

- (3) The site is not dedicated to industrial use and it is not adjoined to a site where more than one-third of the square footage of the site is dedicated to industrial use, as specified.
 - (4) The site is not in an environmentally sensitive area, as specified.
 - (5) The site, if it is located within a neighborhood plan area, satisfies both of the following:
 - (a) The plan applicable to the site was adopted prior to January 1, 2024, as specified.
 - (b) The neighborhood plan allows residential use on the site.
- iii) *Objective Development Standards.* In order to qualify as a use by right, the development project must additionally comply with the following objective development standards:
- (1) The development must be a multifamily housing development, and meet specified density requirements.
 - (2) The development proponent shall conduct an environmental assessment related to hazardous materials, as specified.
 - (3) None of the housing in the development will be located within 500 feet of a freeway.
 - (4) None of the housing in the development will be located within 3,200 feet of a facility that actively extracts or refines oil or natural gas.
 - (5) The development will comply with objective zoning standards, subdivision standards, and design review standards adopted by the local government that are applicable to the parcel, as specified.

Mixed-Income Housing Developments along Commercial Corridors

- a) Deems mixed-income affordable housing development projects to be a use by right and requires local agencies to approve these projects ministerially, as specified, if they comply with the following standards and criteria:
 - i) *Affordability Standards.* The development project must meet or exceed specified affordability requirements.
 - ii) *Location Criteria.* The development project shall be located on a site that complies with specified criteria, including but not limited to:
 - (1) The site is located in a zone where office, retail or parking are principally permitted uses, as specified.
 - (2) The site is located on an infill parcel, as specified.

- (3) The site is not dedicated to industrial use and it is not adjoined to a site where more than one-third of the square footage of the site is dedicated to industrial use, as specified.
 - (4) The site is not in an environmentally sensitive area, as specified.
 - (5) The site, if it is within a neighborhood plan area, satisfies both of the following:
 - (a) The plan applicable to the site was adopted prior to January 1, 2024, as specified.
 - (b) The neighborhood plan allows residential use on the site.
- iii) *Objective Development Standards.* In order to qualify as a use by right, the development project must additionally comply with objective development standards including but not limited to:
- (1) The development must be a multifamily housing development and specified density requirements.
 - (2) The development proponent shall conduct an environmental assessment related to hazardous materials, as specified.
 - (3) None of the housing in the development will be located within 500 feet of a freeway.
 - (4) None of the housing in the development will be located within 3,200 feet of a facility that actively extracts or refines oil or natural gas.
 - (5) The development will comply with objective zoning standards, subdivision standards, and design review standards adopted by the local government that are applicable to the parcel, as specified.
 - (6) Height limits that may exceed those adopted by the local government, as specified.
 - (7) Setback requirement, as specified.
 - (8) Provides that no parking is required except for bike parking, electrical vehicle parking, or parking spaces accessible for persons with disabilities.
- 2) Establishes the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which requires public agencies with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a proposed project to prepare a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or an environmental impact report (EIR) for this action, unless the project is exempt from CEQA.
 - 3) Establishes the Housing Accountability Act (HAA), which provides that when a proposed housing development project complies with applicable, objective general plan, zoning, and subdivision standards and criteria in effect at the time

that the housing development project's application is 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 specified written findings.

- 4) Establishes, pursuant to SB 35 (Weiner, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017), and SB 423 (Weiner Chapter 423 Statutes of 2023), until 2036 a streamlined, ministerial review process for infill housing development projects that meet strict objective standards and are sites that are zoned for residential use or residential mixed-use development (SB 35 Developments).
- 5) Establishes Density Bonus Law (DBL), which requires cities and counties to grant a density bonus and award other incentives or concessions to an applicant for a housing development of five or more units that agrees to set aside a minimum number of units that are affordable to households with low-, very-low, or moderate-income.

