
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

Senator Mike McGuire, Chair

2021 - 2022 Regular

Bill No: SB 9
Author: Atkins
Version: 4/5/21
Consultant: Favorini-Csorba

Hearing Date: 4/22/21
Tax Levy: No
Fiscal: Yes

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT: APPROVALS

Requires ministerial approval of duplexes and specified subdivision maps; allows an extension of subdivision map validity by one year.

Background

Planning and approving new housing is mainly a local responsibility. The California Constitution allows cities and counties to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” It is from this fundamental power (commonly called the police power) that cities and counties derive their authority to regulate behavior to preserve the health, safety, and welfare of the public—including land use authority.

Planning and Zoning Law. State law provides additional powers and duties for cities and counties regarding land use. 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 must include specified mandatory “elements,” including a housing element that establishes the locations and densities of housing, among other requirements. Cities’ and counties’ major land use decisions—including most zoning ordinances and other aspects of development permitting—must be consistent with their general plans. The Planning and Zoning Law also establishes a planning agency in each city and county, which may be a separate planning commission, administrative body, or the legislative body of the city or county itself. Cities and counties must provide a path to appeal a decision to the planning commission and/or the city council or county board of supervisors.

Zoning and approval processes. Local governments use their police power to enact zoning ordinances that shape development, such as setting maximum heights and densities for housing units, minimum numbers of required parking spaces, setbacks to preserve privacy, lot coverage ratios to increase open space, and others. These ordinances can also include conditions on development to address aesthetics, community impacts, or other particular site-specific considerations.

Local governments have broad authority to define the specific approval processes needed to satisfy these considerations. Typically, most large housing projects require “discretionary” approvals from local governments, such as a conditional use permit or a change in zoning laws. This process requires hearings by the local planning commission, public notice, and may require

additional approvals. City or county planning staff can permit some housing projects “ministerially” or “by right”: without discretionary approval from elected officials.

Accessory dwelling units. In recent years, the Legislature has taken large strides to facilitate the development of accessory dwelling units (ADUs), also known as granny flats or second units. Chief among these steps was to require local agencies to ministerially permit the creation of certain types of ADUs within the space of a single family home or in a new or converted structure in the rear of the property, regardless of what local zoning provides. Under this provision of law, a property owner may construct both a junior ADU within the single-family home and a new construction ADU on the same property. ADU law places numerous limitations on the ability of local governments to impose requirements on ADUs, such as requirements for minimum ADU sizes, impact fees, and owner-occupancy. ADU law also limits the parking that local agencies may require for ADUs to one space per unit, and provides that no parking can be required if the ADU is located within one-half mile walking distance of public transit, the ADU is located within an architecturally and historically significant historic district, or there is a car share vehicle located within one block of the ADU.

Subdivision Map Act. The Subdivision Map Act governs how local officials regulate the division of real property into smaller parcels for sale, lease, or financing. Cities and counties adopt local subdivision ordinances to carry out the Map Act and local requirements. City councils and county boards of supervisors use the Map Act to control a subdivision's design and improvements. Local subdivision approvals must be consistent with city and county general plans.

Under the Subdivision Map Act, cities and counties can attach scores of conditions. The Map Act allows local officials to require, as a condition of approving a proposed subdivision, the dedication of property within a subdivision for streets, alleys, drainage, utility easements, and other public easements and improvements. Once subdividers comply with those conditions, local officials must issue final maps. For smaller subdivisions that create four or fewer parcels, local officials usually use parcel maps, but they can require tentative parcel maps followed by final parcel maps. The Map Act also constrains the dedications and improvements that local cities and counties can require as a condition of a subdivision of four or fewer lots to only the dedication of rights-of-way, easements, and the construction of reasonable offsite and onsite improvements for the parcels being created.

In good economic times, an experienced subdivider can comply with a tentative map's conditions in a few years. Scarce financing, complex settings, and inexperience can drag out the time between a tentative map's approval and the filing of a final map. If a tentative map expires, the subdivider must start over, complying with any new required conditions.

California's housing challenges. California faces a severe housing shortage. In its most recent statewide housing assessment, HCD estimated that California needs to build an additional 100,000 units per year above recent averages of 80,000 units per year to meet the projected need for housing in the state. Prior to the onset of COVID-19, California was building approximately 100,000 to 115,000 units a year in recent years, but many analysts expect homebuilding activity to drop.

