

---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Senator Allen, Chair

2019 - 2020 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 2323  
**Author:** Friedman and Chiu  
**Version:** 7/1/2020  
**Urgency:** No  
**Consultant:** Genevieve M. Wong

**Hearing Date:** 8/11/2020  
**Fiscal:** Yes

**SUBJECT:** California Environmental Quality Act: exemptions

**DIGEST:** Expands various CEQA exemptions by modifying the exclusion of sites and authorizing, as one of the criteria for eligibility, a project be located within a very low vehicle travel area for purposes of the transit priority project exemption; by permitting projects be within a very low vehicle travel area and permitting community plans to serve as the basis for exemption of residential, mixed-use, and employment center projects near transit; and modifying the exclusion of sites from affordable agricultural housing, affordable urban housing, and urban infill housing.

### ANALYSIS:

Existing law, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA):

- 1) Requires lead agencies with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a proposed discretionary project to prepare a negative declaration (ND), mitigated negative declaration (MND), or environmental impact report (EIR) for this action, unless the project is exempt from CEQA (CEQA includes various statutory exemptions, as well as categorical exemptions in the CEQA guidelines). (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency must prepare a draft EIR. (CEQA Guidelines §15064(a)(1), (f)(1)).
- 2) Exempts the following projects:
  - a) Transit priority projects that meet certain criteria including, but not limited to, site restrictions, maximum residential units limitations, maximum project site size limitations, and being located within one-half mile of a rail transit station or a ferry terminal included in a regional transportation plan or within one-quarter mile of a high-quality transit corridor included in a regional transportation plan (PRC §21155.1)

- b) Residential projects, employment center projects, and mixed-use development projects, including any subdivision or zoning change, that are (1) within a transit priority area; (2) undertaken to implement and is consistent with a specific plan for which an EIR has been certified; and (3) consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy (SCS) or alternative planning strategy (APS) for which the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has accepted a metropolitan planning organization's determination that the SCS or APS would achieve the greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets (PRC §21155.4). Commonly known as the transit-oriented development (TOD) exemption.
- c) Specified residential housing projects which meet detailed criteria established to ensure the project does not have significant effects on the environment (PRC §§21159.21 – 21159.124). These exemptions are available to:
  - i) Affordable agricultural housing projects not more than 45 units on a site not more than five acres in size;
  - ii) Urban affordable housing projects not more than 100 units on a site not more than five acres in size; and
  - iii) Urban infill housing projects not more than 100 units on a site not more than four acres in size which is within one-half mile of a major transit stop.

This bill:

- 1) Expands the transit priority project exemption by modifying the project sites where a project may be located and permitting, for purposes of meeting a specific location requirement, a transit priority project to be within a very low vehicle travel area, as defined by the bill.
- 2) Expands the housing project, employment center project, and mixed-use development project exemption by permitting community plans, as defined, to serve as the basis for exemption of those projects near transit; and, as an alternative to being located near transit and as a basis for the exemption, authorizes a project to be located within a very low vehicle travel area.

- 3) Expands the specified residential housing projects for affordable agricultural housing, affordable urban housing, and urban infill housing by eliminating the exclusion of sites within the boundaries of state conservancy and otherwise modifying the projects sites where a project may be located.
- 4) Further expands the urban infill housing project exemption by allowing, as an alternative to the requirement that the project be within one-half mile of a major transit stop, a project to be within a very low vehicle travel area.
- 5) Defines “very low vehicle travel area” as either of the following:
  - a) For projects that are at least two-thirds residential uses by square footage, means an area that is surrounded by or adjacent to existing residential development that generates vehicle travel per capita that is under 85 percent of either regional vehicle miles traveled per capita or city vehicle miles traveled per capita.
  - b) For projects that are at least two-thirds office uses by square footage, means an area that is surrounded by or adjacent to existing office development that attracts vehicle travel per employee below 85 percent of the existing vehicle miles traveled per employee for the region.
- 6) Requires the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to create maps depicting these “very low vehicle travel areas” by July 1, 2021, and requires the maps to be updated at least once every four years or as necessary.

## Background

- 1) Background on CEQA.
  - a) *Overview of CEQA Process.* CEQA provides a process for evaluating the environmental effects of a project, and includes statutory exemptions, as well as categorical exemptions in the CEQA guidelines. If a project is not exempt from CEQA, an initial study is prepared to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the initial study shows that there would not be a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency must prepare a negative declaration. If the initial study shows that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency must prepare an EIR.

