



LEGISLATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA  
THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2019 | 6 PM  
CITY OF SUNNYVALE | WEST CONFERENCE ROOM  
456 WEST OLIVE | SUNNYVALE, CA 94088

*Discussion & action may be taken on any of the following items:*

1. Welcome and Roll Call (Vice Mayor Margaret Abe-Koga, Chair) 6:00 PM
2. Consent Agenda
  - a. Approval of April 2019 Legislative Action Committee Minutes
3. Old Business: Housing policy statement next steps (discussion and action if needed), update Housing Legislative Working Group (Klein/Abe-Koga)
4. Legislative Discussion: 6:15 PM
  - a. Housing Bills:
    - AB1279 - high resource areas
    - AB1485 - streamlining
    - SB50 | SB4 combined
    - SB 6 - streamlining
    - AB11 - RDA replacement (by Marico Sayoc)
    - AB1487 - Regional Housing Enterprise (by Marico Sayoc)
    - SB13 - Wieckowski bill
  - b. Non-housing bills:
    - AB291 - emergency preparedness (City of San José)
    - AB707 - request from Valley Water
    - AB332 - wastewater
    - AB836- Clean Air Centers Pilot Program (BAAQMD)
    - AB1744 - heavy duty trucks/smog check requirement (BAAQMD)
5. Other bills members wish to agendize or take action?
6. Public Comment
7. Adjournment 7pm.



LEGISLATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 2019 | 5PM  
CITY OF SUNNYVALE | WEST CONFERENCE ROOM  
456 WEST OLIVE | SUNNYVALE, CA 94088

Vice Mayor Margaret Abe-Koga, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:05 PM. Present:

Campbell	absent
Cupertino	Rod Sinks
Gilroy	absent
Los Altos	Anita Enander
Los Altos Hills	Michelle Wu. At 5:07pm
Los Gatos	Rob Rennie
Milpitas	Rich Tran
Monte Sereno	Rowena Turner
Morgan Hill	absent
Mountain View	Margaret Abe-Koga
Palo Alto	Lydia Kou
San José	absent
Santa Clara	Debi Davis at 5:30 pm
Saratoga	Manny Cappello
Sunnyvale	Gustav Larrson
Executive Director	Andi Jordan

Also present, Councilmember Jeannie Bruins.

**Item 2. Consent Agenda:** March 2019 Legislative Action Committee Minutes were approved (noting Lydia Kou attended for Palo Alto, not Eric Filseth). Motion by Manny Cappello, second by Anita Enander. Motion passes unanimously. 9-0-0-6

AYES – 9 (Sinks, Enander, Rennie, Tran, Turner, Abe Koga, Kou, Cappello, Larrson)

NAYES -

ABSTENTIONS - 0

ABSENT – 6 (Resnikoff, Velasco, Wu, Constantine, Jones, Davis)

**Item 3. 2018 Legislative Guiding Principles.** Motion by Lydia Kou, to strike from page 2, under CEQA “CEQA is utilized to obstruct projects for reasons unrelated to environmental protection” and pass the Legislative Guiding Principles. Second by Eric Filseth. Motion passes unanimously.

AYES – 9 (Sinks, Enander, Rennie, Tran, Turner, Abe Koga, Kou, Cappello, Larrson)

NAYES - 0

ABSTENTIONS - 0

ABSENT – 6 (Resnikoff, Velasco, Wu, Constantine, Jones, Davis)

**Item 4. Discussion of next steps regarding the adopted Housing Policy Statement:**

By unanimous consent, the group agreed that contacting news agencies, writing op/eds, and conducting legislative visits should be included in next steps.

AYES – 10 (Sinks, Enander, Rennie, Tran, Turner, Abe Koga, Kou, Cappello, Larrison, Davis)

NAYES - 0

ABSTENTIONS -0

ABSENT – 5 (Resnikoff, Velasco, Wu, Constantine, Jones)

**Item 5. Discussion of legislation and action on these items:**

SB 330 (Skinner): Oppose

AYES – 10 (Sinks, Enander, Rennie, Tran, Turner, Abe Koga, Kou, Cappello, Larrison, Davis)

NAYES - 0

ABSTENTIONS - 0

ABSENT – 5 (Resnikoff, Velasco, Wu, Constantine, Jones)

AB 1483 WATCH

AB 1484 OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED (opposed to freezing of fees for 2 years).

Unanimous consent

AYES – 10 (Sinks, Enander, Rennie, Tran, Turner, Abe Koga, Kou, Cappello, Larrison, Davis)

NAYES - 0

ABSTENTIONS - 0

ABSENT – 5 (Resnikoff, Velasco, Wu, Constantine, Jones)

SB 50: Cities Association recommends that each city should send a letter and CASCC LAC will discuss next meeting.

AB 68 & AB 881 – OPPOSE: Anita Enander motioned to oppose. Second by Margaret Abe-Koga. Motion passed 9-1-0-5.