A variety of causes have contributed to the state's lack of housing production. Recent reports by the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) and others point to local approval processes as a major

factor. They argue that local governments control most of the decisions about where, when, and how to build new housing, and those governments are quick to respond to vocal community members who may not want new neighbors. The building industry also points to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, and housing advocates note a lack of a dedicated source of funds for affordable housing.

This shortage has driven up housing prices and resulted in overcrowding within existing homes. According to a January 2020 report by the Public Policy Institute of California, “the share of Californians with excessive housing costs is quite high: 38 percent of mortgaged homeowners and 55 percent of renters spend more than 30 percent of their total household income on housing, compared with 28 percent and 50 percent nationwide... California’s rate of overcrowding—the share of housing units with more than one resident per room—was 8.3 percent in 2018, well above the national rate of 3.4 percent. Overcrowding is especially high for rental units: at 13.4 percent, it is more than twice the national rate and the highest in the nation.”

COVID-19 effect on housing. The COVID-19 pandemic has only exacerbated California’s housing challenges. According to the California Association of Realtors’ January 2021 home sales and price report, the median home price in California jumped by almost 22 percent from January 2020 to January 2021, in part due to reluctance of sellers to list homes during the pandemic. At the same time, as many Californians became unemployed due to the pandemic, more individuals at risk of homelessness have fallen into homelessness. The Legislative Analyst’s Office notes in a January 2021 post, “Even before the pandemic, the high cost of housing in California placed renter households in a precarious position, particularly the 1.5 million low-income households who pay at least half of their income in rent. A pandemic-induced job loss adds further financial stress to these households. Due to the composition of the industries and occupations most affected by public health restrictions and declining economic activity, renter households have faced higher rates of job loss during the pandemic because job losses have been concentrated among lower-wage workers who are much more likely to rent than higher-wage workers.”

The author wants to increase the number of units that can be permitted in residential areas.

Proposed Law

Senate Bill 9 requires cities and counties to permit ministerially either or both of the following, as long as they meet specified conditions:

- A housing development of no more than two units (a duplex).
- The subdivision of a parcel into two approximately equal parcels (urban lot split).

To be eligible, a development or parcel to be subdivided must be located within an urbanized area or urban cluster, as defined by the United States Census and cannot be located on any of the following:

- Prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance;
- Wetlands;
- Land within the very high fire hazard severity zone, unless the development complies with state mitigation requirements;

- A hazardous waste site;
- An earthquake fault zone;
- Land within the 100-year floodplain or a floodway;
- Land identified for conservation under a natural community conservation plan, or lands under conservation easement;
- Habitat for protected species; or
- A historic district or property included on the State Historic Resources Inventory, or a site that is designated or listed as a city or county landmark or historic property or district pursuant to a city or county ordinance.

Duplex provisions. SB 9 requires a housing development containing no more than two units to be permitted ministerially in single family zones if the development meets certain conditions, including the requirements on eligible parcels above. A development can include adding one unit to an existing unit, or constructing two new units. However, the project cannot include demolition of more than 25 percent of the exterior walls of an existing structure, unless a local ordinance is more permissive or if the site hasn't been occupied by a tenant in the past three years. A local agency may require a percolation test for units connected to an onsite wastewater treatment system.

Urban lot splits. SB 9 requires a city or county to ministerially approve or deny a parcel map or a tentative and final map for an urban lot split that meets specified requirements, in addition to the requirements for eligible parcels that apply to both duplexes and urban lot splits. Specifically, the urban lot split must meet the following requirements:

- The parcel map subdivides an existing parcel to create two new parcels of approximately equal size, such that one parcel cannot be smaller than 40 percent of the size of the original lot.
- Both newly created parcels are no smaller than 1,200 square feet, unless the local agency adopts a smaller minimum lot size.
- The parcel being subdivided is located within a residential zone.
- The proposed lot split would not require demolition or alteration of rent-restricted housing, housing where an owner has exercised their rights under the Ellis Act within the past 15 years, or housing that has been occupied by tenants in the past three years.
- The parcel being subdivided was not previously created through an urban lot split, and none of the adjoining parcels were created by an urban lot split and owned by the same owner or anyone working in concert with the owner.

SB 9 allows a local agency to approve the lot split only if it conforms to all applicable objective requirements of the Subdivision Map Act, except where the bill says otherwise.

SB 9 prohibits a local agency from imposing regulations that require dedications of rights-of-way or the construction of offsite improvements for parcels created through an urban lot split. However, a local agency may require easements needed for the provision of public services and facilities and require that the parcel have access to, provide access to, or adjoin the public right-of-way, as well as any other conditions that allowed under the Subdivision Map Act that don't conflict with the bill. Local agencies must require that the uses allowed on a lot created by an urban lot split are limited to residential uses.