Generally, an EIR must accurately describe the proposed project, identify and analyze each significant environmental impact expected to result from the proposed project, identify mitigation measures to reduce those impacts to the extent feasible, and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the

proposed project. Prior to approving any project that has received environmental review, an agency must make certain findings. If mitigation measures are required or incorporated into a project, the agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program to ensure compliance with those measures.

- b) *What is analyzed in an environmental review?* An environmental review analyzes the significant direct and indirect environmental impacts of a proposed project and may include water quality, surface and subsurface hydrology, land use and agricultural resources, transportation and circulation, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, terrestrial and aquatic biological resources, aesthetics, geology and soils, recreation, public services and utilities such as water supply and wastewater disposal, and cultural resources. The analysis must also evaluate the cumulative impacts of any past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects/activities within study areas that are applicable to the resources being evaluated. A study area for a proposed project must not be limited to the footprint of the project because many environmental impacts of a development extend beyond the identified project boundary. Also, CEQA stipulates that the environmental impacts must be measured against existing physical conditions within the project area, not future, allowable conditions.
  - c) *CEQA provides hub for multi-disciplinary regulatory process.* An environmental review provides a forum for all the described issue areas to be considered together rather than siloed from one another. It provides a comprehensive review of the project, considering all applicable environmental laws and how those laws interact with one another. For example, it would be prudent for a lead agency to know that a proposal to mitigate a significant impact (i.e., alleviate temporary traffic congestion, due to construction of a development project, by detouring traffic to an alternative route) may trigger a new significant impact (i.e., the detour may redirect the impact onto a sensitive resource, such as a habitat of an endangered species). The environmental impact caused by the proposed mitigation measure should be evaluated as well. CEQA provides the opportunity to analyze a broad spectrum of a project's potential environmental impacts and how each impact may intertwine with one another.
- 2) *CEQA and land use.* The adoption of general plans, specific plans, and community plans are all subject to CEQA.

- a) *General plans.* The Planning and Zoning Law requires every county and city to adopt a general plan that sets out planned uses for all of the area covered by the plan. A general plan provides a long-term vision for the community's growth, and includes goals, policies, and maps to guide decisionmaking on zoning and particular projects. Cities' and counties' major land use decisions—including most zoning ordinances and other aspects of development permitting— must be consistent with their general plans. In this way, the general plan is a blueprint for future development.
- b) *Specific plans.* Local agencies may also adopt specific plans that provide for the systematic implementation of a general plan in a particular area. Specific plans are an optional way to provide for the implementation of the general plan for all or a portion of a community. Specific plans are often appropriate for larger infill development opportunities. They allow a community to determine the mix of uses, densities and development standards that are suitable to the site or sites but that may not be applicable to the jurisdiction as a whole.
- c) *Community plans.* Community plans address specific geographic areas of a city and build upon the more general citywide policies established in the general plan with policy recommendations that apply to the community and neighborhood level. Community plans provide the level of information and community-specific detail that is needed in order to review and assess proposed public and private development projects. While the community plan addresses community needs, its policies and recommendations must be consistent with the general plan, other community and resource plans, and citywide policies. Community plans also address other aspects of land use planning that are unique to their areas, such as mobility, community facilities, and urban design features and guidelines.

The nature of a community plan depends upon the need of the community. A community plan for a developed, mature area would focus on neighborhood enhancement and commercial revitalization goals and action items; whereas a community plan for a newly developing area would focus more on new development needs, e.g. location of new public facilities and infrastructure financing.

Most existing community plans are over 20 years old; several of the plans were adopted in the 1970's or early 1980's. Unlike general plans, community plans are not required to be updated regularly.

- 3) *CEQA exemptions for housing*. CEQA includes various statutory exemptions, as well as categorical exemptions in the CEQA Guidelines, for housing projects. For example, any residential development project, including any subdivision, or any zoning change that is consistent with an adopted specific plan is exempt from CEQA pursuant to a statute enacted in 1984.

In 2002, SB 1925 established CEQA exemptions for certain residential projects providing affordable urban or agricultural housing, or located on an infill site within an urbanized area, and meeting specified unit and acreage criteria.