AYES – 9 (Sinks, Enander, Tran, Turner, Abe Koga, Kou, Cappello, Larrison, Davis)

NAYES - Rennie

ABSTENTIONS -

ABSENT – 5 (Resnikoff, Velasco, Wu, Constantine, Jones)

SB 5 (Beall) Redevelopment – Unanimous consent to support

AYES – 9 (Sinks, Enander, Tran, Turner, Abe Koga, Kou, Cappello, Larrison, Davis)

NAYES - Rennie

ABSTENTIONS -

ABSENT – 5 (Resnikoff, Velasco, Wu, Constantine, Jones)

ACA 1 - Unanimous consent to support





AYES – 9 (Sinks, Enander, Tran, Turner, Abe Koga, Kou, Cappello, Larrison, Davis)  
NAYES - Rennie  
ABSTENTIONS -  
ABSENT – 5 (Resnikoff, Velasco, Wu, Constantine, Jones)

Abe-Koga adjourned the meeting until Thursday, May 9, 2019, 6PM, Sunnyvale City Hall, West Conference Room.

DRAFT



To: Board of Directors    
From: Margaret Abe-Koga & Larry Klein, Cities Association of Santa Clara County  
Appointees/Representatives to the ABAG/MTC Housing Legislative working Group  
RE: Summary of ABAG/MTC Housing Legislative Task Force Meetings  
April 18 and 25, 2019  
Date: April 29, 2019

---

We wanted to provide a short summary of the meetings we have attended thus far. The Task Force is being asked to provide comment on the various housing related bills introduced in the State Legislature.

AB1487 and SB330 were covered on 4/18. The notes from the meeting are attached and provides a summary of the comments that were made.

At the 4/25 meeting, much of the discussion was focused on the newly combined SB50 and SB4 bill. Of particular note was the differentiation of counties that would be subject to SB 50 zoning provisions in transit rich and jobs rich areas. With the <> 600K people/county threshold, counties such as Napa, Solano, Sonoma, and Marin Counties would be exempt. However, all acknowledged this was an arbitrary number and the challenges a county would face if it tipped over this threshold at a later time. For the larger counties that would be subject to SB50, concerns about the jobs rich designation would be problematic without enhanced transportation/transit measures. With the combining of SB4 with B50, the bill would allow for fourplexes anywhere, but the bill does not provide guidelines on setbacks, heights, etc. which makes it problematic.

The State bills are going through committee, and an update was provided on some of the other bills.

- AB1481 on rent control passed out of committee with a 5% + CPI cap on yearly increases.
- AB1487 on HABA (new agency to place funding measures on ballots and to administer affordable housing) passed out of committee with the deletion of the governance structure of 9 members each appointed from MTC and ABAG.
- SB 330 passed out of committee with amendments including up to five hearings for development approval and 1/2 parking space/unit.

The next meeting will be on 5/1 3:00-7:00pm. Bills to be covered include:

- AB1279: high resource areas
- AB1483: data collection and reporting
- AB1485: streamlining
- AB 11: Redevelopment 2.0

It was noted that the MTC/ABAG Joint Legislative Committee will meet on 5/10, so there is an interest in our Task Force completing review and providing input on these bills so they can be shared with the Joint Leg Committee. We have not/will not take votes on the bills, but our comments are being transcribed and presented to the Joint Leg Committee. One member suggested that rather than just providing input on the specific bills, which tend to be concerns or problems with the legislation, the Task Force Members bring stories of success, best practices experienced in our communities.

**Host:** Housing Legislative Working Group Meeting

**Date:** Thursday, April 18, 2019 7PM-9:30PM

**Location:** Board Room, MTC

**Staffing:**

Julie Pierce, HLWG Chair

Jake Mackenzie, HLWG Vice Chair

Therese McMillan, Executive Director

Brad Paul, Deputy Executive Director

Leslie Meissner, Counsel

Rebecca Long, Government Relations Manager

Fred Castro, ABAG Clerk of the Board

Notetaking by: Lily Rockholt, Civic Edge Consulting

**Attendance:** 20 Working Group members including call-ins.

**Chair's Report:** Reviewed HWLG procedures for new members.

**Report on Housing Bill Landscape:**

**Long:** Described the order of materials in the agenda packet, noted that AB 1485 (Wicks) has been significantly revised so it may not make sense to bring before the group. Proceeded to present on SB 330 (Skinner) and AB 1487 (Chiu).

**Discussion related to SB 330:**

**Marin:**

- Asked where SB 330 is now in the legislation process.
  - **Long:** responded that SB 330 was in the Senate Housing Committee, up for vote next Monday. [Note: it passed 8-2]
- Asked if there was any information about the size of the housing projects SB 330 applies to?
  - **Long:** Noted SB 330 applied to all projects that include housing, and the goal was to reduce the timeline for permitting.
  - **Chair Pierce:** Noted SB 330 is about expediting the local process to approve housing projects.
- The impact of parking limitations on fire truck access on narrow legacy roads is a concern.

