

Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments
Joint MTC ABAG Legislation Committee

June 10, 2022

Agenda Item 3c

Assembly Bill 2011 (Wicks): Affordable Housing and High Road Act of 2022

Subject:

Streamlines certain affordable housing development on underutilized commercial sites; Eligibility for streamlining subject to affordability, location, objective design and labor standards.

Overview:

Assembly Bill (AB) 2011 (Wicks) would make housing developments that meet specified affordability and location criteria, objective design standards and labor standards a “use by right” (i.e., no conditional use permit or re-zoning would be required) in a zone where office, retail, or parking are a principally permitted use and eligible for a streamlined, ministerial review (i.e., the project is not subject to a discretionary approval process or review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)) as follows:

1. Multifamily affordable housing consisting of 100 percent affordable units would be allowed without rezoning *and* subject to a streamlined, ministerial review *anywhere in infill areas currently zoned for office, retail or parking*, except if a site is located within a specific plan area for a plan adopted before January 1, 2024, the plan must allow for residential use on the site.
2. Mixed-income multifamily housing would be allowed without rezoning *and* subject to a streamlined, ministerial review on sites in infill areas *along commercial corridors* that are zoned for office, retail or parking, except that if a site is located within a specific plan area for a plan adopted before January 1, 2024, the plan must allow for residential use on the site. A commercial corridor is defined as a highway with a right-of-way between 70 feet and 150 feet (generally four to six lanes).

Specific affordability, location, and objective design standards are described in detail in Attachment A and include project density minimums, among others. For instance, for 100 percent affordable projects, the project must meet or exceed the density deemed appropriate to accommodate housing for lower income households in that jurisdiction as specified in Housing Element Law, which is typically 30 units/acre in urban areas, 20 units per acre in suburban areas and 10 units per acre in rural areas. For mixed-income developments, the objective design

standards are much more extensive and include setback requirements and minimum density and heights, tied to the width of the roadway (commercial corridor) adjacent to the site and setback requirements. Housing developments would still be required to meet local objective planning standards and comply with design review processes so long as those don't conflict with specific provisions in the bill or effectively preclude the development of housing.

New Labor Requirements

Eligibility for this by-right development would be conditioned on a developer including specified labor standards in construction contracts—including that all construction workers shall be paid at least the general prevailing wage—and certifying to a local government that those standards will be met. Development proponents seeking ministerial approval for housing projects with 50 units or more would be subject to additional labor standards, including requirements related to health care for certain employees and participation in apprenticeship programs. These provisions are a fundamental part of the bill and part of a “grand bargain” the bill is attempting to achieve in response to opposition from labor interests to legislative proposals to accelerate housing production.

Recommendation: Support if Amended / ABAG Executive Board

Support if Amended / MTC

Discussion:

Residential Redevelopment of Commercial Areas as Tool to Address Housing Challenges

California and the Bay Area in particular are in the midst of a severe housing shortage and affordability crisis that has only been exacerbated by the COVID 19 pandemic. In late 2021, most renters spend more than 30 percent of their household income on rent and only a quarter of California households could afford to purchase a median priced single-family home (a nearly 30 percent drop since the beginning of the pandemic). A major driver of California's housing affordability challenges is the mismatch between supply and demand for housing affordable to households across all income levels. The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) estimates roughly 2.5 million new units are needed to address this mismatch statewide, including a minimum of 441,176 within the Bay Area (our Regional Housing Needs Determination) over the next eight years.

Residential redevelopment of land zoned for retail and office presents an opportunity to achieve multiple policy goals. According to a December 2020 UC Berkeley Turner Center report, retail properties throughout the state have become underutilized as the sale of many goods and services have shifted towards e-commerce; a shift that has only been accelerated with the COVID-19 pandemic. Mixed-use, mixed-income projects on these sites will help advance Plan Bay Area 2050's (Plan) goals of bringing residents closer to jobs and transit (thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions) while at the same time addressing California's ongoing housing shortage. MTC and ABAG's 2022 Advocacy Program reflects agency support for this policy, with Item 3c including support for "proposals to authorize housing as a permitted use in certain commercial zones, such as shopping malls, office parks and major commercial corridors, subject to local approval, but without requiring zoning changes."

