

AGENDA

Legislative Committee

Date: Thursday, May 9, 2019 - 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
 Place: San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
 1250 San Carlos Avenue
2nd Floor Auditorium
 San Carlos, California

PLEASE CALL Jean Higaki (599-1462) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

1	Public comment on related items not on the agenda.	Presentations are limited to 3 Minutes	
2	Approval of Minutes from April 11, 2019.	Action (O'Connell)	Pages 1-6
3	Review/ recommend approval of the C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified). Consider positions on: SB 50 (Wiener)	Action (Update from Shaw/Yoder/Antwih)	Pages 7-29
4	Receive an update regarding the MTC Housing Legislative Working Group (HLWG)	Information	Oral Report Or Handout
5	Adjournment	Action (O'Connell)	

NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, and on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker. Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

¹From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue.

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES
April 11, 2019**

At 5:23 P.M. Vice Chair Mahanpour called the Legislative Committee meeting to order in the 3rd Floor Gallagher Conference Room at the San Mateo Transit District Office.

Attendance sheet is attached.

Guests or Staff Attending:

Matt Robinson - Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih Inc. (call in)
Sandy Wong, Jean Higaki, Matt Fabry - C/CAG Staff

1. Public comment on related items not on the agenda.

No public comments

2. Approval of Minutes from March 14, 2019.

Member Garbarino moved and member Vaterlaus seconded approval of the March 14, 2019 minutes. Motion passed 8-0.

3. Update from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih (SYA).

Matt Robinson, with Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih Inc., provided a description and status update of bills that have enough details to consider for action:

SB 152 (Beall) Active Program Funding - This bill would increase the share of active transportation (ATP) funds dedicated to regional agencies to 75 percent, distributed by population. Currently, regional agencies receive 40 percent of the funding in the ATP funds for distribution. This bill would give MTC additional resources to program for ATP projects.

Staff clarified that San Mateo tends to compete better in the regional ATP program over the state program, so it would be advantageous to have a larger percent being decided at the region level.

AB 738 (Mullin) Affordable Housing - This bill would allow funds, that are set aside for construction of affordable housing, to be allocated across San Mateo County jurisdictions, allowing cities to pool resources and share credit on their housing production reports based on their proportionate share of funds contributed to fund the proposed affordable project.

It appears that this bill may not get far this year. Even though there is some support for the concept, the perception of any jurisdiction or county getting special treatment in terms of housing would have difficulty getting support in the legislature at this time.

AB 1568 (McCarty) Loss of Transportation Funding for Failure to Meet Housing Production Targets – Originally, this bill would require HCD to review each production report submitted by a city or county in to determine if that city or county has met the applicable minimum housing production goal for the reporting period. If a local agency fails to meet their production targets, the bill would originally require the Controller to withhold Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funding for that jurisdiction and deposit those funds in a separate escrow account for each city or county that is not in compliance.

The bill has since been modified so that it no longer withholds RMRA funds but instead prohibits the jurisdiction from applying for any state grants except for grants that assist the jurisdiction in meeting housing production goals and where it is unconstitutional to prohibit an application. It was still recommended to oppose tying all grants to housing production.

Budget Request - C/CAG staff have been working with Assembly Member Mullin’s staff on a budget request to advance designs of multi-benefit regional stormwater capture projects in San Mateo County. The Assembly Member submitted an \$8 million request to the Senate and Assembly budget committees for planning, environmental review, community engagement, alternatives analysis, and engineering design for regional stormwater retention projects, including existing project concepts in San Bruno and Redwood City. These projects would improve water quality, mitigate downstream flooding, protect downstream disadvantaged communities, recharge groundwater basins, provide alternative water supply, and build resiliency against climate change.

A letter from C/CAG would provide Assembly Member Mullin formal, on the record, support for the budget request in Sacramento. A letter from Assembly Mullin’s office to the assembly and senate budget committee was provided as a handout. A draft letter of support from C/CAG to the assembly and senate budget committee was included in the packet.

Member Vaterlaus asked for clarification if the request was only for stormwater capture or also for sea level rise projects. Member Chuang added that the request would only cover the design phase. Matt Fabry clarified that this funding could go towards large multi-benefit projects that are very expensive to design and build. These funds would help to fund pre-construction phases which is still estimated to cost several million.

Member Lewis asked if the funds would be available for other projects, such as an Atherton project, which has experienced some setbacks and might require more funds to proceed. Staff clarified that the funds could be used for environmental work, community engagement, alternative analysis, and design. It is not for construction capital. The request did not link the funding specifically to the three concepts mentioned in the request and left openings to include other projects. Member Lewis stated a need for financial help with community engagement.

Staff pointed to a \$500,000 grant that the County received for preliminary work on two of the concept projects and an additional \$100K to identify other regional projects. These funds could potentially be used to fund other projects as well.

Member Papan moved and member Carlton seconded a recommendation that the C/CAG Board send letters of support for SB 152 (Beall), AB 738 (Mullin), and Stormwater budget request (Mullin) and moved to oppose AB 1568 (McCarty) with modifications to the letter. Motion passed 9-0. Member Masur abstained due to not hearing the full discussion on some items.

A discussion about SB 50 followed. Staff noted that because general statements of opposition are likely to be ineffective or disregarded by legislators in Sacramento, staff is requesting that individual cities provide C/CAG staff with specific city issues or city position letters to support a position in a draft letter for the Legislative Committee and C/CAG Board's consideration at the May committee and board meeting.

Staff indicated that member O'Connell had sent in some specific points. Member Masur also pointed to a write up from the Cities Association of Santa Clara County that was emailed earlier to members and was also handed out at the meeting.

Matt Robinson provided an update of SB 50 (Wiener) and SB 4 (McGuire). Both passed the Senate housing committee last week. A lot of discussion and opposition was noted on both bills. Both authors of SB 50 and SB 4 are on the housing committee and agreed to talk with each other on merging the two bills. SB 50 has bipartisan support. The bill goes to governance and finance committee next, which McGuire chairs. Bills have till the end of April to move out of the policy committee and into the appropriations committee. He anticipates a lot of work will still be done to amend both bills.

Member Papan believes the committee should oppose SB 50 and added that the San Francisco board of supervisors and planning commission opposed SB 50 and that many cities in San Mateo county have written letters in opposition. She stated that Senator Wiener has visited San Mateo but not recognized the work done by jurisdictions. She expressed concern that if C/CAG does not oppose the bill now it will send the message that the bill is okay. She does not want that message to be encouraged. She expressed further concern that a delay on taking a position may result in a lost opportunity to pull the bill. She noted that C/CAG could be provide specifics on why there is opposition to the bill but that a position should be taken.

Chair O'Connell asked if any member brought information to the meeting, per staff request, that would be helpful to present to legislature at lobby day or to include in a letter for May consideration. She also believed that a position would be needed soon but that the committee and board would need to provide specific points to staff. Member Lewis stated that Senator Hill held a large meeting regarding SB 50 and that every city there was opposed to SB 50.

Chair O'Connell called on Cliff Lentz to speak. Cliff Lentz passed out some information from the MTC Housing Legislative Working Group (HLWG). He thanked the cities for putting their trust in Donna Colson, Don Horsley, and himself to represent them. The CASA compact was adopted by ABAG and MTC. A lot of legislation was sprouted from that effort that needs to be addressed now. Cliff asked the committee to define what it is that they collectively want. The City of Brisbane faced a similar loss of local control with their Baylands development project but negotiated with Senator Hill to come up with a compromise. He sited Burlingame's master

planning effort. Cliff would like a joint meeting with the HLWG and the Legislative Committee to understand what we want as a county and use it to change what the legislation is trying to impose and shape legislation to our county's terms.

Member Papan stated that she just sent staff a letter of opposition from the City of San Mateo. Chair O'Connell asked if the letter included specifics of opposition or positive things that they could point to. Member Papan said that there is a difference in perspectives. She doesn't believe in taking the tact of requesting amendments as the Senator will not be able to sufficiently amend the bill to remove negative impacts. Instead she wants to see the committee and board just take an oppose position that states specifics on why it negatively impacts jurisdictions.

Member Garbarino asked about the latest amendments for SB 50. There was no time to go into details.

4. Discussion in preparation for "2019 Lobby Day"

Staff pointed to a hand out of the latest version of the Lobby Day itinerary. There were still some blank slots on the schedule but a room and start date were set. Lunch will be brought into the room. Matt Robinson is trying to set up a meeting with Housing and Community Development staff. He is also trying line up Senator Wiener and Assemblyman Berman.

Staff will send out parking information to members. Matt advised the committee not to script the discussion as much as past years and to provide more time for a free flowing discussion about the housing bills. This would be an opportunity to communicate main points to delegates and housing committee chairs. The committee will meet with Ronda Paschal and Mark Tollefson, who are housing policy staff from the Governor's office. The schedule should allow participants to leave by 3:15pm.

Staff pointed out that there was a handout provided with highlights regarding housing points that the group was suggested to review. It was staff's guess and it was requested that members look at some of the points and other provided resources to solidify some points to make at Lobby Day, during the half hour preparation time before the meetings.

Member Papan asked about bills in other areas that should be discussed in regards to transportation and water. Staff replied that those area were more straight forward and due to time constraints wanted to focus the discussion on housing points.

