

# PLATINUM | ADVISORS

September 30, 2024

*The Governor has until September 30<sup>th</sup> to sign or veto all measures pending on his desk.*

**TABLE 1: BOARD ADOPTED ITEMS**

Bill	Subject	Status	Adopted Position
<p><b><u>AB 761</u></b> <b>(<u>Freidman D</u>):</b> Enhanced infrastructure financing districts</p>	<p>AB 761 was finally gutted and amended to remove the Transit Transformation Task Force language.</p> <p>As amended, AB 761 would allow an enhanced infrastructure financing district enacted primarily to develop and construct passenger rail projects in Los Angeles County to last 75 years instead of 45 years.</p>	<p><b>Signed Into Law</b> <b>Chapter 344, Statutes of 2024</b></p>	<p>WATCH  (prior version)</p>
<p><b><u>AB 817</u></b> <b>(<u>Pacheco D</u>):</b> Open meetings: teleconferencing: subsidiary body.</p>	<p>AB 817 would authorize a “subsidiary body” to remotely hold a public meeting if specified conditions are met.</p> <p><i>AB 817 failed passage in the Senate Local Government Committee because the author would not accept all the amendments proposed by the Committee. Reconsideration of the bill was granted in the event the author changes her mind.</i></p> <p>The Committee proposed several amendments to narrow the application of the bill to specific types of advisory bodies, which the author accepted. However,</p>	<p>Senate Local Government  Dead</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>

Bill	Subject	Status	Adopted Position
	<p>there were two amendments the author would not accept. This resulted in the chair voting “no” causing the rest of the committee to hold off, or vote no. The two changes that are holding up this bill include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provisions of the bill would not apply to advisory bodies where the members are compensated.</li> <li>• Require a quorum to be present at a single public location; however, members of the body that have “specific needs” may count toward the quorum even if they participate remotely.</li> </ul>		
<p><b><u>AB 1837</u></b> <b>(Papan D)</b> San Francisco Bay area: public transportation.</p>	<p>AB 1837 was never set for hearing by the Senate Transportation Committee. This is due to SB 1031, the regional tax measure, being set aside until next year.</p> <p>This bill would basically codify the existing Regional Network Manager Council that consists of specified Bay Area transit general managers. The bill would require MTC to create a council consisting of 11 representatives that would consist of the general managers from the large operators plus 4 additional general managers selected by specified general managers.</p> <p>The purpose of this council is to provide guidance on regional transit policies.</p>	<p>Senate Transportation</p> <p>Dead</p>	<p>WATCH</p>

Bill	Subject	Status	Adopted Position
<p><b><u>AB 1904</u></b> <b>(Ward D)</b> Transit buses: yield right-of-way sign.</p>	<p>Existing law allows Santa Clara VTA and Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District to equip buses with a “yield right-of-way” sign to inform motorists when the bus re-entering a traffic lane.</p> <p>AB 1904 would expand this authorization to allow any transit operators to equip its bus with yield right-of-way signs. Under AB 1904 these signs could be an illuminated sign or a static decal.</p>	<p><b>Signed Into Law</b> <b>Chapter #555,</b> <b>Statutes of 2024</b></p>	<p>WATCH</p>
<p><b><u>AB 2043</u></b> <b>(Boerner D)</b> Medi-Cal: nonmedical and nonemergency medical transportation</p>	<p>While a similar bill was approved last year, it was disappointing that AB 2043 was held on the Suspense File.</p> <p>AB 2043 direct the State Department of Health Care Service to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure the fiscal burden of providing nonemergency Medi-Cal trips is not unfairly placed on public paratransit providers.</li> <li>• Direct Medi-Cal managed care plans to reimburse public paratransit providers at the state’s fee for service rates.</li> <li>• Engage with public paratransit providers to understand the unique challenges the paratransit providers face, and by June 1, 2026, provide updated guidance that ensures the fiscal burden is not placed on public paratransit providers.</li> </ul>	<p>Senate Appropriations Held on Suspense File  Dead</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>
<p><b><u>AB 2561</u></b> <b>(McKinnor D)</b></p>	<p>As approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee, AB 2561 was significantly amended.</p>	<p><b>Signed Into Law</b> <b>Chapter 409,</b></p>	<p>OPPOSE</p>