**Contra Costa:**

- Asked if voter approval would be eliminated by item 6 in the SB 330 language.
  - **Long:** Stated that this only applies to ballot measures that cap permitting, restrict housing or limit population.
  - Several committee members requested the language be clarified as "no state law can take away the redress from the public."
  - **Chair Pierce:** Noted this language would also impact urban growth boundaries.

- **Long:** Stated the bill would allow land use policies capping growth that were approved by voters on or before January 1, 2019.
- **Chair Pierce:** Noted the need for MTC staff to check on agricultural zoning.
- Stated that this legislation is redundant for many local jurisdictions that already have a standardized permitting process.
- Questioned ability of HCD to develop a single application form that works well for cities of 20,000 to 800,000. Suggested HCD determine what needs to be included, but let local jurisdictions customize the form to account for local conditions and project size.
- Asked for clarification when the developer slows the process down by requiring more time or asking for extensions; does that pause the 12-month clock for approvals?
- Requested that SB 330 investigate developer responsibility for slowing projects down, not just local governments. For example, when project is permitted but the developer decides not to build, or the project doesn't pencil out. What recourse do cities have? The bill is one-sided.
- Concerned that the bill doesn't address the "real issue" which is labor costs and cost of construction.
- Wondered if time limits could be tied to scale of projects and be less one size fits all.
  - **Long:** Noted SB 330 only applies to projects consistent with local zoning and general plans and that other projects would go through normal approval process.
- Concern that by locking in design standards based on what they were on 1/1/2018, it hinders ability to update and improve local design review by local jurisdictions.
- Stated that parking needs should be addressed at the local level to prevent challenges involving local nuances (smaller communities with little or no transit, fire truck access).
- Stated that this would need to have some exceptions for unintended consequences. For example, the Concord Naval Base that needs to be rezoned in order to be used for housing, notes that the retroactive zoning to current standards would kill this project, therefore killing a large housing project and defeating the purpose of SB 330.
- Felt substandard building section creates some major legal liability issues for cities.

#### **Alameda:**

- Asked how a standard form can apply to both small and large cities, it's one size fits all.
- Felt cities, not HCD, should be developing simpler application forms.
- While streamlining approvals is a good idea, there are a number of entitled, approved projects that aren't being built, so streamlining doesn't solve that problem.
- Regarding exempting affordable housing projects from impact fees, residents of such buildings use city services, so why should those buildings not also be subject to fees?
- Agreed current 5-10 year approval process too long, but 12 months too short. What about 1-3 years depending on scale and complexity of project?
- Noted nothing in SB 330 acknowledges funding gap/challenges for affordable housing.
- Stated that city permitting staff shortages often lead to slower project approvals,
- SB 330 doesn't address worsening traffic congestion that more housing will create.
- Setting zoning rules back to 1/1/18 doesn't allow environmental and resilience upgrades.

- Cities need impact fees for schools given major state cut backs on education funding, concern that by capping fees on future development bill would create inequities relative to what prior developments paid
- Re: substandard buildings provision, there needs to be a balanced approach. Comparing this to Oakland's Ghost Fire isn't fair – it would not have been allowed under the proposal given the life safety issues. It's better to have safer, ugly buildings than more tent cities, which is what's happening in their community.

#### **Santa Clara:**

- Noted an additional application wouldn't fix current permitting pipeline problems.
- Stated streamlined application/approval process shouldn't apply to mixed use projects.
- Noted that SB 330 lessens parking requirements, with no ties to how to transport people, closeness to major transportation hubs or potential impacts on narrow streets. Recommended parking be removed from the bill altogether.
- Noted need to identify funding for more transit if parking requirements are eliminated.
- Stated that impact and permit fees are charged to cover what the state isn't providing local jurisdictions for development infrastructure and increased services for constituents.
- Brought up electrification, and that old zoning rules weren't inclusive of environmental upgrades, going back to 1/1/18 zoning won't be helpful in reducing GHG emissions.

#### **San Francisco:**

- There should be a time limit but it shouldn't be uniform; bill should tie timeline for permitting to size and complexity of project (6-24 mo.).
- Asked if the clock stopped when developers are revising their strategies.
- Concerned that recent updates to zoning since 1/1/18 (Central SOMA Plan) would be nullified, which would be very problematic.
- Appreciates concern about impact fees but the need doesn't go away and has to be paid for somehow.
- Noted objective design standards are a great goal but challenging to implement.
- On substandard buildings, understood intent of the bill to keep people housed. While we shouldn't overlook life safety concerns, if basement apartment has 7'3" ceilings but code requires 8' ceilings, allowing a slightly lower ceiling is not a life safety issue. Should also look at providing some funding for owners to make upgrades.

#### **San Mateo:**

- Stated some allowances needed to be made for historical and other landmark buildings.
- Noted their city has already made changes so projects consistent with zoning don't even come to the city council and are just approved by staff.
- 12 months is not enough time for approvals; allowances need to be made for extenuating circumstances.
- Noted that some general plans were updated recently (for first time in decades) to allow for more and denser housing, so retroactive zoning and standards (1/1/18) would be unacceptable as they would undo years' worth of work with the community.