Member Carlton asked if a conference call before Lobby Day was needed. Chair O'Connell suggested that members review the resources that staff provided and bring their top three point to staff to compile and provide during the preparation time before meetings start. Chair O'Connell stated that San Bruno, Brisbane, and Burlingame all put in a lot of effort to develop plans around transit. San Bruno's plan contains almost everything in SB 50 except the parking and noted that the plan has buyoff from the community.

She is hoping to bring the message that there should be some sort of exemption for the cities that are doing or have done their part in addressing housing near transit. It could also be requested

that the state give jurisdictions some time and financial help to develop their own locally accepted plans that addresses the overall goals that state legislators want to see.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:00 P.M.

Legislative Committee 2019 Attendance Record

Agency	Name	Jan 10	Feb 14	March 14	April 11	May 9	June 13	July 11	August	Sept 12	Oct	Nov	Dec 12
Elizabeth Lewis	Atherton	N/A	N/A	x	x								
Foster City	Catherine Mahanpour	x		x	x								
Hillsborough	Marie Chuang (C/CAG Vice Chair)	x	x	x	x								
Menlo Park	Catherine Carlton		x		x								
Millbrae	Gina Papan	x	x		x								
Pacifica	Sue Vaterlaus	x	x	x	x								
Portola Valley	Maryann Moise Derwin (C/CAG Chair)	x	x	x	x								
Redwood City	Shelly Masur	x		x	x								
San Bruno	Irene O'Connell (Leg Vice Chair)	x	x	x	x								
Sounth San Francisco	Richard Garbarino	x	x	x	x								

 no meeting

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: May 9, 2019

To: C/CAG Legislative Committee

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

Subject: Review and recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified).

(For further information, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee review and recommend the C/CAG Board to take a position on any legislation or direct staff to monitor any legislation for future positions to be taken.

FISCAL IMPACT

Unknown.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

The C/CAG Legislative Committee receives monthly written reports and oral briefings from the C/CAG's State legislative advocates. Important or interesting issues that arise out of that meeting are reported to the Board.

For SB 50 (Wiener) Planning and Zoning: Housing Development: Equitable Communities Incentives – This bill is in the process of being revised and there appears to be mixed positions from legislative committee members and board members. Revisions of the bill will be presented at the C/CAG Legislative Committee meeting and the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

1. May 2019 Legislative update from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih, Inc.
2. SB 50 (Wiener) as amended on May 1, 2019
3. Full Legislative information is available for specific bills at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>



SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, inc.
LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

DATE: April 29, 2019
TO: Board Members, City/County Association of Governments, San Mateo County
FROM: Andrew Antwih and Matt Robinson, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.
RE: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – May 2019

Legislative Update

The Legislature returned from Spring Recess on April 22. Policy committees had until April 26 to hear bills that have a fiscal impact to the state and May 31 marks the house of origin deadline. The Governor will release his update to the proposed budget, the May Revise, around May 14. Many of the bills related to the CASA Compact were heard and amended in policy committees before April 26 and some will likely be held in the Appropriations Committees in the coming weeks. We are tracking a number of bills for C/CAG, some of which are identified under ***Bills of Interest*** below.

C/CAG Sacramento Visit

On Tuesday, April 23, C/CAG Legislative Committee members travelled to Sacramento for a series of meetings with members of the Legislature and Newsom Administration. The meetings predominantly focused on housing, legislation surrounding the CASA Compact, and C/CAG's \$8 million budget request for multi-benefit stormwater projects. Overall, it was a successful day and a lot of productive conversations were had with members.

Bills of Interest

SB 5 (Beall) Local-State Sustainable Investment Incentive Program*

This bill would establish the Local-State Sustainable Investment Incentive Program, which would be administered by the Sustainable Investment Incentive Committee. The bill would authorize a city, county, city and county, joint powers agency, enhanced infrastructure financing district, affordable housing authority, community revitalization and investment authority or transit village development district to apply to the Committee to participate in the program and would authorize the Committee to approve or deny applications for projects meeting specific criteria. Upon approval of a project application, the bill would require the Committee to issue an order directing the county auditor to reduce the total amount of ad valorem property tax revenue otherwise required to be contributed to the county's ERAF from the applicant by the annual reduction amount approved. The bill would require a county auditor, if the applicant is an enhanced infrastructure financing district, affordable housing authority, transit village development district, or community revitalization investment authority, to transfer to the district or authority an amount of property tax revenue equal to the reduction amount approved by the Committee.

SB 50 (Wiener) Planning and Zoning: Housing Development: Equitable Communities Incentives*

This bill was amended substantially in the Senate Governance and Finance Committee and as of this writing, the amendments have not come in to print. The bill would essentially grant development rights

for projects within certain proximity to rail and bus routes, or in jobs-rich areas. The amended version of the bill will apply different standards to counties with populations over 600,000, scale back the triggering frequency for bus routes, and make certain exemptions for the coastal zone and wildfire prone areas. Additional changes were made regarding parking minimums.

SB 128 (Beall) Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts: Bonds: Issuance

Existing law authorizes the public financing authority to issue bonds for these purposes upon approval by 55% of the voters voting on a proposal to issue the bonds. This bill would instead authorize the public financing authority to issue bonds for these purposes without submitting a proposal to the voters. The bill would require the resolution to issue bonds to contain specified information related to the issuance of the bonds. *C/CAG SUPPORTS this measure.*

SB 137 (Dodd) Federal Transportation Funds: State Exchange Programs

Existing federal law apportions transportation funds to the states under various programs, including the Surface Transportation Program and the Highway Safety Improvement Program, subject to certain conditions on the use of those funds. Existing law provides for the allocation of certain of those funds to local entities. Existing law provides for the exchange of federal and state transportation funds between local entities and the state under certain circumstances. This bill would authorize the Department of Transportation to allow the above-described federal transportation funds that are allocated as local assistance to be exchanged for Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program funds appropriated to the department. *C/CAG SUPPORTS this measure.*

SB 152 (Beall) Active Program Funding

This bill would increase the share of active transportation (ATP) funds dedicated to regional agencies to 75 percent, distributed by population. Currently, regional agencies receive 40 percent of the funding in the ATP funds for distribution. This bill would give MTC additional resources to program for ATP projects. *C/CAG SUPPORTS this measure.*

AB 11 (Chiu) Community Redevelopment Law of 2019*

This bill, the Community Redevelopment Law of 2019, would authorize cities and counties to create agencies that would use tax increment financing to fund affordable housing and infrastructure projects. This bill takes a similar approach to the tax increment financing structure used by the former redevelopment agencies.

AB 252 (Daly) Caltrans NEPA Delegation

Existing law, until January 1, 2020, provides that the State of California consents to the jurisdiction of the federal courts regarding the compliance, discharge, or enforcement of the responsibilities it assumed as a participant in the program. This bill would extend the operation of these provisions indefinitely. *C/CAG SUPPORTS this measure.*

AB 738 (Mullin) Affordable Housing

This bill would allow funds, that are set aside for construction of affordable housing, to be allocated across San Mateo County jurisdictions, allowing cities to pool resources and share credit on their housing production reports based on their proportionate share of funds contributed to fund the proposed affordable project. The amount of credit a jurisdiction may take shall not exceed 25% of its overall housing need allocation. *C/CAG SUPPORTS this measure.*

AB 825 (Mullin) San Mateo County Flood Control District

Existing law, the San Mateo County Flood Control District Act, establishes the San Mateo County Flood Control District for the purpose of controlling the floodwater and stormwater of the County of San Mateo. This bill would modify the District to change the name to the Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency Agency, revise the governance to a seven-member board including five city council representatives and

two county supervisors, expanding authorities to address sea level rise, and updating funding and financing authorities to reflect changes in the State Constitution since the Act was first written.

C/CAG SUPPORTS this measure.

AB 847 (Grayson) Transportation Funding to Incentivize Housing

This bill would require HCD to review each production report submitted by a city or county in to determine if that city or county has met the applicable minimum housing production goal for the reporting period. The bill would redirect transportation revenues currently used for debt-service (e.g. vehicle weight fees) to be apportioned by the Controller to cities and counties if they have been certified by HCD to have met their very low-income housing goals or low-income housing goals.

AB 1487 (Chiu) Regional Housing Funding*

This bill would enact the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Housing Finance Act and establish the Housing Alliance for the Bay Area (HABA), a regional entity governed by members of MTC and ABAG. HABA would be tasked with establishing a regional funding program to address housing needs in the Bay Area. The funding source is unspecified and left to HABA to determine what's likely to meet the region's needs and garner voter-approval. A portion of the revenues would be returned to each county and a portion would be controlled by HABA.

AB 1568 (McCarty) Loss of Transportation Funding for Failure to Meet Housing Production Targets

This bill would require HCD to review each production report submitted by a city or county in to determine if that city or county has met the applicable minimum housing production goal for the reporting period. If a local agency fails to meet their production targets, the bill would prohibit the entity from applying for certain state grants, including the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program.

C/CAG OPPOSES this measure.

ACA 1 (Aguiar-Curry) Local Government Financing: Affordable Housing and Public Infrastructure: Voter Approval.

