

Date of Hearing: July 10, 2019

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Cecilia Aguiar-Curry, Chair

SB 5 (Beall, et al.) – As Amended June 17, 2019

SENATE VOTE: 31-4

SUBJECT: Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Program.

SUMMARY: Creates the Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Program for local agencies to use local property taxes for affordable housing and housing related projects. Specifically, **this bill:**

1) Defines the following terms:

- a) “Program” as the Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Program;
- b) “Affordable housing and community development investment amount” as the amount of property tax allocated under this program;
- c) “Committee” as the Affordable Housing and Community Development Committee;
- d) “Applicant” as any entity that has submitted an application to the committee;
- e) “Plan” as an application for one or more projects that is submitted to the committee; and,
- f) “Project” to include:
 - i) A project undertaken by a city, county, city or county, joint powers authority (JPA), enhanced infrastructure financing district (EIFD), affordable housing authority (AHA), community revitalization and investment authority (CRIA), or a transit village development district; or,
 - ii) Specified transit priority projects.

2) Specifies that funding allocated to the program shall be used to support a plan that includes the following types of projects:

- a) Predevelopment, development, acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable housing that is affordable to households earning under 120% of an area median income;
- b) Transit-oriented development to facilitate the development of higher density uses within close proximity to transit stations;
- c) Infill development that assists in the new construction or rehabilitation of projects that supports high-density, affordable, and mixed income housing in locations designated as infill, including, but not limited to, any of the following:
 - i) Parks;

- ii) Water, sewer, or other public infrastructure costs;
 - iii) Transportation improvements; and,
 - iv) Traffic mitigation.
- d) Projects to revitalize and restore neighborhoods;
- e) Projects to protect communities from effects of climate change, including, but not limited to, sea level rise, wildfires, seismic safety, and flood protection; and,
- f) The acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of land or property for the above purposes.
- 3) Provides limitations on the eligible uses for funding if an applicant, or its electorate, has taken any action that has any of the following effects:
- a) Established or implemented any provision that:
 - i) Limits the number of land use approvals or permits necessary for the approval and construction of housing that will be issued or allocated within all or a portion of the applicant;
 - ii) Acts as a cap on the number of housing units that can be approved or constructed either annually or for some other time period; and,
 - iii) Limits the population of the applicant.
 - b) Imposes a moratorium or enforces an existing moratorium on housing development within all or a portion of the jurisdiction of the applicant;
 - c) Requires voter approval for specified updates to the applicant's housing element, or specified rezoning or general plan updates to comply with an updated housing element; or,
 - d) Changes the zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reduces the intensity of land use within an existing zoning district below what was allowed under the general plan land use designation and zoning ordinances of the applicant in effect on January 1, 2018.
- 4) Requires that at least 50% of the funding provided under the program and at least 50% of the funding for each project shall be used to construct affordable housing, as specified.
- 5) Provides that funding shall not be used to subsidize the construction of market rate units.
- 6) Specifies that at least 12% of the overall funding for the program shall be set aside for counties with populations of less than 200,000. Specifies that of this amount, 2% shall be set aside to provide technical assistance for counties with populations of less than 200,000.
- 7) Establishes the committee to comprise the following members:
- a) Chair of the Strategic Growth Council or designee;

