
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

Senator Mike McGuire, Chair
2019 - 2020 Regular

Bill No: SB 50
Author: Wiener
Version: 3/11/19
Consultant: Favorini-Csorba

Hearing Date: 4/24/19
Tax Levy: No
Fiscal: Yes

PLANNING AND ZONING: HOUSING DEVELOPMENT: INCENTIVES

Requires local governments to grant an equitable communities incentive to eligible residential developments.

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. Some housing projects can be permitted by city or county planning staff “ministerially” or without further approval from elected officials, but 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 and public notice and may require additional approvals.

Density bonus law. State law, known as density bonus law, grants certain benefits to developers who build affordable units in order to encourage greater affordable housing production. Density bonus law requires cities and counties to grant a density bonus when an applicant for a housing development of five or more units seeks and agrees to construct a project that will contain at least one of the following:

- 10% of the total units of a housing development for lower income households;
- 5% of the total units of a housing development for very low-income households;
- A senior citizen housing development or mobile home park;
- 10% of the units in a common interest development (CID) for moderate-income households; or
- 10% of the total units for transitional foster youth, disabled veterans, or homeless persons.

If a project meets these conditions, the city or county must allow an increase in density on a sliding scale from 20% to 35% over the otherwise maximum allowable residential density under the applicable zoning ordinance and land use element of the general plan, depending on the percentage of units affordable to low-income, very low-income, or senior households.

Density bonus law also grants certain reductions in minimum parking requirements and grants “incentives or concessions” that can be used to waive development policies that add costs or reduce the number of units that a developer can build on a site. The number of incentives or concessions that a project may be eligible for is based on the percentage of affordable units contained in the project, up to a maximum of three. Incentives and concessions can vary widely based on the individual projects, but examples can include reduced fees, waivers of zoning codes, or reduced parking requirements.

Local governments must grant the density increases under density bonus law and can only deny incentives or concessions if it makes written findings, based on substantial evidence, that granting an incentive or concession:

- Is not necessary to ensure that the affordable units get built;
- Would have specific, adverse effects to public health and safety, the physical environment, or historical resources, and there is no way to mitigate for those impacts without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households; or
- Is contrary to state or federal law.

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 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 who may not want new neighbors. The building industry also points to CEQA review, and housing advocates note a lack of a dedicated source of funds for affordable housing.

In addition, California's high—and rising—land costs necessitate dense housing construction for a project to be financially viable and for the housing to ultimately be affordable to lower-income households. Yet, recent trends in California show that new housing has not commensurately increased in density. In a 2016 analysis, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) found that the housing density of a typical neighborhood in California's coastal metropolitan areas increased by only 4 percent during the 2000s. The LAO also compared California's coastal areas to similar metropolitan areas across the country and found that new housing constructed during the 2000s in California's coastal cities was nearly 30% less dense on average than new housing in other comparable cities—10 units/acre in California compared to 14 units/acre in the other metropolitan areas.

Zoning ordinances add additional constraints that can reduce the number of units that can be built: setbacks, floor-area ratios, lot coverage ratios, design requirements, dedications of land for parks or other public purposes, and other regulations can reduce the space on a lot that a building can occupy in ways that lower the number of units that is feasible to construct on a lot.

Housing-related hearings. The Senate Governance and Finance Committee, the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee, and the Senate Housing Committee held a series of three hearings on housing development, affordable housing finance, and zoning and other land use policies in October and November 2018 and March 2019. At those hearings, the Committees heard a wide range of perspectives, including the voices of market-rate and affordable housing developers, local governments, community activists, and academics. One consistent message was that increased density is needed to support additional housing—where panelists tended to differ was on how to achieve that density. (For additional information, please see the background materials and video recordings of the hearings on the Committee's website.)

Advocates for new housing want to increase the allowable density around transit and in other areas throughout the state.

Proposed Law

Senate Bill 50 requires a local government to grant an equitable communities incentive (ECI) to developments that meet specified conditions.