Since SB 1925, additional legislation has provided CEQA exemptions and streamlining for residential (including, but not limited to, affordable housing) and certain other projects in infill areas. SB 375 provided a CEQA exemption for a narrow set of eligible residential projects in infill areas adjacent to transit. SB 226 provided abbreviated CEQA review procedures for a broader set of urban infill projects, including retail, commercial, and public buildings. SB 743 established a new exemption for residential, mixed-use and "employment center" projects located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, if the project is consistent with an adopted specific plan and specified elements of an SB 375 strategy. SB 743 also required the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to propose revisions to the CEQA Guidelines for transportation impacts to better support infill development.

In 2017, the Legislature passed three bills to streamline the CEQA process for affordable housing projects. SB 35 established a ministerial approval process (i.e., not subject to CEQA) for certain multifamily affordable housing projects that are proposed in local jurisdictions that have not met regional housing needs. SB 540 authorizes a city or county to establish a Workforce Housing Opportunity Zone (WHOZ) by preparing an EIR and by adopting a specific plan. Once a WHOZ is established, and for five years thereafter, eligible housing developments within a WHOZ must be approved within 60 days without requiring the preparation of an EIR or negative declaration under CEQA. AB 73 authorizes a city or county to create a Housing Sustainability District (HSD) to complete upfront zoning and environmental review in order to receive incentive payments for residential and mixed-use development projects with an affordable housing component. Once the city or county has prepared an EIR for the HSD, then housing projects within, and consistent with, a designated HSD are exempt from CEQA.

In 2018, AB 1804 codified an existing categorical exemption for infill projects, expanding the exemption to apply to multi-family residential and mixed-use

housing projects on infill sites in unincorporated urbanized areas or urban clusters.

Since 1978, CEQA has included statutory exemptions for housing projects. There are now 12 distinct CEQA exemptions for housing projects. Three are specific to projects with an affordable housing fraction, the rest are available to affordable and market-rate projects alike. Each exemption includes a range of conditions, including requirements for prior planning-level review, as well as limitations on the location and characteristics of the site. These conditions are intended to guard against the approval of projects with significant environmental impacts that go undisclosed and unmitigated – endangering workers, residents, and the greater environment.

However, as these exemptions have been added in bills over the past 40 years, and in particular since SB 1925 in 2002, the conditions in each bill have varied and evolved.

## Comments

- 1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, “AB 2323 is intended to help address California’s housing and climate crises by ensuring that CEQA streamlining for housing projects works as intended, and that well-planned housing near transit and jobs is not delayed unnecessarily. AB 2323, in its current form and with pending amendments, aims to make the existing housing exemptions more consistent, objective and aligned with housing and climate goals.”
- 2) *Expanding CEQA housing exemptions.* AB 2323 expands various CEQA housing project exemptions as follows:
  - a) Expands the exemption for transit priority projects by:
    - i) Modifying the sites excluded from the exemption to make the site exclusions more objective.
    - ii) Permitting a project be within a very low vehicle travel area as an alternative to being within one-half mile of a rail transit station or ferry terminal or within one-quarter mile of a high –quality transit corridor.
  - b) Expands the exemption for TOD projects by:
    - i) Permitting community plans to serve as a basis for the exemption.
    - ii) Permitting a project be located within a very low vehicle travel area as an alternative to the project be located near transit.

- c) Expands the exemption for SB 1925 housing projects by:
    - i) Modifying the sites excluded from the exemption to make the site exclusions more objective, most notably eliminating the exclusion of sites within the boundaries of a state conservancy.
    - ii) Specifically for the urban infill housing exemption, permitting a project be located within a very low vehicle travel area as an alternative to the project being located within one-half mile of a major transit stop.
- 3) *What do we lose when we remove the environment review of CEQA?* Often groups will seek a CEQA exemption to expedite construction of a particular type of project and reduce costs. In this case, already existing, and some argue under-utilized, CEQA exemptions are expanded to increase housing production. Providing an exemption, however, can overlook the benefits of environmental review: to inform decisionmakers and the public about project impacts and identify ways to avoid or significantly reduce environmental damage. Environmental review includes more than just looking at the impact a project may have on a wetland or a threatened species; it looks at things such as air quality, impacts to neighboring facilities such as hospitals and schools, pressure on underlying infrastructure, and so much more, and analyzes those impacts in the context of one another.