- b) Chair of the California Housing Finance Agency or designee;
 - c) Chair of the California Workforce Investment Board or designee;
 - d) Director of Housing and Community Development (HCD) or designee;
 - e) Two people appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly who have knowledge and experience in finance, housing finance, housing planning or development, or land use planning;
 - f) Two people by the Senate Rules Committee who have knowledge and experience in finance, housing finance, housing planning or development, or land use planning; and,
 - g) One public member who has expertise in education finance.
- 8) Requires the committee to review and approve or deny plans received by applicants.
- 9) Specifies that HCD shall provide technical assistance and administrative support necessary for the committee to consider plans.
- 10) Authorizes the following entities to submit an application to the committee for funding:
- a) A city, county, or city and county;
 - b) A JPA comprised of entities that are authorized to submit a plan; or,
 - c) An EIFD, CRIA, AHA, affordable housing and community investment agency (AHCIA), or a transit village development district.
- 11) Specifies the information that shall be included in a plan that is submitted to the committee.
- 12) Requires an applicant to certify that a skilled and trained workforce will be used to complete the project if the plan is approved, unless otherwise specified.
- 13) Provides that, within 30 days of receipt of a plan, the committee shall provide the applicant with a written statement identifying any questions about the plan.
- 14) Specifies that if the committee denies approval of the plan, the committee shall, not more than 30 days following the date the committee has issued a decision, provide the applicant with a written statement explaining the reasons why the plan was denied.
- 15) Requires the committee to develop a rubric to determine which plan to approve and to give priority to plans based upon the rubric. Requires the rubric to contain specified factors.
- 16) Specifies conditions under which the committee is prohibited from approving a plan.
- 17) Provides that the applicant must provide matching resources, including, but not limited to, financial, in-kind land dedication, or public-private funds, for the state investment in the program, unless the applicant is located in a rural area of the state.

- 18) Requires the committee to adopt annual priorities, as specified, and to adhere to the following funding schedule:
 - a) Commencing January 1, 2021, the committee may only approve a plan for funding if the Legislature enacts a budget bill for the applicable fiscal year that specifies the amount available for the committee to allocate pursuant to this program;
 - b) For the five-year period commencing July 1, 2021, the committee may approve \$200 million in plans in the first year, increasing in \$200 million increments each year for five years until reaching \$1 billion after five years;
 - c) For the four-year period commencing July 1, 2026, the annual increase in funding the committee can approve increases by \$250 million each year until it reaches \$2 billion after nine years; and,
 - d) The Legislature, by statute, may direct the committee to suspend consideration of plans in any fiscal year in which the Legislature passes a bill tapping into the Rainy Day account or suspends the Proposition 98 education funding guarantee.
- 19) Specifies that upon approval of a plan, the committee shall issue an order directing the county auditor to transfer an amount of ad valorem property tax revenue in an amount equal to the annual amount approved by the committee.
- 20) Authorizes the applicant to use the funding to incur debt or issue bonds or other financing to support the project or projects included in the plan.
- 21) Requires, on or before July 1, 2022, and annually thereafter, each applicant that has received funding for any fiscal year to provide a report to the committee that includes specified information for the previous fiscal year.
- 22) Specifies that if, based on annual reports submitted to the committee, the committee determines that any of the following has occurred, the committee shall direct the applicant to develop a corrective action plan based on recommendations made by the committee:
 - a) The applicant is not on track to produce the number of housing units included in the plan;
 - b) The applicant is not on track to spend at least 50% of plan funds on affordable housing;
 - c) The applicant is on track to exceed 5% of the administrative limit;
 - d) The applicant is found to have used funding for purposes not authorized under the program;
 - e) The applicant is found to have used funds to subsidize market rate housing;
 - f) The applicant violated the anti-displacement requirements; or,
 - g) The applicant is not on track to complete all of the projects included in the plan according to the timeline included in the plan.