Project requirements. SB 50 requires a project to be either a "jobs-rich housing project" or a "transit-rich housing project." A jobs-rich housing project must be a residential development located in a jobs rich area. SB 50 requires the Department of Housing and Community Development, in consultation with the Office of Planning and Research, to designate and produce maps of jobs-rich areas based on a specified methodology by January 1, 2020, and to update the maps every five years thereafter. That designation must be based on indicators such as proximity to jobs, high area median income relative to the relevant region, and high-quality public schools, as an area of high opportunity close to jobs, and it must include tracts that are both high opportunity and jobs rich, based on specified factors that ensure that residents are proximate to their jobs and reduce commute times.

SB 50 defines a transit-rich housing project to be a residential development located within a one-half mile radius of a rail station or a ferry terminal that is a major transit stop, as defined in existing law, or a one-quarter mile radius of a stop on a high-quality bus corridor. To qualify as a high-quality bus corridor, the bus corridor must have average service intervals of no less frequent than:

- 15 minutes between 6am to 10am and 3pm to 7pm, and 20 minutes from 6am to 10pm, on weekdays.
- 30 minutes between 8am and 10pm on weekends.

SB 50 deems a residential development to be within an area designated as job-rich or transit-rich if at least specified percentages of the parcels and units in the development are located within the jobs-rich area or are located within a one-half mile radius of a major transit stop or a one-quarter mile radius of a stop on a high-quality bus corridor.

To be eligible for an ECI, SB 50 also requires a residential development to be located on a site that is zoned to allow housing as an underlying use and that does not and has not contained housing occupied by tenants, as defined, within the seven years before applying for the ECI, and was not the subject of an Ellis Act eviction within the past fifteen years. The residential development must also comply with:

- All applicable labor, construction, employment, and wage standards otherwise required by law;
- All relevant standards, requirements, and prohibitions imposed by the local government regarding architectural design, restrictions on or oversight of demolition, impact fees, and community benefit agreements; and
- Any other generally applicable requirement regarding the approval of a development project, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and local discretionary approval processes.

SB 50 requires a project that receives an ECI to contain specified percentages of affordable housing units in the development, depending on the size of the project and at the choice of the developer, as specified in the chart below.

Project Size	Inclusionary Housing Requirement
1-10 units	No affordability requirement.
11-20 units	Developer may pay an in lieu fee, where feasible, toward housing offsite affordable to lower income households.
21-200 units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15% low-income OR • 8% very low-income OR • 6% extremely low-income
201 – 350 units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17% low-income OR • 10% very low-income OR • 8% extremely low-income
351 units or more	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% low-income OR • 15% very low-income OR • 11% extremely low-income

If the local government has adopted an inclusionary housing ordinance and that ordinance requires that a new development include levels of affordability in excess of what is required in this bill, the requirements in that ordinance apply. Affordable housing units under the bill must remain affordable under a deed restriction for 55 and 45 years for rental units and units offered for sale, respectively.

SB 50 allows a developer to make a comparable affordability contribution—an in-lieu payment—toward affordable housing offsite, instead of including affordable units within the development. The bill requires the local government collecting the in-lieu payment to make every effort to ensure that future affordable housing will be sited within ½ mile of the original project location within the boundaries of the local government by designating the existing housing opportunity site within a ½ mile radius of the project site for affordable housing. To the extent practical, local housing funds must be prioritized at the first opportunity to build affordable housing on that site. If no housing sites are available, the local government shall designate a site for affordable housing within its jurisdictional boundaries and make findings that the site affirmatively furthers fair housing, as specified.

Equitable communities incentive benefits. SB 50 grants transit-rich and jobs-rich housing projects certain benefits and waivers of local development regulations based on their location, as follows.

All projects, including jobs-rich projects and transit-rich projects within ¼ mile of a bus stop on a high quality bus corridor, receive a waiver from maximum controls on density and minimum automobile parking requirements greater than 0.5 spaces per unit, and up to three incentives and concessions under density bonus law.

Projects within ½ mile radius of a rail station or ferry terminal also receive waivers from any minimum parking requirement and waivers from:

- Maximum height requirements less than 55 feet and maximum floor area ratio requirements less than 3.25 if the project is within ¼ mile of a rail station or ferry terminal; or
- Maximum height requirements less than 45 feet and maximum floor area ratio requirements less than 2.5 if the project is within ¼ to ½ mile radius of a rail station or ferry terminal.

SB 50 provides that when calculating incentives or concessions granted under density bonus, the number of units in the development that is allowed with the ECI must be used as the base density for the project.