Often CEQA exemptions will include certain restrictions or requirements to proactively mitigate or limit a project's potential environmental impacts that would not be analyzed due to the application of an exemption. Is including such criteria an adequate substitution for environmental review and information provided under CEQA?

“CEQA operates, not by dictating pro-environmental outcomes, but rather by mandating that ‘decision makers and the public’ study the likely environmental effects of contemplated government actions and thus make fully informed decisions regarding those actions. ... In other words, CEQA does not care what decision is made as long as it is an informed one.” (*Citizens Coalition Los Angeles v. City of Los Angeles* (2018) 26 Cal. App. 5th 561, 577.)

- 4) *Will expanding existing exemptions through insertion of objective, more consistent standards potentially lead to overlooking important environmental factors?* The CEQA housing exemptions covered by this bill contain various site exclusions. More recent exemptions have been less restrictive, more objective, and have emphasized production of housing in urban areas near transit. Consistent with these objectives, AB 2323 proposes changes to provide consistency for site exclusions between exemptions, and providing a more



objective standard for the identification of those sites. The objective standards to those are found in recent streamlining provisions such as SB 35. However, some stakeholder groups argue that the objective environmental standards of SB 35 were temporary concessions based on the bill's 2026 sunset date and are not appropriate for the permanent exemptions covered by AB 2323.

Inserting more objective-based standards also expands the exemptions. For example, a transit priority project, under AB 2323, could be located in an area not currently permitted under the existing exemption – such as in a developed open-space area; in an area that harms a species protected by the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Native Plant Protection Act, or the California Endangered Species Act; on a project site that is subject to an unusually high risk of fire or explosion from materials stored or used on nearby properties; or on a project site that presents a risk of public health exposure at levels exceeding standards established by a state or federal agency. Or, for a SB 1925 housing exemption, projects could be located within the boundaries of a state conservancy. Some may argue that such site exclusions can be subjective, making it difficult to qualify for the exemption. The standards are perceived as restrictive, defeating the purpose of the exemptions by making them effectively unusable.

However, removing them can also have some concerns. For instance - the unusually high risk of fire or explosion exclusion. Some point to the fact that other CEQA exemptions don't contain such a restriction. But is a restriction not being in other exemptions a good enough reason to take out its consideration from these exemptions? Concern has also been raised over changing a site restriction from areas that have significant value as wildlife habitat and the project does not harm certain protected species to habitats for protected species. What areas of habitat would now be eligible for development under AB 2323 that are otherwise protected under existing law?

Does the fact that it is a subjective consideration justify it being removed as a requirement for a project that is not subject to environmental review? Or are these the changes that are necessary to make the exemptions more accessible?

- 5) *TOD projects – Potentially relying on outdated community plans?* Unlike general plans, community plans are not required to be updated regularly and can be out of date. For example, most community plans in Sacramento County are at least 20 years old. AB 2323 would allow certain community plans to be used as the basis for qualifying for the TOD project exemption. Such community plans are those that have not been updated since at least 2009 and that, in addition to other criteria, include at least two transit priority areas and

the city or county that adopted the plan has adopted a vehicle miles traveled threshold of significance. Although the proposed expanded exemption would require that the community plan have a certified EIR, a lot can change since the time the EIR was certified, especially if the community plan is over 20 years old. The general character of a community can shift, and environmental impacts that may have been relevant 20 years ago may no longer apply. Similarly, new, unconsidered environmental impacts may have developed since the last community plan update. A project that relies on such a community plan as a basis for a CEQA exemption is only as good as the community plan itself. Does allowing local officials to rely on potentially outdated information align with the author's intent of promoting well-planned housing?

*The committee may wish to amend the bill as follows:*

- (a) *Define "community plan," for purposes of CEQA, as part of the general plan of a city or county which applies to a defined geographic portion of the total area included in the general plan, includes or references each of the mandatory elements specified in Section 65302 of the Government Code, and contains specific development policies and implementation measures which will apply those policies to each involved parcel.*
  - (b) *Require that a community plan, for purposes of qualifying for the TOD exemption, has been updated within the previous 15 years.*
- 6) *Defining "very low vehicle travel area."* As an alternative to the transit requirement that is found in the 3 CEQA housing exemptions covered by this bill, AB 2323 offers a different option – that a project be within a "very low vehicle travel area."