- 23) Provides that the applicant shall have one year from the date that the committee directed the applicant to develop a corrective action plan, and the committee shall issue a finding that the applicant is out of compliance with the program, as specified.
- 24) Requires, if the committee finds that the applicant is out of compliance with the program, the committee to direct the auditor to stop transferring moneys from the county's educational revenue augmentation fund (ERAF), and prohibit the applicant from applying for additional funds for this program for a period of five years.
- 25) Specifies that if an applicant is found to be out of compliance with the program, the applicant shall be ineligible to apply for other state grant programs for a period of five years.
- 26) Authorizes an AHCIA to be created in any one of the following ways:
 - a) A city, county, or city and county may adopt a resolution creating an agency; or,
 - b) A city, county, city and county, special district, or any combination of these create an AHCIA by entering into a joint powers agreement.
- 27) Prohibits a school entity or a successor agency of a former redevelopment agency (RDA) from participating in an AHCIA.
- 28) Specifies that the governing body of an AHCIA shall be appointed by the legislative body of the city, county, or city and county that created the AHCIA and shall include three members of the legislative body and two public members who live or work within the plan area. Specifies that if created through a joint powers agreement, the governing body of an AHCIA shall be comprised of a majority of members from the legislative bodies and a minimum of two public members who live or work within the plan area.
- 29) Provides that these reductions can only come from ERAF amounts that were going to be used for K-12 schools, which ensures that the General Fund backfills the lower property tax revenue to schools. To the extent that this bill inadvertently reduces school funding, the bill gives the Department of Finance the ability to recalculate the Proposition 98 guarantee so that schools receive the same amount of funding they would have absent this Program.
- 30) Specifies the process in which the county auditor shall allocate funding.
- 31) Contains legislative findings and declarations to support its purposes.
- 32) Provides that if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts shall be made.
- 33) Specifies that if any provision of this bill is deemed invalid, the entire act shall be null and void.

FISCAL EFFECT: According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, this bill contains:

- a) General Fund impacts of up to \$2 billion annually for up to 30 years when fully implemented, to the extent the Legislature authorizes the allocation of funding at the maximum amounts specified in the bill each year. General Fund expenditures would be up to \$200 million in 2021-22, increasing by up to \$200 million annually through 2025-26, then

increasing by up to \$250 million annually through 2029-30, to reach a cumulative annual impact of \$2 billion by 2029-30. The funding mechanism in this bill requires a specified committee to make awards, to the extent authorized, and direct county officials to allocate property tax revenues from county ERAF to specified local entities with an approved plan of projects each year. Each ERAF shift may have a duration of up to 30 years, as specified in the approved plans. The General Fund generally backfills any reductions in the school share of local property tax revenues, pursuant to the Proposition 98 minimum funding guarantees, including amounts transferred from ERAF.

- b) Preliminary estimates indicate HCD would incur first year costs of approximately \$4.13 million, to the extent the maximum amount is authorized, and ongoing administrative costs of approximately \$3.78 million to support 23 PY of new staff time to establish the program, provide technical assistance and administrative support for the new committee to consider local plans, make awards, and conduct ongoing monitoring and administration of the program. (General Fund) Staff notes the bill authorizes HCD to charge local agency applicants for its reasonable costs to review local plans, which would provide for partial cost-recovery of an unknown portion of HCD costs.
- c) Unknown, potentially reimbursable local mandate costs associated with new requirements imposed on county auditors related to ERAF shifts and property tax allocations. Staff notes that the bill authorizes county auditors to deduct administrative costs from a portion of the funds allocated to local entities with an approved plan of projects, as specified. Ultimately, the Commission on State Mandates would determine whether certain duties mandated by the bill necessitate state reimbursement, after accounting for offsets to costs as a result of the fee authority, should local entities file a successful test claim.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Bill Summary.** This bill establishes the Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Program to provide funding for local entities to pay for specified projects, including affordable housing, transit-oriented development, infill development, housing-related infrastructure, neighborhood revitalization, and infrastructure to protect communities from climate change. The bill authorizes the allocation of ERAF property tax revenues to local entities for those projects, and requires state General Fund backfills to school entities for the associated loss of property tax revenues. This bill establishes a statewide committee to review and approve or deny plans submitted by local agencies. This bill allows local agencies to form an AHCIA to apply for and expend the ERAF revenue on affordable housing and related projects. Lastly, this bill places requirements on agencies receiving funding to ensure compliance with specified obligations, including annual reports that must be submitted to the committee. This bill is sponsored by the author.
- 2) **Author's Statement.** According to the author, "The housing shortage is a major problem affecting every city in California. Since the 1980s, the State has failed to produce the estimated 180,000 necessary new housing units per year. According to HCD, California has a 1.5 million unit shortage of housing available to our lowest income households, who are most at risk of becoming homeless. SB 5 creates desperately needed housing opportunities for hard-working Californians and will also help alleviate poverty, create jobs, and meet our statewide environmental goals without affecting school funding. According to economic analysis prepared by the Northern California Carpenters Regional Council and California

Housing Partnership, this bill would create up to 86,000 new and rehabilitated housing units, 329,000 jobs and spur more than \$60 billion in economic activity over a ten year period.