Bay Area Housing Planning Background

Bay Area jurisdictions are now in the process of planning and zoning updates to accommodate for their share of 441,146 new housing units, as distributed by ABAG through the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA). As such, cities around the Bay Area are already exploring opportunities to accommodate infill residential redevelopment in underutilized commercial corridors. Local jurisdictions face an immense challenge to identify sufficient sites to accommodate new units and to complete rezonings before the January 2023 deadline for final Bay Area housing elements to be adopted and submitted to HCD for certification. Jurisdictions must demonstrate that housing element sites have realistic development potential and reflect realistic development capacity (i.e. it's likely that housing could be developed on the site at the scale reflected in the housing element). If at the time of housing element adoption, a jurisdiction has not yet identified enough existing, properly zoned sites to fully accommodate its RHNA across all income levels, the housing element must include a "program to rezone." Requirements are detailed in the attached ABAG Program to Rezone technical memo (Attachment B).

Although AB 2011 as written would open up more land for development—a policy MTC and ABAG support—it is not currently structured to enable local governments to incorporate that expanded development potential into their ongoing housing element updates.

Recommended Amendments to Integrate Ongoing Planning Efforts into AB 2011

Staff recommends three amendments that aim to support the efforts local governments are undertaking to accommodate much-needed housing while also providing for accelerated housing production if development is lagging behind RHNA goals. First, we recommend that the bill create a nexus between project streamlining and RHNA performance by allowing for ministerial project-level approvals *only* in jurisdictions that are not keeping pace with their RHNA goals. Second, we propose an amendment to ensure local governments that are proactively laying the groundwork to accommodate infill residential development along their commercial corridors continue to have an option to determine *where* within their commercial corridors that residential development is allowed. Specifically, where local governments have already completed (or will complete) plans to redevelop commercial corridors, AB 2011’s streamlining provisions should be limited to the locations identified in those plans for new residential development. Third, we propose an amendment to ensure that local jurisdictions can receive “credit” in their housing elements for those ongoing planning efforts to accommodate residential development in commercial corridors.

1. Tie AB 2011 Ministerial Project Approvals to RHNA Goals

Exempt jurisdictions from AB 2011 ministerial project approvals if the jurisdiction is on track to meet RHNA goals. However, if new housing development is not on pace with RHNA—i.e., the number of permitted units falls below prorated RHNA eight-year targets—or the jurisdiction does not have a certified housing element, the by-right project approval provisions would apply. Of note, this amendment would not revise the bill’s “use by right” provisions.

2. Support Local Planning Process in Commercial Corridors Zoned for Residential Development

For planning areas where a local government has re-zoned (or rezones) to accommodate residential development along commercial corridors, limit AB 2011’s streamlining to those sites within the commercial corridor that allow residential use. With this amendment, sites within rezoned commercial corridors that a jurisdiction *did not authorize* for housing would be exempt from AB 2011 provisions that provide for housing development in commercial corridors *without rezoning*. However, housing developers seeking project approvals *on sites*

that allow residential use could still seek ministerial approval of projects meeting the other AB 2011 criteria. This amendment builds on a provision in the current version of the bill requested by the City of Oakland that limits AB 2011 streamlining within a specific plan area to sites that allow residential use.

3. RHNA Credit for Planning for Residential Redevelopment of Commercial Corridors

The bill should be amended to include provisions to ensure local governments receive “credit” in *the current housing element cycle* for planned residential development in commercial corridors. The bill should address both the timing challenge—AB 2011’s effective date is less than one month before Bay Area housing elements are due—and the concern raised from local government partners that HCD may not deem that sites targeted for redevelopment meet the more stringent “realistic” threshold that’s being applied this cycle to review site inventories. For example, the bill could provide direction to HCD that sites zoned to accommodate residential redevelopment in commercial corridors meet the threshold for “realistic capacity for development,” including outlining specific options local governments may use to analyze development potential.

While staff recognizes that AB 2011, as proposed to be amended, still goes beyond the relatively narrow streamlining described in our 2022 Advocacy Program, given the scale of the Bay Area’s housing shortage, staff recommends the committee consider supporting the legislation, as proposed to be amended, to take advantage of this opportunity to meaningfully accelerate the production of housing while also expanding high wage construction jobs throughout the state.