Sensitive communities. SB 50 delays implementation of the bill in sensitive communities until July 1, 2020 and as provided below. SB 50 defines a sensitive community to mean either:

- Within the nine-county Bay Area, those areas designated as the intersection of disadvantaged and vulnerable communities by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission on December 19, 2018; or
- Outside of the Bay Area, those census tracts identified by HCD as having both (1) 30 percent or more of the population living below the poverty line, as long as college students make up less than 25 percent of the population; and (2) a location quotient of residential racial segregation of at least 1.25.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) must update these sensitive communities every five years.

SB 50 allows a local government to opt-in to using a community-led planning process in sensitive communities to increase density consistent with the residential development capacity and affordability standards in the bill, instead of having SB 50's ECI provisions apply to those sensitive communities. A local government seeking to opt in must do so between January 1, 2020, and an unspecified final date, and must adopt a plan by January 1, 2025. If the local government does not adopt a plan for sensitive communities by that date, SB 50's ECI provisions apply.

Other provisions. SB 50 allows a local government to grant modified or expanded ECIs, as long as it meets the minimum standards in the bill. The bill also allows a recipient of an ECI to apply for ministerial, streamlined approval if they meet the requirements under existing law to qualify for that approval process. SB 50 says that receipt of an ECI cannot be used as a basis for finding a project inconsistent, not in compliance, or not in conformity with local development policies under the Housing Accountability Act or for denial of density bonus. The bill defines its terms and makes findings and declarations to support its purposes.

State Revenue Impact

No estimate.

Comments

1. Purpose of the bill. According to the author, “California’s statewide housing deficit is quickly approaching four million homes -- equal to the total deficit of the other forty-nine states combined. This housing shortage threatens our state’s environment, economy, diversity, and quality of life for current and future generations. In addition to tenant protections and increased funding for affordable housing, we need an enormous amount of new housing at all income levels in order to keep people stable in their homes. Policy interventions focused on relieving our housing shortage must be focused both on the number of new homes built and also the location of those homes: as we create space for more families in our communities, they must be near public transportation and jobs. The status quo patterns of development in California are covering up farmland and wild open space while inducing crushing commutes. Absent state intervention, communities will continue to effectively prohibit people from living near transit and jobs by making it illegal to build small apartment buildings around transit and jobs, while fueling sprawl and inhumane supercommutes.

“Small and medium-sized apartment buildings (i.e., not single-family homes and not high rises) near public transportation and high-opportunity job centers are an equitable, sustainable, and low-cost source of new housing. SB 50 promotes this kind of housing by allowing small apartment buildings that most California neighborhoods ban, regardless of local restrictions on density, within a half mile of rail stations and ferry terminals, quarter mile of a bus stop on a frequent bus line, or census tract close to job and educational opportunities. Around rail stations and ferry terminals, the bill also relaxes maximum height limits up to 45 or 55 feet—that is, a maximum of four and five stories—depending on the distance from transit. Job-rich areas and those serviced only by buses do not trigger height increases, but these areas will benefit from relaxed density and off-street parking requirements that encourage low-rise multifamily buildings like duplexes and fourplexes. SB 50 grants significant local control to individual jurisdictions over design review, labor and local hire requirements, conditional use permits, CEQA, local affordable housing and density bonus programs, and height limits outside of areas immediately adjacent to rail and ferry. This bill also requires an affordable housing component

for all projects over ten units, and contains the strongest anti-displacement rules in state law, including an automatic ineligibility for any property currently or recently occupied by renters.”

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. Moreover, these planning actions and decisions take place within the confines of state laws that require local governments to plan and zone for new housing, subject to approval by HCD, and under threat of fines for improper denial as a result of recent legislation. SB 50 disregards these efforts and the unique features of California’s communities by imposing the same zoning standards statewide. It uniformly imposes minimums for height, bulk, and density of buildings around rail stations and ferry terminals, regardless of the specific characteristics of the community, even though one rail station might be at the heart of a bustling metropolis while another might be located in a relatively isolated rural town—even if the jurisdictions themselves have similar populations. To account for some of the differences among communities, the Committee may wish to consider amending SB 50 to provide different levels of upzoning or increased density based on the characteristics of each community, such as population or other metrics.