“California needs both short and long-term solutions to effectively address our housing and homelessness crisis. Although the recent housing bond and other one-time funding for affordable housing included in the budget are beneficial, all parties recognize California lacks a robust and sustainable financing tool capable of aggressively advancing California’s housing and [greenhouse gas] GHG goals. The state must act with urgency to address the shortage of affordable housing units. SB 5 makes the state a long-term partner and provides much needed money to build affordable housing across the state. It provides a significant ongoing investment, ramping up to \$2 billion annually over time, and offers an effective finance tool lost when the state dissolved redevelopment agencies.

“SB 5, however, bears little resemblance--and is a much better tool--than former redevelopment. Redevelopment had no state supervision and cost controls; it was triggered by local officials identifying ‘blighted’ areas and using eminent domain to consolidate parcels and incentivize economic development, with only 20% of funding dedicated to affordable housing. SB 5 is a narrowly focused tool with strong state accountability. It establishes a state committee staffed by the HCD that can only approve access to capped amounts of a bondable income stream of property tax for projects that advance state policy priorities. At least 50% of funding must be used for affordable housing; other uses are restricted to advancing transit-oriented development, infill infrastructure, revitalizing neighborhoods and combating sea level rise.”

- 3) **Redevelopment.** Article XVI, Section 16 of the California Constitution authorizes the Legislature to provide for the formation of RDAs to eliminate blight in an area by means of a self-financing schedule that pays for the redevelopment project with tax increment derived from any increase in the assessed value of property within the redevelopment project area (or tax increment). Prior to Proposition 13 very few RDAs existed; however, after its passage, RDAs became a source of funding for a variety of local infrastructure activities. Eventually, RDAs were required to set-aside 20% of funding generated in a project area to increase the supply of low and moderate income housing in the project areas. At the time RDAs were dissolved, the Controller estimated that statewide, RDAs were obligated to spend \$1 billion on affordable housing.

At the time of dissolution, over 400 RDAs statewide were diverting 12% of property taxes, over \$5.6 billion yearly. In 2011, facing a severe budget shortfall, the Governor proposed eliminating RDAs in order to deliver more property taxes to other local agencies. Ultimately, the Legislature approved and the Governor signed two measures, ABX1 26 (Blumenfield), Chapter 5 and ABX1 27 (Blumenfield), Chapter 6 that together dissolved RDAs as they existed at the time and created a voluntary redevelopment program on a smaller scale. In response, the California Redevelopment Association (CRA) and the League of California Cities, along with other parties, filed suit challenging the two measures. The Supreme Court denied the petition for peremptory writ of mandate with respect to ABX1 26. However, the Court did grant CRA's petition with respect to ABX1 27. As a result, all RDAs were required to dissolve as of February 1, 2012.