SB 9 allows, until January 1, 2027, a local agency to impose conditions that an applicant be either:

- An owner-occupant for one year from the date of approval of the urban lot split; or
- A qualified nonprofit corporation that receives a welfare exemption from the property tax pursuant to specified sections of law.

Local agencies cannot otherwise impose owner occupancy standards under the bill, and cannot require the correction of nonconforming zoning conditions.

SB 9 prohibits developing more than two units on each of the resulting parcels from a lot split, including ADUs and JADUs

Provisions applicable to duplexes and urban lot splits. SB 9 prohibits projects or lot splits that would require demolition or alteration of an existing housing unit of any of the following types of housing:

- Rent-restricted housing, including deed-restricted affordable housing and housing subject to rent or price control by a public entity's police power;
- Housing that has been the subject of an Ellis Act eviction within the past 15 years; or
- Housing that has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.

SB 9 also prohibits the development of accessory dwelling units on parcels that use both the urban lot split and duplex provisions of the bill.

SB 9 allows a local agency to impose objective zoning, subdivision, and design standards that do not conflict with the provisions of the bill. However, a city or county cannot require a project or lot split to comply with any standard that would physically preclude two units of at least 800 square feet from being built. SB 9 also prohibits a local agency from requiring a setback for an existing structure or a structure constructed in the same location and to the same dimensions as an existing structure. Otherwise local agencies may not require greater than a four-foot setback. SB 9 also applies the limitations on parking requirements from ADU law to both duplexes and urban lot splits under the bill.

SB 9 allows a local agency to adopt an ordinance to implement the duplex and urban lot split requirements and provides that such an ordinance is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act. It also provides that nothing in the bill supersedes the Coastal Act of 1976, except that a local government is not required to hold public hearings for coastal development permit applications. Local agencies also cannot deny a project or lot split because it proposed adjacent or connected structures, so long as they comply with the building code. A local agency must also require that a rental of any unit permitted by the bill is for a term of longer than 30 days.

SB 9 requires local agencies to report the number of units produced and applications for urban lot splits in their annual report to the Department of Housing and Community Development on the implementation of their general plan.

Other provisions. SB 9 allows local governments to extend the life of subdivision maps by one year, up to a total of four years. The bill also includes findings and declarations to support its purposes.

SB 9 defines its terms and includes findings and declarations to support its purposes.

State Revenue Impact

No estimate.

Comments

1. Purpose of the bill. According to the author, “Senate Bill 9 promotes small-scale neighborhood residential development by streamlining the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an existing lot. SB 9 strikes an appropriate balance between respecting local control and creating an environment and opportunity for neighborhood scale development that benefits the broader community. To that end, the bill includes numerous safeguards to ensure that it responsibly creates duplexes and strategically increases housing opportunities for homeowners, renters, and families alike.

“At a time when many Californians are experiencing economic insecurity caused by the pandemic, this bill will provide more options for families to maintain and build intergenerational wealth – a currency we know is crucial to combatting inequity and creating social mobility. SB 9 provides flexibility for multigenerational housing by allowing homeowners to build a modest unit on their property so that their aging parent or adult child can have an affordable place to live.

“Building off the successes of ADU law, SB 9 offers solutions that work in partnership with a number bills included in the Senate’s Housing Package, ‘Building Opportunities For All’ aimed at combating the State’s housing crisis.”

2. One size fits all? California is a geographically and demographically diverse state, and that is reflected in its 482 cities and 58 counties. Local elected officials for each of those municipalities are charged by the California Constitution with protecting their citizens’ welfare. One chief way local governments do this is by exercising control over what gets built in their community. Local officials weigh the need for additional housing against the concerns and desires of their constituents. Where appropriate, those officials enact ordinances to shape their communities based on local conditions and desires. SB 9 allows duplexes to be built in many single-family zones, even if local officials and residents have said they don’t want them, and it allows for the creation of smaller parcels than local governments would allow on their own. However, the bill provides that local zoning standards that don’t conflict with the bill still apply, so the duplexes allowed under the bill will retain much of the look and feel of the neighborhood. Is SB 9 a flexible enough bill to account for the variation in local communities?

