

Date of Hearing: June 9, 2021

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Cecilia Aguiar-Curry, Chair
SB 9 (Atkins) – As Amended April 27, 2021

SENATE VOTE: 28-6

SUBJECT: Housing development: approvals.

SUMMARY: Requires ministerial approval of housing developments with two units (duplexes) and subdivision maps that meet certain conditions, and increases the length of time that local agencies can extend the validity of existing subdivision maps. Specifically, **this bill:**

1) Duplex Provisions.

- a) Requires local agencies to ministerially approve a proposed housing development project containing two residential units on parcels zoned for single-family residential development if all of the following conditions are met:
 - i) The parcel where the housing development will take place is either:
 - (1) Wholly within the boundaries of an urbanized area or urbanized cluster as designated by the United States (US) Census Bureau; or,
 - (2) Located within a city which includes some portion of an urbanized area or urban cluster as designated by the US Census Bureau within its boundaries.
 - ii) The parcel where the housing development will take place is not located on or within any of the following:
 - (1) Prime farmland, or farmland of statewide importance;
 - (2) Wetlands, as defined in 1993 by the US Fish and Wildlife Service;
 - (3) A very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ), as defined by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFire), unless the site has adopted fire hazard mitigation measures required by existing building standards;
 - (4) A hazardous waste site, as defined, unless specified agencies clear the land for residential use;
 - (5) An earthquake fault zone as determined by the State Geologist, unless the development complies with existing applicable building standards;
 - (6) A special flood hazard area as defined, unless certain conditions are met;
 - (7) A regulatory floodway as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), unless certain conditions are met;
 - (8) Land identified for conservation pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act;

- (9) Habitat for protected species, as defined;
 - (10) Land under a conservation easement;
 - (11) A national, state, or local historical district or property, as defined; or,
 - (12) A parcel where the owner of residential property has withdrawn accommodations for rent or lease within the last 15 years.
- iii) The housing development will not require demolition or alteration of any of the following types of housing:
- (1) Housing that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income;
 - (2) Housing that is subject to rent or price control; or,
 - (3) Housing occupied by tenants within the last three years.
- iv) The housing development will not require the demolition of more than 25% of the exterior walls of an existing structure, unless such demolition is allowed by ordinance, or the development has not been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.
- b) Allows local agencies to impose objective design, subdivision, and zoning standards that are not in conflict with the bill, provided that the standards do not:
- i) Physically preclude the development from including up to two units of at least 800 square feet;
 - ii) Require setbacks for an existing structure, or structure built in the same location and to the same dimensions of an existing structure, if the required setbacks would physically preclude the development from including up to two units; or,
 - iii) Require setbacks of more than four feet from the side and rear lot lines, if those setbacks would preclude the development from including up to two units.
- c) Allows local agencies to require a development eligible for ministerial approval under the bill to provide one off street parking space per unit, unless:
- i) The parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of public transit; or,
 - ii) A car share vehicle is located within one block of the parcel.
- d) Allows cities and counties to require residential units connected to an onsite wastewater treatment system that are eligible for ministerial approval under the bill to have a percolation test completed within the last five years or recertified within the last ten years.
- e) Requires local agencies to restrict the rental term of any unit created under the bill to a term of more than 30 days.

- f) Provides that an application for a housing development shall not be rejected solely because it includes adjacent or connected structures provided that those structures meet existing building code and safety standards that are sufficient to allow separate conveyance.

2) Urban Lot Split Provisions.