This constitutional amendment would lower the necessary voter threshold from a two-thirds supermajority to 55 percent to approve local general obligation bonds and special taxes for affordable housing and public infrastructure projects. ***C/CAG SUPPORTS this measure.***

*Bills marked with an * are being tracked by MTC as implementing elements of the CASA Compact. These bills are not sponsored by MTC. The above list does not include all bills MTC has identified.*


[Home](#)
[Bill Information](#)
[California Law](#)
[Publications](#)
[Other Resources](#)
[My Subscriptions](#)
[My Favorites](#)

SB-50 Planning and zoning: housing development: incentives. (2019-2020)

SHARE THIS:



Date Published: 05/01/2019 09:00 PM

AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 01, 2019

AMENDED IN SENATE MARCH 11, 2019

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE— 2019–2020 REGULAR SESSION

SENATE BILL

No. 50

Introduced by Senator Wiener
(Coauthors: Senators Caballero, Hueso, Moorlach, Skinner, and Stone)
(Coauthors: Assembly Members Burke, *Chu*, Diep, Fong, Kalra, Kiley, Low, *McCarty*, Robert Rivas, Ting, and Wicks)

December 03, 2018

An act to amend Section 65589.5 of, *to add Sections 65913.5 and 65913.6 to*, and to add Chapter 4.35 (commencing with Section 65918.50) to Division 1 of Title 7-~~of~~ *of*, the Government Code, relating to housing.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 50, as amended, Wiener. Planning and zoning: housing development: incentives.

Existing

(1) Existing law authorizes a development proponent to submit an application for a multifamily housing development that satisfies specified planning objective standards to be subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process, as provided, and not subject to a conditional use permit.

This bill would authorize a development proponent of a neighborhood multifamily project located on an eligible parcel to submit an application for a streamlined, ministerial approval process that is not subject to a conditional use permit. The bill would define a "neighborhood multifamily project" to mean a project to construct a multifamily structure on vacant land, or to convert an existing structure that does not require substantial exterior alteration into a multifamily structure, consisting of up to 4 residential dwelling units and that meets local height, setback, and lot coverage zoning requirements as they existed on July 1, 2019. The bill would also define "eligible parcel" to mean a parcel that meets specified requirements, including requirements relating to the location of the parcel and restricting the demolition of certain housing development that may already exist on the site.

This bill would require a local agency to notify the development proponent in writing if the local agency determines that the development conflicts with any of the requirements provided for streamlined ministerial approval; otherwise, the development is deemed to comply with those requirements. The bill would limit the

authority of a local agency to impose parking standards or requirements on a streamlined development approved pursuant to these provisions, as provided. The bill would provide that the approval of a project under these provisions expires automatically after 3 years, unless that project qualifies for a one-time, one-year extension of that approval. The bill would provide that approval pursuant to its provisions would remain valid for 3 years and remain valid thereafter, so long as vertical construction of the development has begun and is in progress, and would authorize a discretionary one-year extension, as provided. The bill would prohibit a local agency from adopting any requirement that applies to a project solely or partially on the basis that the project receives ministerial or streamlined approval pursuant to these provisions.

This bill would allow a local agency to exempt a project from the streamlined ministerial approval process described above by finding that the project will cause a specific adverse impact to public health and safety, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the adverse impact.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA does not apply to the approval of ministerial projects.

This bill would establish a streamlined ministerial approval process for neighborhood multifamily and transit-oriented projects, thereby exempting these projects from the CEQA approval process.

*(2) Existing law, known as the ~~Density Bonus Law~~, *density bonus law*, requires, when an applicant proposes a housing development within the jurisdiction of a local government, that the city, county, or city and county provide the developer with a density bonus and other incentives or concessions for the production of lower income housing units or for the donation of land within the development if the developer, among other things, agrees to construct a specified percentage of units for very low, low-, or moderate-income households or qualifying residents.*

*This bill would require a city, county, or city and county to grant upon request an equitable communities incentive when a development proponent seeks and agrees to construct a residential development, as defined, that satisfies specified criteria, including, among other things, that the residential development is either a job-rich housing project or a transit-rich housing project, as those terms are defined; the site does not contain, or has not contained, housing occupied by tenants or accommodations withdrawn from rent or lease in accordance with specified law within specified time periods; and the residential development complies with specified additional requirements under existing law. *The bill would impose additional requirements on a residential development located within a county with a population equal to or less than 600,000.* The bill would require that a residential development *within a county with a population greater than 600,000 that is* eligible for an equitable communities incentive ~~receive~~ *receive, upon request*, waives from maximum controls on density and minimum ~~controls on~~ automobile parking requirements greater than 0.5 parking spots per ~~unit, up to 3 additional incentives or concessions under the Density Bonus Law, and~~ unit. *The bill would require that a residential development also receive* specified additional waivers if the residential development is located within a 1/2-mile or 1/4-mile radius of a major transit stop, as defined. *For a residential development within a county with a population equal to or less than 600,000, the bill would instead require that the incentive provide waivers from maximum controls on density, subject to certain limitations; maximum height limitations less than or equal to one story, or 15 feet, above the highest allowable height for mixed use or residential use; maximum floor area ratio requirements less than 0.6 times the number of stories in the proposed project; and minimum automobile parking requirements, as provided.* The bill would require a local government to grant an equitable communities incentive unless it makes a specified finding regarding the effects of the incentive on any real property or historic district that is listed on a federal or state register of historical resources. The bill would authorize a local government to modify or expand the terms of an equitable communities incentive, provided that the equitable communities incentive is consistent with these provisions.*

The bill would include findings that the changes proposed by these provisions address a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair and, therefore, apply to all cities, including charter cities. The bill would also delay implementation of these provisions in *potentially* sensitive communities, as defined, until July 1, ~~2020,~~ *as provided.* *2020. The bill would further delay implementation of these provisions in sensitive communities, determined as provided, until January 1, 2026, unless the city or county in which the area is located votes to make these provisions applicable after a specified petition and public hearing process. On and after January 1, 2026, the bill would apply these provisions to a sensitive community unless the city or county adopts a community plan for the area that meets certain requirements.*

~~By adding to the duties of local planning officials, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.~~

The Housing Accountability Act prohibits a local agency from disapproving, or conditioning approval in a manner that renders infeasible, a housing development project ~~for very low, low, or moderate income households or an emergency shelter~~ *that complies with applicable, objective general plan, zoning, and subdivision standards and criteria in effect at the time the application for the project is deemed complete* unless the local agency makes specified written findings based on a preponderance of the evidence in the record. That law provides that the receipt of a density bonus is not a valid basis on which to find a proposed housing development is inconsistent, not in compliance, or not in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision of that act.

This bill would additionally provide that the receipt of an equitable communities incentive is not a valid basis on which to find a proposed housing development is inconsistent, not in compliance, or not in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision of that act.

(3) By adding to the duties of local planning officials, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

Vote: majority Appropriation: no Fiscal Committee: yes Local Program: yes

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 65589.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65589.5. (a) (1) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(A) The lack of housing, including emergency shelters, is a critical problem that threatens the economic, environmental, and social quality of life in California.

(B) California housing has become the most expensive in the nation. The excessive cost of the state's housing supply is partially caused by activities and policies of many local governments that limit the approval of housing, increase the cost of land for housing, and require that high fees and exactions be paid by producers of housing.

(C) Among the consequences of those actions are discrimination against low-income and minority households, lack of housing to support employment growth, imbalance in jobs and housing, reduced mobility, urban sprawl, excessive commuting, and air quality deterioration.

(D) Many local governments do not give adequate attention to the economic, environmental, and social costs of decisions that result in disapproval of housing development projects, reduction in density of housing projects, and excessive standards for housing development projects.

(2) In enacting the amendments made to this section by the act adding this paragraph, the Legislature further finds and declares the following:

(A) California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions. The consequences of failing to effectively and aggressively confront this crisis are hurting millions of Californians, robbing future generations of the chance to call California home, stifling economic opportunities for workers and businesses, worsening poverty and homelessness, and undermining the state's environmental and climate objectives.

(B) While the causes of this crisis are multiple and complex, the absence of meaningful and effective policy reforms to significantly enhance the approval and supply of housing affordable to Californians of all income levels is a key factor.

(C) The crisis has grown so acute in California that supply, demand, and affordability fundamentals are characterized in the negative: underserved demands, constrained supply, and protracted unaffordability.

(D) According to reports and data, California has accumulated an unmet housing backlog of nearly 2,000,000 units and must provide for at least 180,000 new units annually to keep pace with growth through 2025.

(E) California's overall homeownership rate is at its lowest level since the 1940s. The state ranks 49th out of the 50 states in homeownership rates as well as in the supply of housing per capita. Only one-half of California's households are able to afford the cost of housing in their local regions.

(F) Lack of supply and rising costs are compounding inequality and limiting advancement opportunities for many Californians.

(G) The majority of California renters, more than 3,000,000 households, pay more than 30 percent of their income toward rent and nearly one-third, more than 1,500,000 households, pay more than 50 percent of their income toward rent.

(H) When Californians have access to safe and affordable housing, they have more money for food and health care; they are less likely to become homeless and in need of government-subsidized services; their children do better in school; and businesses have an easier time recruiting and retaining employees.

(I) An additional consequence of the state's cumulative housing shortage is a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions caused by the displacement and redirection of populations to states with greater housing opportunities, particularly working- and middle-class households. California's cumulative housing shortfall therefore has not only national but international environmental consequences.

(J) California's housing picture has reached a crisis of historic proportions despite the fact that, for decades, the Legislature has enacted numerous statutes intended to significantly increase the approval, development, and affordability of housing for all income levels, including this section.

(K) The Legislature's intent in enacting this section in 1982 and in expanding its provisions since then was to significantly increase the approval and construction of new housing for all economic segments of California's communities by meaningfully and effectively curbing the capability of local governments to deny, reduce the density for, or render infeasible housing development projects and emergency shelters. That intent has not been fulfilled.

