Planning Advisory Committee
Thursday, June 21, 2018 – 9:00 a.m.
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions

2. Administrative
   2.1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- (ACTION)
   2.2. Review Meeting Notes from April 19, 2018 * – (ACTION)
   2.3. SCTA Planning Activities update*

3. Updates from group - DISCUSSION

4. Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study – Scope and Funding Plan*

5. Housing updates
   5.1. Permitting database*
   5.2. Roundtable discussion on creative approaches or regulatory fixes to incentivize or fill gaps in housing production.
   5.3. Housing legislation
      5.3.1. AB 2267 Sonoma County housing legislation – see attached summary and full text of the bill at https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB2267
      5.3.2. State housing bill presentation by Goldfarb Lipman Attorneys to BAPDA May 4, 2018 http://bapda.net/events/2018spring/Understanding_the_2017_Housing_Bills.pdf

6. SB743 Update – Example of VMT Estimation/Evaluation Tool – City of San Jose: http://www.sanjoseca.gov/vmt

7. Other Business /Next agenda

8. Public Comment

9. Adjourn -(ACTION)

*Attachment

The next SCTA meeting will be July 9, 2018
The next PAC meeting will be August 16, 2018

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA/RCPA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Planning Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system. TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS: Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check www.511.org, www.srcity.org/citybus or www.sctransit.com

490 Mendocino Ave. #206, Santa Rosa, CA | 707.565.5373 | scta.ca.gov | rcpa.ca.gov
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Meeting Notes of April 19, 2018

ITEM

1. Introductions

Meeting called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Vicki Parker.

Committee Members: Vicki Parker, Chair, City of Cotati; Nancy Adams, City of Santa Rosa; Jessica Jones, City of Santa Rosa; Eric Gage, City of Santa Rosa; Scott Duiven, City of Healdsburg; Milan Nevajda, City of Petaluma; Jeff Beiswenger, City of Rohnert Park; Amy Lyle, Permit Sonoma.

Guests: Steve Birdlebough, Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition; Ada Chan, ABAG.

Staff: Suzanne Smith; Janet Spilman; Chris Barney; Dana Turrey; Brant Arthur; Drew Nichols; Aleka Seville; Carolyn Glanton; Julian Ruzzier-Gaul (CivicSpark Fellow).

2. Administrative

2.1. Approval of the agenda

Approved as submitted.

2.2. Review meeting notes from February 15, 2018

Approved as submitted.

2.3. SCTA Planning Activities update

N/A

3. Update from group

City of Cotati:

Vicki Parker reported the City of Cotati is currently processing permits for a 74 unit multifamily project. The improvement plans and documents are set to be presented to the city council at the end of July, early August.

The planned hotel in the city is still in the process of submitting a formal application. Concept reviews with staff are continuous.

Ms. Parker also reported on the current road projects underway.

City of Healdsburg:

Scott Duiven reported to the committee on affordable housing projects in Healdsburg, which are aimed to be online in the spring or summer. A subdivision has been approved and will include inclusionary and accessory dwelling units (ADU).

City of Petaluma:

Milan Nevajda introduced himself to the committee as the new representative to the PAC from the City of Petaluma.

City of Rohnert Park:

Jeff Beiswenger reported the General Plan update has begun. The Urban Growth Boundaries will not be changing, just brought it into compliance with State law.

Mr. Beiswenger further described construction of the Cambria Hotel, and continued activity in the central Rohnert Park PDA.

In the University District Specific Plan area 400 units have been completed, and another 400 will be built.
He commented that builders face challenges with building apartment complexes due to increases in construction, material, and labor costs.

**City of Santa Rosa:**

Jessica Jones reported that Coffey Park projects are under construction. Staff continues to work diligently on housing policies and will bring an update to the Planning Commission and City Council next week on all housing items. There will be a joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting that will discuss the Housing Action Plan, General Plan update, the Santa Rosa Downtown Specific Plan, along with the idea of an express review process.

Currently home rebuilds and affordable housing projects are priorities above other projects.

The General Plan update will be potentially delayed due to fire recovery efforts. There is not enough funding available for a comprehensive update.

Suzanne Smith asked the cost of the General Plan update.