*Based on type of use.* The definition for "very low vehicle travel area" provides two standards depending on the type of project – residential or office. Development projects are not often characterized using the term "office," but instead referred to as "retail" or "commercial" uses. Merriam-Webster's definition of "office," *the place in which a professional person conducts business*, would encompass retail and commercial uses, however, the author may wish to consider using the term "retail" or "commercial" instead as to remain consistent with existing code references.

*What if a project fits in neither category?* Under the proposed definition of "very low vehicle travel area," the area that a project is to be located, for purposes of using it as a basis to qualify for an exemption, is tied to the type of project – whether it has at least two-thirds residential uses or whether it has at least two-thirds office uses. However, what if a project does not fit within either category? What if the project is 60 percent residential and 40 percent

office, which does not fit in either category? Is that project ineligible for the “very low vehicle travel area” option and must be located near transit, as otherwise required by the exemption?

*Can this definition lead to sprawl?* The definition of “very low vehicle travel area” includes an area that is surrounded by or adjacent to existing residential or office development. Thus, a project site can be next to an existing development on one side, and undeveloped space on the remaining sides. This can lead to sprawl.

*To address these concerns, the committee may wish to amend the bill as follows:*

- *Amend the definition of “very low vehicle travel area” to mean an urbanized area that meets either of the following:*
  - *For residential and mixed-use projects, an area where the existing residential development generates vehicle miles traveled per capita that is below 85% of either regional vehicle miles traveled per capita or city vehicle miles traveled per capita.*
  - *For employment-center projects, an area where the existing office development attracts vehicle miles traveled per employee that is below 85 % of the existing vehicle miles traveled per employee that is below 85% of the existing vehicle miles traveled per employee for the region.*
- *Define “area” as a travel analysis zone, hexagon, or grid, as determined by the applicable Metropolitan Planning Organization or the Office of Planning and Research.*
- *Require OPR to maintain statewide maps depicting these areas.*
- *To avoid sprawl that could potentially result from exempting development located in “very low vehicle travel areas,” amend each of the exemptions to require that a project be in a lot that has been previously developed; or a vacant site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins, or is separated only by an approved public right-of-way from, parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses.*

7) *Does adding “very low vehicle travel area” significantly expand the exemptions?*

Currently, OPR is developing a SiteCheck mapping tool, which would show, among other things, areas that would be in “very low vehicle travel area” and areas that would be within a certain proximity to a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor. That site mapping tool is not yet available to the public.

On one hand, the application of “very low vehicle travel area” would increase the geographic areas in which certain CEQA exemptions apply. But on the other hand, using “very low vehicle travel area” also creates an incentive to build around areas that have already been developed and discourages development on greenfield sites. It would seem that the additional consideration of whether an area is a very low vehicle travel area is consistent with the Legislature’s policy of encouraging smart growth.

8) *Are current exemptions too restrictive and will expanding them solve California’s housing crisis?*

It has been argued that some CEQA exemptions, particularly SB 1925 exemptions, include conditions which are excessively restrictive and subjective, making the exemptions difficult to use.

A study by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) seems to suggest that other exemptions are being used. In 2018, AEP surveyed 46 cities and counties throughout the state to determine CEQA’s impact on housing production.<sup>1</sup> The survey found that 42.3 percent of housing projects in those jurisdictions were reviewed under streamlining provisions or exemptions for affordable housing, infill, and transit priority projects. Another 9.3 percent were determined to be eligible for other exemptions. The survey found that cities and counties were not fully utilizing the affordable housing exemption, but instead opting for a full EIR for projects that were eligible for the exemption. The survey respondents also indicated that, among the barriers to increased housing production in California, CEQA is not a major cause. The costs of building, lack of available sites, and lack of financing for affordable housing were all cited as primary barriers to housing production.

Thus, even if eligible for an exemption, it appears that project applicants are instead opting to go through the CEQA process. One argument is that projects applicants, and perhaps due to the uncertainty tied to some of the subjective site restrictions, would rather play it safe than sorry. Will efforts by AB 2323 to expand the exemptions and prevent the delay of housing near transit and jobs by including more objective-based standards result in project applicants utilizing the exemptions? Or do other considerations, such as level of scrutiny the project may still face from community groups or level of risk of eventually having to do an environmental review following a court proceeding anyway, play into the decision to opt for environmental review?

---

<sup>1</sup> CEQA’s Impact on Housing Production: 2018 Survey of California’s Cities and Counties.