3. Sure, but will it work? Local governments have shown that they are nothing if not creative when it comes to stopping projects that their residents don’t want. State housing law has for decades followed the cycle of attempting to encourage local governments to build more, only to see those efforts thwarted by enterprising officials who find a legal loophole, which the Legislature then closes. While SB 50 grants waivers from some development standards, it doesn’t make any changes to local approval processes for projects that benefit from an ECI. Instead, it relies on several of the latest legislative efforts to clamp down on gamesmanship by local governments. These include SB 35 (Wiener, 2017), which established a streamlined approval process for developments that are consistent with objective development standards and meet other stringent requirements, and recent changes to strengthen the Housing Accountability Act, which prohibits local governments from denying housing projects that are consistent with local development policies. These policies are relatively untested, and SB 50 explicitly provides that local approval processes still apply. If history is any guide, local officials may find other ways around them to avoid approving denser projects, even with the changes to local zoning that SB 50 provides.

4. Windfall profits. Valuation of real estate is complicated, but a fundamental principle is that property is as valuable as its highest and best use allows. Land that can only accommodate construction of a few new units of housing is less valuable than land that can accommodate more, all else being equal, and same goes for larger developments versus smaller ones. When zoning rules change to allow more building, property values go up—an effect that was demonstrated in a recent study of upzoning in Chicago. SB 50 allows more units to be built and reduces costs associated with developments by granting additional waivers and concessions of development policies and letting developers off the hook for building expensive parking spots. SB 50 also allows developers to choose the density at which they build, potentially allowing them to maximize profits by building larger luxury units instead of smaller, lower priced ones. In exchange, developers must build or fund some affordable housing. However, California’s existing density bonus program already provides increasing benefits to developers for increasing

levels of affordability, and SB 50 grants additional benefits without requiring much beyond density bonus in the way of additional affordable housing. This upends the balance struck in density bonus law to capture for the public a fair and reasonable portion of the value created by upzoning. Proposition 13 (1978) further restricts the ability of the public to capture that value by placing constitutional restrictions on property tax rates—meaning local governments see less of a gain from increased property values than they otherwise would. The Committee may wish to consider whether SB 50’s inclusionary requirements and other provisions results in a fair distribution of the benefits provided by the density increases that it allows.

5. Location, location, location. Because SB 50 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. By many measures, the Coastal Act has been a success: towns along the coast have been able to maintain their character and continue to be a draw for tourists who wish to experience and enjoy views of the coastline. SB 50 also applies to historic districts—areas of California that the state, federal, or local governments have cultural significance, and whose character may be impaired by new development. To ensure that these parts of the state are protected, the Committee may wish to consider amending SB 50 to limit the applicability of the bill to these areas or allow local governments to make findings if a project that benefits from an ECI would impair coastal or historic resources.

6. Sensitive areas. Many communities in California are already undergoing dramatic change that is disproportionately affecting low-income communities and communities of color. These communities are particularly vulnerable because developers seek cheaper land on which to build new housing. To mitigate this effect, local governments have adopted community plans to manage gentrification and preserve these communities as much as possible. By increasing the development potential of parcels across the state, SB 50 may exacerbate these trends. The bill includes a delay of five years before the bill affects certain designated communities, and it provides that local policies and standards other than those that the bill waives still apply. But at the end of that five-year delay, communities must either have upzoned on their own to what the bill requires or be subject to the bill’s provisions. This may not provide adequate protection for communities at risk of gentrification. In addition, many local governments have taken important steps to increase zoning and allow for more housing to be built in their communities. For example, the City of Los Angeles has adopted transit-oriented development plans for targeted infill development after extensive community discussions, and this program is seeing marked success. SB 50 overrides those local processes and fails to recognize the efforts that some jurisdictions have made to balance the need for new housing and protection of existing communities.