Ms. Jones responded the total budget is estimated around $2-2.5 million; the city currently has $1.4 million.

Amy Lyle further asked if a timeline has been established.

Ms. Jones responded the timeline is three years.

**County of Sonoma, Permit Sonoma:**

Amy Lyle reported to the committee that housing amendments are in progress, and progress has been made on these amendments as they worked through the housing commission. The amendments are set in three parts:

First element will focus on ADUs and will be presented to the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors (BOS) in May. This amendment permits the allowance of ADUs up to 1200sq-ft. Staff is also considering waiving the development fees associated with ADUs outside the burn areas. Furthermore, staff is looking at adding flexibility for mixed use development in commercial areas and incentives for transitional and supportive housing.

The second element will be related to workforce housing. This is aimed to create a tool, not to rezone, that would permit cottage housing and micro-apartments. These are hoped to be available in high density areas with transit areas to employment centers.

The third element will address rezoning housing sites and also removing an exclusion of ADUs.

Ms. Lyle further described ongoing work with Caltrans for a realignment of Highway 1 near Gleason Beach.

Lastly, Ms. Lyle discussed the cannabis ordinance. The BOS has reviewed the cannabis ordinance and requested more information on neighborhood compatibility and security. The ordinance amendments have been separated into two parts. First will reaffirm the medical element to harmonize with the state regulations, and second, will consider zoning districts and permits, among other elements that need to be addressed.

Ms. Smith asked about the timeline for Sonoma County’s General Plan update.

Ms. Lyle responded the scope will begin in the fall, tentatively; however the work plan will be presented to the BOS in May and there is no anticipated budget yet.
Ada Chan briefly updated the committee on the steering committee for CASA, recalling the discussion from the previous SCTA PAC meeting. The subject matter of the steering committee will be discussing the “fiscalization of land.”

Ms. Chan updated the committee on the next BAPDA meeting. Ms. Chan highlighted the Senate Bill 35 item, which addresses streamlining for development.

Ms. Chan explained jurisdictions should consider the by rights, how they come together, and how far the general plan must be to ensure development proposals are approved that meet the community’s expectations as the general plan updates begin.

4. Draft siting recommendations for PG&E proposal for resilient EV charging in wildfire affected areas

Brant Arthur updated the committee on work with PG&E and Sonoma Clean Power. PG&E received funding totaling $20 million from SB-350 and have expressed an interest to focus on wildfire resiliency via EV charging stations.

PG&E has requested assistance with identifying locations where charging stations can be available in the event of a power outage.

Mr. Arthur described the charging levels that are available with each charging station and displayed a map describing existing and potential locations in Sonoma County. Most of these locations identified served as evacuation centers during the October 2017 wildfires.

Jeff Beiswenger inquired if these will be public-private partnership, or will solely be in public spaces.

Mr. Arthur responded that PG&E will install the charging stations and the infrastructure, but the owner will operate.

Amy Lyle asked if there is a residential component.

Mr. Arthur responded the EV Charge Network program already in place for workplace and multifamily places.

Janet Spilman asked about existing conventions of having a consistent, findable location for EV charging stations in all the cities city hall for example.

The committee further discussed the concept and the recommendations.

5. Sonoma County Travel Model Update

Chris Barney updated the committee on the Sonoma County Travel Model update. The land use conditions have been updated and a consultant has been selected to work on the revalidation of the model (TJKM Transportation Consultants). The updated land use assumptions will be checked with real world data and the model output will be checked for reasonableness as part of the validation process.

Furthermore there is a focus on origin-destination study to better understand travel movements in Sonoma County.

Milan Nevajda asked about the boundary of the travel model.

Mr. Barney responded the scope of the travel model will be within the county boundaries, but noted the interest to expand to neighboring counties to understand who is coming and leaving the county.

Mr. Barney also commented on SB 743. The deadline for compliance is set for January 1, 2020.
Vicki Parker asked about the SB 743 resources and what the model update or travel behavior study would provide to support SB 743 compliance.

Mr. Barney answered that a trip report with travel flows and graphics would be produced which could be used as a resource for traffic studies. Technical memorandums covering threshold setting and VMT estimation techniques could be produced to support SB 743 compliance efforts.