- 9) *Tracking exemptions.* The purpose of this bill is to make the covered CEQA housing exemptions less restrictive. However only the infill exemption codified in 2018, which is not subject to this bill, has a reporting requirement for when the exemption is used. It is unknown to what extent the transit priority projects exemption, TOD exemption, and SB 1925 urban infill housing project exemption are being utilized.

*To track the use of exemptions and to help the Legislature gain a better understanding of how often the exemptions are used, the committee may wish to amend the bill to require the lead agency to file a notice of exemption with OPR when one of these housing exemptions is used.*

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

SB 899 (Wiener) provides that housing is a use by right on land owned by a religious institution or nonprofit college, as specified. SB 899 has been referred to the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee.

SB 1289 (Chang) exempts from CEQA, until January 1, 2029, residential and mixed-use development projects that meet certain requirements. SB 1289 was held in this committee.

AB 1279 (Bloom) requires residential development projects in designated high-opportunity areas be a use by right if certain requirements are met. AB 1279 is in the Senate Housing Committee.

SB 4 (McGuire, 2019) would have created a streamlined, ministerial approval process for an eligible neighborhood multifamily project or eligible transit-oriented development project located on an eligible parcel. SB 4 was held in the Senate Governance and Finance Committee.

SB 50 (Wiener, 2019) would have required a local government to grant an equitable communities incentive, which reduces specified local zoning standards in “jobs-rich” and “transit rich” areas,” as defined, when a development proponent meets specified requirements, if the local government has not adopted a local flexibility plan, as specified. SB 50 would have also required a neighborhood multifamily project containing up to four dwelling units to be subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process. SB 50 did not receive enough votes to get off of the Senate Floor.

SB 384 (Morrell, 2019) would have established expedited administrative and judicial review of environmental review and approvals granted for housing

development projects with 50 or more residential units. SB 384 was held in this committee.

SB 1340 (Glazer, 2018) would have required Judicial Council to adopt a rule of court to establish procedures requiring courts to fully adjudicate CEQA actions and proceedings, to the extent feasible, and prohibit courts from staying or enjoining challenged projects, as specified. SB 1340 was held in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

AB 73 (Chiu, Chapter 371, Statutes of 2017) exempts from CEQA, a housing project that meets specified criteria and that is in a housing sustainability district.

AB 1804 (Berman, Chapter 670, Statutes of 2018) provides a statutory exemption from CEQA for infill development residential and mixed-use housing projects within an unincorporated area of a county, as specified.

AB 1886 (McCarty, 2016), for purposes of a transit priority project meeting the requirements for abbreviated review under the Sustainable Communities Strategy provisions of CEQA, revises the definition of “transit priority project” by increasing the percentage, from 25% to 50%, of the project area that maybe farther than one-half mile from a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor. AB 1886 was held in this committee.

SB 674 (Corbett, Chapter 549, Statutes of 2014) revised the residential infill exemption by increasing the amount of allowable neighborhood-serving goods, services, or retail uses from 15% of the total project floor area to 25% of the total building square footage.

**SOURCE:** Authors

**SUPPORT:**

350 Sacramento

American Planning Association, California Chapter

Associated Builders and Contractors Northern California Chapter

Association of Environmental Professionals

Bay Area Council

Bay Area Housing Action Coalition

Bay Area Housing Advocacy Coalition

Bridge Housing Corporation

California Apartment Association

California Association of Realtors

California Building Industry Association

California Chamber of Commerce  
California Community Builders  
California League of Conservation Voters  
California YIMBY  
Central City Association of Los Angeles  
Council of Infill Builders  
Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce  
Habitat for Humanity California  
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce  
Los Angeles Business Council  
Mayor Eric Garcetti, City of Los Angeles  
Murrieta Wildomar Chamber of Commerce  
North Orange County Chamber of Commerce  
Oceanside Chamber of Commerce  
Orange County Business Council  
Peninsula for Everyone  
Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce  
Rancho Cordova Chamber of Commerce  
Rural County Representatives of California  
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)  
San Francisco Housing Action Coalition  
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership  
Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce  
Silicon Valley Leadership Group  
Silicon Valley @ home  
The Two Hundred  
Up for Growth California  
YIMBY Action

**OPPOSITION:**

Bay Area Transportation Working Group  
City of Rancho Palos Verdes  
State Building & Construction Trades Council of California  
Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund

**-- END --**