- 4) **Previous Attempts to Replace RDAs.** After the Supreme Court’s 2011 *Matosantos* decision dissolved all RDAs, legislators enacted several measures creating new tax increment financing tools to pay for local economic development. The Legislature authorized the creation of EIFDs [SB 628 (Beall), Chapter 785, Statutes of 2014] quickly followed by CRIAs [AB 2 (Alejo), Chapter 319, Statutes of 2015]. Similar to EIFDs, CRIAs use tax increment financing to fund infrastructure projects, with two big differences: CRIAs may only be formed in economically depressed areas, but do not require voter approval. Two years ago, the Legislature authorized the formation of AHAs, which may use tax increment financing exclusively for rehabilitating and constructing affordable housing and also do not require voter approval to issue bonds [AB 1598 (Mullin), Chapter 764, Statutes of 2017]. Last year, SB 961 (Allen), Chapter 559, Statutes of 2018, removed the vote requirement for a subset of EIFDs to issue bonds and required these EIFDs to instead solicit public input. While these entities share fundamental similarities with RDAs in terms of using various forms of tax-increment financing, they differ in one significant aspect, which is not having access to the school’s share of property tax revenue.
- 5) **Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds.** Proposition 13 gave the state authority to allocate the local property tax among local agencies, schools, and community college districts. Each year, the state estimates how much each district will receive in local property tax revenue (and student fee revenue in the case of community colleges). Then, the annual Budget Act appropriates state General Fund to “make up the difference” and fund the district’s revenue limit or apportionment at the intended level. Frequently, however, the actual property tax revenues allocated to school districts may be less than the state and local agencies anticipate. The state’s education finance system addresses these shortfalls differently for different types of educational entities. For K-12 districts that require additional funding to meet the minimum guaranteed level of funding, known as nonbasic aid school districts, all funding shortfalls are backfilled automatically with additional state aid. In contrast, basic aid districts do not require state aid to meet the minimum guaranteed level of funding because local property tax is sufficient. Explicit state action is required to backfill community college funding shortfalls.

In 1992-93 and 1993-94, in response to serious budgetary shortfalls, the state permanently redirected almost one-fifth of total statewide property tax revenue from cities, counties, and special districts to K-12 and community college districts. Under the changes in property tax allocation laws, county auditors deposit the redirected property tax revenue into a countywide fund for schools, also known as a county’s ERAF. In 2017-18, cities, counties, and special districts deposited around \$9.6 billion into county ERAFs. Because Proposition 98 obligates the state to ensure that school districts all receive a minimum guaranteed level of funding, contributions to ERAF reduce the state’s funding obligations for K-14 education. Before counties distribute property tax revenue from ERAF to nonbasic aid schools and community colleges, the county diverts some ERAF back to local agencies to account for two other funding formulas: a) excess ERAF; and, b) the vehicle license fee (VLF) swap.

- 6) **Excess ERAF.** In the late 1990s, some county auditors reported that their ERAF accounts had more revenue than necessary to offset all state aid to nonbasic aid K-12 and community college districts. In response, the Legislature required that some of these surplus funds instead be used for countywide special education programs, and any remaining funds be returned to cities, counties, and special districts in proportion to the amount of property taxes they contributed to ERAF. The ERAF funds returned to noneducational local agencies are

known as “excess ERAF.” In 2017-18, nearly \$600 million was returned to local agencies in the form of excess ERAF.

7) **VLF-Property Tax Swap (2004-05 Budget).** Prior to the 2004 budget agreement, the total VLF revenue, including the backfill from the state General Fund, was allocated in proportion to population. As part of the 2004-05 budget agreement, the Legislature enacted the "VLF-property tax swap," which replaced the backfill from the state General Fund with property tax revenues (dollar-for-dollar) that otherwise would have gone to schools through ERAF. This replacement funding is known as the "VLF adjustment amount." The state General Fund then backfilled schools for the lost ERAF money. After the dollar-for-dollar swap in FY 2004-05, property tax in lieu of VLF payments (VLF adjustment amount) to cities and counties is allocated in proportion to each jurisdiction's annual change in gross assessed valuation (property tax revenues). The VLF swap shifts billions of dollars annually from ERAF to non-school local agencies.

8) **Policy Considerations.** The Committee may wish to consider the following:

a) **Not RDA 2.0.** Like RDAs, the funding scheme proposed in this bill allows for the issuance of bonds to support the activities of local entities. RDAs, however, used a very stable source of funding to finance their redevelopment activities, mainly property tax revenues generated by growth in the assessed value of properties in a project area – commonly known as tax increment revenues. This bill seeks to use ERAF funding and leverage the constitutional guarantee for education funding to provide funding that can be used to issue bonds for affordable housing and related infrastructure. While this is a creative way to fund these programs, it is unclear how successful local agencies will be at completing projects and issuing bonds based on this revenue source for three reasons: First, this revenue source is relatively untested compared to tax increment financing. Second, there is no guarantee that the Legislature will pass a budget bill approving funding for this program from year to year. Third, this funding can be pulled back from the agency if it is not following through on key factors in the plan that was approved by the committee, potentially removing funding that is needed to service the bond debt.