- a) Requires local agencies to ministerially approve a parcel map for an “urban lot split,” that complies with the following:
 - i) The urban lot split is a parcel map that performs all of the following:
 - (1) Subdivides a parcel that is zoned for single-family residential use;
 - (2) Subdivides a parcel that is located:
 - (a) Wholly within the boundaries of an urbanized area or urbanized cluster as designated by the US Census Bureau; or,
 - (b) Located within a city which includes some portion of an urbanized area or urban cluster as designated by the US Census Bureau.
 - (3) Subdivides an existing parcel to create two new parcels of roughly equal size, as defined; and,
 - (4) Creates two parcels that are no smaller than 1,200 square feet, unless a smaller minimum lot size is allowed by an ordinance adopted by a local agency.
 - b) Requires a parcel subdivided by an urban lot split to meet all of the following requirements:
 - i) The parcel is not located on or within:
 - (1) Prime farmland, as defined;
 - (2) Wetlands, as defined in 1993 by the US Fish and Wildlife Service;
 - (3) A VHFHSZ, as defined by CALFire, unless the site has adopted fire hazard mitigation measures required by existing building standards;
 - (4) A hazardous waste site, as defined, unless specified agencies clear the land for residential use;
 - (5) An earthquake fault zone as determined by the State Geologist, unless the development complies with applicable building standards;
 - (6) A special flood hazard area as defined, unless certain conditions are met;
 - (7) A regulatory floodway as defined by FEMA, unless certain conditions are met;
 - (8) Land identified for conservation pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act;

- (9) Habitat for protected species, as defined;
 - (10) Land under a conservation easement;
 - (11) A national, state or local historical district or property; or,
 - (12) A parcel where the owner of residential property has withdrawn accommodations for rent or lease within the last 15 years.
- ii) The urban lot split would not require demolition or alteration of any of the following types of housing:
 - (1) Housing that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income;
 - (2) Housing that is subject to rent or price control; or,
 - (3) Housing occupied by tenants within the last three years.
 - iii) The urban lot split does not subdivide either of the following types of parcels:
 - (1) A parcel previously established through an urban lot split; or,
 - (2) A parcel where the owner or a person acting in concert with the owner previously subdivided an adjacent parcel through an urban lot split.
- c) Requires local agencies to approve urban lot splits that conform to the objective requirements of the Subdivision Map Act in accordance with the following:
 - i) Ministerially and without discretionary review; and,
 - ii) Without the imposition of regulations that require dedications of rights-of-way, or the construction of offsite improvements as a condition of approval.
 - d) Allows local agencies to impose objective design and subdivision standards to parcels created by an urban lot split provided that the standards do not conflict with the standards established in the bill and do not:
 - i) Physically preclude the construction of two units on either of the resulting parcels;
 - ii) Result in a unit size of less than 800 square feet;
 - iii) Require setbacks for an existing structure, or structure built in the same location and to the same dimensions of an existing structure if the required setbacks would physically preclude the development from including up to two units; or,
 - iv) Require setbacks of more than four feet from the side and rear lot lines, if those setbacks would preclude the development from including up to two units.

- e) Provides that local agencies may impose or require any of the following conditions on an urban lot split:
 - i) Easements required for the provisions of public services and facilities;
 - ii) Requirements that parcels have access to or adjoin the public right-of-way;
 - iii) Off street parking of up to one space per unit, unless the parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of public transit or a car share vehicle located within one block of the parcel.
- f) Requires local agencies to limit parcels created through urban lot splits to residential uses, and to restrict the rental term of any unit created through an urban lot split to a term of more than 30 days.
- g) Prohibits a local agency from requiring the correction of nonconforming zoning conditions as a condition of approval of an urban lot split.
- h) Provides that an urban lot split shall not be rejected solely because it includes adjacent or connected structures provided that those structures meet existing building codes and safety standards that are sufficient to allow separate conveyance.
- i) Authorizes a local agency to, until 2027, impose an owner occupancy requirement on an applicant for an urban lot split. An applicant may satisfy the owner occupancy requirements imposed by a jurisdiction by occupying one of the units created under the provisions of this bill for one year after the approval of an urban lot split. Additionally an applicant that is a qualified nonprofit corporation, as defined, satisfies the owner occupancy requirements.

3) Other Provisions.