- Asked if this could include up-zoning banking, so if certain areas were up-zoned, and another area needed to be downzoned, would this be allowed?

**Long:** Yes, bill allows for a “no net loss in residential capacity” approach

- State should indemnify cities in substandard building section, a legal nightmare.
- Shared concern for using a rent standard linked to national standards when it is known that the Bay Area and California more broadly have the highest rents in the nation.

**Long:** Noted the bill’s application is pegged to a national standard, but it doesn’t yet specify what percent *above the national average rent* and *below the national average vacancy rate* a jurisdiction’s average rent would need to be to fall under the bill’s provisions.

**Solano:**

- Noted ownership changes on projects after approval that slow or prevent construction. A subdivision approved in 2005 has had 3 owners since then and is now dead.
- Noted that Solano County is the most affordable county in the Bay Area region, however they still have a low vacancy rate of two percent.
- Noted Solano County residents have the longest commute times and imposing a 0.5 parking per unit would negatively affect them given county’s limited public transit.
- Stated that cities have to charge the fees they do because of Prop 13. Fix that first.
- Concerned allowing legalizing sub-standard buildings because they already had people in them would legalize flop houses, and places deemed unfit due to health hazards.

**Napa:**

- Stated SB 330 addressed too many issues, thought it would be ineffective because of it.

**Public comment:**

1. Stated allowing sub-standard buildings to be occupied would mean more low-income people living in unsuitable conditions. Finished by stating this entire part of SB 330 should be eliminated.
2. Noted this proposed bill doesn’t allow for the ongoing protection for some historical buildings and historic districts and that this should be revised.

**Discussion related to AB 1487 (Chiu):**

**Long:** Provided an overview of AB 1487, to fund Housing Alliance for the Bay Area (HABA), and explained that it is based on CASA Compact Item 10, the Regional Housing Entity (RHE).

**McMillan:** Stated that MTC/ABAG has not had the chance to review AB 1487.

**Marin:**

- Thought the sales tax funding would be problematic for the entire Bay Area, but definitely Marin.
- Questioned the efficiency of creating another government entity.

### **Napa:**

- Asked why ABAG can't do it? Asked who the members of HABA would be.
  - **Long:** Stated they would be representatives of MTC and ABAG, board members, the staff would be MTC/ABAG Staff. The bill specifies that more staff would likely be needed with housing expertise.

### **Sonoma:**

- **Chair Mackenzie:** Noted that ABAG and MTC will be having some deep conversations about the practicality of this, and implementation as well.
  - **Chair Pierce:** Noted these discussions would be happening in July.

### **Contra Costa:**

- Concern that continuing to increase taxes makes the region less competitive economically. Focus instead on redirecting existing on line sales tax revenue to the point of sale.
- Noted the housing crisis is a *statewide* problem and it needs a permanent *statewide* funding source. Sales and parcel taxes are all we have to fund schools, parks and local infrastructure.
- Stated they didn't think MTC should be part of this new organization. Has had issues with the way MTC handled transportation funding and its distribution in the past.
- Noted that a new regional agency isn't needed to secure or allocate housing funds, the counties can do it. Many have a system in place now to allocate state and county funds.
- Wondered if the role of HABA could be managed through existing non-profits.
- Emphasized the taxes should be on large employers (e.g. head tax) and proportionally adjusted upward in areas contributing the most to the jobs-housing imbalance such as San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara County.
- Noted that for linkage fees, the term "mixed use" should be better defined in the bill.
  - **Long:** Noted MTC staff will pass this along to the author.

### **Alameda:**

- Didn't appreciate proposal for new regional body given how CASA didn't include smaller cities until after Compact was done, instead of including them earlier in the conversation.
- Concerned three biggest cities would have disproportionate amount of power in HABA.
- Stated that if this work needs a regional administrative body, it should be ABAG.
- Concerned it doesn't address jobs-housing balance by city or by sub-region (East/West).
- Stated this could increase social injustice by forcing more low-income workers to commute even greater distances to work so they spend more time away from family.
- Urged more transit investments that help people moving to the Tri-Valley, Tracy and Stockton get to and from work in Bay Area quicker and easier.
- Stated that the Bay Area is already heavily taxed. If you increase taxes on residents, they'll have less money to spend on necessities at local businesses.
- Noted this doesn't address the need to fund more transit, schools, etc. for new residents.
- Asked what happens when regional tax measures compete with local tax measures.
- Noted this doesn't take into account the innovative things many cities are already doing.

### **Santa Clara:**

- Noted Santa Clara passed a \$950 million bond for affordable housing. A regional tax on top of that would cause outrage with residents that would see it as double taxation.
- Worried this would adversely affect the Caltrain Measure going on the ballot in 2020.
- Liked idea of using the point of origin sales tax from online transactions to fund housing.
- Opposed new layer of regional bureaucracy. Suggested that all new housing funds go directly to cities by formula. Any money not spent by a city within three years goes back to the county. Opposed any of the funds being used for general fund as reward for achieving housing goals; should all be for affordable housing directly.
- Noted that the City Association of Santa Clara County supports ABAG playing this role.
- One job-rich city stated that it is considering limiting future office growth.
- Shared they are concerned about redundancies with funding sources, double taxation.
  - **Long:** Discussed that with any sales tax increase for housing, the amount would be reduced proportionally in each jurisdiction where a sales tax measures was already dedicated to housing.