Known Positions: See Attachment C

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Assembly Bill 2011 Affordability, Location, and Design Standard Criteria
- Attachment B: ABAG Technical Memo – Programs to Rezone
- Attachment C: Assembly Bill 2011 Known Positions


Alix A. Bockelman

Assembly Bill 2011 Affordability, Location and Objective Design Standards

Affordability Requirements

100 Percent Affordable	Mixed Income
100 percent of the units within the development project, excluding managers units, are dedicated to lower income households at an affordable rent or at an affordable for-sale cost.	Not less than 15 percent of the units shall be set at an affordable rent for low-income households or, for owner-occupied developments, either 30 percent of the units must be reserved for moderate-income households or 15 percent for low-income households.
Units must be subject to a recorded deed restriction for 55 years for rental units or 45 years for owner-occupied units.	Affordable units must be subject to a recorded deed restriction for a period of 55 years for rental units or 45 years for owner-occupied units.
<i>No comparable requirement.</i>	If the amount of affordable housing required by a local inclusionary housing ordinance exceeds that specified in the bill, then the project must abide by the local inclusionary housing ordinance.

See next page

Location Requirements

100 Percent Affordable	Mixed Income
<p>Within a zone where office, retail, or parking are a principally permitted use, except if a site is located in an area with a specific area plan. In that case, residential must be an allowable use on the site .</p>	<p>Meets all the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Site is in a zone where office, retail or parking are a principally permitted use, , except if a site is located in an area with a specific area plan. In that case, residential must be an allowable use on the site; 2) Site abuts a commercial corridor, which is a road that is not a freeway but that has a right of way of between 70 to 150 feet; 3) Site has a frontage along the commercial corridor of a minimum of 50 feet
<p>Units are located on a legal parcel or parcels that are either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Within a city where the city boundaries include some portion of either an urbanized area or urban cluster; or 2) In an unincorporated area, the legal parcels are wholly within the boundaries of an urbanized area or urban cluster. 	<p><i>Same requirement.</i></p>
<p>At least 75 percent of the site perimeter adjoins parcels that are developed with urban uses.</p>	<p><i>Same requirement.</i></p>
<p>It is not adjacent to any site where more than one-third of the square footage of the site is dedicated to industrial uses.</p>	<p><i>Same requirement.</i></p>

100 Percent Affordable	Mixed Income
<p>It is not an environmentally unsafe or sensitive area, such as a wetland, a high or very high fire hazard severity zone, unless the site has adopted fire hazard mitigation measures required by existing building standards, a hazardous waste site, an earthquake fault zone, flood plain, area identified for conservation, or other location limitation in SB 35 (Wiener, 2017).</p>	<p><i>Same requirement.</i></p>
<p>It is not an existing site governed under the Mobilehome Residency Law, the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law, the Mobilehome Parks Act, or the Special Occupancy Parks Act.</p>	<p><i>Same requirement.</i></p>
<p><i>No comparable requirement.</i></p>	<p>The site is not greater than 20 acres.</p>
<p><i>No comparable requirement.</i></p>	<p>The development would not require the demolition of affordable housing (as defined), rent-controlled housing, sites occupied by tenants within the past 10 years, or a historic structure that was placed on a national, state or local historic register.</p>
<p><i>No comparable requirement.</i></p>	<p>The property does not contain housing units that are occupied by tenants, and units at the property are (or were) subsequently offered for sale to the general public by the subdivider or subsequent owner of the property.</p>

Objective Design Standards

100 Percent Affordable	Mixed Income
It is a multifamily housing project.	<i>Same requirement.</i>
At least 67 percent of the square footage of the new construction associated with the project is designated for residential use.	<i>Same requirement.</i>
<p>The residential density will meet or exceed the applicable density deemed appropriate to accommodate housing for lower income households in that jurisdiction as specified in Housing Element Law. Generally, that density is 30 units per acre in urban areas, 20 units per acre in suburban areas, and 10 units per acre in rural areas.</p>	<p>The residential density for the development is determined as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In a metro jurisdiction, residential density for the development must meet or exceed the greater of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The residential density allowed on the parcel by the local government; b. For sites less than one acre, 30 units per acre. c. For sites of one acre or greater on a commercial corridor of less than 100 feet in width, 40 units per acre; d. For sites of one acre or greater on a commercial corridor of 100 feet in width or greater, 60 units per acre; e. Notwithstanding c. and d. above, for sites within one-half mile of a major transit stop, 80 units per acre. 2) In a non-metro jurisdiction, residential density for the development must meet or exceed the greater of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The residential density allowed on the parcel by the local government; b. For sites less than one acre in size, 20 units per acre c. For sites of one acre or greater on a commercial corridor of less than 100 feet in width, 30 units per acre;

