

Date of Hearing: June 17, 2024

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Lori D. Wilson, Chair

SB 915 (Cortese) – As Amended May 16, 2024

SENATE VOTE: 26-9

SUBJECT: Local government: autonomous vehicle service

SUMMARY: Authorizes cities with a population of 250,000 or greater to enact ordinances to protect public health, safety, and welfare as it relates to autonomous vehicle (AV) services within that jurisdiction. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Defines “autonomous vehicle services” to mean any entity that has received authority to conduct commercial passenger service or engage in commercial activity using driverless vehicles by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), the Public Utility Commission (CPUC) or any other state agency.
- 2) Requires the local ordinances to have all of the following:
 - a) The establishment or registration of rates for the provision of an AV service conducting commercial passenger service that has all of the following requirements:
 - i) The AV service may set fares to charge a flat rate, however the city may set a maximum rate.
 - ii) The AV service may use any type of device or technology approved by the Division of Measurement Standards to calculate fares, including the use of Global Position System (GPS) metering, as specified.
 - iii) Requires AV service to disclose fares, fees, or rates to the customer.
 - b) Establish reasonable vehicle caps and hours of service restrictions; and,
 - c) Establish a fee schedule and disciplinary process for any moving violations or traffic obstruction caused during the operation of a vehicle by an AV service.
- 3) Authorizes a city with a population of less than 250,000 that shares a border or is contiguous to a city that has enacted an ordinance to enact an ordinance or ordinances in regard to AV services to enact an ordinance that is substantially consistent with the ordinance or the ordinances of the city that has enacted an ordinance pursuant to this bill.
- 4) Prohibits an enacted ordinance from banning the safe operation of AVs.
- 5) Requires an AV service to include an interoperability or override system in each of its vehicles accessible by first responders in case of an emergency.
- 6) Requires an AV service to provide training for first responders on how to interact with the vehicles and use the override system.

- 7) Requires an AV service providing commercial passenger service to maintain reasonable financial responsibility to conduct passenger transportation services in accordance with the requirements of an ordinance passed by a local jurisdiction.
- 8) Requires an AV service providing commercial passenger service to comply with the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.
- 9) Requires an AV service providing commercial passenger service to maintain a disabled access education and training program to instruct its employees on compliance with the Federal ADA of 1990 and state disability rights laws and regulations. The education and training program must include instructions on the duty to provide equal access, including, but not limited to those with service animals, provide effective communication, including the right to alternative formats and auxiliary aids, and make reasonable accommodations or modifications to rules, policies, and practices where necessary to provide equal access to an AV service for a person with a disability.
- 10) Requires an AV services providing commercial passenger service to provide wheelchair-accessible vehicles, or, if an AV service uses nonwheelchair-accessible vehicles, the AV service must demonstrate that it is providing wheelchair-accessible service that is equivalent to non-wheelchair-accessible service in terms of service area, response time, availability, and wait time. Authorizes an AV service to contract with another company to provide the wheelchair accessible vehicles. Requires an AV service to collect and maintain records and data on trips provided, trips declined, trips canceled, wait times, response times, and service availability for rides requested by users needing wheelchair-accessible vehicles and for other users to establish that its wheelchair-accessible service is equivalent to its nonwheelchair-accessible service.
- 11) Requires an AV service providing commercial passenger service to maintain its motor vehicles used in passenger transportation services in a safe operating condition, and in compliance with the vehicle code, subject to annual inspection by the city, county, or city and county in which It operates, at a facility that is certified by the National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence or a facility registered with the Bureau of Automotive Repair.
- 12) Provides an airport operator the authority to regulate AV service access to airports and to set fees for AVs at the airport.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Authorizes the operation of AVs on public roads for testing purposes under certain circumstances specified in DMV regulations. (Vehicle Code (VEH) 38750).
- 2) Defines “autonomous vehicle” to mean vehicle equipped with technology that makes it capable of operation that meets the definition of Levels 3, 4, or 5 of the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) International's Taxonomy and Testing of Autonomous Vehicles Definitions for Terms Related to Driving Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles, standard J3016 (APR 2021). (VEH 38750)
- 3) Defines “autonomous technology” to mean technology that has the capability to drive a vehicle without the active physical control or monitoring by a human operator. (VEH 38750)