This bill:

- 1) Makes a series of changes to AB 2011. Specifically, the bill:

Definitions

- a) Adds or amends the following terms for the purposes of AB 2011:
 - i) Defines "Base units" to mean the same as "total units" in DBL and specifies that affordability requirements for purposes of AB 2011 are calculated based on the number of base units.
 - ii) Expands the existing definition of "commercial corridor" so that the provisions of AB 2011 apply to narrower corridors in areas zoned for taller buildings, specifically:
 - (1) For parcels zoned for a height limit of less than 65 feet, a right-of-way of at least 70 and not greater than 150 feet is required; or
 - (2) For any parcel zoned for a height limit equal to or greater than 65 feet, a right-of-way of at least 50 and not greater than 150 feet is required.
 - iii) Defines "deemed complete" as having the same meaning as it does in the HAA.
 - iv) Defines "freeway" as a highway where the owners of abutting lands have no right or easement of access to or from their abutting lands or have

- only limited or restricted right or easement of access. Specifies that a freeway does not include onramps and offramps.
- v) Revises the existing definition of “industrial use” to include any use that requires a permit from an air quality district. Specifies that industrial uses exclude power substations and utility conveyances, uses where the only source permitted by an air quality district is a backup generator, and on-site residential self-storage.
 - vi) Defines “minimum efficiency reporting value” (“MERV”) to mean the measurement scale developed by the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers used to report the effectiveness of air filters.
 - vii) Amends the existing definition of “neighborhood plan” to include timing parameters so that a neighborhood plan does not include plans adopted after January 1, 2024 and within 25 years of the date that a development proponent submits an application. The revised definition also excludes a community plan or plans that cumulatively cover more than one-half of the area of a jurisdiction.
 - viii) Amends the existing definition of “principally permitted use” to specify that parking shall be considered a principally permitted use on a site even if the site requires a conditional use permit for parking, and specifies that the definition of principally permitted use applies to any site that met the definition as of January 1, 2023, or at any time thereafter.
 - ix) Defines “regional mall,” as a site that has:
 - (1) At least 250,000 square feet of permitted retail use;
 - (2) At least two-thirds of the permitted uses on the site are retail uses; and
 - (3) At least two of the permitted retail uses on the site that are at least 10,000 square feet.
 - x) Deletes the definition of “side street” and associated “side street” provisions throughout AB 2011.
 - xi) Defines “street” as a way or place of whatever nature, publicly maintained and open to the use of the public for purposes of vehicular travel. Street includes highway and sidewalks as defined.
 - xii) Amends the definition of “urban uses” to include:
 - (1) A public park surrounded by other urban uses; and
 - (2) A parking lot or structure.
 - xiii) Amends the definition of “use by right” to clarify that an AB 2011 development shall be approved ministerially without discretionary review

and that no aspect development shall be subject to review under the CEQA.

- xiv) Defines very low vehicle travel area as an urbanized area, as designated by the United States Census Bureau, where the existing residential development generates vehicle miles traveled per capita that is below 85% of either regional vehicle miles traveled per capita or city vehicle miles traveled per capita, as specified.

Site Location Criteria that Apply to Affordable and Mixed-Income Housing Developments.

- a) Amends the site location criteria that apply to both 100% affordable and mixed-income housing development projects eligible for ministerial approval as follows:
 - i) Clarifies that bicycle and pedestrian paths are in the same category as streets and highways and, therefore, do not interfere with a property being identified as adjoined by “urban uses.”
 - ii) Makes industrial sites eligible for streamlined ministerial review if either of the following conditions apply:
 - (1) The site has not been occupied for the past three years.
 - (2) The site, as of January 1, 2022, allowed residential uses as a principally permitted use on the site.
 - iii) Aligns site location restrictions on streamlining within the sensitive sites in the coastal zone with site location restrictions that apply to SB 35 developments except that AB 2011 developments are eligible on sites that are located in the coastal zone that are not zoned for multifamily housing.
 - iv) Specifies that for a site that is identified in a neighborhood plan before January 1, 2024 and within 25 years of the development proponent submitting an application, the site must be identified as permitting multifamily housing development on the site.

Objective Development Standards that Apply to Affordable and Mixed-Income Housing Developments.

- a) Amends the objective development standards that both 100% affordable and mixed-income housing development projects must meet to qualify for ministerial approval as follows:

- i) Expands application of AB 2011 to developments that include housing located within 500 feet of a freeway, so long as these projects provide air filtration with a MERV of 13 in the habitable parts of the building.
 - ii) Expands application of AB 2011 to developments that include housing within 3,200 feet of oil and gas facilities, so long as these projects provide air filtration with a MERV of 13 in the habitable parts of the building.
 - iii) Prohibits the imposition of new common open space requirements for AB 2011 projects that convert existing space from nonresidential buildings to residential uses.
- b) Extends the historic site protection provisions that apply to mixed-income developments to 100% affordable developments.
 - c) Provides that the affordability requirements in AB 2011, for both 100% affordable and mixed-income developments, shall only apply to the new units created by the development project for purposes of calculating affordability requirements when a project utilizing AB 2011 is proposed on a site that contains existing housing units.