- a) Allows local agencies to adopt an ordinance to implement the provisions of this bill allowing for ministerial approval of duplex developments and urban lot splits, and specifies that the action to adopt the ordinance is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- b) Specifies that a local agency is not required to permit more than two units on parcels that are subdivided through an urban lot split.
- c) Requires local agencies to include information on the number of applicants for urban lot splits and the number of units constructed under the provisions of this bill in the annual housing element report submitted to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
- d) Allows local agencies to extend the life of subdivision maps by an additional 12 months.
- e) States that the provisions of the bill address a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair and therefore its provisions are applicable to all cities, including charter cities.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Requires, pursuant to Planning and Zoning Law, every city and county to adopt a general plan that sets out planned uses for all of the area covered by the plan, and requires the general plan to include seven mandatory elements, including a land use element.
- 2) Requires major land use decisions by cities and counties, such as development permitting and subdivisions of land, to be consistent with their adopted general plans.
- 3) Requires, under CEQA, lead agencies with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a proposed project to prepare a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or an environmental impact report (EIR), unless the project is exempt from CEQA.
- 4) Provides, pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act, the following related to the subdivision of land:
 - a) Requires a city or county to require a tentative and a final map for all subdivisions of land creating five or more parcels, except for subdivisions which meet specified conditions;
 - b) Requires a city or county to require a parcel map for subdivisions meeting specified conditions;
 - c) Limits the improvements a city or county may require for a subdivision of land that is less than five parcels; and,
 - d) Requires a legislative body of a city or county to deny approval of a tentative map or a parcel map if it makes any of the following findings:
 - i) That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans;
 - ii) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans;
 - iii) That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development;
 - iv) That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development;
 - v) That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are likely to cause environmental damage, injure wildlife, or are likely to cause serious public health problems; or,
 - vi) That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will conflict with certain easements providing access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.
- 5) Requires local agencies to ministerially approve 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 and places numerous limitations on the ability of cities and counties to impose requirements on ADUs.

FISCAL EFFECT: According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) estimates it would incur costs of \$87,000 annually for 0.5 PY of staff time to update the Streamlined Ministerial Approval Guidelines, and provide technical assistance and outreach education to local agencies and affordable housing developers. (General Fund)

Unknown local costs to establish streamlined project review processes for proposed duplex housing developments and tentative maps for urban lot splits, and to conduct expedited design reviews of these proposals. These costs are not state-reimbursable because local agencies have general authority to charge and adjust planning and permitting fees to cover their administrative expenses associated with new planning mandates, (local funds).

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Author's Statement.** According to the author, "Senate Bill 9 provides options for homeowners by streamlining the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an existing lot. Building off the successes of ADU law, SB 9 strikes an appropriate balance between respecting local control and creating an environment and opportunity for neighborhood housing 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. 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. SB 9 is part of the Senate's Housing Package, 'Building Opportunities For All' that establishes opportunities to make real progressive and positive changes in our communities to strengthen the fabric of our neighborhoods with equity, inclusivity, and affordability."
- 2) **Bill Summary.** This bill requires local agencies to ministerially approve subdivisions of specific types of parcels called urban lot splits, and specific types of housing developments of up to two units (duplexes). Under this bill, a property owner could seek ministerial approval for an urban lot split, a duplex, or the owner could seek approval for both an urban lot split and a duplex. Urban lot splits and duplexes are only eligible for ministerial approval if the project meets the applicable objective standards specified in the bill.

The bill allows a local agency to adopt an ordinance to implement the provisions of the bill and provides that such an ordinance is not a project under CEQA. Finally, the bill also increases the length of time a local government can extend the life of a subdivision map.

- 3) **California's Housing Crisis.** 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 over recent averages of 80,000 units per year to meet the projected need for housing in the state. A variety of causes have contributed to the 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 that may not want new neighbors. The

building industry also points to CEQA review as an impediment, and housing advocates note a lack of a dedicated source of funds for affordable housing.