The committee continued to discuss the budget and scope of work of the travel behavior study, and the relationship to general plan updates. The PAC requested that staff return with a proposed budget and cost sharing framework for the group to review in June.

6. Urban Footprint Update

Chris Barney updated the committee on Urban Footprint (UF), stating the software has officially been released. The information was included in the staff report.

UF will provide free licenses if the jurisdictions are willing to sign a data sharing agreement.

Mr. Barney also explained continued work on a pilot project to demonstrate what UF can do. This project is focused on analyzing the 30,000 housing units goal promoted by the County.

Mr. Barney provided a handout showing possible distributions of future housing units to the committee and requested feedback on the scenarios.

The committee continued discussing the projects in the pipeline, and for sub divisions. Staff will email a summary of pipeline projects in each jurisdiction, which includes tables and background information on the calculations and categories. The PAC agreed to update and revise the list of pipeline projects and send them back to staff by May 30, 2018.

7. ABAG – Housing

7.1 Web portal

Ada Chan demonstrated the ABAG Housing Policy and Data Explorer, an online database of policies and permit information approved by jurisdictions throughout the Bay Area.. Amy Lyle observed the web portal does not describe the rural investment areas.

Ms. Chan acknowledged that observation and will discuss with IT to include the Rural Investment interlay.

7.2 Data Requests

Ada Chan announced the 2016 housing permit data was received from all the jurisdictions and explained the deadline for 2017 data will be in August. Ms. Chan urged the committee to submit their housing data as soon as possible.

8. Other Business/Next Agenda

8.1 Bay Area Planning Directors Association Spring Meeting, May 4

The next PAC meeting will be June 21st, 2018.

9. Public Comment

N/A

10. Adjourn

The committee adjourned at 10:47 a.m.
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: Janet Spilman, Director of Planning
Item: Planning Activities Report
Date: June 11, 2018

Issue:
Information only.

Background:

PLANNING

- **Transit Integration and Efficiency Study** – SCTA released an RFP on April 24 and received one proposal (from Nelson Nygaard) on May 22, 2018. An interview will be conducted in early June and a proposed contract will be brought to the SCTA Board of Directors for consideration in July 2018.

- **Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning** - SCTA staff has collected updates to the bicycle and pedestrian project list for Appendix A of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and updated it accordingly. Revised bicycle and pedestrian maps are underway.

- **Plan Bay Area 2050** – Staff is participating in early stages of update.

ADMINISTRATION OF ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

- **Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA3)** - staff submitted the program of projects for Fiscal Year 2018-2019 to MTC. Agreements between sponsors and MTC are underway.

- **Transportation for Clean Air Fund, County Program Manager (TFCA, CPM)** – staff submitted the program of projects for Fiscal Year 2018-2019 to BAAQMD. - Next – SCTA contracting with BAAQMD and project sponsors

- **Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) Cycle 5** – staff submitted program of projects to MTC. Next – MTC approval of program of projects

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

- **Santa Rosa Car Share Pilot Program** – Zipcar reservations in April were highest to date, with an uptick in usage of the vehicle located at Railroad Square. A new short-term marketing plan has been implemented with a combination of web-based, print, SMART overhead panel advertisement, and incentives for new members. In early July, Zipcar and staff will discuss whether the current agreement expiring in August 2018 will be extended. Santa Rosa residents and employees can take advantage of complementary annual Zipcar memberships subsidized by the grant. [Zipcar.com/SantaRosa](http://Zipcar.com/SantaRosa)

- **Safe Routes to School** – Staff has received Authorization to Proceed from Caltrans for the Safe Routes to Schools Countywide Program, which is funded through the OBAG program for the upcoming 5-year cycle. The Request for Proposals was released on May 31. Staff continues to work with Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition to administer the gap year (2017/2018) Measure M funded SRTS program.
• **Bike Share Grant** – SCTA staff has submitted final comments on the draft funding agreement to MTC and is working with the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) on a program implementation work plan. Staff anticipates bringing the funding agreement with MTC and cooperative agreement with TAM to the SCTA in July. Funding is anticipated to be available starting July 1, 2018.