Revisions to Density, Affordability, and Development Standards that only apply to Mixed-income Housing Developments.

- a) Expands the types of sites eligible mixed-income developments eligible for ministerial approval to include:
 - i) Projects that will convert an existing office building that is at least 50,000 square feet.
 - ii) Projects that will convert a regional mall, as defined, provided that the site of the regional mall is not greater than 100 acres, and establishes the following standards for a development project at a regional mall:
 - (1) The average size of a block, as defined, shall not exceed three acres.
 - (2) At least 5 % of the site shall be dedicated to open space.
 - (3) For a portion of the property that fronts a street that is newly created by the project, a building shall abut within 10 feet of the street for at least 60% of the frontage.
- b) Clarifies that the prohibition on parking requirements that applies to mixed-income housing developments also prohibits requirements for replacement parking.
- c) Clarifies that affordability requirements are calculated on the base units, prior to the calculation of any applicable density bonus;

- d) Specifies that a development project shall comply with a local affordable housing requirement if both of the following conditions are satisfied:
 - i) The local affordable housing requirement prescribes a greater percentage of affordable units or requires a deeper level of affordability than what is required by AB 2011.
 - ii) The local government makes written findings, as specified, that the housing development is economically feasible if subject to the local affordable requirement.
- e) Clarifies how to conduct affordability calculations if the local affordable housing requirement requires greater than 15% of the units to be dedicated for low-income households but does not require the provision of homes affordable to very low and extremely low income households.
- f) Establishes that the maximum allowable densities provided in AB 2011 for mixed-income developments are calculated on the base units, prior to the calculation of any applicable density bonus.
- g) Establishes that the methodologies for determining maximum allowable residential density established in DBL apply to mixed-income housing development projects under AB 2011.
- h) Reduces the minimum density that a housing development project must meet in order to qualify for AB 2011 streamlining as follows:
 - i) For a housing development project with an application that is deemed complete on or before January 1, 2027:
 - (1) By 25% for projects sites located in a very low vehicle travel area, within one-half mile of a major transit stop, as defined.
 - (2) By 50% for all other eligible project sites.
 - (3) For a housing development project with an application that is deemed complete on or after January 1, 2027 the minimum density is reduced by 25%.
- i) Removes residential density limits for AB 2011 projects that convert existing buildings into residential uses, unless the development project adds 20% of more, new square footage to an existing building.
- j) Requires ground floor front setbacks to be calculated from the public right-of-way, rather than the front property line.
- k) Precludes local objective design standards from preventing developments to be built to the maximum allowable density established by the bill.
- l) Prohibits local objective design standards from requiring the development to reduce unit size to meet the objective standard.

- m) Allows development proponents to use density bonus concessions, incentives, and waivers to deviate from AB 2011's height restrictions, as well as AB 2011's side and rear setback requirements.

Ministerial Approval

- a) Makes the following changes to the process for public agencies to ministerially approve 100% affordable and mixed-income housing development projects:
 - i) Establishes a schedule for the local approval process as follows:
 - (1) Requires a local government to determine if a project is consistent or inconsistent with objective planning standards:
 - (a) Within 60 days of submittal of an application if the development contains 150 or fewer housing units; or,
 - (b) Within 90 days of submittal of an application if the development contains more than 150 housing units.
 - (c) Within 30 days of a re-submittal of a development proposal application that addresses written feedback from the local government after the initial submission of the development proposal.
 - ii) Requires a local government to provide the development proponent with an exhaustive list of standards the development conflicts with, as specified.
 - iii) Establishes the following timelines under which the local government must approve the development proposal once it determines that a proposal complies with applicable objective standards:
 - (1) Within 90 days of submittal if the development contains 150 or fewer housing units; or
 - (2) Within 180 days of submittal if the development contains more than 150 housing units.
 - iv) Requires a public agency with coastal development permitting authority to approve a coastal development permit if it determines that the development is on an eligible site, as specified, and is consistent with all objective standards of the local government's certified local coastal program or, for areas that are not subject to a fully certified local coastal program, the certified land use plan of that area.