Bill	Subject	Status	Adopted Position
Local public employees: vacant positions.	<p>As currently drafted, AB 2561 would require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to adopting a budget, a public agency is required to present the status of vacancies and recruitment and retention efforts during a public hearing before its governing board at least once per fiscal year.</li> <li>• Allows a bargaining unit to make a presentation on vacancies at the same hearing.</li> <li>• If the vacancy rate of a single bargaining unit exceeds 20% then the public agency's presentation to the governing board shall include specified information, such as the number and duration of the vacancies.</li> </ul> <p>While numerous local governments remain opposed to AB 2561, the amendments do scale back the requirements that were previously in the bill.</p>	Statutes of 2024	
<p><b>AB 2824</b> <b>(McCarty D)</b> Battery; Public Transportation Provider</p>	<p>As amended, AB 2824 would expand the application of existing provisions for battery of a bus operator to also include an agent, employee, or contractor to a public transit operator. The existing penalty for battery includes a fine of up to \$10,000, or up to one year in county jail, or both. The bill would also include imprisonment in state prison for up to 16 months, or 2 years, or 3 years.</p>	<p>Assembly Public Safety</p> <p>Dead</p>	Watch

Bill	Subject	Status	Adopted Position
	<p>AB 2824 will not move forward this year. The author and the sponsors could not reach an agreement on adding provisions to the bill that would allow transit operators to issue prohibition orders.</p>		
<p><b>AB 3214</b> <b>(Fong, Mike D)</b> Public transit: advertising.</p>	<p>AB 3214 would require the state to prioritize purchasing advertising space offered by public transit operators when implementing a public awareness campaign.</p> <p>This measure will not move forward this year. The author and sponsors will pursue an administrative solution before seeking legislation.</p>	<p>Assembly Transportation</p> <p>Dead</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>
<p><b>SB 960</b> <b>(Wiener D)</b> Transportation: planning: transit priority projects: multimodal.</p>	<p>SB 960 would place in statute the requirement for Caltrans to include “complete street” improvements to all transportation projects.</p> <p>The bill was amended on July 3<sup>rd</sup> to reflect suggested changes by Caltrans. While the amendments provide some flexibility to Caltrans to phase in these requirements, the overall intent of the bill remains in place. Caltrans suggesting amendments bodes well for SB 960 being signed into law.</p> <p>This bill also requires inclusion of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit priority facilities in the Transportation Asset Management Plan, the State Highway System Management Plan, and the plain language performance report of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). This bill requires any project in the SHOPP to include bicycle,</p>	<p><b>Signed Into Law</b> <b>Chapter 630, Statutes</b> <b>of 2024</b></p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>

Bill	Subject	Status	Adopted Position
	pedestrian, and transit priority projects unless a specified exception applies.		
<p><b>SB 961</b> <b>(Wiener D)</b> Vehicles: safety equipment.</p>	<p>SB 961 would require starting with the 2030 model year that certain passenger vehicles, motortrucks, and buses manufactured or sold in the state to be equipped with a passive intelligent speed assistance system.</p> <p>Governor Newsom stated, <i>“While I appreciate the intent to improve traffic safety, this bill presents several challenges. Federal law, as implemented by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), already regulates vehicle safety standards, and adding California-specific requirements would create a patchwork of regulations that undermines this longstanding federal framework. NHTSA is also actively evaluating intelligent speed assistance systems, and imposing state-level mandates at this time risks disrupting these ongoing federal assessments.”</i></p> <p>SB 961 was amended to exempt motor trucks with a weight rating over 8,500 pounds that are already subject to federal rules, and passenger vehicles that are not equipped with GPS or front facing camera. <i>However, the bill was not amended to exempt public transit buses.</i></p>	<p><b>Vetoed</b></p>	<p>SUPPORT IF AMENDED</p>

Bill	Subject	Status	Adopted Position
<p><b><u>SB 1031</u></b> <b>(Wiener D)</b> San Francisco Bay area: local revenue measure: transportation improvements.</p>	<p>Given growing debate over the content of the bill, Senators Wiener and Wahab decided to shelve the bill for this year in order to provide more time to develop a consensus measure that will be introduced next session.</p> <p>The language in SB 1031 is extensive. The bill contains 2 proposals. The first directs CalSTA to study the consolidation of all Bay Area transit operators, and then develop a plan for consolidation.</p> <p>The second area provides MTC with the authority to seek a regional funding measure for transit operations and capital programs. The regional measure also includes provisions that consolidated funding and policy authority over transit operations with MTC.</p>	<p>Assembly Desk</p> <p>Dead</p>	<p>WATCH</p>
<p><b><u>SB 1420</u></b> <b>(Caballero D)</b> Hydrogen.</p>	<p>As amended, SB 1420 would add hydrogen production facilities and onsite storage and processing facilities to the types of facilities that existing law makes eligible for centralized permitting and expedited review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).</p> <p>While an agreement could not be reached on clarifying the definition of clean hydrogen, it is a topic of growing interest and will likely be addressed in legislation next year.</p>	<p><b>Signed Into Law</b></p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>