**DATA MANAGEMENT AND FORECASTING**

- **Travel Model Update** – Travel model validation and recalibration is underway. Work has focused on reviewing model inputs and refining trip generation parameters. Staff presented a cost-sharing plan to the TAC for additional model improvements and the preparation of a travel behavior study for Sonoma County. These improvements and the travel behavior study would focus on supporting general plan updates and other local planning work and provide support for SB 743 compliance. The cost-sharing plan and revised project scope will be reviewed by the PAC in June.

- **Pending and Permitted Development Tracking** – Work continues on improving the Sonoma County Pending and Permitted Development Database. Local planners are reviewing pipeline projects for their jurisdictions and are identifying project status for housing projects. This database tracks countywide pipeline projects and feeds this information into the Sonoma County Travel Model.

- **Modeling and analysis support** - Data, analysis, and mapping support has been provided for projects located in the Highway 101 corridor and City of Santa Rosa. Online maps showing different methods for designating disadvantaged communities in Sonoma County have been updated to include new ATP and Cal EnviroScreen 3 criteria.

**COORDINATION & OUTREACH**

**Local Activities**

- Spare the Air Resources Team – Worked with the Resources Team on outreach to employers on commute programs and website improvements.

**Regional Coordination**

- MTC/ABAG committees: Regional Advisory Working Group, Regional Modeling Working Group; Transit Finance Working Group, Active Transportation Working Group, Transportation Demand Management Working Group

- SB743 – Staff is coordinating with regional and local planning and public works staff on SB743 implementation, which directs lead agencies to shift CEQA transportation impact analysis from LOS to VMT.

- CMA Planners meetings

- Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Plan – Continued coordination between CBPAC members and the Caltrans Bike Plan team on final plan development.

**Policy Impacts:**

All activities are consistent with SCTA policy.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Information only.
Staff Report

To:  Planning Advisory Committee

From:  Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner

Item:  Sonoma County Travel Model Update and Cost Sharing Proposal for Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study and Additional Model Improvements

Date:  June 21, 2018

Issue:

What is the status of the Sonoma County Travel Model (SCTM) 2018 update?

Background:

SCTA received three proposals in response to the 2018 Sonoma County Travel Model Update Request for Proposals. TJKM Transportation Consultants were selected to complete the travel model calibration and validation portion of this work. TJKM and SCTA are currently working through the initial phases of travel model validation, which is focused on checking 2015 existing land use model inputs and trip generation rates.

The SCTM model update RFP included one primary, and two optional tasks as follows:

- Task 1: Model calibration/validation – The Sonoma County Travel Model will be recalibrated and revalidated using a base year of 2015. Validation will include static and dynamic validation approaches, and will include future year (2040) scenario reasonableness testing.

  Deliverables will include a recalibrated and revalidated travel model, a model validation report documenting the model update and model reasonableness, and a copy of all travel data used to recalibrate/revalidate the travel model.

- Optional Task 2: Travel behavior study – Gather and summarize data using traditional and state-of-the-art techniques on Sonoma County travel behavior including current information on travel flows, average trip lengths (miles and minutes), travel modes, major destinations, trip purposes, travel peaks, etc. Travel behavior studies have been conducted in Napa and Marin counties recently.

  Deliverables would include a final report summarizing travel flows, trends, and behavior for Sonoma County jurisdictions along with background data and graphics that could be used to support local general plan updates, provide information useful in the development of station area and area specific plans, and to support other local planning and engineering activities.

- Optional Task 3: Optional model improvements – Make improvements to the travel model including enhanced estimation of visitor/tourism travel, weekend travel, expanding model boundaries, and providing tools and resources to support SB 743 implementation (required compliance date is
Deliverables would include model improvements and reports that would enhance the travel model’s ability to support general plan updates and other local planning work, improve model output that is used to develop traffic impact studies, and to support local jurisdictions in implementing SB743. SB743 support could include guidance on setting thresholds, analyzing projects, and calculating VMT.