### **San Mateo:**

- Prefer to see new resources come from the state.
- Concerned they do not qualify for the various affordable housing funds; they have not qualified for redevelopment funds in the past.
- Affirmed they oppose new regional agency that will only be responsive to three big cities.
- Concern about a drain of resources from small cities going to big ones.
- Noted they recently spent \$150 million to expand local school capacity but will soon need more.
- Brought up Caltrain 1/8 cent sales tax going on ballot next year in Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Francisco Counties, they do not want to tax their county more than the already proposed tax increases. Want to dedicate sales and parcel taxes for local needs.
- Stated they'd be happy with a head tax for bigger employers in their county and suggested state legislature vote to give counties the direct authority to charge larger employers a head tax so big companies can start to make ongoing contributions.

### **San Francisco:**

- Stated support for AB 1487 and felt the technical assistance and data a regional housing entity could provide cities across the region is a very important part of it.
- Noted that unlike other urban centers *most, if not all*, of the Bay Area is unaffordable.
- Noted that we do transportation funding regionally, we should do the same for housing and ABAG currently provides regional funding through the San Francisco Estuary Partnership and SF Restoration Authority (\$25 million/year thru regional Measure AA).
- Taxes aren't the top contributor to the Bay Area's high cost of living.
- Stated that even if San Francisco had not accepted so many new tech jobs those jobs would have gone somewhere else in the Bay Area.

### **Solano:**

- Would like to see more of a focus on the jobs-housing balance, they would welcome employers such as Facebook or Amazon and house their employees as well.
- Liked variable head tax, high in SF and Silicon Valley, low or none in Solano.
- Suggested if MTC and ABAG each get 9 seats on the board, one be from each county. Bill should specify how counties are represented.
  - **Chair Pierce:** Noted that there are lots of small cities on the ABAG Board.
  - **Chair Mackenzie:** Stated that historically MTC has engaged in regional planning and addressed more than just transportation. Noted MTC engagement on housing furthers the implementation of the Plan Bay Area 2040 Action Plan.
- Noted that AB 1487 felt like another example of legislators coming up with big picture ideas without fully thinking through the many potential unintended consequences.

**Public Comment:**

1. Stated he opposed AB 1487 because ABAG and MTC boards have not reviewed the bill or agreed to staff HABA.
2. Noted she works for a non-profit organization that worked on AB 1487 with Senator Chiu and believes AB 1487 will go a long way to helping to correct the housing crisis. She doesn't see it as a big agency but more like a storefront operation that provides technical assistance, funding and data to local jurisdictions that want to build more housing. She said she wanted to speak to people after the meeting was over if they had any questions for her or the non-profit she represents. She also said that if people don't like this bill, she would ask them what else they think the state could do to help build more housing.
3. On phone: Stated that they should use staff in housing authorities in the region and hire more to scale up to the challenges rather than make an entirely new entity or out of MTC or ABAG staff.

**Adjournment/Next Meeting:**

They decided to proceed with discussion of SB 50 (Weiner), SB 4 (McGuire and Beall), AB 1279 (Bloom), and AB 1483 (Grayson), at their next meeting on April 25, 2019.

### Past Production

Figure 1.1 shows the annual growth in housing units from 2000-2015 compared to the current projected average annual need of 180,000 new homes.

**Figure 1.1**  
**Annual Production of Housing Units 2000-2015**  
Compared to Projected Statewide Need for Additional Homes



Sources: 2000-2015 New construction housing permit data from Construction Industry Research Board. 2015-2025 Projected Annual Need from HCD Analysis of State of California, Department of Finance P-4: State and County Projected Households, Household Population, Group Quarters, and Persons per Household 2010-2030—Based on Baseline 2013 Population Projection Series. Estimate is subject to change until final release. Graphic by HCD. Note: Prior Statewide Housing Plan, "Raising the Roof" (1997-2020), projected California needed to add an average of 220,000 new homes/yr to keep up with projected population increases; updated projected need is less due to lower population increase projections and higher household formation rates.

