity here. In addition, the bill restricts a city from imposing a penalty for the first violation, but then requires a penalty for subsequent violations.

As for revenue derived from the utilization of a sound-activated enforcement device, the bill provides that it must first be used by the participating city to recover the costs of the program created pursuant to this section, but then allows it to be used for traffic calming measures, including, but not limited to, bicycle lanes, chicanes, chokers, curb extensions, median islands, raised crosswalks, road diets, roundabouts, speed humps or speed tables, and traffic circles.

One concerning absence in the bill is the lack of specificity on the type of technology that can be used and the level of accuracy these devices provide. A "sound-activated enforcement system" is simply defined as an "electronic device that utilizes automated equipment that activates when the noise levels have exceeded the legal sound limit and is designed to obtain a clear photograph of a vehicle license plate." In other contexts, the use of video or photographs depicts the violation itself. Here, the violation is connected to sound and a photograph that is thereafter taken. While the bill requires annual calibration checks, the ultimate issue is not only whether the device consistently triggers at a certain decibel threshold, but that the sound is coming from a specific vehicle in violation of the relevant Vehicle Code provisions.

Reasonable questions are raised about how such technology can differentiate between vehicles in busy roadways, one of the target environments for enforcement, or how the devices can differentiate between sound emanating from a vehicle's muffler versus other nearby causes, such as construction. Even basic elements of these systems are unknown and not spelled out in the bill, such as how the device even identifies where sound is coming from or where the camera would be situated.

If a motorist receives a violation, what would be the basis for challenging such a citation? What evidence is accessible to the motorist? Where a picture may show a vehicle in an intersection after a red light or a car parked in a bus lane, a photograph of a license plate does not inherently establish a violation of a noise provision specific to mufflers.

It is also unclear at what decibel level the device must be calibrated. For motorcycles, the limit is 92 dbA if manufactured before 1970, but 80 dbA if after 1985. The periods in between are at varying levels. For motor vehicles, the limit is based on a matrix of weight and date of manufacture. For the purposes of exhaust systems installed on

motor vehicles with a manufacturer's gross vehicle weight rating of less than 6,000 pounds, other than motorcycles, a sound level of 95 dbA or less is in compliance.

These details should arguably be established and the accuracy of these systems ensured before motorists are subject to financial penalties.

The author may wish to limit these pilot projects to collecting more information about the accuracy of the technology and simply provide warnings to drivers rather than subject them to infractions without first testing these systems out. One lesson is taken from a similarly narrow pilot done in Edmonton:

The community and public services committee report summarizes efforts to collect data on the use of specialized noise monitoring equipment as well as trends in vehicle noise, planned in two phases during the summers of 2019 and 2020.

Part of that included testing automated noise monitoring technologies cycled between nine locations from July to September 2020.

The equipment was able to detect and record audio levels and video when noise thresholds were broken.

But the technology couldn't tell the difference between sources of noise or identify offending vehicles to the precision required by court.

"It's concerning that it's not as accurate as we would hope for," Coun. Jon Dziadyk, the committee's vice-chair, said Monday.

Administration's goal was to identify when best to deploy enforcement personnel, according to the report. Peace officers were also sent to verify the information and identify offending vehicles.

Only one instance resulted in enforcement being taken. Peace officers spent 150 hours at or near targeted enforcement locations.²

² *Edmonton noisy vehicle enforcement pilot sees mixed results* (February 16, 2021) CBC News, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/edmonton-noisy-vehicle-enforcement-pilot-sees-mixed-results-1.5914862>.

4. Stakeholder concerns

Safer Streets LA emphasizes the equity concerns:

[W]e are very concerned about the equity issues implicated by this new technology. How can we be assured that only those who are flagrantly violating the law by modifying their exhaust systems are targeted and not low-income working-class vehicle owners who might simply be driving an older vehicle and not have the means to upgrade? How do we ensure that those who are incorrectly ticketed (as no technology is perfect) can be made whole after having to expend time and money defending themselves against a ticket issued in error?