3. Land rush. First adopted in 1907, the Subdivision Map Act is now the result of dozens of amendments that reflect changing legislative concerns. In the 1920s, legislators added consumer protections to the Map Act after land speculators fleeced buyers. For most of the past century, local officials have had the power to require subdividers to dedicate land for streets and

easements. Additional requirements for public improvements and other conditions have been layered on over the years, such as easements for sunlight to power solar energy systems, and dedication of land for parks, transit facilities, and bike trails. These dedications and conditions serve an important purpose: to protect future buyers of land by ensuring that each parcel has the necessary services and improvements to make it functional and accessible. Conditions are imposed at the map level because it becomes much harder for a local government to implement rational development patterns and adequate public infrastructure after a parcel is broken up into smaller parcels with different owners. Local subdivision ordinances also further other important goals: they determine lot sizes, which can affect the feel of a neighborhood or preserve certain types of land uses. For example, in agricultural areas, minimum lot sizes prevent the creation of parcels that are too small to farm, and in urban areas, standardized parcel sizes contribute to the overall look and feel of a neighborhood. SB 9 allows smaller parcel sizes than local governments might otherwise allow and limits the conditions that local governments can require, contrary to past legislation and practices on subdivisions. Some local governments may be concerned about the impact that these restrictions will have on their ability to promote orderly development.

On the other hand, the difference between splitting a single lot into two parcels that border a right-of-way and a large subdivision with hundreds of parcels (or even smaller subdivisions of just four lots) may be more than just a difference of degree: they may be different kinds of subdivisions that simply do not give rise to the same concerns that arise when creating a greater number of parcels. For example, street layout becomes much less important for the creation of two parcels in a previously developed area. Furthermore, SB 9 includes important safeguards to limit the extent to which these smaller parcels deviate from other parcels in the area and head off negative unintended consequences. These bumpers include prohibiting serial urban lot splits on the same parcel to create smaller and smaller parcels and requiring the lot to be split into two approximately equal parts, rather than creating one very small parcel and one large parcel.

4. Location, location, location. Because SB 9 changes local zoning in communities statewide, it impacts some areas of the state that Californians have traditionally considered to be worthy of special treatment. In particular:

- California voters adopted the Coastal Act of 1976, which regulates development in the coastal zone to protect coastal resources and ensure coastal access. SB 9 applies to parcels in the coastal zone. However, SB 9 provides a safeguard by stating that nothing in the bill can be construed to supersede or in any way alter or lessen the effect or application of the Coastal Act.
- SB 9 borrows from an existing prohibition on developing in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (enacted by SB 35, Wiener, 2017). However, that prohibition allows development if the project meets state fire mitigation requirements, so SB 9's provisions are not a blanket ban on duplexes in these areas.
- SB 9's provisions apply to both infill and greenfield parcels, as long as they meet the other requirements in the bill.

Some previous legislation in the housing production space, such as SB 50 (Wiener, 2019), excluded these areas from some parts of the bill. On the other hand, SB 50 allowed for much larger developments than contemplated by SB 9 that have the potential for larger impacts in these areas. In addition, current ADU law, which SB 9 follows in several ways, does not

prohibit the development of ADUs in any of these areas. Moreover, SB 9 requires residential zoning for its provisions to be applicable. This requirement means that the local government has already decided that these areas are suitable for residential use and, as long as the city or county rezones elsewhere to make up for the lost capacity, it can shift where these projects are allowed by restricting residential uses. In addition, automatically excluding parcels in these areas at the state level would reduce the overall housing production that is likely to result from the bill and may force development into poorer communities while carving out wealthier ones. The Committee may wish to consider the manner in which SB 9 balances the need for local control, housing production, and equity.

6. Let's be clear. Committee staff recommends the following clarifying amendments:

- Change references to “tentative and final maps” to “parcel maps;”
- Include a definition of local agency and standardize references throughout the bill;
- Specify that the urban lot splits can only occur on parcels in single family residential zones, consistent with the duplex provisions; and
- Clarify that JADUs cannot be constructed on parcels that use both the duplex provisions and the lot split provisions.

7. Charter city. The California Constitution allows cities that adopt charters to control their own “municipal affairs.” In all other matters, charter cities must follow the general, statewide laws. Because the Constitution doesn't define “municipal affairs,” the courts determine whether a topic is a municipal affair or whether it's an issue of statewide concern. SB 9 says that its statutory provisions apply to charter cities. To support this assertion, the bill includes a legislative finding that ensuring access to affordable housing is a matter of statewide concern.

8. Mandate. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local governments for the costs of new or expanded state mandated local programs. Because SB 9 adds to the duties of local planning officials, Legislative Counsel says that the bill imposes a new state mandate. SB 9 disclaims the state's responsibility for providing reimbursement by citing local governments' authority to charge for the costs of implementing the bill's provisions.