- 4) States that an AV does not include a vehicle that is equipped with one or more collision avoidance systems, including, but not limited to, electronic blind spot assistance, automated emergency braking systems, park assist, adaptive cruise control, lane keep assist, lane departure warning, traffic jam and queuing assist, or other similar systems that enhance safety or provide driver assistance, but are not capable, collectively or singularly, of driving the vehicle without the active control or monitoring of a human operator. (VEH 38750)
- 5) Prohibits the operation of AVs on public roads for non-testing purposes unless the vehicle manufacturer submits an application to DMV that is approved pursuant to DMV regulations. (VEH 38750)
- 6) Requires DMV to approve an application submitted by a manufacturer for the operation of AVs for non-testing purposes if DMV finds that the applicant has submitted all information and completed testing necessary to satisfy that the AVs are safe to operate on public roads and the applicant has complied with all requirements specified in DMV regulations. (VEH 38750)
- 7) Authorizes DMV to impose additional requirements it deems necessary to ensure the safe operation of AVs if those vehicles are capable of operating without the presence of a driver inside the vehicle. (VEH 38750)

Existing DMV regulations:

- 1) Requires AV manufacturers to have a testing or deployment permit to operate an autonomous vehicle in California.
- 2) Restricts the testing and deployment of autonomous vehicles to vehicles under 10,001 pounds and excludes motorcycles.
- 3) Authorizes both the testing and deployment of AVs without a human operator inside the vehicle.
- 4) Requires an AV with a testing permit (but not a deployment permit) to report collisions to DMV within 10 days of the collision if the collision resulted in damage of property or in bodily injury or death if they have a testing permit
- 5) Requires AVs with a testing permit (but not a deployment permit) to report disengagements on an annual basis.

FISCAL EFFECT: According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, “The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) could incur costs in a future fiscal year, likely exceeding \$100,000 and potentially reaching the low hundreds of thousands of dollars, to the extent local ordinances would require the department to revise AV regulations, conduct additional oversight of AVS permittees, and coordinate with local agencies. The timing and magnitude of costs would depend upon the content, timing, and number of ordinances enacted by local agencies. (Motor Vehicle Account)

In addition, the CPUC indicates that fiscal impacts to coordinate with local jurisdictions to prevent regulatory overlap, consider new reporting requirements, ensure CPUC staff is educated on new regulations, and address other unanticipated issues would be minor and absorbable at this

time. CPUC notes, however, that it would eventually incur unabsorbable ongoing legal staffing costs of approximately \$276,000 annually (1.0 PY), beginning in a future fiscal year, as more local ordinances are enacted and AV commercial passenger services expand throughout the state. (PUC Transportation Reimbursement Account)

COMMENTS:

In 2012, the Legislature passed SB 1298 (Padilla), Chapter 570 which permitted AVs to operate on public roads for testing by a driver under certain conditions. In 2014, DMV released regulations to allow for testing AVs with a test driver. In April 2018, DMV finalized regulations for the testing and deployment of AVs on public roads without a driver. About 35 companies currently have a testing permit with a driver and six companies have received an AV permit for testing without a driver. Only three companies currently have a valid driverless deployment permit. While this bill would apply to all autonomous vehicle manufacturers broadly – in testing with a driver, driverless testing, and full driverless deployment - most of the recent public attention has been focused on a limited number of companies that have fully deployed their driverless vehicles for commercial service under CPUC programs.

In 2018, the CPUC initially authorized two pilot programs for the private prearranged transportation of passengers AVs:

- 1) The "Drivered AV Passenger Service" pilot program allows for the provision of passenger service in AVs with a driver in the vehicle. Under this pilot program, a safety driver is available to assist with operations if needed.
- 2) The "Driverless AV Passenger Service" pilot program allows for the provision of passenger service in AVs without a driver in the vehicle. Under this pilot program, a communication link between passengers and "remote operators" of the vehicle must be available and maintained at all times during passenger service.

To be eligible to participate in the CPUC's AV Passenger Service pilot programs, participants must possess the appropriate corresponding Autonomous Vehicle Tester Program Manufacturer's Testing Permit from the DMV for and comply fully with DMV's AV testing regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Article 3.7). Under the AV Passenger Service pilot programs, monetary compensation may not be charged for any rides in test AVs. Currently, only one company (Waymo LLC), is authorized for full driverless deployment under the CPUC's program. One other company (Zoox, Inc.) is authorized for driverless testing.