(L) It is the policy of the state that this section should be interpreted and implemented in a manner to afford the fullest possible weight to the interest of, and the approval and provision of, housing.

(3) It is the intent of the Legislature that the conditions that would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health and safety, as described in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) and paragraph (1) of subdivision (j), arise infrequently.

(b) It is the policy of the state that a local government not reject or make infeasible housing development projects, including emergency shelters, that contribute to meeting the need determined pursuant to this article without a thorough analysis of the economic, social, and environmental effects of the action and without complying with subdivision (d).

(c) The Legislature also recognizes that premature and unnecessary development of agricultural lands for urban uses continues to have adverse effects on the availability of those lands for food and fiber production and on the economy of the state. Furthermore, it is the policy of the state that development should be guided away from prime agricultural lands; therefore, in implementing this section, local jurisdictions should encourage, to the maximum extent practicable, in filling existing urban areas.

(d) A local agency shall not disapprove a housing development project, including farmworker housing as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 50199.7 of the Health and Safety Code, for very low, low-, or moderate-income households, or an emergency shelter, or condition approval in a manner that renders the housing development project infeasible for development for the use of very low, low-, or moderate-income households, or an emergency shelter, including through the use of design review standards, unless it makes written findings, based upon a preponderance of the evidence in the record, as to one of the following:

(1) The jurisdiction has adopted a housing element pursuant to this article that has been revised in accordance with Section 65588, is in substantial compliance with this article, and the jurisdiction has met or exceeded its share of the regional housing need allocation pursuant to Section 65584 for the planning period for the income category proposed for the housing development project, provided that any disapproval or conditional approval shall not be based on any of the reasons prohibited by Section 65008. If the housing development project includes a mix of income categories, and the jurisdiction has not met or exceeded its share of the regional housing need for one or more of those categories, then this paragraph shall not be used to disapprove or conditionally approve the housing development project. The share of the regional housing need met by the jurisdiction shall be calculated consistently with the forms and definitions that may be adopted by the Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to Section 65400. In the case of an emergency shelter, the jurisdiction shall have met or exceeded the need for emergency shelter, as identified pursuant to paragraph (7) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583. Any disapproval or conditional approval pursuant to this paragraph shall be in accordance with applicable law, rule, or standards.

(2) The housing development project or emergency shelter as proposed would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the ~~specific~~ *specific*, adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households or rendering the development of the emergency shelter financially infeasible. As used in this paragraph, a "specific, adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete. Inconsistency with the zoning ordinance or general plan land use designation shall not constitute a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety.

(3) The denial of the housing development project or imposition of conditions is required in order to comply with specific state or federal law, and there is no feasible method to comply without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households or rendering the development of the emergency shelter financially infeasible.

(4) The housing development project or emergency shelter is proposed on land zoned for agriculture or resource preservation that is surrounded on at least two sides by land being used for agricultural or resource preservation purposes, or which does not have adequate water or wastewater facilities to serve the project.

(5) The housing development project or emergency shelter is inconsistent with both the jurisdiction's zoning ordinance and general plan land use designation as specified in any element of the general plan as it existed on the date the application was deemed complete, and the jurisdiction has adopted a revised housing element in accordance with Section 65588 that is in substantial compliance with this article. For purposes of this section, a change to the zoning ordinance or general plan land use designation subsequent to the date the application was deemed complete shall not constitute a valid basis to disapprove or condition approval of the housing development project or emergency shelter.

(A) This paragraph cannot be utilized to disapprove or conditionally approve a housing development project if the housing development project is proposed on a site that is identified as suitable or available for very low, low-, or moderate-income households in the jurisdiction's housing element, and consistent with the density specified in the housing element, even though it is inconsistent with both the jurisdiction's zoning ordinance and general plan land use designation.

(B) If the local agency has failed to identify in the inventory of land in its housing element sites that can be developed for housing within the planning period and are sufficient to provide for the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need for all income levels pursuant to Section 65584, then this paragraph shall not be utilized to disapprove or conditionally approve a housing development project proposed for a site designated in any element of the general plan for residential uses or designated in any element of the general plan for commercial uses if residential uses are permitted or conditionally permitted within commercial designations. In any action in court, the burden of proof shall be on the local agency to show that its housing element does identify adequate sites with appropriate zoning and development standards and with services and facilities to accommodate the local agency's share of the regional housing need for the very low, low-, and moderate-income categories.

(C) If the local agency has failed to identify a zone or zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without a conditional use or other discretionary permit, has failed to demonstrate that the identified zone or zones include sufficient capacity to accommodate the need for emergency shelter identified in paragraph (7) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, or has failed to demonstrate that the identified zone or zones can accommodate at least one emergency shelter, as required by paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, then this paragraph shall not be utilized to disapprove or conditionally approve an emergency shelter proposed for a site designated in any element of the general plan for industrial, commercial, or multifamily residential uses. In any action in court, the burden of proof shall be on the local agency to show that its housing element does satisfy the requirements of paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to relieve the local agency from complying with the congestion management program required by Chapter 2.6 (commencing with Section 65088) of Division 1 of Title 7 or the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code). ~~Neither shall anything~~ *Nothing* in this section *shall* be construed to relieve the local agency from making one or more of the findings required pursuant to Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code or otherwise complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code).

(f) (1) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a local agency from requiring the housing development project to comply with objective, quantifiable, written development standards, conditions, and policies appropriate to, and consistent with, meeting the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need

pursuant to Section 65584. However, the development standards, conditions, and policies shall be applied to facilitate and accommodate development at the density permitted on the site and proposed by the development.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a local agency from requiring an emergency shelter project to comply with objective, quantifiable, written development standards, conditions, and policies that are consistent with paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583 and appropriate to, and consistent with, meeting the jurisdiction's need for emergency shelter, as identified pursuant to paragraph (7) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583. However, the development standards, conditions, and policies shall be applied by the local agency to facilitate and accommodate the development of the emergency shelter project.

(3) This section does not prohibit a local agency from imposing fees and other exactions otherwise authorized by law that are essential to provide necessary public services and facilities to the housing development project or emergency shelter.

(4) For purposes of this section, a housing development project or emergency shelter shall be deemed consistent, compliant, and in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision if there is substantial evidence that would allow a reasonable person to conclude that the housing development project or emergency shelter is consistent, compliant, or in conformity.

(g) This section shall be applicable to charter cities because the Legislature finds that the lack of housing, including emergency shelter, is a critical statewide problem.

(h) The following definitions apply for the purposes of this section:

(1) "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.

(2) "Housing development project" means a use consisting of any of the following:

(A) Residential units only.

(B) Mixed-use developments consisting of residential and nonresidential uses with at least two-thirds of the square footage designated for residential use.

(C) Transitional housing or supportive housing.

(3) "Housing for very low, low-, or moderate-income households" means that either (A) at least 20 percent of the total units shall be sold or rented to lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code, or (B) 100 percent of the units shall be sold or rented to persons and families of moderate income as defined in Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code, or persons and families of middle income, as defined in Section 65008 of this code. Housing units targeted for lower income households shall be made available at a monthly housing cost that does not exceed 30 percent of 60 percent of area median income with adjustments for household size made in accordance with the adjustment factors on which the lower income eligibility limits are based. Housing units targeted for persons and families of moderate income shall be made available at a monthly housing cost that does not exceed 30 percent of 100 percent of area median income with adjustments for household size made in accordance with the adjustment factors on which the moderate-income eligibility limits are based.

(4) "Area median income" means area median income as periodically established by the Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code. The developer shall provide sufficient legal commitments to ensure continued availability of units for very low or low-income households in accordance with the provisions of this subdivision for 30 years.

(5) "Disapprove the housing development project" includes any instance in which a local agency does either of the following:

(A) Votes on a proposed housing development project application and the application is disapproved, including any required land use approvals or entitlements necessary for the issuance of a building permit.

(B) Fails to comply with the time periods specified in subdivision (a) of Section 65950. An extension of time pursuant to Article 5 (commencing with Section 65950) shall be deemed to be an extension of time pursuant to this paragraph.

(i) If any city, county, or city and county denies approval or imposes conditions, including design changes, lower density, or a reduction of the percentage of a lot that may be occupied by a building or structure under the applicable planning and zoning in force at the time the application is deemed complete pursuant to Section

65943, that have a substantial adverse effect on the viability or affordability of a housing development for very low, low-, or moderate-income households, and the denial of the development or the imposition of conditions on the development is the subject of a court action which challenges the denial or the imposition of conditions, then the burden of proof shall be on the local legislative body to show that its decision is consistent with the findings as described in subdivision (d) and that the findings are supported by a preponderance of the evidence in the record. For purposes of this section, "lower density" includes any conditions that have the same effect or impact on the ability of the project to provide housing.

(j) (1) When a proposed housing development project complies with applicable, objective general plan, zoning, and subdivision standards and criteria, including design review standards, in effect at the time that the housing development project's application is determined to be complete, but the local agency proposes to disapprove the project or to impose a condition that the project be developed at a lower density, the local agency shall base its decision regarding the proposed housing development project upon written findings supported by a preponderance of the evidence on the record that both of the following conditions exist:

(A) The housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety unless the project is disapproved or approved upon the condition that the project be developed at a lower density. As used in this paragraph, a "specific, adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete.

(B) There is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the adverse impact identified pursuant to paragraph (1), other than the disapproval of the housing development project or the approval of the project upon the condition that it be developed at a lower density.

(2) (A) If the local agency considers a proposed housing development project to be inconsistent, not in compliance, or not in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision as specified in this subdivision, it shall provide the applicant with written documentation identifying the provision or provisions, and an explanation of the reason or reasons it considers the housing development to be inconsistent, not in compliance, or not in conformity as follows:

(i) Within 30 days of the date that the application for the housing development project is determined to be complete, if the housing development project contains 150 or fewer housing units.

(ii) Within 60 days of the date that the application for the housing development project is determined to be complete, if the housing development project contains more than 150 units.

(B) If the local agency fails to provide the required documentation pursuant to subparagraph (A), the housing development project shall be deemed consistent, compliant, and in conformity with the applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision.

(3) For purposes of this section, the receipt of a density bonus pursuant to Section 65915 or an equitable communities incentive pursuant to Section 65918.51 shall not constitute a valid basis on which to find a proposed housing development project is inconsistent, not in compliance, or not in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision specified in this subdivision.

(4) For purposes of this section, a proposed housing development project is not inconsistent with the applicable zoning standards and criteria, and shall not require a rezoning, if the housing development project is consistent with the objective general plan standards and criteria but the zoning for the project site is inconsistent with the general plan. If the local agency has complied with paragraph (2), the local agency may require the proposed housing development project to comply with the objective standards and criteria of the zoning which is consistent with the general plan, however, the standards and criteria shall be applied to facilitate and accommodate development at the density allowed on the site by the general plan and proposed by the proposed housing development project.

(5) For purposes of this section, "lower density" includes any conditions that have the same effect or impact on the ability of the project to provide housing.

(k) (1) (A) The applicant, a person who would be eligible to apply for residency in the development or emergency shelter, or a housing organization may bring an action to enforce this section. If, in any action brought to enforce this section, a court finds that either (i) the local agency, in violation of subdivision (d), disapproved a housing development project or conditioned its approval in a manner rendering it infeasible for the development of an emergency shelter, or housing for very low, low-, or moderate-income households, including farmworker housing, without making the findings required by this section or without making findings supported by a preponderance of the evidence, or (ii) the local agency, in violation of subdivision (j), disapproved a housing development project

complying with applicable, objective general plan and zoning standards and criteria, or imposed a condition that the project be developed at a lower density, without making the findings required by this section or without making findings supported by a preponderance of the evidence, the court shall issue an order or judgment compelling compliance with this section within 60 days, including, but not limited to, an order that the local agency take action on the housing development project or emergency shelter. The court may issue an order or judgment directing the local agency to approve the housing development project or emergency shelter if the court finds that the local agency acted in bad faith when it disapproved or conditionally approved the housing development or emergency shelter in violation of this section. The court shall retain jurisdiction to ensure that its order or judgment is carried out and shall award reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit to the plaintiff or petitioner, except under extraordinary circumstances in which the court finds that awarding fees would not further the purposes of this section. For purposes of this section, "lower density" includes conditions that have the same effect or impact on the ability of the project to provide housing.

(B) (i) Upon a determination that the local agency has failed to comply with the order or judgment compelling compliance with this section within 60 days issued pursuant to subparagraph (A), the court shall impose fines on a local agency that has violated this section and require the local agency to deposit any fine levied pursuant to this subdivision into a local housing trust fund. The local agency may elect to instead deposit the fine into the Building Homes and Jobs *Trust* Fund, if Senate Bill 2 of the 2017-18 Regular Session is enacted, or otherwise in the Housing Rehabilitation Loan Fund. The fine shall be in a minimum amount of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) per housing unit in the housing development project on the date the application was deemed complete pursuant to Section 65943. In determining the amount of fine to impose, the court shall consider the local agency's progress in attaining its target allocation of the regional housing need pursuant to Section 65584 and any prior violations of this section. Fines shall not be paid out of funds already dedicated to affordable housing, including, but not limited to, Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Funds, funds dedicated to housing for very low, low-, and moderate-income households, and federal HOME Investment Partnerships Program and Community Development Block Grant Program funds. The local agency shall commit and expend the money in the local housing trust fund within five years for the sole purpose of financing newly constructed housing units affordable to extremely low, very low, or low-income households. After five years, if the funds have not been expended, the money shall revert to the state and be deposited in the Building Homes and Jobs *Trust* Fund, if Senate Bill 2 of the 2017-18 Regular Session is enacted, or otherwise in the Housing Rehabilitation Loan Fund, for the sole purpose of financing newly constructed housing units affordable to extremely low, very low, or low-income households.

(ii) If any money derived from a fine imposed pursuant to this subparagraph is deposited in the Housing Rehabilitation Loan Fund, then, notwithstanding Section 50661 of the Health and Safety Code, that money shall be available only upon appropriation by the Legislature.

(C) If the court determines that its order or judgment has not been carried out within 60 days, the court may issue further orders as provided by law to ensure that the purposes and policies of this section are fulfilled, including, but not limited to, an order to vacate the decision of the local agency and to approve the housing development project, in which case the application for the housing development project, as proposed by the applicant at the time the local agency took the initial action determined to be in violation of this section, along with any standard conditions determined by the court to be generally imposed by the local agency on similar projects, shall be deemed to be approved unless the applicant consents to a different decision or action by the local agency.

(2) For purposes of this subdivision, "housing organization" means a trade or industry group whose local members are primarily engaged in the construction or management of housing units or a nonprofit organization whose mission includes providing or advocating for increased access to housing for low-income households and have filed written or oral comments with the local agency prior to action on the housing development project. A housing organization may only file an action pursuant to this section to challenge the disapproval of a housing development by a local agency. A housing organization shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs if it is the prevailing party in an action to enforce this section.

(l) If the court finds that the local agency (1) acted in bad faith when it disapproved or conditionally approved the housing development or emergency shelter in violation of this section and (2) failed to carry out the court's order or judgment within 60 days as described in subdivision (k), the court, in addition to any other remedies provided by this section, shall multiply the fine determined pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (k) by a factor of five. For purposes of this section, "bad faith" includes, but is not limited to, an action that is frivolous or otherwise entirely without merit.

(m) Any action brought to enforce the provisions of this section shall be brought pursuant to Section 1094.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure, and the local agency shall prepare and certify the record of proceedings in

accordance with subdivision (c) of Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure no later than 30 days after the petition is served, provided that the cost of preparation of the record shall be borne by the local agency, unless the petitioner elects to prepare the record as provided in subdivision (n) of this section. A petition to enforce the provisions of this section shall be filed and served no later than 90 days from the later of (1) the effective date of a decision of the local agency imposing conditions on, disapproving, or any other final action on a housing development project or (2) the expiration of the time periods specified in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (5) of subdivision (h). Upon entry of the trial court's order, a party may, in order to obtain appellate review of the order, file a petition within 20 days after service upon it of a written notice of the entry of the order, or within such further time not exceeding an additional 20 days as the trial court may for good cause allow, or may appeal the judgment or order of the trial court under Section 904.1 of the Code of Civil Procedure. If the local agency appeals the judgment of the trial court, the local agency shall post a bond, in an amount to be determined by the court, to the benefit of the plaintiff if the plaintiff is the project applicant.

(n) In any action, the record of the proceedings before the local agency shall be filed as expeditiously as possible and, notwithstanding Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure or subdivision (m) of this section, all or part of the record may be prepared (1) by the petitioner with the petition or petitioner's points and authorities, (2) by the respondent with respondent's points and authorities, (3) after payment of costs by the petitioner, or (4) as otherwise directed by the court. If the expense of preparing the record has been borne by the petitioner and the petitioner is the prevailing party, the expense shall be taxable as costs.

(o) This section shall be known, and may be cited, as the Housing Accountability Act.

SEC. 2. *Section 65913.5 is added to the Government Code, to read:*

65913.5. *For purposes of this section and Section 65913.6, the following definitions shall apply:*

(a) *"Development proponent" means the developer who submits an application for streamlined approval pursuant to Section 65913.6.*

(b) *"Eligible parcel" means a parcel that meets all of the following requirements:*

(1) *The parcel satisfies the requirements specified in paragraphs (2) and (6) of subdivision (a) of Section 65913.4.*

(2) *The development of the project on the proposed parcel would not require the demolition or alteration of any of the following types of housing:*

(A) *Housing that is subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income.*

(B) *Housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power.*

(C) *Housing that has been occupied by tenants within the past 10 years.*

(3) *The site was not previously used for housing that was occupied by tenants that was demolished within 10 years before the development proponent submits an application under this section.*

(4) *The development of the project on the proposed parcel would not require the demolition of a historic structure that was placed on a national, state, or local historic register.*

(5) *The proposed parcel 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.*

(c) *"Local agency" means a city, including a charter city, a county, including a charter county, or a city and county, including a charter city and county.*

(d) *"Neighborhood multifamily project" means a project to construct a multifamily structure of up to four residential dwelling units that meets all of the following requirements:*

(1) *The project meets one of the following conditions:*

(A) *The parcel or parcels on which the neighborhood multifamily project would be located is vacant land, as defined in subdivision (e).*

(B) The project is a conversion of an existing structure that does not require substantial exterior alteration. For the purposes of this subparagraph, a project requires "substantial exterior alteration" if the project would require either of the following:

(i) The demolition of 25 percent or more of the existing exterior vertical walls, measured by linear feet.

(ii) Any building addition that would increase total interior square footage by more than 15 percent.

(2) (A) The neighborhood multifamily project meets all objective zoning standards and objective design review standards that do not conflict with this section or Section 65913.6. If, on or after July 1, 2019, a local agency adopts an ordinance that eliminates residential zoning designations or decreases residential zoning development capacity within an existing zoning district in which the development is located than what was authorized on July 1, 2019, then that development shall be deemed to be consistent with any applicable requirement of this section and Section 65913.6 if it complies with zoning designations not in conflict with this section and Section 65913.6 that were authorized as of July 1, 2019.

(B) For purposes of this paragraph, "objective zoning standards" and "objective design review standards" means standards that involve no personal or subjective judgment by a public official and are uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development proponent and the public official before the development proponent submits an application pursuant to this section. These standards include, but are not limited to, height, setbacks, floor area ratio, and lot coverage.

(3) The project provides at least 0.5 parking spaces per unit.

(e) "Vacant land" means either of the following:

(1) A property that contains no existing structures.

(2) A property that contains at least one existing structure, but the structure or structures have been unoccupied for at least five years and are considered substandard as defined by Section 17920.3 of the Health and Safety Code.

SEC. 3. *Section 65913.6 is added to the Government Code, to read:*

65913.6. *(a) For purposes of this section, the definitions provided in Section 65913.5 shall apply.*

(b) Except as provided in subdivision (g), a development proponent of a neighborhood multifamily project on an eligible parcel may submit an application for a development to be subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process provided by this section and not be subject to a conditional use permit if the development meets the requirements of this section and Section 65913.5.

(c) (1) If a local agency determines that a development submitted pursuant to this section is in conflict with any of the requirements specified in this section or Section 65913.5, it shall provide the development proponent written documentation of which requirement or requirements the development conflicts with, and an explanation for the reason or reasons the development conflicts with that requirement or requirements, as follows:

(A) Within 60 days of submission of the development to the local agency pursuant to this section if the development contains 150 or fewer housing units.

(B) Within 90 days of submission of the development to the local agency pursuant to this section if the development contains more than 150 housing units.

(2) If the local agency fails to provide the required documentation pursuant to paragraph (1), the development shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of this section and Section 65913.5.

(d) Any design review or public oversight of the development may be conducted by the local agency's planning commission or any equivalent board or commission responsible for review and approval of development projects, or the city council or board of supervisors, as appropriate. That design review or public oversight shall be objective and be strictly focused on assessing compliance with criteria required for streamlined projects, as well as any reasonable objective design standards published and adopted by ordinance or resolution by a local agency before submission of a development application, and shall be broadly applicable to development within the local agency. That design review or public oversight shall be completed as follows and shall not in any way inhibit, chill, or preclude the ministerial approval provided by this section or its effect, as applicable:

(1) Within 90 days of submission of the development to the local agency pursuant to this section if the development contains 150 or fewer housing units.

(2) *Within 180 days of submission of the development to the local agency pursuant to this section if the development contains more than 150 housing units.*

(e) *Notwithstanding any other law, a local agency, whether or not it has adopted an ordinance governing automobile parking requirements in multifamily developments, shall not impose automobile parking standards for a streamlined development that was approved pursuant to this section beyond those provided in the minimum requirements of Section 65913.5.*

(f) (1) *If a local agency approves a development pursuant to this section, that approval shall automatically expire after three years except that a project may receive a one-time, one-year extension if the project proponent provides documentation that there has been significant progress toward getting the development construction ready. For purposes of this paragraph, "significant progress" includes filing a building permit application.*

(2) *If a local agency approves a development pursuant to this section, that approval shall remain valid for three years from the date of the final action establishing that approval and shall remain valid thereafter for a project so long as vertical construction of the development has begun and is in progress. Additionally, the development proponent may request, and the local agency shall have discretion to grant, an additional one-year extension to the original three-year period. The local agency's action and discretion in determining whether to grant the foregoing extension shall be limited to considerations and process set forth in this section.*

(g) *This section shall not apply if the local agency finds that the development project as proposed would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, including, but not limited to, fire safety, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households. As used in this paragraph, a "specific, adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete. Inconsistency with the zoning ordinance or general plan land use designation shall not constitute a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety.*

(h) *A local agency shall not adopt any requirement, including, but not limited to, increased fees or inclusionary housing requirements, that applies to a project solely or partially on the basis that the project is eligible to receive ministerial or streamlined approval pursuant to this section.*

(i) *This section shall not affect a development proponent's ability to use any alternative streamlined by right permit processing adopted by a local agency, including the provisions of subdivision (i) of Section 65583.2 or 65913.4.*

SEC. 2. SEC. 4. Chapter 4.35 (commencing with Section 65918.50) is added to Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code, to read:

CHAPTER 4.35. Equitable Communities Incentives

65918.50. For purposes of this chapter:

(a) "Development proponent" means an applicant who submits an application for an equitable communities incentive pursuant to this chapter.

(b) "Eligible applicant" means a development proponent who receives an equitable communities incentive.

(c) "FAR" means floor area ratio.

(d) "High-quality bus corridor" means a corridor with fixed route bus service that meets all of the following criteria:

(1) It has average service intervals *for each line and in each direction* of no more than ~~15~~ 10 minutes during the three peak hours between 6 a.m. to 10 a.m., inclusive, and the three peak hours between 3 p.m. ~~and to~~ 7 p.m., inclusive, on Monday through Friday.

(2) It has average service intervals *for each line and in each direction* of no more than 20 minutes during the hours of 6 a.m. to 10 p.m., inclusive, on Monday through Friday.

(3) It has average *service* intervals *for each line and in each direction* of no more than 30 minutes during the hours of 8 a.m. to 10 p.m., inclusive, on Saturday and Sunday.

(e) (1) "Jobs-rich area" means an area identified by the Department of Housing and Community Development in consultation with the Office of Planning and Research that is ~~both~~ high opportunity and jobs rich, based on whether, in a regional analysis, the tract meets *both of* the following:

(A) The tract is ~~higher opportunity and~~ *high opportunity, meaning* its characteristics are associated with positive educational and economic outcomes for households of all income levels residing in the tract.

(B) The tract meets either of the following criteria:

(i) New housing sited in the tract would enable residents to live ~~in or near a jobs-rich area, as measured by employment density and job totals.~~ *near more jobs than is typical for tracts in the region.*

(ii) New housing sited in the tract would enable shorter commute distances for residents, ~~compared to existing commute levels.~~ *relative to existing commute patterns for people of all income levels.*

(2) The Department of Housing and Community Development shall, commencing on January 1, 2020, publish and update, every five years thereafter, a map of the state showing the areas identified by the department as "jobs-rich areas."

(f) "Job-rich housing project" means a residential development within ~~an area identified as a jobs-rich area by the Department of Housing and Community Development in consultation with the Office of Planning and Research, based on indicators such as proximity to jobs, high area median income relative to the relevant region, and high-quality public schools, as an area of high opportunity close to jobs.~~ *area.* A residential development shall be deemed to be within ~~an area designated as job-rich~~ *a jobs-rich area* if both of the following apply:

(1) All parcels within the project have no more than 25 percent of their area outside of the ~~job-rich~~ *jobs-rich* area.

(2) No more than 10 percent of residential units or 100 units, whichever is less, of the development are outside of the ~~job-rich~~ *jobs-rich* area.

(g) "Local government" means a city, including a charter city, a county, or a city and county.

(h) "Major transit stop" means a rail transit station or a ferry terminal that is a major transit stop pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code.

(i) "Potentially sensitive community" means any of the following:

(1) An area that is designated as "high segregation and poverty" or "low resource" on the 2019 Opportunity Maps developed by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee.

(2) A census tract that is in the top 25 percent scoring census tracts from the internet-based CalEnviroScreen 3.0 tool.

(3) A qualified census tract identified by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development for 2019.

(4) It is the intent of the Legislature to consider all of the following:

(A) Identifying additional communities as potentially sensitive communities in inland areas, areas experiencing rapid change in housing cost, and other areas based on objective measures of community sensitivity.

(B) Application of the process for determining sensitive communities established in subdivision (d) of Section 65918.55 to the San Francisco Bay area.

(j)

(j) "Residential development" means a project with at least two-thirds of the square footage of the development designated for residential use.

(k)

(k) "Sensitive community" means either of the following:

~~(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), an area identified by the Department of Housing and Community Development, which identification shall be updated every five years, in consultation with local community based organizations in each metropolitan planning region, as an area where both of the following apply:~~

~~(A) Thirty percent or more of the census tract lives below the poverty line, provided that college students do not compose at least 25 percent of the population.~~

~~(B) The location quotient of residential racial segregation in the census tract is at least 1.25 as defined by the Department of Housing and Community Development.~~

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), an area identified pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 65918.55.

(2) In the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, Santa Clara, San Francisco, San Mateo, Solano, and Sonoma, areas designated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission on December 19, 2018, as the intersection of disadvantaged and vulnerable communities as defined by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, which identification of a sensitive community shall be updated at least every five years by the Department of Housing and Community Development.

~~(C)~~

(I) "Tenant" means a person who does not own the property where they reside, including residential situations that are any of the following:

(1) Residential real property rented by the person under a long-term lease.

(2) A single-room occupancy unit.

(3) An accessory dwelling unit that is not subject to, or does not have a valid permit in accordance with, an ordinance adopted by a local agency pursuant to Section 65852.22.

(4) A residential motel.

(5) A mobilehome park, as governed under the Mobilehome Residency Law (Chapter 2.5 (commencing with Section 798) of Title 2 of Part 2 of Division 2 of the Civil Code), the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law (Chapter 2.6 (commencing with Section 799.20) of Title 2 of Part 2 of Division 2 of the Civil Code), the Mobilehome Parks Act (Part 2.1 (commencing with Section 18200) of Division 13 of the Health and Safety Code), or the Special Occupancy Parks Act (Part 2.3 (commencing with Section 18860) of Division 13 of the Health and Safety Code).

(6) Any other type of residential property that is not owned by the person or a member of the person's household, for which the person or a member of the person's household provides payments on a regular schedule in exchange for the right to occupy the residential property.

~~(D)~~

(m) "Transit-rich housing project" means a residential development, the parcels of which are all within a one-half mile radius of a major transit stop or a one-quarter mile radius of a stop on a high-quality bus corridor. A project shall be deemed to be within the radius if both of the following apply:

(1) All parcels within the project have no more than 25 percent of their area outside of a one-half mile radius of a major transit stop or a one-quarter mile radius of a stop on a high-quality bus corridor.

(2) No more than 10 percent of the residential units or 100 units, whichever is less, of the project are outside of a one-half mile radius of a major transit stop or a one-quarter mile radius of a stop on a high-quality bus corridor.

65918.51. A local government shall, upon request of a development proponent, grant an equitable communities incentive, as specified in Section 65918.53, when the development proponent seeks and agrees to construct a residential development that satisfies the requirements specified in Section 65918.52.

65918.52. In order to be eligible for an equitable communities incentive pursuant to this chapter, a residential development shall meet all of the following criteria:

(a) The residential development is either a job-rich housing project or transit-rich housing project.

(b) The residential development is located on a site ~~that, at~~ *that meets the following requirements:*

(1) At the time of application, the site is zoned to allow housing as an underlying use in the zone, including, but not limited to, a residential, mixed-use, or commercial zone, as defined and allowed by the local government.

(2) If the residential development is located within a coastal zone, as defined in Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code, the site satisfies the requirements specified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 65913.4.

(3) *The site is not located within any of the following:*

(A) *A coastal zone, as defined in Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code, within a city with a population of less than 50,000.*

(B) *A very high fire hazard severity zone, as determined by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection pursuant to Section 51178, or within a very high fire hazard severity zone as indicated on maps adopted by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection pursuant to Section 4202 of the Public Resources Code. A parcel is not ineligible within the meaning of this paragraph if it is either of the following:*

(i) *A site excluded from the specified hazard zones by a local agency, pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 51179.*

(ii) *A site that has adopted fire hazard mitigation measures pursuant to existing building standards or state fire mitigation measures applicable to the development.*

(C) *A parcel that is a contributing parcel within a historic district established by an ordinance of the local government that was in effect as of December 31, 2010.*

(c) *If the residential development is located within a county that has a population equal to or less than 600,000, the residential development satisfies all of the following additional requirements:*

(1) *The site satisfies the requirements specified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 65913.4.*

(2) *The site is not located within either of the following:*

(A) *An architecturally or historically significant historic district, as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 5020.1 of the Public Resources Code.*

(B) *A flood plain as determined by maps promulgated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, unless the development has been issued a flood plain development permit pursuant to Part 59 (commencing with Section 59.1) and Part 60 (commencing with Section 60.1) of Subchapter B of Chapter I of Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations.*

(3) *The residential development has a minimum density of 30 dwelling units per acre in jurisdictions considered metropolitan, as defined in subdivision (f) of Section 65583.2, or a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre in jurisdictions considered suburban, as defined in subdivision (e) of Section 65583.2.*

(4) *The residential development is located within a one-half mile radius of a major transit stop and within a city with a population greater than 50,000.*

~~(e)~~

(d) (1) If the local government has adopted an inclusionary housing ordinance requiring that the development include a certain number of units affordable to households with incomes that do not exceed the limits for ~~moderate income~~, *moderate income*, lower income, very low income, or extremely low income specified in Sections 50079.5, 50093, 50105, and 50106 of the Health and Safety Code, and that ordinance requires that a new development include levels of affordable housing in excess of the requirements specified in paragraph (2), the residential development complies with that ordinance. The ordinance may provide alternative means of compliance that may include, but are not limited to, in-lieu fees, land dedication, offsite construction, or acquisition and rehabilitation of existing units.

(2) (A) If the local government has not adopted an inclusionary housing ordinance, as described in paragraph (1), the residential development includes an affordable housing contribution for households with incomes that do not exceed the limits for extremely low income, very low income, and low income specified in Sections 50093, 50105, and 50106 of the Health and Safety Code.

(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the residential development is subject to one of the ~~following~~: *following, as applicable*:

(i) If the project has 10 or fewer units, no affordability contribution is imposed.

(ii) If the project has 11 to 20 residential units, the development proponent may pay an in-lieu fee to the local government for affordable housing, where feasible, pursuant to subparagraph (C).

(iii) If the project has more than 20 residential units, the development proponent shall do either of the following:

(I) Make a comparable affordability contribution toward housing offsite that is affordable to lower income households, pursuant to subparagraph (C).

(II) Include units on the site of the project that are affordable to extremely low income, ~~as defined in Section 50105 of the Health and Safety Code,~~ very low income, or ~~low income~~ *lower income* households, as defined in ~~Section 50079.5 Sections 50079.5, 50105, and 50106~~ of the Health and Safety Code, as follows:

Project Size	Inclusionary Requirement
21– 200 units	15% low <i>lower</i> income; or 8% very low income; or 6% extremely low income
201–350 units	17% low <i>lower</i> income; or 10% very low income; or 8% extremely low income
351 or more units	25% low <i>lower</i> income; or 15% very low income; or 11% extremely low income

(C) *(i)* The development proponent of a project that qualifies pursuant to clause (ii) or subclause (I) of clause (iii) of subparagraph (B) may make a comparable affordability contribution toward housing offsite that is affordable to lower income households, ~~as follows: pursuant to this subparagraph.~~

~~(i) The local government collecting the in-lieu fee payment shall make every effort to ensure that future affordable housing will be sited within one-half mile of the original project location within the boundaries of the local government by designating an existing housing opportunity site within a one-half mile radius of the project site for affordable housing. To the extent practicable, local housing funding shall be prioritized at the first opportunity to build affordable housing on that site.~~

~~(ii) If no housing opportunity sites that satisfy clause (i) are available, the local government shall designate a site for affordable housing within the boundaries of the local government and make findings that the site for the affordable housing development affirmatively furthers fair housing, as defined in Section 8899.50.~~

(ii) For the purposes of this subparagraph, "comparable affordability contribution" means either a dedication of land or direct in-lieu fee payment to a housing provider that proposes to build a residential development in which 100 percent of the units, excluding manager's units, are sold or rented at affordable housing cost, as defined in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code, or affordable rent, as defined in Section 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, subject to all of the following conditions:

(I) The site, and if applicable, the dedicated land, is located within a one-half mile of the qualifying project.

(II) The site, and if applicable, the dedicated land, is eligible for an equitable communities incentive.

(III) The residential development that receives a dedication of land or in-lieu fee payment pursuant to this paragraph provides the same number of affordable units at the same income category, which would have been required onsite for the qualifying project pursuant to subclause (II) of clause (iii) of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2).

(IV) The value of the dedicated land or in-lieu fee payment must be at least equal to the capitalized value of the forgone revenue that the development proponent would have incurred if the qualifying project had provided the required number and type of affordable units onsite.

(V) The comparable affordability contribution is subject to a recorded covenant with the local jurisdiction. A copy of the covenant shall be provided to the Department of Housing and Community Development.

(iii) For the purposes of this subparagraph, "qualifying project" means a project that receives an equitable communities incentive by providing a comparable affordability contribution.

(iv) The qualifying development shall not be issued a certificate of occupancy before the residential development receiving a dedication of land or direct in-lieu fee payment pursuant to this subparagraph receives a building permit.

(D) Affordability of units pursuant to this paragraph shall be restricted by deed for a period of 55 years for rental units or 45 years for units offered for sale.

~~(d)~~

(e) The site does not contain, or has not contained, either of the following:

(1) Housing occupied by tenants within the seven years preceding the date of the application, including housing that has been demolished or that tenants have vacated prior to the application for a development permit.

(2) A parcel or parcels on which an owner of residential real property has exercised their rights under Chapter 12.75 (commencing with Section 7060) of Division 7 of Title 1 to withdraw accommodations from rent or lease within 15 years prior to the date that the development proponent submits an application pursuant to this chapter.

~~(e)~~

(f) The residential development complies with all applicable labor, construction employment, and wage standards otherwise required by law and any other generally applicable requirement regarding the approval of a development project, including, but not limited to, the local government's conditional use or other discretionary permit approval process, the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code), or a streamlined approval process that includes labor protections.

~~(f)~~

(g) The residential development complies with all other relevant standards, requirements, and prohibitions imposed by the local government regarding architectural design, restrictions on or oversight of demolition, impact fees, and community benefits agreements.

~~(g)~~

(h) The equitable communities incentive shall not be used to undermine the economic feasibility of delivering low-income housing under the state density bonus program or a local implementation of the state density bonus program, or any locally adopted program that puts conditions on new development applications on the basis of receiving a zone change or general plan amendment in exchange for benefits such as increased affordable housing, local hire, or payment of prevailing wages.

65918.53. (a) (1) Any transit-rich or ~~jobs-rich~~ *job-rich* housing project *within a county that has a population greater than 600,000* that meets the criteria specified in Section 65918.52 shall receive, upon request, an equitable communities incentive as follows:

~~(1)~~

(A) A waiver from maximum controls on density.

~~(2)~~

(B) A waiver from minimum automobile parking requirements greater than 0.5 automobile parking spots per unit.

~~(3) Up to three incentives and concessions pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 65915.~~

~~(b)~~

(2) An eligible applicant proposing a residential development *within a county that has a population greater than 600,000* that is located within a one-half mile radius, but outside a one-quarter mile radius, of a major transit stop shall receive, in addition to the incentives specified in ~~subdivision (a);~~ *paragraph (1)*, waivers from all of the following:

~~(1)~~

(A) Maximum height requirements less than 45 feet.

~~(2)~~

(B) Maximum FAR requirements less than 2.5.

~~(3)~~

(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), any ~~maximum~~ *minimum* automobile parking requirement.

~~(e)~~

(3) An eligible applicant proposing a residential development *within a county that has a population greater than 600,000* that is located within a one-quarter mile radius of a major transit stop shall receive, in addition to the incentives specified in ~~subdivision (a), paragraph (1)~~, waivers from all of the following:

~~(1)~~

(A) Maximum height requirements less than 55 feet.

~~(2)~~

(B) Maximum FAR requirements less than 3.25.

~~(3)~~

(C) Notwithstanding paragraph ~~(1)~~ (2) of subdivision ~~(b)~~ (a), any minimum automobile parking requirement.

(b) A residential development within a county that has a population less than or equal to 600,000 that meets the criteria specified in Section 65918.52 shall receive, upon request, an equitable communities incentive as follows:

(1) A waiver from maximum controls on density, subject to paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) of Section 65918.52.

(2) A waiver from maximum height limitations less than or equal to one story, or 15 feet, above the highest allowable height for mixed use or residential use. For purposes of this paragraph, "highest allowable height" means the tallest height, including heights that require conditional approval, allowable pursuant to zoning and any specific or area plan that covers the parcel.

(3) Maximum FAR requirements less than 0.6 times the number of stories proposed for the project.

(4) A waiver from minimum automobile parking requirements, as follows:

(A) If the residential development is located within a one-quarter mile radius of a rail transit station in a city with a population of greater than 100,000, the residential development project shall receive a waiver from any minimum automobile parking requirement.

(B) If the residential development does not meet the criteria specified in clause (i), the residential development project shall receive a waiver from minimum automobile parking requirements of less than 0.5 parking spaces per unit.

~~(d)~~

(c) Notwithstanding any other law, ~~for purposes of calculating any additional incentive or concession~~ a project that qualifies for an equitable communities incentive may also apply for a density bonus, incentives or concessions, and parking ratios in accordance with subdivision (b) of Section ~~65915~~, 65915. To calculate a density bonus for a project that receives an equitable communities incentive, the "otherwise maximum allowable gross residential density" as described in subdivision (f) of Section 65915 shall be equal to the proposed number of units ~~in~~ in, or the proposed square footage of, the residential development after applying the equitable communities incentive received pursuant to this ~~chapter shall be used as the base density for calculating the incentive or concession under that section.~~ chapter. In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of this chapter and subdivision (b) of Section 65915 at the unit count or square footage or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this chapter and as may be increased under Section 65915 in accordance with this subdivision, but no additional waivers or reductions of development standards, as described in subdivision (e) of Section 65915 shall be permitted.

(d) The local government shall grant an incentive requested by an eligible applicant pursuant to this chapter unless the local government makes a written finding, based on substantial evidence, that the incentive would have a specific, adverse impact on any real property or historic district that is listed on a federal or state register of historical resources and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable.

(e) An eligible applicant proposing a project that meets all of the requirements under Section 65913.4 may submit an application for streamlined, ministerial approval in accordance with that section.

(f) The local government may modify or expand the terms of an equitable communities incentive provided pursuant to this chapter, provided that the equitable communities incentive is consistent with, and meets the minimum standards specified in, this chapter.

65918.54. The Legislature finds and declares that this chapter addresses a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair as that term is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California Constitution. Therefore, this chapter applies to all cities, including charter cities.

~~65918.55.(a) Implementation of this chapter shall be delayed in sensitive communities until July 1, 2020.~~

~~(b) Between January 1, 2020, and _____, a local government, in lieu of the requirements of this chapter, may opt for a community led planning process in sensitive communities aimed toward increasing residential density and multifamily housing choices near transit stops, as follows:~~

~~(1) Sensitive communities that pursue a community led planning process at the neighborhood level shall, on or before January 1, 2025, produce a community plan that may include zoning and any other policies that encourage multifamily housing development at a range of income levels to meet unmet needs, protect vulnerable residents from displacement, and address other locally identified priorities.~~

~~(2) Community plans shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the overall residential development capacity and the minimum affordability standards set forth in this chapter within the boundaries of the community plan.~~

~~(3) The provisions of this chapter shall apply on January 1, 2025, to sensitive communities that have not adopted community plans that meet the minimum standards described in paragraph (2), whether those plans were adopted prior to or after enactment of this chapter.~~

65918.55. (a) *On or before July 1, 2020, Sections 65918.51 to 65918.54, inclusive, shall not apply to a potentially sensitive community. After July 1, 2020, Sections 65918.51 to 65918.54, inclusive, shall apply in any potentially sensitive community that is not identified as a sensitive community pursuant to subdivision (b).*

(b) On or before July 1, 2020, sensitive communities in each county shall be identified and mapped in accordance with the following:

(1) The council of governments, or the county board of supervisors in a county without a council of governments, shall establish a working group comprised of residents of potentially sensitive communities within the county, ensuring equitable representation of vulnerable populations, including, but not limited to, renters, low-income people, and members of classes protected under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (Part 2.8 (commencing with Section 12900) of Division 3 of Title 2).

(2) The working group shall develop a map of sensitive communities within the county, which shall include some or all of the areas identified as potentially sensitive communities pursuant to subdivision (i) of Section 65918.50. The working group shall prioritize the input of residents from each potentially sensitive community in making a determination about that community.

(3) Each board of supervisors or council of governments shall adopt the sensitive communities map for the county, along with an explanation of the composition and function of the working group and the community process and methodology used to create the maps, at a public hearing held on or before July 1, 2020.

(c) Sections 65918.51 to 65918.54, inclusive, shall apply in a sensitive community on and after January 1, 2026, unless the city or county in which the sensitive community is located has adopted a community plan for an area that includes the sensitive community that is aimed toward increasing residential density and multifamily housing choices near transit stops and meets all of the following:

(1) The community plan is not in conflict with the goals of this chapter.

(2) The community plan permits increased density and multifamily development near transit, with all upzoning linked to onsite affordable housing requirements that meet or exceed the affordable housing requirements in Sections 65918.51 to 65918.54, inclusive. Community plans shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the overall residential development capacity and the minimum affordability standards set forth in Sections 65918.51 to 65918.54, inclusive, within the boundaries of the community plan.

(3) The community plan includes provisions to protect vulnerable residents from displacement.

(4) The community plan promotes economic justice for workers and residents.

(5) The community plan was developed in partnership with at least one of the following:

(A) A nonprofit or community organization that focuses on organizing low-income residents in the sensitive community.

(B) A nonprofit or community organization that focuses on organizing low-income residents in the jurisdiction.

(C) If there are no nonprofit or community organizations working within the sensitive community or the jurisdiction, a nonprofit with demonstrated experience conducting outreach to low-income communities.

(6) Residents of the sensitive community are engaged throughout the planning process, including through at least three community meetings that are held at times and locations accessible to low-income residents.

(7) All public documents and meetings related to the planning process are translated into all languages spoken by at least 25 percent of residents of the sensitive community.

(8) The community plan is adopted before July 1, 2025.

(d) Each city and each county shall make reasonable efforts to develop a community plan for any sensitive communities within its jurisdiction. A community plan may address other locally identified priorities, provided they are not in conflict with the intent of this chapter or any other law. A city or county may designate a community plan adopted before July 1, 2020, as the plan that meets the requirements of this paragraph, provided that the plan meets all criteria in this section.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, Sections 65918.51 to 65918.54, inclusive, shall apply in any sensitive community if all of the following apply:

(1) At least 20 percent of adult residents of the sensitive community sign a petition attesting that the community desires to make the provisions of Sections 65918.51 to 65918.54, inclusive, applicable in the area. The petition shall describe in plain language the planning standards set forth in Sections 65918.51 to 65918.54, inclusive; be translated into all languages spoken by at least 25 percent of residents in the affected area; and collect contact information from signatories to the petition, including first, middle, and last name, mailing address, and phone number and email address if available.

(2) The local government has verified the petition to ensure compliance with paragraph (1).

(3) Following signature verification, the local government provides public notice and opportunity to comment to residents of the affected area and holds a minimum of three public hearings in the affected area at a time and in a place and manner accessible to low-income residents and other vulnerable populations.

(4) The governing body for the city or county in which the sensitive community is located determines, by majority vote, to apply this chapter in the affected area.

(f) It is the intent of the Legislature to consider all of the following:

(1) Tasking local government entities with greater community connection with convening and administering the process for identifying sensitive communities.

(2) Requiring review by the Department of Housing and Community Development of the designation of sensitive communities.

SEC. 3. SEC. 5. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code.