9. Incoming! The Senate Housing Committee approved SB 9 at its April 15th meeting on a vote of 7-2. The Senate Governance and Finance Committee is hearing SB 9 as the committee of second reference. The Senate Rules Committee also ordered a third referral of SB 9 to the Senate Environmental Quality Committee. However, due to the ongoing health and safety risks of the COVID-19 virus, the referral to Environmental Quality was rescinded.

9. Related legislation. SB 1120 (Atkins, 2020) was substantially similar to SB 9. SB 1120 was approved by the Senate Governance and Finance Committee on a vote of 7-0 and passed both houses, but was not taken up for concurrence in the Senate in time to be enacted.

SB 9 is part of the Senate's housing package, along with the following bills:

- SB 5 (Atkins), which authorizes the issuance of \$6.5 billion in general obligation bonds intended to finance housing-related programs that serve the homeless and extremely low income and very low income Californians. SB 5 is currently pending in the Senate

Housing Committee and is double-referred to the Senate Governance and Finance Committee.

- SB 6 (Caballero), which enacts, until January 1, 2029, the Neighborhood Homes Act, to establish housing as an allowable use on any parcel zoned for office or retail uses. The Senate Governance and Finance Committee approved SB 6 at its March 11th hearing on a vote of 5-0. SB 6 is set for hearing on April 29th in the Senate Housing Committee.
- SB 7 (Atkins), which reenacts the Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2011 (AB 900, Buchanan) to allow for streamlined judicial review of large projects that meet high environmental and labor standards. SB 7 also allows a housing project with at least 15% of its units affordable to lower income households and a minimum investment of \$15 million and that meets other criteria to use the same streamlining provisions. SB 7 is currently pending in the Assembly Natural Resources Committee.
- SB 8 (Skinner), which extends the sunset on the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 by five years, to January 1, 2030, and makes other changes. The Senate Governance and Finance Committee approved SB 8 at its March 25th hearing on a vote of 5-0. SB 8 is set for hearing on April 29th in the Senate Housing Committee.
- SB 10 (Wiener), which allows a local government to adopt an ordinance to allow up to 10 units per parcel, notwithstanding local voter initiatives, in infill, transit-rich, or high opportunity areas. SB 10 also provides that this zoning is not considered a project under the California Environmental Quality Act. SB 10 is also scheduled to be heard at the Committee's April 22nd hearing.

Support and Opposition (4/19/21)

Support: Darrell Steinberg- Mayor, Sacramento; Jon Wizard - Councilmember, City of Seaside; Libby Schaaf- Mayor, City of Oakland; Todd Gloria- Mayor, City of San Diego Zach Hilton- City Council Member, City of Gilroy; AARP; Abundant Housing LA; Adu Task Force East Bay; All Home; American Planning Association, California Chapter; Bay Area Council; Bridge Housing Corporation; Cal Chamber; California Yimby; Casita Coalition; Cbia; Chan Zuckerberg Initiative; Circulate San Diego; City of Marywood; East Bay for Everyone; Facebook, INC.; Fieldstead and Company, INC.; Generation Housing; Greenbelt Alliance; Habitat for Humanity California; Hello Housing; Housing Action Coalition; Local Government Commission; Long Beach Yimby; Los Angeles Business Council; Midpen Housing; Midpen Housing Corporation; Modular Building Institute; Monterey; County of; Mountain View Yimby; National Association of Hispanic Real Estate Professionals; Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California; North Bay Leadership Council; Northern Neighbors; Peninsula for Everyone; People for Housing - Orange County; San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce; San Fernando Valley Yimby; San Francisco Yimby; Sand Hill Property Company; Santa Cruz Yimby; Share Sonoma County; Silicon Valley Leadership Group; South Bay Yimby; South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth; Spur; Streets for People Bay Area; Sv@home; Techequity Collaborative; Tent Makers; Turner Center for Housing Innovation At the University of California, Berkeley; The Two Hundred; Tmg Partners; United Way of Greater Los Angeles; Urban Environmentalists; Yimby Action; Yimby Democrats of San Diego County; Zillow Group

Opposition: Adams Hill Neighborhood Association; Aids Healthcare Foundation; Alameda Citizens Task Force; Albany Neighbors United; Belmont; City of; Berkeley Associated Neighbors Against Non-affordable Housing; Berkeley Flatlanders Group; Blue Dove