SCTA has funded Task 1 of this project (Model Validation) and is working on identifying additional funding to complete Tasks 2 and 3. The SCTA Planning Advisory Committee discussed the outstanding tasks at the April 2018 meeting and expressed an interest in moving forward with the travel behavior study and optional model improvement tasks and requested that staff develop a cost sharing proposal for their review and to present this information to the TAC. The TAC reviewed the attached cost proposal at their May meeting and recommended that it be forwarded back to the PAC for comment. The attached draft project budget and schedule (Attachment A) and cost sharing proposal (Attachment B) are attached.

Staff proposes that contributing agencies be invited to participate in an ad hoc project advisory group that would work with SCTA and consultants to guide and complete remaining project tasks by:

- identifying specific areas or locations for study and analysis,
- identifying specific research questions which could be answered by collecting and analyzing travel behavioral data,
- identifying specific work products (data, tables, maps, charts, etc.) that would be produced,
- providing guidance and input on adjusting or reducing the project scope of work,
- guiding the development of SB 743 implementation tools and reports.

**Policy Impacts:**

The revalidated travel model will be used for all SCTA modeling and scenario analysis work. Additional data collection and model improvements could support local general plan updates and other local planning and engineering work.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

The consultant contract budget for Task 1 of the 2018 travel model update (model calibration/validation) is $50,000. Staff time will also be required to manage the consultant contract and to perform model update tasks not included in the model update scope of work. SCTA is seeking funding to complete the travel behavior study and implement additional model improvements. Estimated cost for completing this work in full is $185,000. Project cost could be spread over two years (fiscal years 18/19 – 19/20) and could be reduced by removing project components or reducing the project scope.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Consider identifying which unfunded model improvements would be important for your jurisdiction. Review and provide feedback on draft cost sharing proposal. Consider identifying and providing resources to complete this work.
### Attachment A.
**Sonoma County Travel Model Update and Travel Behavior Study - Budget and Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel Model Validation</td>
<td><strong>Currently funded and underway.</strong> Includes update of model base year from 2010 to 2015 and recalibrating/revalidating the travel model using current traffic counts, transit ridership counts, and travel survey data.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Spring 2018 - Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Travel Behavior Study</td>
<td>Propose a simple approach focused on mobile source data and other existing data sources to assemble this dataset and report.</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Spring 2019 - Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Weekend Model*</td>
<td>Use data collected as part of Task 2 to develop weekend modeling capability. Could include updated weekend trip generation, mode share adjustments using weekend schedules and ridership estimates, and weekend peaking factor adjustments.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Visitor and tourism travel improvements*</td>
<td>Add new tourism trip purpose. Includes additional data collection. Uses data collected as part of Task 2.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Winery/Ag. Model improvements*</td>
<td>Add new land use category and trip generation specific to winery and agricultural uses. Uses data collected as part of Task 2.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SB 743 support</td>
<td>Provide support and recommendations on SB 743 implementation including: Setting thresholds, calculating VMT, analyzing induced demand, accounting for entire trip lengths, and SB 743 reporting. Could requires some work associated with Task 7. Expanded Gateways.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Fall 2018 - Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expanded Gateways*</td>
<td>Add additional gateways/external zones to improve SCTM's ability to account for and analyze out of county travel. Would be enhanced by data collected as part of Task 2. Travel Behavior Study.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Fall 2018 - Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*uses information gathered as part of Task 2. Travel Behavior Study

**TOTAL** $235,000

**UNFUNDED TOTAL** $185,000
Attachment B.
Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study and Model Enhancements - Draft Cost Sharing Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>SCTA</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cities Total</th>
<th>Per City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Model Validation (funded and underway)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Travel Behavior Study</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Weekend Model</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Visitor and tourism travel improvements</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Winery/Ag. Model improvements</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SB 743 support</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expanded Gateways</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SONOMA COUNTY PENDING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - UNITS BY JURISDICTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>HU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>1,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>4,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>4,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sonoma County Pending Residential Development - Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>7038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>6423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14767</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sonoma County Pending Residential Development - Project Status

- Pre-Application
- Under Review
- Approved
- Under Construction
Sonoma County Pending Residential Development - Priority Development vs. Non-PDA Location