100 Percent Affordable	Mixed Income
	<p>d. For sites one acre or greater on a commercial corridor of 100 feet in width or greater, 50 units per acre; and</p> <p>e. Notwithstanding b. and c. above, for sites within one-half mile of a major transit stop, 70 units per acre.</p>
<p>The applicable standards are those in effect at the time that the development is submitted to the local government.</p>	<p><i>Same requirement.</i></p>
<p>The applicable standards must not preclude any additional density, or any other concessions, incentives, or waivers of development standards granted pursuant to Density Bonus Law.</p>	<p><i>Same requirement.</i></p>
<p><i>No comparable requirement.</i></p>	<p>The height limit applicable to the housing development must be the greater of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The height allowed on the parcel by the local government 2) For sites on a commercial corridor of less than 100 feet in width, 35 feet 3) For sites on a commercial corridor of 110 feet in width or greater, 45 feet 4) Notwithstanding 2. and 3. above, for sites within one-half mile of a major transit stop, 65 feet.
<p><i>No comparable requirement.</i></p>	<p>The property meets the following setback standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) For the portion of the property fronting a commercial corridor: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No setbacks can be required b. All parking must be set back at least 25 feet, and

100 Percent Affordable	Mixed Income
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="915 342 1409 510">c. On the ground floor, the development must abut within 10 feet of the property line for at least 80 percent of the frontage.<li data-bbox="846 527 1414 829">2) For the portion of the property that fronts a side street, which is a road that is not a freeway that has a right-of-way of between 25 to 70 feet, the development must abut within 10 feet of the property line for at least 60 percent of the frontage<li data-bbox="846 846 1403 1650">3) When the property line of a site abuts a single-family property, as specified, the following must occur:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="915 982 1386 1241">a. The ground floor of the development must be set back at 10 feet from the single-family property. The amount required to be set back may be decreased by the local government; and<li data-bbox="915 1257 1414 1650">b. Starting with the third floor of the property, each subsequent floor of the development must be stepped back from the single-family property in an amount equal to five feet multiplied by the floor number. The amount required to be stepped back may be decreased by the local government.<li data-bbox="846 1667 1403 1879">4) When the property line of a site abuts a property that is not a single-family property, starting with the third floor of the property, each subsequent floor of the development must be stepped back

100 Percent Affordable	Mixed Income
	<p>from the other property in an amount equal to five feet multiplied by the floor number. The amount required to be stepped back may be decreased by the local government.</p>
<p><i>No comparable requirement.</i></p>	<p>No parking can be required, except that the bill does not reduce, eliminate, or preclude local requirements to provide bicycle parking, electric vehicle supply equipment installed parking spaces, or parking spaces that are accessible to persons with disabilities that would have otherwise applied to the development.</p>
<p>It meets the applicable objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards, as specified, for the zone that allows residential use at a greater density between the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The existing zoning designation for the parcel; and 2) The closest parcel that allows residential use at a density that meets the density requirements described above. <p>The applicable standards shall be those in effect at the time that the development is submitted to the local government pursuant to this article.</p> <p>The applicable standards shall not preclude any additional density or any other concessions, incentives, or waivers of development standards granted pursuant to the Density Bonus Law in Section 65915.</p>	<p>It meets the applicable objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards, as specified, for the zone that allows residential use at the residential density determined in the bill. If no zone exists that allows such a residential density, the applicable standards are those for the zone that allows the greatest density within the city, county, or city and county.</p> <p>The applicable standards shall be those in effect at the time that the development is submitted to the local government pursuant to this article.</p> <p>The applicable standards shall not preclude any additional density requirements or any other concessions, incentives, or waivers of development standards granted pursuant to the Density Bonus Law in Section 65915.</p>



Programs To Rezone

Technical Memo

**Please note: This is a summary of the rules regarding programs to rezone. In some cases, details have been omitted for clarity. Please discuss with your City Attorney or County Counsel.*