- 4) **Objective Standards and CEQA.** CEQA requires the state and local governments to study and mitigate, to the extent feasible, the environmental impacts of proposed projects, providing a key protection for the environment and residents of California. This bill exempts any ordinance a local agency adopts to administer the ministerial approval of these projects from CEQA. Additionally, under the bill, duplexes and urban lot splits that meet specified conditions must be approved ministerially by the relevant local agency. Ministerial approvals remove a project from all discretionary decisions of a local government, including an environmental review under CEQA. Thus, establishing processes to approve certain types of projects ministerially also creates exemptions from CEQA.

A CEQA exemption provides a tremendous benefit to property owners, developers, local governments and other parties involved in the approval of a project as it allows for the project to be completed in an expedited fashion and can insulate the project from CEQA lawsuits. In light of the state's ongoing housing crisis, the Legislature has created several exemptions to CEQA that are designed to increase the production of housing. The protection of resources afforded by CEQA is not exempted lightly. The Legislature balances the risk of allowing projects to proceed without a full environmental review by limiting exemptions to projects that comply with scores of objective standards and criteria. These standards and criteria are an expression of the state's values and ensure that exempt projects do not result in harm to public health and safety and the environment.

- 5) **Ministerial Approval Under This Bill.** This bill continues the practice of limiting CEQA exemptions to projects that meet specific objective criteria. In order to qualify for ministerial approval, both types of projects, whether they are executed in tandem or independently, may only occur on single family parcels located in urbanized areas or clusters or within cities that include urbanized areas or clusters within their boundaries. Additionally, the bill excludes projects on parcels that are located on or within any of the following:
- a) Prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance;
 - b) Wetlands;
 - c) Land within the VHFHSZ, unless the development complies with existing state mitigation requirements;
 - d) A hazardous waste site;
 - e) An earthquake fault zone, unless the development complies with existing state mitigation requirements;
 - f) Land within the 100-year floodplain or a floodway;
 - g) Land identified for conservation under a natural community conservation plan, or lands under conservation easement;
 - h) Habitat for protected species;

- i) A national, state, or local historical district or property; or,
- j) A parcel where the owner of residential property has withdrawn accommodations for rent or lease within the last 15 years.

The bill additionally prohibits projects from qualifying for ministerial approval if the project would require the evacuation or eviction of an existing housing unit of any of the following types of housing:

- a) Rent-restricted housing, including deed-restricted affordable housing and housing subject to rent or price control by a public entity's police power; or,
 - b) Housing that has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.
- 6) **Project Specific Criteria.** In addition to the qualifying and disqualifying criteria that apply to both types of projects, urban lot splits and duplex developments are subject to an additional layer of objective criteria that are unique to each type of project, as follows:
- a) **Duplexes.** This bill requires local agencies to ministerially approve housing developments that contain two units (duplexes) located on parcels zoned for single family housing that meet the criteria noted above; however, the housing development may not require the demolition of more than 25% of the existing exterior walls of a residential structure, unless a local ordinance specifically allows a greater rate of demolition, or the site has not been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.
 - b) **Urban Lot Splits.** This bill amends the Subdivision Map Act to define "urban lot splits," and requires local agencies to ministerially approve subdivision maps that qualify as an urban lot split. In addition to the parcel-specific criteria noted above, a proposed subdivision must conform to the following criteria to qualify as an urban lot split:
 - i) The subdivision divides a parcel that is zoned for single family residential use;
 - ii) The subdivision divides the existing parcel into two parcels of roughly equal size, as specified;
 - iii) The subdivision creates parcels no smaller than 1,200 square feet, unless a smaller size is specifically allowed by local ordinance; and,
 - iv) The subdivision must not divide a parcel that was previously created by or is adjoined to a parcel previously created by an urban lot split.
- 7) **Other Conditions and Requirements.** The bill additionally restricts the types of requirements and conditions that may be applied to projects that meet all of the objective criteria for ministerial approval applicable to that project. In addition to requiring ministerial approval, the bill prohibits local agencies from imposing regulations that require dedications of rights-of-way or the construction of offsite improvements. However, a local agency may require easements and that the parcel have access to, provide access to, or adjoin the public right-of-way. A local agency can impose objective zoning and design standards that do not conflict with the bill, so long as those standards do not physically preclude the development from including up to two units.