G	H	I	J
1	Which city do you represent?	Are there planning guidelines in your city that have increased opportunities for housing development, zoning changes, Precise/Specific Plans, etc? (text box will allow a long answer)	What has worked in your city to provide more affordable housing opportunities? What would you like to see the State do to facilitate expanded housing development opportunities and housing funding in your City?
2	Campbell	We are in the process of a General Plan update and we've given direction to the GP Advisory Committee and Staff to propose opportunities for housing, including below market, throughout the city vs. consolidating our growth in one area. In addition, Council has recently approved applications to permit requests for zoning changes that have the potential to open up additional large parcels for new housing and/or mixed use. We have additional commercial properties in mind that might fit into the same category and the general direction seems to indicate flexibility in how we zone those parcels for future residential and commercial uses.	Density bonuses, especially for rental properties when we couldn't otherwise mandate below market rentals due to State law, have provided additional BMR units in our city. They have also been effective in adding affordable units in for sale developments. We've also engaged with a BMR Administrator (House Keys) and, while this doesn't by itself increase the number of affordable housing units, it does make it easier for buyers to navigate through the purchase process and for rentals, it's enabled us to verify that BMR tenants still qualify for the affordable housing units they occupy and, when they no longer qualify, it opens up those units to others who do and who historically have been waitlisted.
3	Cupertino	The Housing Element was adopted in May 2015 with zoning standards that allowed for speedy accommodation of RHNA. By September 2016, the City approved two housing projects totaling 788 net new units and 342 replacement units.	City BMR Affordable Housing Funds (funded by Housing Mitigation Fees) CDBG Funds Inclusionary Housing Ordinance ADUs
4	Gilroy	Specific Plans, establishing 20 du/ac. minimum density in multi-family residential zones	Approval of building permits for 80 Very Low and 480 Low Income dwelling units in the last four years. 15% Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirement in Neighborhood District areas. Rezoning sites to allow residential at 20-30 du/ac.
5	Los Altos	We have increased our inclusionary housing requirements.	Focus incentives for increased housing in job-rich and transit-rich areas. Small cities with minimal economic development opportunities need support to increase employment opportunities. Small cities will still have significant challenges achieving future RHNA targets.
6	Los Altos	The Housing Element of our General Plan includes numerous goals, policies, and programs that support the development of housing, including affordable housing in Los Altos. In addition the City has an inclusionary and density bonus regulations in place that provide for the production of affordable housing and there is a housing impact fee that will provide funds that support affordable housing.	I would like the HCD to be less threatening and allow cities to take the steps they need that will address their specific needs for additional housing.
7	Los Altos Hills	Yes, the Town's prohibition on most non-residential land uses and favorable treatment of home occupations under our Zoning Ordinance ensures a job-housing balance that is very favorable to housing.	The State should make available meaningful grants for small communities like Los Altos, that can be used to leverage funds collected by the City to support and provide affordable housing.
8	Los Gatos	-We have an adopted North 40 Specific Plan that is facilitating phase one construction of approximately 340 units. -The Town has updated its ADU regulations, and ADU approvals have risen significantly since then. -We have a longstanding Below Market Price housing ordinance which requires the on-site construction of 20% affordable housing with very limited exceptions to pay an in lieu fee.	The Town's ADU program is successful and our zoning rules make it relatively easy to obtain a development permit for an ADU.
9	Los Gatos	Yes, we have 1 specific plan (North 40) and Affordable Housing Overlays throughout the town.	The Town is mostly built out under our current density and zoning rules and so there's nothing helpful that the State can do to facilitate expanded housing development opportunities and housing funding in the Town.
10	Milpitas	1. The updates to the Municipal Zoning Code for Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) (2nd reading for adoption going to CC on May 7th) will increase the access single-family homeowners have to alternative living arrangements and/or newly created rental income streams. Homeowners may pursue ADU construction for many reasons such as creating rental income to offset a mortgage, housing relatives, assisting in the downsizing and aging in place, or increasing a property's resale value. From the City's perspective, ADUs offer a community benefit to help address the community's need for creating more affordable housing options. These updated guidelines will also ensure a streamlined process of approval from Planning, Building, Fire, and Land Development departments. 2. The current updates to the City of Milpitas General Plan, Midtown Specific Plan and Transit Area Specific Plan (TASP) generally incentivize the development of housing through housing and affordable housing density bonuses, the availability of CDBG funding to support development entitlement, and reduced parking requirements. The General Plan update includes 14 opportunity areas and potential locations to accommodate future growth, support economic development through the revitalization of neighborhood commercial centers, and the introduction of new housing. The Midtown Specific Plan update centers around the realization of a major city corridor, to create a vibrant mixed-use district that will address the City's evolving needs including new residential development, streetscape improvements and to spur development through increased FARs, potential reductions in parking requirements to account for the walkability of the corridor and other community benefits. The TASP updates focused on the intensification of transit-oriented mixed-use development, that offers incentives to developers with	-Updating our ADU regulations. -Implementing our longstanding Below Market Price housing ordinance which requires the on-site construction of 20% affordable housing with very limited exceptions to pay an in lieu fee.