ACLU California Action echoes a concern of other groups in opposition that this bill opens the door to more widespread use of problematic technology:

The text of the bill is vague about what technologies and tech vendors would be authorized, but it would appear to permit the use of ShotSpotter-like sound-activated technologies.³ Like many others, we question the accuracy and fairness of ShotSpotter,⁴ a major vendor of such noise-activated enforcement technology, and have joined privacy organizations calling for serious scrutiny of claims made by its vendors.⁵ A MacArthur Justice Center report on the use of ShotSpotter in Chicago, for example, found that “ShotSpotter imposes a massive additional burden of unfounded and unnecessary police deployments – but only in the predominantly Black and Latinx districts where it is deployed[,]”⁶ and initial police responses to 88.7% of ShotSpotter alerts found no incidents involving a gun.⁷ A highly critical report by the Chicago Office of the Inspector General (OIG) found that Chicago “police responses to ShotSpotter alerts rarely produce evidence of a gun-related crime, rarely

³ “ShotSpotter is gunshot detection, acoustic surveillance technology that uses sophisticated sensors to detect, locate and alert law enforcement agencies of illegal gunfire incidents in real time.” *ShotSpotter Frequent Asked Questions*, ShotSpotter, available at https://www.shotspotter.com/system/content/uploads/ShotSpotter_FAQ_June_2017.pdf.

⁴ See, for example, Jay Stanley, *Four Problems with the ShotSpotter Gunshot Detection System*, ACLU (August 24, 2021), available at <https://www.aclu.org/news/privacy-technology/four-problems-with-the-shotspotter-gunshot-detection-system>.

⁵ Matthew Guariglia, *It’s Time for Police to Stop Using ShotSpotter*, Electronic Frontier Foundation (July 29, 2021), available at <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2021/07/its-time-police-stop-using-shotspotter>.

⁶ *ShotSpotter is deployed overwhelmingly in Black and Latinx neighborhoods in Chicago*, MacArthur Justice Center, available at <https://endpolicesurveillance.com/burden-on-communities-of-color/>.

⁷ Jay Stanley, *Four Problems with the ShotSpotter Gunshot Detection System*, ACLU (August 24, 2021), available at <https://www.aclu.org/news/privacy-technology/four-problems-with-the-shotspotter-gunshot-detection-system>.

give rise to investigatory stops, and even less frequently lead to the recovery of gun crime-related evidence during an investigatory stop.”⁸

SUPPORT

Streets for All (sponsor)
California Contract Cities Association
California Police Chiefs Association
City of Hayward
City of Laguna Beach
City of San Diego
City of Santa Monica

OPPOSITION

ACLU California Action
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Oakland Privacy
Safer Streets LA

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation:

AB 2084 (Jones-Sawyer, 2022) *See* Comment 1.

AB 2336 (Friedman, 2022) *See* Comment 1.

Prior Legislation:

SB 111 (Newman, 2021) *See* Comment 1.

SB 735 (Rubio, 2021) *See* Comment 1.

AB 550 (Chiu, 2021) would have authorized a pilot program for automated speed enforcement in several cities in California. This bill died in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 917 (Bloom, Ch. 709, Stats. 2021) *See* Comment 1.

SB 371 (Caballero, 2019) *See* Comment 1.

⁸ Joseph M. Ferguson, *The Chicago Police Department’s Use of Shotspotter Technology*, City of Chicago Office of Inspector General (August 2021), available at <https://igchicago.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Chicago-Police-Departments-Use-of-ShotSpotter-Technology.pdf>.

SB 1079 (Portantino)

Page 14 of 14

AB 1051 (Hancock, Ch. 427, Stats. 2016) *See Comment 1.*

AB 1287 (Chiu, Ch. 485, Stats. 2015) *See Comment 1.*

AB 1041 (Ma, Ch. 325, Stats. 2011) *See Comment 1.*

AB 2567 (Bradford, Ch. 471, Stats. 2010) *See Comment 1.*

AB 101 (Ma, Ch. 377, Stats. 2007) *See Comment 1.*

SB 1136 (Kopp, Ch. 54, Stats. 1998) *See Comment 1.*

SB 833 (Kopp, Ch. 922, Stats. 1995) *See Comment 1.*

SB 1802 (Rosenthal, Ch. 1216, Stats. 1994) *See Comment 1.*

PRIOR VOTES:

Senate Transportation Committee (Ayes 12, Noes 1)