- PDA
- Non-PDA
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### Sonoma County Travel Model Pending Development and Permitted Projects Database - Jurisdictional Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Non-Residential Project Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cloverdale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>16000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>40438 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreational Areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15655 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>290365 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotati</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>41850 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6184 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>546052 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1276 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>349623 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1855401 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>621</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>527380 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreational Areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>520 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>316050 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>277037 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Land Use Type</td>
<td># of Projects</td>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>Non-Residential Project Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>575715 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>344 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8040 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12861 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76714 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>372 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>440 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86724 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>755000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86813 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>488 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreational Areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>374300 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8200 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Land Use Type</td>
<td># of Projects</td>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>Non-Residential Project Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>62 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124300 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104289 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98500 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>259433 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130912 sqft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sebastopol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Non-Residential Project Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18645 sqft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sonoma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Non-Residential Project Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4396 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17096 sqft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Windsor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Non-Residential Project Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134275 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreational Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3500 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19500 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>232411 sqft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why it is needed: When 5,300 homes were destroyed in Sonoma County in the October 2017 wildfires—the already serious countywide housing shortage became a housing crisis so severe that it threatens the local economy. To stabilize communities and the local economy, the City of Santa Rosa and County of Sonoma must act quickly to provide for dramatically increased housing production in areas most suited for new housing development—areas served by high quality transit and already planned for growth. In part due to unique local circumstances, existing streamlining provisions in CEQA will not allow the City and County to move quickly enough.

What it does: As amended, AB 2267 provides narrow and time-limited CEQA streamlining options for certain local agency land use plans and for cutting-edge residential development projects near SMART stations in the City of Santa Rosa and County of Sonoma. The bill has three key components:

1. Limited CEQA exemption for amendments to existing Specific Plans in core areas of Santa Rosa. The proposed amendments to Government Code 65457 would give a limited CEQA exemption to allow the City of Santa Rosa to amend its existing Specific Plans to increase permitted heights and density, diversify housing stock, and establish new criteria for transportation impacts analysis. This exemption is limited to Specific Plans in the City of Santa Rosa that overlap with designated Priority Development Areas (as identified in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Plan Bay Area 2040) or within a transit priority area (defined in CEQA as areas within a ½ mile of a major transit stop). This exemption would expire on January 1, 2024.

2. Expedited resolution of CEQA lawsuits challenging local agency approvals of land use plans in the “RED Area”. Proposed new Government Code § 65458 provides that for a 5-year period (until January 1, 2024), CEQA lawsuits filed to challenge adoption or amendment of certain land use plans in Santa Rosa and unincorporated Sonoma County would be handled by the courts so that litigation is resolved, to the extent feasible, within 270 days. To be eligible for the exemption, a RED Area Plan must:
   a. Apply to parcels located within the “RED Area”: areas in Santa Rosa and unincorporated County that overlap with Priority Development Areas, the Sonoma County Airport Employment Investment Area, or transit priority areas.
   b. Meet standards specified in the bill related to affordable housing, higher densities for residential development within ½ mile of an active passenger rail station, and zero net additional greenhouse gas emissions at plan buildout.

3. Limited CEQA exemption for “RED Leadership Development Projects.” The proposed new Public Resources Code §§21189.60-21189.63 make a CEQA exemption available until January 1, 2024 for individual development projects in the RED Area that are certified as meeting specific standards related to site location and transit proximity, provision of affordable units, minimum density within .5 mile of existing major transit stops, zero net additional greenhouse gas emissions, provision of unbundled parking, and payment of prevailing wage.
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- Changes in Processing Housing Applications
  - Housing Accountability Act
  - SB 35
  - ‘No Net Loss’

- Return of Rental Inclusionary Requirements

- Housing Elements & Annual Reports

- Special Districts

- ADUs
HAA AND SB 35

Housing Accountability Act

- Government Code Sec. 65589.5
- Affects all residential projects

SB 35

- Government Code Sec. 65913.4
- “Streamlining” for some residential projects

Both laws focus on “objective standards” and favor predictability over flexibility.
“The Legislature’s intent in enacting this section in 1982 and in expanding its provisions since then was to significantly increase the approval & 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 of, or render infeasible housing development projects. This intent has not been fulfilled.”
WHAT IS AN “OBJECTIVE” STANDARD?