- v) Clarifies that a development proponents use of incentives, concessions, and waivers of development standards pursuant to DBL does not subject to the development to CEQA or local discretionary review.
 - vi) Specifies that the receipt of any density bonus, concession, incentive, waiver, or reduction of development standards, and parking ratios to which the applicant is entitled under DBL shall not constitute a basis to find the project inconsistent with a local coastal program.
 - vii) Requires a local government to provide a credit to the development for any fee, as defined in the Mitigation Fee Act, for existing uses that are demolished as part of the development at the rate established by the local government for those existing uses, as specified.
 - viii) Requires local governments that utilize existing authority in AB 2011 to exempt a parcel from the streamlining provisions in AB 2011, to update their zoning maps to reflect those changes and post that information on their internet websites.
 - ix) Shifts the timing and obligation of conducting certain environmental assessments in the following way:
 - (1)Deletes language that required development proponents to conduct specified environmental assessments as condition of eligibility for accessing AB 2011 streamlining provisions, as specified.
 - (2)Requires local governments to condition approval of a development eligible for streamlining under AB 2011 on the completion a Phase I Environmental Assessment of hazardous substances, as defined.
 - (3)Requires that if recognized environmental conditions are found on the site additional review and mitigation must be prepared and implemented prior to a local agency issuing a certificate of occupancy for the development.
- b) Allows a housing development project application submitted on or before December 31, 2024 to use the provisions of AB 2011 as applicable on December 31, 2024 or the provisions of AB 2011 as applicable on or after January 1, 2025.
- 2) Specifies that the HAA applies to development proceedings that move forward under AB 2011, and specifies that this amendment is declaratory of existing law.

COMMENTS:

- 1) *Author's Statement.* "AB 2243 amends the language of the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act of 2022 (AB 2011, Wicks). These amendments

facilitate implementation of AB 2011 by expanding its geographic applicability and clarifying aspects of the law that are subject to interpretation. Collectively, the changes in AB 2243 would improve AB 2011 and, in doing so, make it easier to build more housing in the right locations.”

- 2) *California’s Housing Crisis.* California faces a severe housing shortage. A variety of factors have contributed to the lack of housing production. The Statewide Housing Plan adopted by the Department of Housing and Community Development in 2022 found California needs approximately 2.5 million units of housing, including one million units affordable to lower income households, to address this mismatch over the next eight years. That would require production of over 300,000 units a year, including over 120,000 units a year of housing affordable to lower income households. However, production in the past decade has lagged at under 100,000 units per year – including less than 10,000 units of affordable housing per year.
- 3) *Zoning Codes and Designations.* Zoning codes are generally adopted by cities and counties to identify allowable activities (*e.g.*, office, retail, housing, etc.) as well as the allowed intensity of those activities (*e.g.*, height, density, etc.) in specific areas of their jurisdiction. Zoning codes are as varied as cities and counties themselves. Some jurisdictions opt for broad, all-encompassing zoning designations that allow multiple uses. Others adopt remarkably specific zoning designations that regulate allowable uses to a fine degree of detail. In addition to identifying the types of uses allowed (and not allowed) within a specific zone, cities and counties may denote the conditions under which a use is allowed. For example, a city may allow single family housing construction as a use by right in a low density residential zone, but require a conditional use permit for multifamily developments of more than five units in that same zone.

Cities and counties may also grant variances from strict application of the code to allow developments that otherwise would not comply with the strict interpretation of the zoning code. The process for granting a variance may be embedded in the zoning code and is typically subject to a hearing by the zoning administrator or the legislative body of the city or county.

- 4) *Zoning Ordinances and CEQA.* CEQA establishes a process for evaluating the environmental effects of a project. Under CEQA, a local agency carrying out a discretionary project must first determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Projects can include jurisdiction-wide efforts such as the update of a general plan, approval of jurisdiction-wide contracts (*e.g.*, waste hauling contracts or water service), and zoning ordinance amendments. A project can also include individual development actions such as the approval of housing developments, stadiums, gas storage facilities, and other types of

developments. In the case of any discretionary project, if a local agency finds that the potential for significant environmental impacts exists, CEQA requires the agency to prepare and certify the completion of an environmental impact report (EIR). While CEQA includes certain statutory and categorical exemptions, the provisions of CEQA explicitly apply to “discretionary projects proposed to be carried out or approved by public agencies, including, but not limited to, the enactment and amendment of zoning ordinances, the issuance of zoning variances, the issuance of conditional use permits, and the approval of tentative subdivision maps unless the project is exempt from this division.” (Emphasis added).