The Committee may wish to consider the impact of this bill if the bond market determines this revenue source does not provide enough certainty.

b) **Uses of Funding.** While the bill requires at least 50% of the overall funding and at least 50% of each project's plan is allocated to affordable housing, the remaining 50% is allocated towards the program's other six eligible uses. Some of these categories are relatively broad, from dealing with sea level rise to encouraging local economic development. One of the critiques of redevelopment was that funding was used for projects that were not the highest priority. Given the range of funding uses, it is possible that this new program could face similar criticisms when implemented. On the other hand, broader categories allow the program to be flexible and account for the various challenges local agencies face constructing affordable housing and related infrastructure. The Committee may wish to consider if the uses for the ERAF funding should be more explicit.

c) **Technical and Clarifying Issues.** In order to create consistency, the Committee may wish to consider fixing the following issues in the bill:

- i) The stated intent of the bill is to ensure that all local agencies, including special districts, continue to receive all of their excess ERAF allocations. To avoid any confusion during implementation of this bill, further clarification can be made.

Revenue and Taxation Code Section 97.68.1(a). The county auditor shall transfer an amount, equal to the countywide affordable housing and community development investment amount, from the county's Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund, up to the amount available in the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund after complying with subdivision (d), and deposit that amount into the Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Fund ~~to the county's Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Fund~~ established pursuant to subdivision (b).

Revenue and Taxation Code Section 97.68.1(d)(1). Reduce any allocations of excess, additional, or remaining funds that would otherwise have been allocated to county superintendents of schools, cities, counties, special districts, and cities and counties pursuant to clause (i) of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of Sections 97.2 and 97.3, Section 97.70, and Article 4 (commencing with Section 98) had this section not been enacted. The allocations required by this section shall be adjusted to comply with this paragraph.

- ii) The author has asked the Committee to clarify that infrastructure related to climate change includes "natural infrastructure" as to not, unintendedly, limit the types of potentially needed projects.

Government Code Section 55903(E). Protecting communities dealing with the effects of climate change, including, but not limited to, sea level rise, wildfires, seismic safety, and flood protection. Eligible projects include the construction, repair, replacement, and maintenance of infrastructure, including natural infrastructure, related to protecting communities from climate change.

- iii) Correct an incorrect reference to an agency.

Government Code Section 62302(b)(1)(B). Any of the following entities may create an authority agency by entering into a joint powers agreement pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1:

9) **Committee Amendments.** The Committee may wish to amend the bill to fix the clarifying and technical issues referenced above.

10) **Arguments in Support.** The League of California Cities argues, "SB 5 would create a local-State partnership to provide up to \$2 billion annually to fund state approved affordable housing, infrastructure, and economic development projects that also support state policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, expand transit oriented development (TOD), address poverty, and revitalize neighborhoods. With a multi-billion dollar state budget surplus for the 2019/2020 fiscal year, the League believes the time is right for the state to restore more

robust financing mechanisms that support local efforts to build more affordable housing, provide essential infrastructure, and create opportunities in underserved communities.”