SB 35 definition:

- “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 applicant and the public official prior to submittal.”

- Examples:
  - Height, setbacks, lot coverage, % open space, density, FAR, etc.
WHAT IS NOT “OBJECTIVE”? 

Standards found not to be “objective:”

- “Address unmet need for senior housing.”
- “Special care shall be taken to avoid obstructing views to the surrounding hills.”
- “Produce high quality authentic design.”
- “Reflect look and feel of the community.”

*Honchariw v. County of Stanislaus (2011)*

- Map Act finding that “the site is not physically suitable for the proposed development” is not objective
If desire to deny or reduce density:

- Identify **objective** standards project does not comply with.
- If project complies with all, must find specific adverse effect on public health & safety.

“Specific adverse effect” must be significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable based on written health & safety standards on date project deemed complete, & no way to mitigate.
HAA APPLICABILITY

Applies to **ALL** “housing development projects” and emergency shelters:

- Residences only;
- Transitional & supportive housing;
- Mixed use projects with at least 2/3 the square footage designated for residential use.

Affordable AND market-rate
Within 30-60 days of completeness the City must:

- Provide list of any inconsistencies with any “plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement or similar provision”;
- Explain why the project inconsistent; or
- “Deemed consistent.”
Also “deemed consistent” if: “substantial evidence that would allow a reasonable person to conclude” is consistent

- Developer may submit own evidence re: consistency
- City findings must be based on ‘preponderance of the evidence,’ not merely ‘substantial evidence’
- Attorneys’ fees to both market-rate & affordable
- $10K/unit fine if ignore court
**SB 35: ‘STREAMLINING’**

Determine if Jurisdiction is Subject to SB 35

- Not enough building permits to satisfy RHNA
- OR
- No Annual Report for 2 Years

Determine if Project is Eligible for Streamlining

- 2 or more units in urbanized area zoned or planned for residential
- &
- Meets all objective standards
- &
- Meets affordable housing and labor requirements

Determine if Exclusion Applies

- Project site may not be on list of exclusions
- OR
- Project must not require subdivision unless LIHTC-funded and/or meets labor requirements
SB 35 PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS

- No CEQA review
- Ministerial review ONLY based on ‘objective’ standards
- Review can’t last more than 90 – 180 days from submittal
‘NO NET LOSS’ OF RHNA SITES (65863)

- Applies when:
  - Any site in inventory either downzoned to reduce density; or approved at lower density than shown; OR
  - Site approved with fewer units at the income level shown in the inventory.
- Only applicable to counties and general law cities.
Must designate specific sites that can “accommodate” the RHNA at each income level during the planning period (65583.2).

Sites “accommodating” lower income housing must be at “default densities” of 10 – 30 du/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>DU/A</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Income Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>041-0042-002</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037-0400-027</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038-0100-040</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039-1100-039</td>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO NET LOSS REQUIRED FINDINGS

- Reduction in density/income level OK if:
  - Reduction consistent with GP and Housing Element; and
  - Remaining sites in Element are adequate at all income levels. Must quantify unmet need and remaining capacity by income level.

- Options:
  - Remaining sites in Housing Element adequate to meet the RHNA at all income levels; or
  - County approved more units on some site than shown in inventory or has other units at that income category; or
  - Other sites NOT in Housing Element can make up difference; or
  - Another site “identified and made available.” Time limit of 180 days for income category only.
### No Net Loss
- Is the project on a Housing Element site in a county or general law city?
- Must provide at least the number of units listed in the Housing Element at the income level shown in the Housing Element or comply with ‘no net loss’ (Section 65863)
- Also applies to non-residential approvals on housing element sites

### HAA
- Is the project a “housing development project”?
- Must advise on consistency within 30 – 60 days of completeness
- Specific findings required to deny or reduce density
- Additional findings required to deny or reduce density if project is affordable or an emergency shelter

### SB 35
- Does the project qualify for streamlining?
- Must advise on consistency within 60 – 90 days of submittal
- Must complete “public oversight” within 90 – 180 days
- Exempt from CEQA review.
PROPOSED LEGISLATION: STREAMLINING

- **AB 2631 (Allen) – Streamlining for BMR Housing**
  - Streamline ministerial approval (SB 35-light) for low or moderate income housing development of 25 or less units located on a vacant site in a public transit corridor

- **AB 3194 (Daly) - Housing Accountability Act**
  - Provide that project consistent with zoning ordinance if the zoning ordinance does not allow the maximum residential use, density or intensity permitted by the land use or housing elements
RENTAL INCLUSIONARY HOUSING

- AB 1505 restores the ability of counties to adopt inclusionary housing policies for rental projects.