Taxi Regulations: This bill authorizes cities with a population of 250,000 or more to regulate AV services similarly to how they regulate taxis and mirrors statute enabling cities to regulate taxis. Two key differences are unlike current taxi statutes, this bill authorizes cities to regulate AV delivery services and also, extend to vehicles capable of carrying eight or more passengers.

According to the author, "Local governments adopt ordinances on any given week, nimbly and with local accountability. SB 915 returns control to the local communities who know their streets best. The emergence of commercial autonomous vehicles is an exciting technological development with massive potential upsides for safety and convenience. We must ensure this innovative technology rolls out safely. SB 915 strikes the right balance between responsible technology deployment, regional consistency, and public safety."

According to the *California Labor Federation*, writing as a co-sponsor of this bill, “Right now, robotaxis and other autonomous vehicle services are operating in California communities without input from local government, concerned residents, emergency responders, or workers. Over the last year, driverless vehicles have delayed transport and medical care, blocked emergency vehicles, and interfered during active firefighting and crime scenes. First responders have been forced to relocate their emergency vehicles because of wayward AVs. The San Francisco Fire Department indicated that more than 70 driverless vehicles interfered with emergency responders in 2023 alone. Despite numerous examples of widespread technological failures, state regulators just approved expanded deployment across the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles County.

SB 915 will bring much-needed local input to communities impacted by the deployment of robotaxis and other autonomous vehicle services. In California, only the CPUC and the DMV authorize and govern AV services, not local governments. SB 915 guarantees that local governments also have a say in regulating AVs operating on their streets, by allowing larger cities to enact ordinances that include important considerations like maximum fares, vehicle caps, and data transparency to customers.”

According to *Taxi Regulation in the Age of Uber*, a journal article published by the New York University Journal of Legislation and Public Policy, there are five pillars of taxi regulation: limiting the number of taxis (medallion caps), taxi fares, health and safety regulations such as background checks and insurance requirements, regulations to protect the economic interests and health and safety of taxi drivers, and universal service requirements.

Medallion Caps. Under this bill, cities would be authorized to establish medallion caps to limit the number of AVs, both for passenger service and delivery service. Congestion may become an increasingly larger problem for autonomous vehicles. This problem has already been realized with Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) such as Uber and Lyft which lack medallion caps. According to a 2018 San Francisco County Transportation Authority report *TNCs and Congestion*, Uber, and Lyft resulted in a 51% increase in daily vehicle hours of delay between 2010 and 2016. During the same period, there was a 47% increase in the vehicle miles traveled during that same period. There was also a 55% average speed decline on roadways during the same period. On an absolute basis, TNCs comprised an estimated 25% of total vehicle congestion citywide and 36% in the downtown core.

According to *Three Revolutions, Steering Automated, Shared, and Electric Vehicles to a Better Future*, written by CARB board member and Director of University of California’s Institute of Transportation Studies Daniel Sperling, “In a study of urban passenger travel worldwide, researchers at the University of California, Davis, estimated that with driverless cars but with little pooling and electrification, GHG emissions would increase 50% and vehicle use 15 to 20% between now and 2050.”

While medallion caps were the tool of choice for reducing taxi congestion decades ago, there may be better means of reducing congestion today. According to *Taxi Regulation in the Age of Uber*, “Jurisdiction-wide caps are blunt tools that limit the number of taxis even in places and at times where there are no congestion concerns, such as the city outside the central business district or the airports. Perversely, these caps often lead taxis to concentrate in the areas of the

city that are the most congested, because these also are the places where it is easiest for taxis to find passengers. The caps also create barriers to entry that may increase taxi fares, and reduce service quality and innovation.” Moreover, the report notes that taxis and TNCs may alleviate congestion if they are pooled. *Three Revolutions* notes that “where driverless cars are pooled and electrified, vehicle use would drop by 60% compared to business as usual, GHG emissions would drop by 80%, and overall cost of vehicles, fuel use, and infrastructure would drop by more than 40%-- representing a savings of \$5 trillion per year.”

Taxi Regulation in the Age of Uber notes that a better way to address congestion would be to permit congestion charges. “The advent of e-hailing services such as Uber might provide the occasion for implementing congestion charging *for taxis* in specific areas such as an airport where traffic congestion is a major issue, and where taxis are a major contributor and a low-cost source of reductions. The technology that Uber uses for “surge pricing” could be adapted to implement a very sophisticated form of congestion charge for taxis. The charge could be varied based not only on where the vehicle is driving and when to reflect its contribution to congestion but also the number of passengers, to credit individuals who are reducing the number of vehicles on the road by pooling.”