Adequate Sites Program

If a jurisdiction’s Housing Element does not identify enough existing, properly zoned sites to accommodate its RHNA, the Housing Element must have a program to rezone properties for housing to make up for the shortfall. This program can be an overlay zone on specific sites. *The following rules apply to the sites that need to be rezoned (i.e., the zoning is not in place on January 31, 2023).*

Program Requirements

Requirements that Apply to Sites Regardless of Income Level

- **Listed in sites inventory:** All sites that are proposed to be rezoned must be listed in the sites inventory.
- **Replacement requirements:** All sites, including those listed in the site inventory, must be subject to the lower income replacement housing requirements contained in density bonus law, even if they do not have any deed restricted housing.
- **Sufficient sites:** The jurisdiction must identify enough sites to rezone to cover any shortfall.
- **Rezoned in sufficient time:** The jurisdiction should also identify a timeline that matches state law (see below).

Requirements that Apply to Low and Very Low Income Sites

The rules regarding very low and low income sites are more complicated. If the rezoning occurs after January 31, 2023, the rezoning program(s) must include the following components:

- **By right approval:** The zoning must allow for by-right approvals if at least 20% of the units in a project are affordable to lower income households and the project does not need a subdivision. See below for definition of “by right.”
- **Limits on small sites:** The site must be large enough for at least 16 units under the rezoning.
- **Minimum 20/30 units per acre:** The zoning must allow at least 20/30 units per acre, depending on the agency’s default density, unless adequate justification can be provided to HCD to support a lower density as suitable for lower income housing. If you don’t know your default density, [HCD provides guidance here](#).

- **Limits on mixed-use development:** There are limits on using mixed-use sites. Specifically, the jurisdiction must meet one of the two following conditions:
 1. At least half of the lower income units must be placed in zoning districts that are exclusively residential, or
 2. The rules must allow for 100% residential development and must require that the proposed development be at least 50% residential by floor area.

Definition of By Right

Applies to lower income sites if 20% of units are affordable to lower income households and no subdivision is required.

Jurisdictions may not require a conditional-use permit, a planned unit development permit, or any other discretionary permit. Any CEQA review must be done at the time of the rezoning approval. The housing project itself is not subject to CEQA.

Any subdivision of a site is subject to the Subdivision Map Act, CEQA, and all other local laws. Design review is acceptable as long as:

1. It does not trigger CEQA,
2. It is based on objective standards, and
3. It does not result in the project being rejected or the density reduced.

See the end of the memo for the statutory language regarding by right approvals.

Timing

The rezoning program should be implemented as early as possible. The timing of the rezoning depends on when whether the Housing Element is certified within 120 days of the Housing Element deadline. (The deadline is January 31, 2023, and 120 more days is May 31, 2023.)

1. If a Housing Element is certified by May 31, 2023, the rezoning must happen by May 31, 2026 (3+ years from the deadline).
2. If the Housing Element is *not* certified by May 31, 2023, the rezoning must be completed by January 31, 2024.
3. If rezoning is needed because the agency failed to complete all required rezoning in the fifth cycle, the “carryover” rezoning must be completed by January 31, 2024.

Please note: Of the 197 jurisdictions in the Southern California region, 2 were certified within 120 days of the deadline.

Under certain circumstances, if jurisdictions complete 75% of their rezoning on time, they may be eligible for an extension for the final 25%.

Consequences of Not Rezoning on Time

If a local government fails to complete the rezoning by the deadline, HCD may decertify a housing element and may refer the jurisdiction to the Attorney General. Per the Housing Accountability Act, for housing development projects where at least 20% of the total units are affordable, in most cases a locality cannot reject a proposed development project on a site identified by the rezoning program.

Sample Language

HCD offers the following sample language that could be included in a Housing Element, with edits in red.