7. Where’s my flying car? Transportation and land use are intimately connected—land use patterns influence the distance traveled and mode of transportation used. These factors in turn affect whether the state will achieve its greenhouse gas emissions targets or other environmental goals. SB 50 attempts to shift land use patterns to encourage greater use of transit, including both buses and passenger rail, by building more densely in those areas and by reducing parking minimums. However, tying density to bus stops poses some practical challenges. Because most bus routes have little fixed infrastructure relative to rail, building near bus stops that currently exist doesn’t ensure that transit will be available in the long term. Some local jurisdictions are eliminating bus stops as new modes of transportation, such as ride-sharing, become more prevalent and bus routes become less viable. In addition, the residents of new market-rate

development are likely to be higher income who would rather drive their cars instead of riding buses. Accordingly, new developments enabled by SB 50 may not drive enough of an increase in bus ridership to ensure the viability of those routes. The Committee may wish to consider amending SB 50 to more precisely identify bus routes that are likely to be relatively permanent.

8. Let's be clear. The Committee may wish to consider the following clarifying amendments to SB 50 to ensure that the author's intent is accurately carried out:

- SB 50 specifies certain service intervals for a bus line to be considered a high quality bus corridor, but it is unclear whether those intervals could be met by buses going in opposite directions. The Committee may wish to consider amending SB 50 to clarify that high quality bus corridors must meet the frequency requirements of the bill for each line going in each direction.
- SB 50 grants up to three waivers and concessions pursuant to density bonus law, but it is unclear whether those are additive to those already granted under density bonus law, or whether this is restating existing law. In addition, the bill provides that the base density for purposes of calculating the density bonus that a project is eligible is the density of the project after the bill's incentives are applied. However, because the bill removes density limits, it is unclear how this would work. The Committee may wish to consider amending SB 50 to clarify its interaction with density bonus law.

9. 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 50 says that its statutory provisions apply to charter cities. To support this assertion, the bill includes a legislative finding that it addresses a matter of statewide concern.

10. Mandate. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local governments for the costs of new or expanded state mandated local programs. Because SB 50 adds to the duties of local planning officials, Legislative Counsel says that the bill imposes a new state mandate. SB 50 disclaims the state's responsibility for providing reimbursement by citing local governments' authority to charge for the costs of implementing the bill's provisions.

11. Incoming! The Senate Housing Committee approved SB 50 at its April 2nd meeting on a vote of 9-1. The Senate Governance and Finance Committee is hearing it as the committee of second reference.

12. Related legislation. Last year, the Legislature considered SB 827 (Wiener), which would have increased heights and density near major transit stops to as high as 85 feet in some versions of the bill. SB 827 failed passage in the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee.

This year, the Legislature will consider SB 50 along with other bills that modify local zoning. SB 330 (Skinner), which the Committee approved at its April 10th meeting on a vote of 6-0, enacts the "Housing Crisis Act of 2019," which, until January 1, 2030 makes changes to local approval processes and imposes restrictions on certain types of development standards.

SB 4 (McGuire), which the Committee will also hear at its April 24th meeting, grants by-right approval to projects that exceed local height, floor area ratio, and density restrictions if those

projects meet specified conditions. SB 4 and SB 50 share some similarities, but also present differences. This bill only applies in jurisdictions that have produced fewer homes in the last 10 years than jobs and have unmet housing needs, whereas SB 50 does not have threshold requirements. Also, the zoning benefits in SB 50 extend to projects in proximity to high-quality bus corridors, while SB 4’s transit proposal only applies to rail stations and ferry terminals. While both bills only apply to parcels in residential zones, SB 4 only applies to infill sites and does not apply in specified areas. SB 50 does not limit density, however it is limited to areas designated as “jobs-rich” by HCD and the Office of Planning and Research. Lastly, SB 4 also provides a streamlined approval process, where SB 50 relies on existing processes to ensure developments get approved.

The following chart identifies significant differences between the transit-based provisions of the two bills:

	SB 4 TOD	SB 50 Transit-Rich
Location	½ mile of rail or ferries that are located in urban communities	½ mile of rail or ferries or ¼ mile of stops on high quality bus corridors
Density	Metro areas: min. 30 units/acre Suburban: min. 20 units per acre	No minimum or maximum
Parking	Projects in cities with under 100,000 population or those located within ¼ to ½ mile from rail or ferry stops: consistent with density bonus law Projects in cities with 100,000+ population or those located within 0 to ¼ mile of rail or ferry stops: no parking minimum	No parking minimum
Height	One story over allowable height	No less than 45' or 55' (depending on proximity to rail or ferry) Meet existing zoning around bus stops, but developer may use waivers, concessions, or incentives to modify
FAR	0.6 times the number of stories	No less than 2.5 or 3.25 (depending on proximity to rail or ferry) Meet existing zoning around bus stops, but developer may use waivers, concessions, or incentives to modify