- The Bill explicitly supersedes the California Court of Appeal’s 2009 decision in Palmer/Sixth Street Properties LP v. City of Los Angeles (Palmer).

- The policies must meet certain standards and the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) may review the policies in certain circumstances.
Local governments may require new rental housing include percentage of affordable units

Ordinances must provide “alternative means of compliance” with inclusionary requirements

Alternatives may include, but are not limited to:

- In lieu fees
- Land dedication
- Off-site development of units
- Acquisition and rehabilitation of existing units
PROPOSED LEGISLATION:
DENSITY BONUS

- SB 1227 (Skinner) - Density Bonus for Student Housing
- AB 2372 (Gloria) - Floor Area Ratio Bonus for Affordable Housing
- AB 2753 (Friedman) - Revisions to Density Bonus Application
  - Local government must notify applicant for Density Bonus in writing within 30 calendar days of application of completeness
  - Local government would have 60 days from complete application to act to approve or disapprove a density bonus
  - Failure to meet deadlines results in application deemed completed and density bonus granted
- AB 2797 (Bloom) - Density Bonus and Coastal Act of 1976
  - Prohibits local agency from finding a project is inconsistent with Public Resources Code Section 30251 on the basis of density bonus, incentives, waivers, or reduced parking ratios; overturns Kalnel and requires harmonizing laws
SB 35 & AB 879

- Housing Element annual reports required from all jurisdictions on April 1 of each year

- New requirements regarding report contents
More rigorous analysis will be required during next update cycle. In the meantime...

- HCD may revoke finding of housing element compliance
  - May review actions or “failure to act” that is inconsistent with an adopted housing element or state housing element law, including failure to implement housing element program

- HCD authorized to refer violations to Attorney General
PROPOSED LEGISLATION:
HOUSING PRODUCTION

- **SB 828 (Wiener) – Housing Element**
  - Require local agency to plan and accommodate 200% of RHNA all income categories

- **AB 1771 (Bloom) Revisions to RHNA allocation process**

- **AB 2923 (Chiu) – BART TOD Guidelines**
  - Require BART to adopt new transit oriented development guidelines and jurisdictions to conform zoning to BART standards

- **AB 3147 (Caballero) – Fee Mitigation Act**
  - No increased fees under Mitigation Fee Act once project application is deemed “complete”
ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

- **AB 494/SB 229** continue to ease ADU restrictions
  - ‘Interior ADUs’ in all districts permitting s-f homes
  - Less ability to limit tandem parking and parking in setbacks

- HCD expressly authorized to review ordinances
PROPOSED LEGISLATION: ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

- AB 2890 (Ting)
- SB 1469 (Skinner)
- SB 831 (Wieckowski)

- Focus on limiting ADU fees
- Relaxed development standards (no FAR cap, no parking)
- Remove authorization for owner-occupancy requirements
NEW ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOOLS

- **SB 540**
  - Workforce Housing Opportunity Zones

- **AB 73**
  - Housing Sustainability Districts

- **AB 1568**
  - Neighborhood Infill Finance and Transit Improvement Districts

- **AB 1598**
  - Affordable Housing Authorities
PROPOSED LEGISLATION: AFFORDABLE HOUSING FINANCING

- **SB 912 (Beall and Skinner)**
  - $1 billion general fund allocation to HCD for funding programs to address homelessness and affordable housing and $1 billion for permanent transitional housing for persons below 60% of AMI

- **AB 3171 (Ting)**
  - General fund allocation to fund Local Homelessness Solutions Accounts

- **AB 3152 (Chiu) Welfare Exemption for Moderate Income Housing**
  - Property tax welfare exemption for qualified non-profit owners of moderate-income housing
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