- 11) **Arguments in Opposition.** The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association (HJTA) argues, “Taking the tax increment from schools in order to bond against it for decades recreates problems that existed with the original RDA program – debts the state is still paying off almost a decade later. Rather than have to backfill yet another revenue stream, creating grant programs and funding them with more stable sources of revenue (namely SB 2 and SB 3 revenues) targets these funds more appropriately to better address what is legitimately a housing crisis in California. HJTA would also like to see eminent domain protections in SB 5, including that private property can’t be taken for a private use. While California does need more affordable housing projects, we also need to ensure existing homeowners are protected.”
- 12) **Double-Referral.** This bill was heard by the Housing and Community Development Committee on July 3, 2019, and passed with a 6-1 vote.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Abode Services
Affordable Housing Network of Santa Clara County
American Planning Association, California Chapter
Associated Builders and Contractors, Northern California Chapter
Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Council
Big City Mayors
Bill Wilson Center
Bridge Housing Corporation
California Apartment Association
California Association for Local Economic Development
California Association of Housing Authorities
California Contract Cities Association
California Forward Action Fund
California Hawaii State Conference of the NAACP
California Housing Partnership
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
California League Conservation Voters
California Legislative Conference of Plumbing, Heating, and Piping Industry
California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Council of Laborers
California State Pipe Trades Council
Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County
Cities Association of Santa Clara County
Cities of: Alameda, Albany, Arcata, Atascadero, Beverly Hills, Brentwood, Burbank, Camarillo, Cerritos, Cloverdale, Clovis, Concord, Cotati, Covina, Crescent City, Cupertino, Downey, East Palo Alto, Encinitas, Escondido, Eureka, Farmersville, Fort Bragg, Fountain Valley, Garden Grove, Glendale, Goleta, Half Moon Bay, La Mirada, Lafayette, Laguna Beach,

Support (continued)

Laguna Niguel, Lakeport, Lakewood, Los Alamitos, Mill Valley, Modesto, Moorpark, Mountain View, Napa, Norwalk, Novato, Orange Cove, Palo Alto, Paramount, Pasadena, Pinole, Pismo Beach, Placentia, Rancho Cucamonga, Rohnert Park, Rosemead, Roseville, Salinas, San Carlos, San Diego, San Jose, San Rafael, Sand City, Santa Cruz, Santa Monica, South Pasadena, Stanton, Stockton, Thousand Oaks, Vallejo, Ventura, West Hollywood

City Manager of the City of Hollister
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights
Construction Employers' Association
Core Affordable Housing
Councilmember Tony Madrigal, Modesto City Council, District 2
EAH Housing
East Bay Housing Organizations
Eden Housing
First Community Housing
Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley
Housing California
Housing Trust Silicon Valley
Indivisible San Jose
International Union of Operating Engineers, Cal-Nevada Conference
Kosmont Companies
League of California Cities
League of California Cities, Los Angeles County Division
League of California Cities, San Diego County Division
LifeMoves
Local Government Commission
Marin County Council of Mayors and Council Members
Mayor of San Jose Sam Liccardo
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MidPen Housing Corporation
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
MuniServices
National Electrical Contractors Association, California Chapters
Newport Realty Advisors
Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California
Northern California Allied Trades
Northern California Carpenters Regional Council
Northern California Sheet Metal Workers' Local 104
Petaluma Pie Company
PICO California
Rainbow Chamber Of Commerce Silicon Valley
ROEM Development Corporation
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
San Diego Association of Governments
San Francisco Housing Action Coalition
San Joaquin Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School
Sand Hill Property Company

Support (continued)

Santa Clara & San Benito Counties Building & Construction Trades Council
Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority
Satellite Affordable Housing Associates
Silicon Valley at Home (Sv@Home)
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Silicon Valley Young Democrats
South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
South Bay YIMBY
Southern California Association of Governments
Southwest California Legislative Council
SPUR
Stanislaus Council of Governments
State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
TechEquity Collaborative
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Town of Colma
Town of Corte Madera
Town of Danville
Town of Fairfax
Tracy Chamber of Commerce
Tuolumne County Chamber of Commerce
UA Local Union 393
United Contractors
Ventura Council of Governments
Wall and Ceiling Alliance
Western States Council of Sheet Metal Workers
Western Wall and Ceiling Contractors Association
Working Partnerships USA

Opposition

Association of California School Administrators (unless amended)
California Association of School Business Officials (unless amended)
California School Boards Association (unless amended)
California Teachers Association
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education (unless amended)
School Employers Association of California (unless amended)
Small School Districts Association (unless amended)
One Individual

Analysis Prepared by: Jimmy MacDonald / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958