Both bills also increase density in areas not tied to transit, as summarized in the chart below:

	SB 4 Neighborhood Multifamily	SB 50 Jobs-Rich
Density	Urban communities: fourplexes Non-urban communities: duplexes	No limit
Parking	0.5 spaces per unit	0.5 spaces per unit
Height	Meet existing zoning requirements	Meet existing zoning, but developer may use waivers, concessions, or incentives to modify
FAR	Meet existing zoning requirements	Meet existing zoning, but developer may use waivers, concessions, or incentives to modify

Support and Opposition (4/19/19)

Support: 3,025 Individuals; 6beds, Inc.; AARP; Bay Area Council; Bridge Housing Corporation; Building Industry Association of The Bay Area; Burbank Housing Development Corporation; Calasian Chamber of Commerce; California Apartment Association; California Chamber of Commerce; California Community Builders; California National Party; California Yimby; Dana Point Chamber Of Commerce; Emeryville; City of; Facebook, Inc.; Fieldstead and Company, Inc.; Fossil Free California; Greater Washington; Hamilton Families; Local Government Commission; Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; Ms.; Murrieta Chamber of Commerce; Natural Resources Defense Council; North Orange County Chamber of Commerce; Oakland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce; Office of The Mayor, San Francisco; Orange County Business Council; Oxnard Chamber of Commerce; Related California; Santa Cruz County Chamber of Commerce; Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce; Schott & Lites Advocates Llc; Silicon Valley At Home (Sv@Home); Silicon Valley Leadership Group; South Bay Jewish Federation; South Bay Yimby; Spur; State Council on Developmental Disabilities; Stripe; Technet-Technology Network; The Silicon Valley Organization; Tmg Partners; Valley Industry And Commerce Association; Yimby Action

Opposition: 1,850 Individuals; Aids Healthcare Foundation; Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (Acce) Action; American Planning Association, California Chapter; Asian Pacific Environmental Network; Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association; Bay Area Transportation Working Group; Berkeley Tenants Union; Brentwood Community Council - West Los Angeles; Causa Justa :: Just Cause; Central Valley Empowerment Alliance; Century Glen Hoa; City of Brentwood; City of Chino Hills; City of Cupertino; City of Downey; City of Glendale; City of Lafayette; City of Lakewood; City of La Mirada; City of Palo Alto; City of Rancho Cucamonga; City of Rancho Palos Verdes; City of Pinole; City of Redondo Beach; City of San Mateo; City of Santa Clarita; City of Solana Beach ;City of Sunnyvale; City of Vista; Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods; Preserve LA; Concerned Citizens of Los Feliz; Cow Hollow Association; Dolores Heights Improvement Club; Dolores Street Community Services; East Mission Improvement Association; East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice; City of Glendora; Grayburn Avenue Block Club; Homeowners of Encino; Housing for All Burlingame; Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco; Jobs with Justice San Francisco; Jordan Park Improvement Association; Legal Services for Prisoners with Children; League of California Cities; Los Angeles Tenants Union - Hollywood Local Case Worker; Los Angeles

Tenants Union -- Networking Team; Miraloma Park Improvement Club; Mission Economic Development Agency; New Livable California DbA Livable California; Noe Neighborhood Council; Northeast Business Economic Development DbA Northeast Business Association; City of Pasadena; Planning Association for the Richmond; Poder; Redstone Labor Temple Association; Regional-Video; Sacred Heart Community Service; San Francisco Senior And Disability Action; San Francisco Rising Alliance; San Francisco Tenants Union; Save Capp Street; Senior and Disability Action; SF Ocean Edge; Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association; South Bay Cities Council Of Governments; South Brentwood Residents Association; South of Market Community Action Network; Stand Up For San Francisco; Sunset-Parkside Education And Action Committee (Speak); Sutro Avenue Block Club/Leimert Park; Telegraph Hill Dwellers; Tenant Sanctuary; Tenants Together; The San Francisco Marina Community Association; Toluca Lake Homeowners Association; United to Save the Mission; Urban Habitat; West Mar Vista Residents Association; Yah! (Yes to Affordable Housing)

-- END --