Fare setting. Under this bill, locals would be allowed to set a maximum fare for AVs. According to *Taxi Regulation in the Age of Uber*, “Many cities historically have regulated the fare levels of taxi services. The standard justification for regulating the level of taxi fares for street-hailed taxis is imperfect information. When passengers hail taxis on the street, they are poorly positioned to assess whether a fare that a taxi is proposing is reasonable because riders lack essential information. The passenger will not know when the next taxi will come by and what it will charge, and searching for additional taxis to compare the prices that they would charge will be costly.”

Unlike taxis, AVs are hailed using apps. These apps display the price of the trip ahead of time. Moreover, with competition, a user will be able to better select the most affordable price by price shopping on the various apps, something previously not possible with taxis.

Health and safety regulations. Another pillar of taxi regulations that this bill authorizes is health and safety regulations. According to *Taxi Regulation in the Age of Uber*, “Cities regulate the attributes of taxi drivers, for example by requiring that they are a certain age; that they undergo training, drug testing, and criminal background checks; and that they are certified as fit for the job of taxi-driving by a physician. Cities also require that taxis are insured in case of accidents and that the vehicles meet certain specifications.”

Under this bill, cities are authorized to set separate insurance rates for AVs, creating different insurance requirements from city to city. DMV regulations already create a \$5 million coverage requirement for AVs, five times the insurance coverage required for TNCs. Regulations related to driver safety are unnecessary, as AVs lack a driver. Service hour requirements, as permitted, are also unnecessary, as they are generally set to ensure drivers are not on the road too long, increasing the likelihood of a collision. AVs will be able to operate without such concerns.

The bill also empowers cities to conduct safety inspections for AVs. However, such a regulation can be done at a statewide level. CPUC regulations already require vehicles to be inspected by a facility licensed by the California Bureau of Automotive Repair upon introduction into service and every 12 months or 50,000 miles thereafter, whatever comes first.

Moving violations. There has been an open question by the San Francisco Police Department on whether they can issue a citation for a moving violation of an AV and to whom law enforcement can issue it. AB 1777 (Ting of 2024) clarifies when an AV is liable for a moving violation. The penalty for these moving violations would be the same for moving violations for driver-operated vehicles. Under this bill, locals are given the authority to establish their own fines for moving violations and the amount of the fine is not capped.

Without a cap, cities could be incentivized to write tickets to AVs for revenue purposes. According to a New York Times investigation *The Demand for Money Behind Many Police Traffic Stops*, “A hidden scaffolding of financial incentives underpins the policing of motorists in the United States, encouraging some communities to essentially repurpose armed officers as revenue agents searching for infractions largely unrelated to public safety.” According to the investigation, at least 20 states have evaluated police performance on the number of traffic stops per hour. Over 730 municipalities rely on fines and fees for at least 10% of their revenue.

Lack of trust in the regulator. The supporters of this bill lack trust in DMV and the CPUC as regulators of AVs and are looking for another entity to regulate AVs. The League of Cities, writing in support of this bill, argues “Currently, only the CPUC) and the DMV authorize and govern AV services, not local governments. As a result, Robotaxis and other AV services are operating in California communities without input from local government, concerned residents, or emergency responders.

As AVs have primarily been tested and deployed on public roads in San Francisco, we have seen AVs repeatedly create large traffic jams when they stop working in traffic lanes. AVs have also blocked emergency vehicles from responding to calls. Between January 2023 and February 2024, the San Francisco Fire Department reported at least 85 incidents in which AVs have negatively impacted firefighters' operations or interfered with emergency responses. SB 915 ensures that law enforcement, fire, and emergency responders can intervene in a wayward AV that interferes with a response to an emergency.”

As the supporters of this bill note, most AV testing and deployment in California has occurred in San Francisco. In January 2023, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority asked the CPUC to reject Google-owned Waymo’s request to allow commercial deployment throughout the city.

The incidents of driverless vehicles blocking traffic that San Francisco reported to the CPUC were only known to them because of 9-1-1 calls or posts on social media. These incidents were not reported to DMV because DMV only requires disengagement reports for vehicles with a testing permit, but not a deployment permit. Companies also do not consider disengagements where a human operator is not present in the vehicle as a reportable disengagement under DMV regulations, allowing AV companies using remote operators to take over AVs to avoid reports to the DMV about disengagements.

The General Motors-Cruise LLC vehicles involved in these types of incidents had a DMV deployment permit at the time of the incidents. To get this permit, a company must self-certify that the “autonomous technology is designed to detect and respond to roadway situations in compliance with all provisions of the California Vehicle Code and local regulation applicable to the performance of the dynamic driving task in the vehicle’s operational design domain, except

when necessary to enhance the safety of the vehicle's occupants and/ or other road users. DMV is permitted to suspend or revoke a deployment permit based on the performance of the vehicles if they determine the AVs are not safe for public operation. DMV had not suspended or revoked a testing or deployment permit for this reason, even after Cruise LLC in June of 2022 had to issue a recall for 80 vehicles after one of their vehicles got into a crash in San Francisco injuring two people after making an unprotected left turn (law enforcement contributed the other vehicle with mostly being at fault).

Instead, DMV approved the expansion of their hours of service, allowable operating speeds and their ability to test a vehicle incapable of being operated by a human operator.

The DMV only suspended Cruise's permit 24 days after one of their vehicles drove over a pedestrian that had been struck by another vehicle. The Cruise vehicle had come to a complete stop after the crash but then proceeded to drive over the pedestrian. DMV took action against Cruise after it had discovered the company did not show them the entire video of the incident, stopping the video right after the initial crash.

The Autonomous Vehicle Industry Association and the California Chamber of Commerce believe the Legislature should trust existing regulations and oppose this bill. They argue that "SB 915 would nullify the decisions of California's experienced state regulators. Under California's comprehensive statutory and regulatory AV frameworks, the DMV has established robust regulations for the testing and deployment of AVs, imposing a range of obligations, including incident reporting requirements. The DMV issues permits to AV companies based on the agency's experience regulating vehicle safety and operation, and the Department has the authority to suspend and revoke such permits upon determining an AV is not safe for operation on public roads. Moreover, the CPUC has established an additional layer of regulatory requirements for AV passenger services pursuant to its authority to regulate transportation network companies ("TNCs"). The CPUC has established four AV programs that, among other obligations, require AV passenger services to submit passenger safety plans and extensive trip-level information as part of their authorizations. These state regulatory frameworks are designed to adapt to the AV industry as it matures, and processes to establish and update the respective rules for AVs provide significant opportunities for public participation. SB 915 would throw away the decade of experience these agencies have spent regulating AVs by preventing an AV service that has been approved by the DMV and CPUC from operating in a city with an ordinance established under SB 915 that is onerous or inconsistent with other local ordinances."

Committee concerns: There are legitimate concerns about the DMV and CPUC's regulation of AVs. However, the solution to that issue is not to abandon state regulation in favor of local regulation, and moreover imposing an outdated scheme for the regulation of taxis to AVs is in appropriate. Local control of transportation-for-hire has largely been usurped with the rise of TNCs. Statewide regulation with CPUC has created an economic marketplace where transportation for-hire vehicles are more readily accessible for users at more affordable prices. As AVs expand, the Legislature should consider if it is more appropriate to continue to regulate the next generation of transportation for-hire at a state level or go back to the previous scheme of regulating vehicles at the local level that may have the result of diminished service.

As described above, medallion caps, fare regulation, and safety inspections are regulatory schemes that have largely been abandoned in the age of TNCs. App-based hailing that displays the price of a trip removes the imperative to give local control over fares. Medallion caps, which

were generally favored to reduce congestion and negative impacts on the environment through fuel consumption are better dealt with through statewide electrification requirements (all AVs under 8,500 pounds will be required to be electric by model year 2031) encouraging pooling (San Francisco currently has the authority and does tax non-pooled rides at a higher rate to encourage riders to opt for pooled rides) and congestion pricing.

The state already has insurance requirements on AVs that are five times higher than TNCs insurance requirements and already requires vehicles to be inspected every year. Additional local regulations duplicating that effort are unnecessary. AVs lack a human operator, and as a result much of the taxi regulatory scheme about ensuring the safety of the driver, like background checks, is unnecessary.

Finally authorizing locals to be able to establish moving violation fines could set a dangerous precedent for policing for profit. California is one of the few states in the country that does not have a single city that receives more than 10% of its revenue from traffic tickets. Authorizing locals to set their fines for AVs could have a perverse incentive to over-police AVs to make up for lost revenue.

Proposed committee amendments. The Committee recommends striking the provisions of the bill related to imposing unnecessary local control of AVs. Specifically, the committee recommends the following amendments:

Strike section 1 of the bill related to findings and declarations. These provisions relate to findings and declarations related to unnecessary local control

Strike the definition of city and reasonable vehicle caps in VEH 38760 to conform with removing local control.

Strike 38761 in its entirety for authorizing locals to issue taxi-like regulations for AV services.

Strike VEH (38762(b)(1) authorizing locals to set insurance rates different from the one imposed by the state.

Strike 38762(b)(5) authorizing locals to require annual inspections of AVs, as CPUC requirements already require such inspections.

Strike 38762(b)(6) and (7) as sharing data with locals is no longer necessary to impose a local regulatory scheme.

Strike (VEH) 38763 as technical cleanup.

Related Legislation: AB 1777 (Ting) of 2024 places various requirements on manufacturers of autonomous vehicles (AVs) by July 1, 2026. That bill is pending before Senate Transportation Committee.

AB 2286 (Aguiar-Curry) of 2024 restricts an AV with a gross vehicle weight (GVW) of 10,001 pounds or more from being operated on public roads for testing purposes, transporting goods, or transporting passengers without a human safety operator physically present in the AV at the time of operation. That bill is pending before Senate Transportation Committee.

AB 3061 (Haney) of 2024 requires the manufacturers of AVs to report to the DMV any vehicle collision, traffic violation, or disengagement, or the assault or harassment of any passenger or safety driver that involves a manufacturer's vehicle in California starting July 31, 2025. That bill is pending before Senate Transportation Committee.

AB 316 (Aguiar-Curry) of 2023 was substantially similar to AB 2286. That bill was vetoed by Governor Newsom.

SB 1298 (Padilla), Chapter 570, Statutes of 2012 established conditions for the operation of AVs upon public roadways.

AB 650 (Low) of 2016 would have prohibited cities and counties from creating additional rules and regulations on taxicab transportation services, as specified, and states the intent of the Legislature that the regulation of taxicab transportation services and taxicab drivers be consolidated with other modes of for-hire transportation regulated by the state. That bill was vetoed by the Governor.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO (co-sponsor)
California Professional Firefighters (co-sponsor)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
Board of Supervisors for the City and County of San Francisco
California Democratic Party
California School Employees Association
City of Los Angeles
City of Oakland
City of Oceanside
City of Palo Alto
Consumer Attorneys of California
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Clara
Disability Rights California
Honorable Adam Schiff, Member of The United States Congress
League of California Cities
Los Angeles City Council District 13
Los Angeles County
Mission Street Neighbors
Orange County Employees Association
Rural County Representatives of California
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance
Secure Justice
Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO

Opposition

Alliance for Automotive Innovation
Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International
Aurora Innovation, INC.
Autonomous Vehicle Industry Association
Bay Area Council
California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce
California Chamber of Commerce
California Contract Cities Association
California Delivery Association
California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
Campbell Chamber of Commerce
Central City Association of Los Angeles
Central Valley Yemen Society
Chamber of Progress
City of Norwalk
Coalition of California Chambers – Orange County
Coalition of Small and Disabled Veteran Businesses
Consumer Technology Association
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
City of Norwalk
Daimler Truck North America
Family Business Association of California
Flasher Barricade Association
Fremont Chamber of Commerce
Inland Empire Economic Partnership
Kodiak Robotics, INC.
Latin Business Association
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Business Council
Los Angeles County Business Federation (BIZ-FED)
Motional
Mountain View Chamber of Commerce
National Federation of Independent Business - California
National Federation of the Blind of California
Navistar, INC.
Nuro
Orange County Business Council
Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce
Plus AI
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Salinas Council Member Steve McShane
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
San Juan Capistrano Chamber of Commerce
San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce
San Mateo County Economic Development Association

Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce
Si Se Puede Fresno, Tulare, Kings & Kern
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Spartan Radar
Stack AV
STAR Milling Co.
Steve McShane, City Councilman, City of Salinas
Technet
Tesla
Tore Robotics
Town of Danville
Uber
United Spinal Association
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Volvo Autonomous Solutions
Volvo Group North America
Waabi Innovation US Inc.
Waymo
Zoox

Analysis Prepared by: David Sforza / TRANS. / (916) 319-2093