Sample Program 1:

*To accommodate the remaining lower-income RHNA of 89 units, the City of X will identify and rezone a minimum of 4.5 acres of vacant land to the R3 zoning district, allowing exclusively residential uses and a minimum of 20 units per acre to a maximum of 30 units per acre by ~~June 30~~ **January 31, 2024**. Rezoned sites will permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily uses by right pursuant to Government Code section 65583.2(i) for developments in which 20 percent or more of the units are affordable to lower income households **and do not require a subdivision** and will be selected from sites 20 through 30 in the parcel listing (Appendix A). As reflected in Appendix A, each site has the capacity to accommodate at least 16 units and will be available for development in the planning period where water, sewer, and dry utilities can be provided.*

Objective: Create opportunity for at least 89 units of multifamily housing for lower income households

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Timeline: Sites rezoned by June 30, 2024

Funding Source(s): General fund

Sample Program 2: Rezone Program on Mixed-use Sites

*To accommodate the remaining lower-income RHNA of 150 units, the City will identify and rezone 8 acres of sites within the MU-30 zoning district, allowing owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential uses “by-right”, at a minimum of 20 units per acre by ~~June 30, 2017~~ **January 31, 2024**. Sites will allow projects to be 100 percent residential by-right but shall require residential uses to occupy at least 50 percent of the total floor area of the mixed-use project. Rezoned sites will permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily uses by right pursuant to Government Code section 65583.2(i) for developments in which 20 percent or more of the units are affordable to lower income households **and do not require a subdivision** and will be selected from sites 15 through 30 in the parcel listing (Appendix A) and have the capacity for at least 16 units per site.*

Objective: Create opportunity for at least 150 units of rental housing for lower income households

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Timeline: Sites rezoned by June 30, 2024

Funding Source(s): General fund

Statutory Language Regarding By Right

For purposes of this section and Section 65583, the phrase “use by right” shall mean that the local government's review of the owner-occupied or multifamily residential use may not require a conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary local government review or approval that would constitute a “project” for purposes of Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code. Any subdivision of the sites shall be subject to all laws, including, but not limited to, the local government ordinance implementing the Subdivision Map Act. A local ordinance may provide that “use by right” does not exempt the use from design review. However, that design review shall not constitute a “project” for purposes of Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code. Use by right for all rental multifamily residential housing shall be provided in accordance with subdivision (f) of Section 65589.5

Assembly Bill 2011 (Wicks) Known Positions

Support:

CA Conference of Carpenters (Co-Sponsor)
California Housing Consortium (Co-Sponsor)
AARP
Abundant Housing LA
Affirmed Housing
All Home
Bay Area Council
Burbank Housing Development Corporation
California Apartment Association
California Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies
California Coalition for Rural Housing
California Community Builders
California Housing Partnership
California YIMBY
Carpenter Local Union 1599
Carpenters Local 152
Carpenters Local 22
Carpenters Local 562
Carpenters Local 619
Carpenters Local 661
Carpenters Local 701
Carpenters Local 714
Carpenters Local 721
Carpenters Local 909
Carpenters Local 951
Carpenters Local Union #1109
Carpenters Local Union 1789
Carpenters Local Union 2236
Carpenters Union Local 180

Carpenters Union Local 405
Carpenters Union Local 46
Carpenters Union Local 505
Carpenters Union Local 605
Carpenters Union Local 713
Carpenters Union Local 805
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 001
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 007
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 101
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 1904 Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 417
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 66
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 710
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 91
City of San Mateo
CivicWell
Construction Employers' Association
Council of Infill Builders
Destination: Home
Drywall Lathers Local 9109
Drywall Local Union 9144
East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
Fieldstead and Company
Generation Housing
Greenbelt Alliance
Housing Action Coalition
Housing California
Lathers Local 681
Making Housing and Community Happen
Mercy Housing California
MidPen Housing Corporation
Millwrights Local 102

Modular Installers Association
Non Profit Housing Association of Northern California
Northern California Carpenters Regional Council
Pile Drivers Local 34
Richmond Community Foundation
San Diego Housing Federation
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation
Satellite Affordable Housing Associates
Silicon Valley Community Foundation
Southern California Association of Nonprofit Housing
Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters
SV@Home Action Fund
The Kennedy Commission
The Pacific Companies
The Two Hundred
United Lutheran Church of Oakland
United Ways of California
USA Properties Fund
Ventura County Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice

Support with Amendments:

Mayor Darrell Steinberg, City of Sacramento
Mayor Libby Schaaf, City of Oakland

Oppose:

California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Pipe Trades Council
City of Laguna Beach
City of Mission Viejo

City of Rancho Santa Margarita

District Council 16, International Union of Painters and Allied Trades

State Building & Construction Trades Council of California

Western States Council Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation