
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

Senator Anna M. Caballero, Chair

2023 - 2024 Regular

Bill No: SB 423
Author: Wiener
Version: 3/28/23
Consultant: Peterson

Hearing Date: 4/26/23
Tax Levy: No
Fiscal: Yes

LAND USE: STREAMLINED HOUSING APPROVALS: MULTIFAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

Eliminates the sunset date for SB 35 (Wiener, 2017), makes changes to the SB 35 approval process, and revises SB 35 labor standards.

Background

Planning and approving new housing is mainly a local responsibility. The California Constitution allows cities and counties to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” It is from this fundamental power (commonly called the police power) that cities and counties derive their authority to regulate behavior to preserve the health, safety, and welfare of the public—including land use authority.

Planning and Zoning Law. State law provides additional powers and duties for cities and counties regarding land use. The Planning and Zoning Law requires every county and city to adopt a general plan that sets out planned uses for all of the area covered by the plan. A general plan must include specified mandatory “elements,” including a housing element that establishes the locations and densities of housing, among other requirements. Cities’ and counties’ major land use decisions—including most zoning ordinances and other aspects of development permitting—must be consistent with their general plans. The Planning and Zoning Law also establishes a planning agency in each city and county, which may be a separate planning commission, administrative body, or the legislative body of the city or county itself. Cities and counties must provide a path to appeal a decision to the planning commission and/or the city council or county board of supervisors.

Zoning and approval processes. Local governments use their police power to enact zoning ordinances that shape development, such as setting maximum heights and densities for housing units, minimum numbers of required parking spaces, setbacks to preserve privacy, lot coverage ratios to increase open space, and others. These ordinances can also include conditions on development to address aesthetics, community impacts, or other particular site-specific considerations.

Local governments have broad authority to define the specific approval processes needed to satisfy these considerations. Some housing projects can be permitted by city or county planning staff “ministerially” or without further approval from elected officials, but most large housing projects require “discretionary” approvals from local governments, such as a conditional use

permit or a change in zoning laws. This process requires hearings by the local planning commission and public notice and may require additional approvals.

SB 35 (Wiener, 2017). In 2017, the Legislature enacted a substantial package of legislation aimed at addressing the state's housing crisis. Among others, the Legislature enacted SB 35 (Wiener) to provide for a streamlined, ministerial process for approving housing developments that are in compliance with the applicable objective local planning standards—including the general plan, zoning ordinances, and objective design review standards. SB 35 was intended to enable developments that face local opposition, but are consistent with local objective development standards, to be constructed. To be eligible for streamlining under SB 35, a specified percentage of the total housing units in the development must be affordable to lower-income households (those under 80 percent of area median income), as follows:

- 10 percent, if the locality has not issued building permits for enough above moderate-income—greater than 120 percent of area median income (AMI)—units to meet their regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) requirement. If a project is located within the nine-county Bay Area, the project may instead include 20 percent of the units affordable to moderate income households (up to 120 percent AMI).
- 50 percent, if the locality has not issued building permits for enough lower-income units to meet their RHNA requirement; or
- The percentage in a local inclusionary zoning ordinance if it is higher than the requirements above.

All but 29 cities and counties in California are subject to some streamlining under SB 35 because they have not issued building permits to housing units sufficient to meet their RHNA at one or more income levels.

SB 35 also included certain requirements for labor standards, such as the use of a skilled and trained workforce on an eligible project. However, SB 35 exempts projects of 10 housing units or less from the affordability requirements and labor standards.

SB 35 excludes a variety of types of lands from its provisions, on the basis that because SB 35 approvals are ministerial and therefore not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These lands include:

- The Coastal Zone;
- Prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance;
- Wetlands;
- Very high fire hazard severity zones, unless the development complies with all state mitigation measures;
- Hazardous waste sites, unless the sites have been cleared by specified state agencies for residential or mixed uses;
- Fault zones;
- Certain flood hazard areas and floodways; and
- Certain types of habitat or land for conservation.

SB 35 sunsets on January 1, 2026.

State housing laws. The Legislature has enacted a variety of statutes to facilitate and encourage the provision of housing, particularly affordable housing and housing to support individuals with disabilities or other needs. Among them is the Housing Accountability Act (HAA), enacted in 1982 in response to concerns over a growing rejection of housing development by local governments due to not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) sentiments among local residents (SB 2011, Greene). The HAA, also known as the “Anti-NIMBY” legislation, restricts a local agency’s ability to disapprove, or require density reductions in, housing projects that devote at least 2/3rds of their floor area to residential units.

To build on the HAA and other recent housing legislation intended to streamline development, the Legislature enacted SB 330 (Skinner, 2019): the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (HCA). The HCA had several main components:

- Prohibits certain local actions that would reduce housing capacity. The HCA prohibits downzoning unless the city or county concurrently upzones an equal amount elsewhere so that there is no net loss in residential capacity. It also voids certain local policies that limit growth, including building moratoria, caps on the numbers of units that can be approved, and population limits;
- Prohibits a local agency from imposing design standards that are not objective if those standards were adopted after January 1, 2020;
- Prohibits a local agency from applying new rules or standards to a project after a preliminary application containing specified information is submitted. The local agency must also make any required determinations on whether a project site is a historic site when a complete preliminary application is filed. However, if the project significantly changes, local agencies may apply new rules;
- Requires local agencies to exhaustively list all information needed to make a development application complete under the Permit Streamlining Act, limits that list to only those items on the checklist for application required by state law, and prohibits the local agency from requiring additional information. The checklist information must also be posted online;
- Establishes a cap of five hearings that can be conducted on a project that complies with objective local standards in place at the time a development application is deemed complete; and
- Establishes certain anti-displacement protections.

SB 8 (Skinner, 2021) extended the sunset on the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 by five years, to January 1, 2030, and provides that until January 1, 2034, the HCA’s provisions apply to a housing development project that submits a preliminary application before January 1, 2030.

California’s housing challenges. California faces a severe housing shortage. In its most recent statewide housing assessment, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) estimated that California needs to build an additional 100,000 units per year over recent averages of 80,000 units per year to meet the projected need for housing in the state. A variety of causes have contributed to the lack of housing production. Recent reports by the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) and others point to local approval processes as a major factor. They argue that local governments control most of the decisions about where, when, and how to build new housing, and those governments are quick to respond to vocal community members who may not want new neighbors. The building industry also points to CEQA review, and housing advocates note a lack of a dedicated source of funds for affordable housing.

The author wants to make changes to the SB 35 streamlining process, change the labor standards for SB 35 projects, and remove the SB 35 sunset date.

Proposed Law

Senate Bill 423 eliminates SB 35's sunset date, makes numerous changes to the SB 35 process, revises the labor standards for SB 35 projects, and makes other changes.

Process changes. SB 423 makes the following changes to SB 35's process to streamline eligible development projects:

- Expands the types of local governments subject to SB 35 streamlining to include local governments that have not adopted a compliant housing element as determined by HCD;
- Provides that if a local government requires units restricted to higher incomes than those required for SB 35 streamlining, those units meet SB 35's affordable housing requirements;
- Expands SB 35 to apply in coastal zones, and wetlands or protected habitats if authorized by a permit or other approval issued pursuant to federal or state law;
- Requires that if a local government's planning director or equivalent position determines that a development is consistent with objective planning standards, the local government must approve the development, and requires that local government official to provide documentation if they find a conflict;
- Provides that when local governments receive an SB 35 application, all its departments that issue approvals must comply with SB 35 timelines;
- Removes public oversight from the design review process, including by the relevant city council or board of supervisors;
- Prohibits a local government from requiring any of the following prior to approving a development:
 - Studies, information, or other materials that do not pertain directly to determining whether the development is consistent with the objective planning standards applicable to the development;
 - Compliance with any standards necessary to receive a postentitlement permit, but does not prohibit a local agency from requiring compliance with any standards necessary to receive a postentitlement permit after a local agency has issued a permit pursuant to SB 35; and
- Authorizes the Department of General Services (DGS), at its discretion, to act in the place of a locality or local government, for development on property owned by or leased to the state.

Labor standards. The measure removes the requirement for SB 35 projects over ten units to use a skilled-and-trained workforce, and replaces that requirement with the following labor standards. First, the development proponent must require in contracts with construction contractors, and must certify to the local government, that all the standards specified in the bill will be met in project construction.

Second, a development that is not in its entirety a public work, as specified, must be subject to all of the following wage provisions:

- All construction workers employed in the execution of the development must be paid at least the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for the type of work and geographic area, as specified, except that apprentices registered in programs approved by the Chief of the Division of Apprenticeship Standards may be paid at least the applicable apprentice prevailing rate;
- The development proponent must ensure that the prevailing wage requirement is included in all contracts for the performance of the work for those portions of the development that are not a public work; and
- All contractors and subcontractors for those portions of the development that are not a public work must maintain and verify payroll records, as specified, and make those records available for inspection and copying. This requirement does not apply if all contractors and subcontractors performing work on the development are subject to a project labor agreement that requires the payment of prevailing wages to all construction workers employed in the execution of the development and provides for enforcement of that obligation through an arbitration procedure.

Third, the obligation of the contractors and subcontractors to pay prevailing wages pursuant to this bill are subject to the following enforcement provisions:

- They may be enforced by the Labor Commissioner, an underpaid worker, and a joint labor-management committee through a civil action, as specified; and
- These enforcement provisions do not apply if all contractors and subcontractors performing work on the development are subject to a project labor agreement that requires the payment of prevailing wages to all construction workers employed in the execution of the development and provides for enforcement of that obligation through an arbitration procedure.

However, the requirement that the employer pay prevailing wages does not apply to those portions of development that are not a public work if otherwise provided in a bona fide collective bargaining agreement covering the worker.

For a development of 50 or more housing units, the development proponent must require in contracts with construction contractors, and must certify to the local government, that each contractor of any tier who will employ construction craft employees or will let subcontracts for at least 1,000 hours must ensure all of the following:

- A contractor with construction craft employees must either participate in an apprenticeship program approved by the State of California Division of Apprenticeship Standards, as specified, or request the dispatch of apprentices from a state-approved apprenticeship program, as specified. A contractor without construction craft employees must show a contractual obligation that its subcontractors meet these requirements.
- Each contractor with construction craft employees must make health care expenditures for each employee comparable to a Covered California Platinum level plan for two 40-year-old adults and two dependents 0 to 14 years of age for the Covered California rating area in which the development is located. A contractor without construction craft employees must show a contractual obligation that its subcontractors comply with this requirement. Qualifying expenditures are credited toward compliance with prevailing wage payment requirements.

A construction contractor is deemed in compliance with the requirements of the above bullets if it is signatory to a valid collective bargaining agreement that requires utilization of registered apprentices and expenditures on health care for employees and dependents.

For purposes of establishing the total number of units in a development under the bill, including for the 50-unit requirement above, SB 423 states that a development project includes both of the following:

- All projects developed on a site, regardless of when those developments occur; and
- All projects developed on sites adjacent to a site developed pursuant to the bill if, after January 1, 2023, the adjacent site had been subdivided from the site developed pursuant to the bill.

The bill subjects the development proponent to monthly compliance reporting with the labor standards above, and other reporting and disclosure requirements regarding payroll records, the apprenticeship program participation, and health care requirements, as specified.

A development proponent that fails to provide the monthly report is subject to a civil penalty for each month for which the report has not been provided, in the amount of 10 percent of the dollar value of construction work performed by that contractor on the development in the month in question, up to a maximum of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000). Any contractor or subcontractor that fails to comply with the labor standards is subject to a civil penalty of \$200 per day for each worker. Penalties may be assessed, reviewed, and deposited using existing procedures in the Labor Code.

Other provisions. SB 423 includes a severability clause that provides that the health care provisions of the bill are severable from the others, but that the other labor standards are integral to the measure and not severable. SB 423 declares its intent and defines its terms.

State Revenue Impact

No estimate.

Comments

1. **Purpose of the bill.** According to the author, “SB 423 removes the sunset on one of California’s most successful housing laws, SB 35, which expedites the approval of new homes.

California has failed to create enough housing at all income levels. Currently, California ranks 49th out of 50 states in per capita housing units. The Legislative Analyst’s Office recommends the state produce 100,000 units annually beyond the expected 100,000 to 140,000 units per year.

To help address this crisis, the Legislature passed SB 35 in 2017. The Turner Center reported that over 18,000 units have been proposed under SB 35, with 13,000 built. Of those proposed, 13,000 are affordable to very low- or low-income categories. The Mission Economic Development Agency utilized SB 35 for a 130-unit, 100% affordable project, and, decreased timelines between 6 months and 1 year. Although the bill has successfully increased affordable housing production, SB 35 under-performed producing market rate housing, something SB 423 seeks to address.

Without an extension, SB 35 will expire on Jan. 1, 2026. SB 423 makes SB 35 permanent, keeping a primary mechanism for streamlining housing production in place. This bill also helps California’s construction workforce thrive. Construction workers will be protected by the requirement to pay prevailing wages, and on projects over 50 units, contractors must offer apprentices employment and cover health care expenditures. This creates an economic base and opportunities for construction workers and provides our state with the highly skilled workforce it needs to build our future. SB 423 ensures California does not take a step back in addressing the housing crisis, but rather leans in to assist localities in streamlining much needed housing.”

2. Local control. Local elected officials typically have the final say over development in their jurisdiction. This follows the principle that voters choose city council members and county supervisors to faithfully represent their constituents’ interests, and local officials are best positioned to interpret their own laws. A handful of local governments have overruled their planning staff in an attempt to deny SB 35 projects. For example, the Burbank City Council denied an SB 35 project with HCD technical assistance that indicated the project qualified for SB 35 streamlining, and planning staff concluding that the project met the applicable objective general plan and zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards it needed to qualify for SB 35. HCD responded to this decision with a notice of violation informing the City that it may use its enforcement powers, including referring the matter to the Attorney General. The City of Burbank ultimately recanted and approved the project. To try to avoid similar situations in the future, SB 423 puts the power to approve whether a project qualifies for SB 35 streamlining in the hands of planning staff. It is unclear that devolving power to unelected staff members, and thereby making changes to a fundamental power that local elected officials possess, is necessary given the universe of laws that create strong deterrents for local governments that improperly deny housing projects.

3. Worker protections. Most recent streamlining or zoning-related bills enacted by the Legislature in recent years require the use of a skilled and trained workforce in addition to paying prevailing wage, with the notable exception of AB 2011 (Wicks, 2022), which—in exchange for a by-right process and significant height and zoning changes—requires the payment of prevailing wage, various apprenticeship mandates, and payment of certain healthcare expenditures. AB 2011 also included a right of action for labor organizations and workers to sue if the bill’s labor requirements are violated. SB 423 replaces its skilled-and-trained requirement with the labor provisions of AB 2011. The State Building and Construction Trades Council states that these standards are insufficient for several reasons, including that (1) the requirement to pay for healthcare may be preempted by federal law, (2) the apprenticeship standards are inadequately specified, and (3) developers can split projects into multiple projects to stay under the threshold where healthcare expenditures and apprenticeships are required. Are the labor standards in SB 423 sufficient to ensure that workers and developers are receiving a fair share of the benefits created by the bill?

4. SB 35’s golden hour. SB 35 sunsets on January 1, 2026. SB 423 would alter some of SB 35’s provisions and go into effect January 1, 2024, two years before SB 35 is set to sunset. SB 35 is one of the most consequential housing laws the Legislature has enacted, and remains controversial, especially with regard to which labor standards the measure should apply to its projects, and two more years of information could provide valuable information regarding its effects. Should the Legislature expand and extend SB 35’s provisions with so much time before its scheduled sunset date?

5. State sovereignty. State projects are not generally subject to local oversight or discretionary approvals unless state law explicitly provides otherwise. SB 423 states that DGS, at its discretion, can act in the place of a locality or local government, for development on property owned by or leased to the state. Despite the state's sovereignty over local land use decisions, some questions remain whether this also exempts the state from CEQA pursuant to SB 35's provisions, since the rest of SB 35 presumes that a local agency is the entity approving the project. On the one hand, this provision could help clarify that the state can also approve SB 35 projects on its land. On the other hand, this provision could also raise confusion about whether this grants DGS new authority to act in place of a local government when making land use decisions. The Committee may wish to consider whether further clarity regarding DGS's role in SB 35 projects is necessary.

6. Recent SB 35 legislation. The Legislature has enacted numerous measures in recent years to address challenges that various projects have encountered in gaining SB 35 approvals, including:

- SB 765 (Wiener, 2018), which was not referred to the Senate Governance and Finance Committee. SB 765 changed the treatment of proposed subdivisions under SB 35, among other changes.
- AB 1485 (Wicks, 2019), which the Senate Governance and Finance Committee approved at its July 10th, 2019, hearing on a vote of 7-0. AB 1485 allowed housing projects in the Bay Area to qualify for SB 35 by including 20% moderate-income units, among other changes.
- AB 168 (Aguiar-Curry, 2020), which the Senate Governance and Finance Committee approved at its July 10th, 2019, hearing on a vote of 7-0. AB 168 added a process to SB 35 for determining if a project would affect tribal cultural resources. This process includes a consultation between the California Native American Tribes traditionally affiliated with the project area and the relevant local government to identify tribal cultural resources and agree upon mitigation measures needed to preserve them.
- AB 831 (Grayson, 2020), which was referred to the Senate Governance and Finance Committee, but that referral was rescinded due to the COVID-19 pandemic. AB 831 prohibited unreasonable delay by local governments in issuing subsequent permits for SB 35 projects, among other changes.
- AB 1174 (Grayson, 2021), which the Senate Governance and Finance Committee approved at its June 23, 2021, hearing on a vote of 5-0. AB 1174 extended the validity of SB 35 approvals under certain conditions and made other changes.
- AB 2668 (Grayson, 2022), which the Senate Governance and Finance Committee approved at its June 29, 2022, hearing on a vote of 5-0. AB 2668 makes numerous changes to the SB 35 approval process, including:
 - Clarifies that an SB 35 project is not subject to a conditional use permit or any other non-legislative discretionary approval.
 - Provides that the inclusionary requirements apply to the base project, before calculating any density bonus units.
 - Authorizes an SB 35 project to be located on a hazardous waste site if a local government has otherwise determined the site to be suitable for development or the site is an underground storage tank site and has received a specified closure letter.
 - Provides that a local government shall not determine that a development seeking to use SB 35 or modify an SB 35-approved project is in conflict with its objective

planning standards based on the absence of application materials, provided the application contains substantial evidence that would allow a reasonable person to conclude that the development is consistent with the objective planning standards.

6. Mandate. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local governments for the costs of new or expanded state mandated local programs. Because SB 423 imposes new duties on local officials, Legislative Counsel says that it imposes a new state mandate. SB 4 disclaims the state's responsibility for providing reimbursement by citing local governments' authority to charge for the costs of implementing the bill's provisions.

7. Charter city. The California Constitution allows cities that adopt charters to control their own "municipal affairs." In all other matters, charter cities must follow the general, statewide laws. Because the Constitution doesn't define "municipal affairs," the courts determine whether a topic is a municipal affair or an issue of statewide concern. SB 423 says that its statutory provisions apply to charter cities. To support this assertion, the bill includes a legislative finding that ensuring access to affordable housing is a matter of statewide concern.

8. Incoming! The Committee on Housing approved SB 423 by a vote of 9 to 1 on March 21st. The Committee on Governance and Finance is hearing the measure as the committee of second reference.

Support and Opposition (4/21/23)

Support: California Conference of Carpenters (Co-Sponsor)
 California Housing Consortium (Co-Sponsor)
 California Yimby (Co-Sponsor)
 Inner City Law Center (Co-Sponsor)
 Alysa Cisneros - Sunnyvale City Council Member
 Anthony Phan - Milpitas Councilmember
 Emily Ramos - City of Mountain View Council Member
 Jaron Brandon - Supervisor, Tuolumne County
 Jen Wolosin - Menlo Park Mayor
 Jesse Zwick - City of Santa Monica Council Member
 John M Erickson, Phd - West Hollywood Mayor Pro Tempore
 José Trinidad-castañeda - City of Buena Park Council Member
 London Breed - Mayor of City & County of San Francisco
 Lucas Ramirez - City of Mountain View Council Member
 Mike Johnson - City of Ventura Councilmember
 Rashi Kesarwani - City of Berkeley Councilmember
 Richard Mehlinger - City of Sunnyvale Council Member
 Zach Hilton - City of Gilroy Council Member
 21st Century Alliance
 AARP
 Abode Communities
 Abundant Housing LA
 Active San Gabriel Valley
 Affirmed Housing
 All Home
 Amg & Associates, LLC
 Bay Area Council

Buildcasa
California Apartment Association
California Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies
California Community Builders
California Community Economic Development Association (CCEDA)
California State Board of Equalization
California State Council of Laborers
Carpenters Local 1109
Carpenters Local 152
Carpenters Local 1599
Carpenters Local 1607
Carpenters Local 1789
Carpenters Local 180
Carpenters Local 213
Carpenters Local 217
Carpenters Local 22
Carpenters Local 323
Carpenters Local 35
Carpenters Local 405
Carpenters Local 46
Carpenters Local 505
Carpenters Local 562
Carpenters Local 605
Carpenters Local 619
Carpenters Local 661
Carpenters Local 701
Carpenters Local 713
Carpenters Local 714
Carpenters Local 721
Carpenters Local 751
Carpenters Local 805
Carpenters Local 951
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 007
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 101
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 1904
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 417
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 710
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 91
Central City Association
City and County of San Francisco
Civicwell (formally the Local Government Commission)
Climate Action Campaign
Community Coalition
Construction Employers' Association
Council of Infill Builders
Crp Affordable Housing and Community Development
Culver City for More Homes
Cupertino for All
Destination: Home
Devine & Gong, INC.

Drywall Lathers Local 9109
Drywall Lathers Union Local 9068
Drywall Lathers Union Local 9083
Drywall Local Union 9144
East Bay for Everyone
East Bay Yimby
Eastside Housing for All
Eden Housing
Fieldstead and Company, INC.
Fremont for Everyone
Generation Housing
Greenbelt Alliance
Grow the Richmond
Habitat for Humanity California
Housing Action Coalition
Imagine LA
Inclusive Lafayette
Industrial Carpenters Union Local 2236
International Union of Operating Engineers, Cal-nevada Conference
Linc Housing
Lisc San Diego
Livable Communities Initiative
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Mercy Housing
Merritt Community Capital Corporation
Meta
Midpen Housing
Midpen Housing Corporation
Millwrights Local 102
Mountain View Yimby
Napa-Solano for Everyone
Neighborhood Housing Services of Los Angeles County
Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California (NPH)
Nor Cal Carpenters Union
Northern Neighbors Sf
Novin Development Corp.
Path (people Assisting the Homeless)
Peninsula for Everyone
Peninsula Interfaith Climate Action
People for Housing - Orange County
Pile Drivers Local 34
Place Initiative
Progress Noe Valley
Resources for Community Development
Salesforce.com, INC.
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)
San Francisco Yimby
San Luis Obispo Yimby
Santa Cruz Yimby
Santa Rosa Yimby

Satellite Affordable Housing Associates
Silicon Valley Community Foundation
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
South Bay Yimby
South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth
Southern California Association of Non-profit Housing (SCANPH)
Southern California District Council of Laborers
Southside Forward
Spur
Streets for All
Sunrise Silicon Valley
Sustainable Growth Yolo
The John Stewart Company
The Pacific Companies
The San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund
The United Way of Greater Los Angeles
Union Station Homeless Services
Urban Environmentalists
Urban League of San Diego County
Ventura County Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice
Ventura County Yimby
Wall and Ceiling Alliance (WACA)
Westside for Everyone
Yimby Action
Yimby Democrats of San Diego County
1 Individual

Opposition:

Association of California Cities - Orange County (ACC-OC)
California Contract Cities Association
California Labor Federation, Afl-cio
California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Pipe Trades Council
Catalysts for Local Control
Century Glen Hoa
City of Agoura Hills
City of Bakersfield
City of Bellflower
City of Beverly Hills
City of Brentwood
City of Colton
City of Concord
City of Corona
City of Del Mar
City of Downey
City of Duarte
City of Eastvale
City of Elk Grove
City of Fairfield
City of Fontana

City of Fortuna
City of Fullerton
City of Glendora
City of Grand Terrace
City of Hesperia
City of Indian Wells
City of Inglewood City Hall
City of Kerman, CA
City of La Habra
City of La Mirada
City of Lafayette
City of Laguna Beach
City of Laguna Niguel
City of Lakeport
City of Lakewood
City of Lakewood CA
City of Lincoln
City of Menifee
City of Mission Viejo
City of Montebello
City of Moorpark
City of Morgan Hill
City of Newport Beach
City of Norwalk
City of Novato
City of Oceanside
City of Ontario
City of Orinda
City of Palm Desert
City of Paramount
City of Perris
City of Pico Rivera
City of Pismo Beach
City of Placentia
City of Pleasant Hill
City of Rancho Cucamonga
City of Redding
City of Rosemead
City of San Marcos
City of Simi Valley
City of Stockton
City of Temecula
City of Thousand Oaks
City of Tulare
City of Turlock
City of Tustin
City of Vista
City of Whittier
City of Wildomar
City of Yorba Linda

Coalition of California Utility Employees
IBEW Local Union 569
International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 18
International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 8
League of California Cities
Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities
Mccmc
Mission Street Neighbors
New Livable California DbA Livable California
Orange County Council of Governments
Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association
State Building and Construction Trades Council of Ca
Town of Apple Valley
Town of Fairfax
Truckee; Town of
United Neighbors San Dimas
Ventura Council of Governments
Western States Council Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation
21 Individuals

-- END --