- 8) **Subdivision Map Extensions.** This bill allows local agencies to extend the life of subdivision maps by one year, up to a total of four years depending on the type of map. The expanded authority to extend maps granted under this bill is discretionary.
- 9) **Policy Considerations.** The Committee may wish to consider the following:
- a) **Demolition Restrictions.** The duplex provisions of the bill prohibit the demolition of more than 25% of the existing exterior structural walls of an existing residential property, unless:
- i) A greater percentage of demolition is allowed by local ordinance; or
 - ii) The property has not been occupied by tenants for a period of more than three years.
- Property that has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years is already excluded from both the duplex and urban lot split provisions of the bill. Therefore, it appears the 25% demolition restriction would never apply to a property eligible for the streamlining provisions in this bill. If the bill is intended to prohibit the demolition of more than 25% of an existing structure, the author may wish to clarify this provision.
- b) **Fire and Earthquake Provisions.** The parcels that are eligible for the streamlining provided in this bill are limited by a list of environmental criteria that were first adopted in SB 35 (Weiner, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017). This list of exclusionary environmental criteria is frequently cited in bills that seek to streamline housing development projects in some fashion. The suite of environmental exclusions created by this list is complex and includes various cross-references to existing federal and state regulations and statutes, as well as qualifiers that negate the exclusions if the proposed development meets specified conditions.
- With respect to fire hazards and earthquake hazards, the SB 35 criteria cited in this bill allows for streamlining on parcels located in VHFHSZs and in earthquake fault zones so long as the proposed development on the parcel complies with existing law. Specifically, parcels and developments in these zones may be subject to streamlining if the proposed development complies with existing building code standards and applicable state fire mitigation requirements. As a practical matter, all development projects are required to comply with the state building code standards as adopted by local agencies, and developments in VHFHSZs are already required to comply with state law imposing fire mitigation requirements. In practice, the SB 35 fire hazard and earthquake hazard language cited in this bill does not increase or decrease the scope of parcels subject to streamlining under this bill.
- If the bill is intended to prohibit or limit streamlining in VHFHSZs and earthquake fault zones, the author may wish to clarify this provision.
- 10) **Arguments in Support.** The California Building Industry Associations (CBIA) writes in support, “SB 9 requires that qualified applications to a local government to create a duplex or subdivide an existing residential parcel be approved ministerially without discretionary review. According to the McKinsey Global Institute, nearly 800,000 units could be developed by adding units the units in existing single-family zones. Per their projections, an additional 600,000 units could be developed in just three counties alone by building housing

on small lots near existing residential development. These small-scale development policies build upon successful state housing measures like the promotion of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), which grew to comprise one-fifth of all new housing stock in Los Angeles in just two years, increasing critically necessary housing supply. Additionally, this policy leverages valuable but previously untapped resources, such as developed but underutilized land, while building valuable equity for homeowners.”

- 11) **Arguments in Opposition.** The League of California Cities writes in opposition, “SB 9 as currently drafted will not spur much needed housing construction in a manner that supports local flexibility, decision making, and community input. State-driven ministerial or by-right housing approval processes fail to recognize the extensive public engagement associated with developing and adopting zoning ordinances and housing elements that are certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development...”
- 12) **Double-Referral.** This bill is double-referred to the Housing and Community Development Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

AARP
Abundant Housing LA
ADU Task Force East Bay
All Home
American Planning Association, California Chapter
Bay Area Council
Bridge Housing Corporation
Cal Asian Chamber of Commerce
California Chamber of Commerce
California Apartment Association
California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce (CAPCC)
California Building Industry Association
California Community Economic Development Association (CCEDA)
California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
California Yimby
Casita Coalition
Chan Zuckerberg Initiative
Circulate San Diego
City of Alameda
City of Oakland
City of San Diego
Council Member Jon Wizard, City of Seaside
Council Member Zach Hilton, City of Gilroy
Council of Infill Builders
East Bay for Everyone
Eden Housing
Facebook, INC.
Fathers and Families of San Joaquin