Neighborhood; Brea; City of; Burton Valley Neighborhoods Group; California Alliance of Local Electeds; California Cities for Local Control; California Contract Cities Association; Century Glen Hoa; Cherrywood Leimert Park Block Club; Chino Hills; City of; Chino; City of; Citizens Preserving Venice; City of Arcata; City of Azusa; City of Bellflower; City of Beverly Hills; City of Brentwood; City of Burbank; City of Camarillo; City of Carpinteria; City of Carson; City of Cerritos; City of Chino; City of Clayton; City of Clearlake; City of Clovis; City of Colton; City of Corona; City of Cypress; City of Diamond Bar; City of Dorris; City of Downey; City of Eastvale; City of Fortuna; City of Foster City; City of Fountain Valley; City of Garden Grove; City of Glendora; City of Grand Terrace; City of Hesperia; City of Hidden Hills; City of Inglewood City Hall; City of Irvine; City of Irwindale; City of Kerman; City of King; City of La Palma; City of La Quinta; City of La Verne; City of Laguna Beach; City of Laguna Niguel; City of Lakeport; City of Lancaster; City of Los Alamitos; City of Los Altos; City of Lomita; City of Martinez; City of Menifee; City of Monterey; City of Moorpark; City of Murrieta; City of Newport Beach; City of Norwalk; City of Novato; City of Oakdale; City of Ontario; City of Orinda; City of Palos Verdes Estates; City of Paramount; City of Pismo Beach; City of Poway; City of Rancho Cucamonga; City of Rancho Palos Verdes; City of Rancho Santa Margarita; City of Redding; City of Redondo Beach; City of Rohnert Park; City of San Dimas; City of San Jacinto; City of San Marcos; City of San Marino; City of Santa Clara; City of Santa Clarita; City of Saratoga; City of Signal Hill; City of South Pasadena; City of Sunnyvale; City of Thousand Oaks; City of Torrance; City of Tracy; City of Vacaville; City of Vista; City of Westlake Village; City of Whittier; City of Yorba Linda; College Terrace Residents Association; Committee to Save the Hollywoodland Specific Plan; Community Associations Institute - California Legislative Action Committee; Comstock Hills Homeowners Association; Craftsman Village Historic District; Cupertino; City of; D4ward; Dublin; City of; Durand Ridge United; El Dorado Park South Neighborhood Association - Long Beach; El Segundo, City of; Escalon City; Half Moon Bay; City of; Hidden Hill Community Association; Hills 2000 Friends of The Hills; Hollywood Knolls Community Club; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association; Irwindale; City of; LA Brea Hancock Homeowners Association; Lafayette Homeowners Association; Lafayette; City of; Lakewood Village Neighborhood Association; Las Virgenes-malibu Council of Governments; Latino Alliance for Community Engagement; League of California Cities; Linda Vista-annandale Association; Livable Pasadena; Lomita; City of Los Altos Residents Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities; Los Feliz Improvement Association; Mccmc; Merced; City of; Miracle Mile Residential Association; Mission Street Neighbors; Mission Viejo; City of; Montecito Association; Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance Trees Committee; New Livable California DbA Livable California; Northeast Neighbors of Santa Monica; Pacific Palisades Community Council; Palo Alto; City of; Pismo Beach; City of; Placentia; City of; Pleasanton; City of; Rancho Cucamonga; City of; Resident Information Resource of Santa Monica; Residents of 47th Avenue; Riviera Homeowners Association; S.b. Residents for Responsible Development; San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments; Santa Clarita; City of; Santa Monica Coalition for A Livable City ; Save Lafayette; Seaside Neighborhood Association; Shadow Hills Property Owners Association; Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association; South Bay Cities Council of Governments; South Bay Residents; Southshores Homeowners Association; Stanton; City of; Sunnyvale United Neighbors; Sunset-parkside Education and Action Committee; Sustainable Tamalmonite; Temecula; City of; Temecula Valley Neighborhood Coalition; Town of Apple Valley; Town of Colma; Town of Fairfax; Town of Mammoth Lakes; Town of Ross; United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles; Ventura Council of Governments; Ventura; City of; Verdugo Woodlands West Homeowners Association; West Pasadena Residents' Association; West Torrance Homeowners Association; Westside Regional Alliance of Councils; Westwood Highland Homeowners Association;

Westwood Hills Property Owners Association; Westwood Homeowners Association; Wilshire Montana Neighborhood Coalition; Windsor Square Association; Yorba Linda, City of; Hundred Individuals.

-- END --