- 5) *Housing Development Projects and CEQA*. In light of the state’s ongoing housing crisis, the Legislature created several statutory exemptions from CEQA for specific types of housing development projects in order to increase the production of housing. The Legislature also created several statutory schemes that require local governments to approve specified housing development projects ministerially. Ministerial approvals remove a project from all discretionary decisions of a public agency, and thus are not subject to CEQA which only applies to discretionary approvals.

Bypassing CEQA can provide a tremendous benefit to property owners, developers, local governments and other parties involved in the approval of a project as it allows for the project to be completed in an expedited fashion. The Legislature balances the risk of allowing projects to proceed without a full environmental review by ensuring that these projects comply with scores of objective standards and criteria and that they are not located on environmentally sensitive sites. These standards and criteria are an expression of the state’s values and ensure that exempt projects do not result in harm to public health and safety and the environment.

- 6) *Authorizing Residential Development in Commercial Zones*. In addition to streamlining CEQA review at the project level for specific types of housing developments, the Legislature recently enacted several bills to facilitate the production of more housing by increasing the sites available for residential development. Notably, AB 2011 (Wicks) --- the provisions of which are substantively amended by this bill --- and the Middle Class Housing Act of 2022 (SB 6, Caballero, Chapter 659, Statutes of 2022) both made certain types of housing developments an allowable use on land zoned for commercial uses; these bills effectively rezoned eligible parcels statutorily and increased the stock of land that could be developed into housing in California. These bills obviated the need for a local government to conduct a CEQA review in order to

rezone certain commercial parcels to allow housing development on these parcels.

Additionally, AB 2011 required local governments to ministerially approve housing developments on these parcels if they included specific levels of affordable housing and met other development criteria. Working in tandem, AB 2011's statutory rezoning of commercial parcels, and its requirement for local governments to approve affordable housing projects ministerially, can dramatically expedite the approval and development of much needed housing in California.

- 7) *Rebalancing AB 2011's Scope.* While AB 2011 requires local governments to ministerially approve certain types of affordable housing projects, it included an extensive list of site-specific and development criteria that a housing development project must meet to qualify for ministerial approval. This bill will amend several of the site-specific criteria in ways that expand the number of sites eligible for ministerial approval, and it will amend other criteria in ways that narrow the number of sites eligible for ministerial approval. Specifically, AB 2011 excluded sites that were within 500 feet of a freeway or within 3,200 feet of an active oil or gas extraction facility or refinery from eligibility for ministerial approval. This bill will allow for ministerial approval within 500 feet of a freeway or within 3,200 feet of an oil or gas extraction facility or refinery if the development includes an MERV 13 air filtration system. Conversely, AB 2011 applies statewide without any limitations on its provisions in the coastal zone. This bill will narrow the scope of commercial land that is eligible for streamlined development to exclude certain sensitive sites in the coastal zone.
- 8) *CEQA Mitigation and Air Quality.* Several environmental justice groups, writing in opposition, have raised concerns with provisions of the bill that would extend AB 2011 to include housing developments located within 500 feet of a freeway or within 3,200 feet of an active oil or gas facility. CEQA requires public agencies to study and mitigate, to the extent feasible, the impact a proposed project will have on the environment. These groups contend that expanding AB 2011 projects in these areas "could result in substantial public health harm, an outcome that could be avoided or at least mitigated through CEQA review." However, a CEQA analysis, and any associated mitigation measures stemming from the analysis are focused on the inverse; in other words, CEQA analyses focus on mitigating the impacts a project will have on the environment. Generally the courts have found that CEQA is not a tool for assessing, and by extension mitigating, the impact the existing environment (e.g., existing air pollution from a freeway) will have on a project. It is unclear

what mitigation measures, if any, could be applied to these housing development projects if they were subject to CEQA.