11	Monte Sereno	The City's current Housing Element has been certified by HCD. Beyond those outlined in our Housing Element, the City doesn't have any additional planning guidelines to increase the opportunities for housing development, zoning changes, Precise/Specific Plans, etc.	ADUs and a mandatory 20% inclusionary policy on 5 units or more.
12	Morgan Hill	Downtown Specific Plan and EIR, General Plan Update 2016 density increase of residential property	A fund similar to RDA
13	Mountain View	Last year, the City approved the North Bayshore Precise Plan, which would allow the development of approximately 10,000 residential units with a minimum 20% affordable housing goal. In addition, the City is in the process of developing the E. Whisman Precise Plan which would plan for approximately 5,000 housing units, also with a 20% percent affordability goal. It is scheduled for City Council consideration on May 7, 2019. Both Precise Plans encourage a mix of rental and ownership housing and use a Bonus FAR mechanism to achieve the affordable housing goals. The City has conducted a visioning plan for the Terra Bella neighborhood (south of 101 freeway/North Bayshore) and has studied the potential for up to 2,600 housing units. If the City continues with a Terra Bella Precise Plan, then the three Precise Plans would increase the Mountain View's residential capacity by 50%. The San Antonio and El Camino Real Precise Plans have also facilitated a significant number of market rate and affordable housing developments in the past few years.	1. The City has been successful in funding the development of affordable housing with Housing Authority funds, including but not limited to Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, and a partnership with the county using Measure A funding. Similarly, the City has been able to leverage existing partnerships with developers to secure additional deed restricted units that were once fair market rate units. 2. The City has engaged in more outreach around its below market rate (BMR) housing program. Additionally, City staff been able to promote more first time home-buyer type programs to its constituents. 3. In June 2018, the City passed Affordable Housing Ordinance No. 297 which requires all new developments of 10 or more units to build at least 15% of those units as affordable. 4. The City recently passed the affordable housing residential in-lieu fees to promote the construction of more affordable housing in-lieu of paying a fee to construct the units. Additionally, the City established their non-residential affordable housing fees. 5. The City will fund Project Sentinel from CDBG and the Housing Fund to further promote access to affordable housing and to ensure tenants are protected.
14	Santa Clara	The City's General Plan currently designates lands in proximity of transit with density ranges that vary from a minimum of 37 DU/AC to a maximum of 100 DU/AC, and is considering a range of 85-350 DU/AC for the Tasman East Specific Plan scheduled for adoption later this year. The City has already identified and designated parcels as Focus Areas within the City for higher density residential development. The City has completed the preparation of a Specific Plan for the Lawrence Station Specific Plan area and is currently in the process of preparing Specific Plans for the Tasman East, El Camino Real, Patrick Henry Drive and Freedom Circle Specific Plan areas, with expected completion of the Specific Plan process for each in 2018, 2019 or 2020 depending upon the Plan area. Collectively these Plans will provide for over 20,000 new housing units, of which at least 2,000 would be BMR units as the City transitions to a 15% inclusionary requirement. Some of the market rate and BMR units are already permitted and under construction. A majority of units are expected to be permitted within the next five years, but implementation in some cases could take longer and will depend upon market conditions.	The ADUs constructed in our City count towards our very-low income level RHNA allocation. To-date we have permitted more than is required by our RHNA allocation.
15	Saratoga	Yes	No suggestions at this time.
16	Sunnyvale	• Lawrence Station Area Plan – Currently studying a housing increase of 2,839 units over the 2,323 unit development capacity that was approved in 2016 for a total of 5,162 units of development capacity. • El Camino Real Corridor Specific Plan – Currently studying a residential plus scenario that could result in a total of 6,900 units along El Camino Real • Evaluating the Moffett Park Specific Plan for potentially adding housing in one of our business parks. • Downtown Specific Plan – Studying the addition of 700+ new residential units in a commercial/office heavy location. • Land Use and Transportation Element of the Sunnyvale General Plan - Adopted in 2016 with a development potential of 6,000 new units predominately in the areas mentioned above, but also in other areas of the City (e.g. Village Centers) • Housing Strategy currently underway which could result in program recommendations to increase housing supply. • Rezoned significant amount of industrial land to Residential uses between 1980 and 2018 (over 28,000 units, with many being property redevelopment initiated). • Updated Sunnyvale's ADU regulations over the last few years which has increased applications and tripled the number of permitted units in just the last year.	Support Chui AB 10 Bill to increase affordable Housing Tax Credit to \$550 M, Support Beall/McGuire SB 5. BTW: Also in response to Contra Costa the notes say: "Long: Stated the bill would allow land use policies capping growth that were approved by voters on or before January 1, 2019. I believe the date is "unless approved before Jan, 20, 2005
17	Sunnyvale	• Updated Sunnyvale's ADU regulations over the last few years which has increased applications and tripled the number of permitted units in just the last year.	The City Council seeks to address a variety of housing needs, including market rate housing, general affordable housing, homelessness response (including permanent supportive housing/apid rehousing), missing middle housing, and homeownership. The current funding sources are focused on the low and very low income populations (i.e. tax credits, AHP, CDBG, etc.) and there needs to be more resources for those populations. The City making significant progress towards its low and very low income RHNA numbers and more needs to be done. However, like most jurisdictions, little progress is made for the moderate income population because of the lack of funding and resources for that income category. The City seeks to facilitate moderate income housing by revising its BMR policies to help target housing for moderate income households and exploring homeownership opportunities. Funding from the State and modifying some of its policies (i.e. modify the density bonus law to encourage moderate income housing or income mixing) could help address the missing middle.