Fieldstead and Company, INC.
Generation Housing
Greenbelt Alliance
Habitat for Humanity California
Hello Housing
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
Housing Action Coalition
Inner City Struggle
League of Women Voters of California
Lisc San Diego
Livable Sunnyvale
Local Government Commission
Long Beach Yimby
Los Angeles Business Council
Midpen Housing Corporation
Modular Building Institute
Monterey; County of
Mountain View Yimby
National Association of Hispanic Real Estate Professionals (NAHREP)
Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California
North Bay Leadership Council
Northern Neighbors
Office of Sacramento Mayor Darrell Steinberg
Peninsula for Everyone
People for Housing - Orange County
Pierre Charles General Construction
Plus Home Housing Solutions
San Diego Housing Commission
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Fernando Valley Yimby
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Research Association
San Francisco Yimby
Sand Hill Property Company
Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee
Santa Cruz Yimby
Schneider Electric
Share Sonoma County
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
South Bay Yimby
South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth
Streets for People Bay Area
Sv@home
Techequity Collaborative
Tent Makers
Turner Center for Housing Innovation At the University of California, Berkeley
The Casita Coalition
The Two Hundred
Tmg Partners

United Way of Greater Los Angeles
Urban Environmentalists
Yimby Action
Yimby Democrats of San Diego County
Zillow Group

Support If Amended

California Association of Realtors
California Community Land Trust Network
City of Morgan Hill
Landwatch Monterey County
Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA)

Oppose

140 Individuals
Adams Hill Neighborhood Association
Aids Healthcare Foundation
Alameda Citizens Task Force
Albany Citizens United
Albany Neighbors United
Allied Neighborhoods Association of Santa Barbara
Angelenos for Trees
Association of California Cities - Orange County (ACC-OC)
Baldwin Hills Homeowners Association, Inc
Berkeley Associated Neighbors Against Non-affordable Housing
Berkeley Flatlanders Group
Berkeley Together
Blue Dove Neighborhood
Brentwood Homeowners Association
Build Affordable Faster California
Burton Valley Neighborhoods Group
California Alliance of Local Electeds
California Cities for Local Control
Catalysts
Century Glen HOA
Cherrywood Leimert Park Block Club
Citizens Planning Association of Santa Barbara County
Citizens Preserving Venice
City of Agoura Hills
City of Arcata
City of Belmont
City of Beverly Hills
City of Burbank
City of Carson
City of Cerritos
City of Clovis
City of Chino Hills

City of Colton
City of Corona
City of Cupertino
City of Diamond Bar
City of Dublin
City of Eastvale
City of El Segundo
City of Elk Grove
City of Fountain Valley
City of Hesperia
City of Hidden Hills
City of Huntington Beach
City of Iwrindale
City of King
City of La Canada Flintridge
City of Lafayette
City of Laguna Niguel
City of Lancaster
City of Livermore
City of Lomita
City of Menifee
City of Merced
City of Mission Viejo
City of Montclair
City of Newport Beach
City of Norwalk
City of Ontario
City of Orinda
City of Palo Alto
City of Palos Verdes Estates
City of Paramount
City of Pasadena
City of Pismo Beach
City of Pleasanton
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
City of Rancho Santa Margarita
City of Redondo Beach
City of Rohnert Park
City of Rolling Hills
City of Rolling Hills Estates
City of San Carlos
City of San Clemente
City of San Dimas
City of San Jacinto
City of San Marcos
City of San Ramon
City of Santa Clara
City of Santa Clarita
City of Santa Monica