- 9) *Technical Amendments.* **The author will accept amendments to correct a drafting error. Specifically, the bill as currently written amends Section 65912.123 (j) to add a new paragraph (3). In new language the word “built” is omitted and the language reads, “*The objective standards shall not preclude a development from being at the residential density...*” The amendments will read “*The objective standards shall not preclude a development from being built at the residential density...*”**
- 10) *Opposition.* As noted above, several environmental justice groups have raised concerns with provisions of the bill that would extend AB 2011 to include housing developments located within 500 feet of a freeway or within 3,200 feet of an active oil or gas facility. Additionally several cities write in opposition expressing concern that AB 2011 was only recently enacted and argue “that cities need the time and space to implement the dozens new housing laws that have been passed in recent years...”
- 11) *Double referral.* This bill was also referred to the Local Government Committee.

RELATED LEGISLATION:

SB 423 (Weiner, Chapter 778, Statutes of 2023) — extended the sunset, amended the labor standards, and made other changes to SB 35 (Wiener), Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017.

SB 4 (Weiner, Chapter 771, Statutes of 2023) — establishes the Affordable Housing on Faith and Higher Education Lands Act of 2023, which, until January 1, 2036, enables 100% affordable housing to be a use by right on land owned by religious institutions and independent institution of higher education.

AB 2011 (Wicks, Chapter 647, Statutes of 2022) — required specified housing development projects to be a use by right on specified sites zoned for retail, office, or parking, as specified.

AB 2668 (Grayson, Chapter 658, Statutes of 2022) — added parameters for determining a project’s compliance with the streamlined, ministerial process created by SB 35 (Wiener, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017).

SB 6 (Caballero, Chapter 659, Statutes of 2022) — the Middle Class Housing Act of 2022, establishes housing as an allowable use on any parcel zoned for office or retail uses.

SB 9 (Atkins, Chapter 162, Statutes of 2021) — required ministerial approval of a housing development of no more than two units in a single-family zone (duplex), the subdivision of a parcel zoned for residential use into two parcels (lot split), or both.

AB 1174 (Grayson, Chapter 160, Statutes of 2021) — made several changes to the SB 35 process.

AB 831 (Grayson, Chapter 194, Statutes of 2020) — added a process for SB 35 projects to be modified after their approval.

AB 1485 (Wicks, Chapter 663, Statutes of 2019) — made various changes to SB 35 including allowing for streamlining of housing developments that include a percentage of low-income and/or moderate-income housing.

AB 2162 (Chiu, Chapter 753, Statutes of 2018) — streamlined affordable housing developments that include a percentage of supportive housing units and onsite services.

SB 35 (Wiener, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) — created a ministerial approval process for specified infill, multifamily housing development projects.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: Yes

POSITIONS: (Communicated to the committee before noon on Wednesday, June 12, 2024).

SUPPORT:

California Conference of Carpenters (Co-Sponsor)
Housing Action Coalition (Co-Sponsor)
21st Century Alliance
Abundant Housing LA
California Apartment Association
California Community Builders
California Housing Consortium
California School Employees Association
California YIMBY
Circulate San Diego

Civicwell
Fieldstead and Company, INC.
Generation Housing
Habitat for Humanity California
Housing Trust Silicon Valley
Inner City Law Center
LeadingAge California
MidPen Housing
People for Housing - Orange County
Sand Hill Property Company
Spur
The Two Hundred
Western States Regional Council of Carpenters
YIMBY Action

OPPOSITION:

350 Bay Area Action
Action Asian Pacific Environmental Network
Beverly-Vermont Community Land Trust
Black Women for Wellness
California Environmental Justice Alliance Action, a Project of Tides Advocacy
California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice
Catholic Charities of The Diocese of Stockton
Center for Biological Diversity
Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment
City of La Habra
City of Newport Beach
City of Santa Clarita
Climate Equity Policy Center
Climate Health Now
Communities for A Better Environment
Courage California
Disability Rights California
East Bay Community Law Center
Environmental Health Coalition
Esperanza Community Housing Corporation
Fossil Free California
Fractracker
Friends of The Earth
Greenpeace USA
Housing Equity & Advocacy Resource Team (HEART)

Labor Network for Sustainability
Labor Rise Climate Jobs Action
Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability
League of California Cities
Livable California
Mothers Out Front
Mothers Out Front California
No Coal in Oakland
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Sacramento Chapter
Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay Area Chapter
Poder
Sacred Heart Community Service
Stand.earth
Sunflower Alliance
Tenemos Que Reclamar Y Unidos Salvar LA Tierra - South LA (trust South La)
Tri-valley Cities of Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Ramon, and Town of
Danville
Voices in Solidarity Against Oil in Neighborhoods (VISION)
Voting 4 Climate & Health

-- END --