18	Sunnyvale	• The City recently entered into a Disposition and Development agreement with a developer to build 490-unit 100% affordable housing development with 25% of the unit allocated to household with developmental disabilities, on City-owned property in downtown Sunnyvale. In addition to the long-term lease of the land, the City has allocated \$12.5M to support development of this project. • HMF has been used to not only fund new units but also for rehabilitation and preservation of the existing affordable units that would otherwise be lost due to expiring deed restrictions or sale of property. • The City is currently working on a Housing Strategy Study to adopt policies that could stabilize mobile home parks, which can be one of main naturally occurring affordable housing opportunities in the city. • Currently updating inclusionary requirement for rental housing developments • Currently analyzing increasing the percentage of the inclusionary	Rethink and redesign local redevelopment agencies that previously provided roughly \$1 billion annually for affordable housing. A new bill would allow cities and counties to establish similar agencies to boost affordable housing stock, improve public transit and reduce climate-warming carbon emissions, with greater oversight and management.
19	Sunnyvale	• The City's Housing Mitigation Funds (HMF) have been used to fund new affordable housing developments, this fee is charged on commercial developments. A new RFP will be issued in summer of 2019 to fund new affordable housing developments over \$50 million in HMFs have been awarded since 1980. • The City recently entered into a Disposition and Development agreement with a developer to build 490-unit 100% affordable housing development with 25% of the unit allocated to household with developmental disabilities, on City-owned property in downtown Sunnyvale. In addition to the long-term lease of the land, the City has allocated \$12.5M to support development of this project. • HMF has been used to not only fund new units but also for rehabilitation and preservation of the existing affordable units that would otherwise be lost due to expiring deed restrictions or sale of property. • The City is currently working on a Housing Strategy Study to adopt policies that could stabilize mobile home parks, which can be one of main naturally occurring affordable housing opportunities in the city. • Currently updating inclusionary requirement for rental housing developments • Currently analyzing increasing the percentage of the inclusionary	Dedicated funding for affordable housing. • Support and maintain local control. • Don't completely disregard CEQA when the effects of denser streamlined projects need to be further evaluated in regards to traffic and infrastructure needs (which shouldn't immediately be burdened on existing property owners). • Remove the notion that one size fits all. Cities/Counties with successful housing programs and housing development should not be penalized the same as cities not doing their fair share. • Increase state wide funding programs, such as the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program or other development funds, similar to the two Bills passed in 2018 (i.e. real estate development fees to fund housing). • Do not divert funding that goes to Cities/Counties to instead be used for a regional housing approach. • Improve transportation and transit lines before assuming they have capacity for extra growth/density. • Analyze opportunity centers (not just frequency of buses or number of job centers) before laying on new policies that would affect them. • Get a better understanding for the existing residents on their viewpoint towards housing in their community before removing public engagement opportunities. The advocates are loud, neighbors may not be. • Include cities and counties in outreach and education on new legislation. Provide technical support for smaller, less staffed cities to be able to accommodate all changes. • Encourage politicians to work together on bills. There is too much overlap and bills are often not written clearly or accurately leaving implementation difficult if not impossible.
20	Sunnyvale	• The City's Housing Mitigation Funds (HMF) have been used to fund new affordable housing developments, this fee is charged on commercial developments. A new RFP will be issued in summer of 2019 to fund new affordable housing developments over \$50 million in HMFs have been awarded since 1980. • The City recently entered into a Disposition and Development agreement with a developer to build 490-unit 100% affordable housing development with 25% of the unit allocated to household with developmental disabilities, on City-owned property in downtown Sunnyvale. In addition to the long-term lease of the land, the City has allocated \$12.5M to support development of this project. • HMF has been used to not only fund new units but also for rehabilitation and preservation of the existing affordable units that would otherwise be lost due to expiring deed restrictions or sale of property. • The City is currently working on a Housing Strategy Study to adopt policies that could stabilize mobile home parks, which can be one of main naturally occurring affordable housing opportunities in the city. • Currently updating inclusionary requirement for rental housing developments • Currently analyzing increasing the percentage of the inclusionary	The City Council seeks to address a variety of housing needs, including market rate housing, general affordable housing, homelessness response (including permanent supportive housing/apid rehousing), missing middle housing, and homeownership. The current funding sources are focused on the low and very low income populations (i.e. tax credits, AHP, CDBG, etc.) and there needs to be more resources for those populations. The City making significant progress towards its low and very low income RHNA numbers and more needs to be done. However, like most jurisdictions, little progress is made for the moderate income population because of the lack of funding and resources for that income category. The City seeks to facilitate moderate income housing by revising its BMR policies to help target housing for moderate income households and exploring homeownership opportunities. Funding from the State and modifying some of its policies (i.e. modify the density bonus law to encourage moderate income housing or income mixing) could help address the missing middle.