City of Saratoga
City of Signal Hill
City of Thousand Oaks
City of Westlake Village
City of Yorba Linda
Coalition for Economic Survival
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council
College Street Neighborhood Group
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
Crescenta Highlands Neighborhood Association
Crescenta Valley Community Association
D4ward
Durand Ridge United
El Dorado Park South Neighborhood Association - Long Beach
Encinitas Neighbors Coalition
Environmental Defense Center
Friends of Sutro Park
Grayburn Avenue Block Club
Hidden Hills Community Association
Hills 2000 Friends of The Hills
Hollywood Knolls Community Club
Hollywood Riviera
Hollywoodland Homeowners Association
Homeowners of Encino
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
LA Brea Hancock Homeowners Association
Lafayette Homeowners Council
Lakewood Village Neighborhood Association
Land Park Community Association
Las Virgenes-malibu Council of Governments
Latino Alliance for Community Engagement
League of California Cities
Linda Vista-annandale Association
Livable Pasadena
Los Altos Residents
Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities
Los Angeles Urban League
Los Feliz Improvement Association
Miracle Mile Residential Association
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Street Neighbors
Montecito Association
Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance Trees Committee
Neighbors for A Better San Diego

New Livable California DbA Livable California
North of Montana Association
Northeast Neighbors of Santa Monica
Orange County Council of Governments
Pacific Palisades Community Council
Planning Association for The Richmond
Resident Information Resource of Santa Monica
Riviera Homeowners Association
Santa Monica Coalition for A Livable City (SMCLC)
Save Lafayette
Save Our Single Family Neighborhoods
Save Sacramento Neighborhoods
Seaside Neighborhood Association
Shadow Hills Property Owners Association
Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
South Bay Residents for Responsible Development
South Shores Community Association
Southwood Homeowners Association
Spaulding Square Neighborhood Assoc
Sunnyvale United Neighbors
Sunset-parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sustainable TamalmonTE
Sutro Ave Block Club (NORTH)
Tahoe Donner Association
Tamalpais Design Review Board
Temecula Valley Neighborhood Coalition
The Mangan Park Neighborhood Association
The Valley Village Homeowners Association
Town of Danville
Town of Truckee
United Neighbors
United Neighbors of Senate District 13
Verdugo Woodlands West Homeowners Association
West Pasadena Residents' Association
West Torrance Homeowners Association
Westside Regional Alliance of Councils
Westwood Highlands Neighborhood Association
Westwood Hills Property Owners Association
Westwood Homeowners Association
Wilshire Montana Neighborhood Coalition
Windsor Square Association

Oppose Unless Amended

Build Affordable Faster CA
California Contract Cities Association
City of Pismo Beach
City of Stanton

City of Azusa
City of Bellflower
City of Brea
City of Brentwood
City of Camarillo
City of Carpinteria
City of Chino
City of Clayton
City of Clearlake
City of Cypress
City of Dorris
City of Downey
City of Escalon
City of Folsom
City of Fortuna
City of Foster City
City of Garden Grove
City of Glendora
City of Grand Terrace
City of Half Moon Bay
City of Indian Wells
City of Inglewood
City of Irvine
City of Irwindale
City of Kerman
City of La Mirada
City of La Palma
City of La Quinta
City of La Verne
City of Laguna Beach
City of Lakeport
City of Lakewood
City of Los Alamitos
City of Los Altos
City of Martinez
City of Maywood
City of Monterey
City of Moorpark
City of Murrieta
City of Newman
City of Novato
City of Oakdale
City of Pinole
City of Placentia
City of Poway
City of Rancho Cucamonga
City of Redding
City of San Gabriel
City of San Marino

City of Simi Valley
City of South Pasadena
City of Sunnyvale
City of Temecula
City of Torrance
City of Tracy
City of Vacaville
City of Ventura
City of Vista
City of Whittier
Kensington Property Owners Association
League of California Cities Central Valley Division
Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
Town of Apple Valley
Town of Colma
Town of Fairfax
Town of Mammoth Lakes
Town of Ross
Ventura Council of Governments

Analysis Prepared by: Hank Brady / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958