

LACC - Legislative Subcommittee

Submission to Council for consideration on June 22, 2021

Summary of Proposed Positions:

Bill	Vice Mayor's Position	Councilmember Weinberg's Position
SB 9 (Lot splits) <i>(Council's current position is to oppose unless amended.)</i>	Oppose <i>(At the June 8, 2021 meeting, the Council voted 3-2 against opposing SB 9.)</i>	The Council should withdraw its letter of opposing SB 9 unless amended. Based on the Council decision on June 8, 2021 not to oppose SB 9 outright, a proposed letter of support is also included for the Council's consideration
SB 16 (Disclosure of police records)	Oppose	Support
AB 989 (Housing Admin. Review Bd.)	Oppose	Remain Neutral (send no letter)
AB 1401 (Parking)	Oppose	Support

Table of Contents

Summary of SB 9..... 3

Summary of SB 16..... 5

Summary of AB 989 7

Summary of AB 1401 10

Council’s May 13, 2021 letter opposing SB 9 unless amended 12

Draft Letter withdrawing opposition to SB 9 unless amended 14

Draft Letter in Support of SB 9 15

Draft Letter in Opposition to SB 16 17

Draft Letter in Support of SB 16 19

Draft Letter in Opposition to SB 989 21

Draft Letter in Support of AB 1401 23

Draft Letter in Opposition to AB 1401 25

SB 9:

Summary from the League of Women Voters (not endorsed by the Vice Mayor):

“The Planning and Zoning Law provides for the creation of accessory dwelling units by local ordinance, or, if a local agency has not adopted an ordinance, by ministerial approval, in accordance with specified standards and conditions. This bill, among other things, would require a proposed housing development containing no more than 2 residential units within a single-family residential zone to be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or hearing, if the proposed housing development meets certain requirements, including, but not limited to, that the proposed housing development would not require demolition or alteration of housing that is subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income, that the proposed housing development does not allow for the demolition of more than 25% of the existing exterior structural walls, except as provided, and that the development is not located within a historic district, is not included on the State Historic Resources Inventory, or is not within a site that is legally designated or listed as a city or county landmark or historic property or district.”

Summary Provided by the Vice Mayor:

- Allows “by right” lot splits in all single-family zones and the construction of 2 units on each split, thus a by right construction of up to 4 units on any current single-family lot in Los Altos (there is a minimum lot size in the bill but it appears there are no such small lots in Los Altos). Lot split must be approximately equal, or no more than 60/40.
- There is an option to build a single home with ADU and/or JDU on either or both splits, depending on how the development proceeds (thus a maximum of 6 units on the formerly single-family lot).
- Requires ministerial approval of the development. For example, in Los Altos that means staff approval instead of Design Review Commission process for 2 stories.

- City may apply objective development standards unless they preclude the development. The development standards must allow each unit to be at least 800 square feet.
- Required side and rear setbacks cannot be greater than 4 feet. However, if a structure is replaced on the same footprint and the existing structure has smaller setbacks, those setbacks apply.
- Exempted from the bill are parcels where existing development has been rented for the past three years and/or is under rent control for moderate or below income levels. This, and a few other exceptions, would have rare application in Los Altos.
- Can require 1 on-site parking space per unit unless within ½ mile walking distance of a “major transit stop” or “high-quality transit corridor,” in which case the city cannot impose any on-site parking requirement.
- Until January 1, 2027, the city may impose an “owner occupancy requirement” if the applicant intends to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of one year from the date of the approval of the urban lot split. The bill does not specify how a city would establish such “intent.”

Anticipated Impact on Los Altos:

Unknown. Los Altos’ neighborhoods have large, single family lots which could be subdivided under the proposed law and have up to four residential units where only one previously existed, with the potential for additional ADU/JADU units in some circumstances. The decision to subdivide is up to the individual property owner; it is unknown whether or how many lots in Los Altos will be subdivided per SB 9. This would increase Los Altos’ inventory of housing units. It will also increase density.

Council’s previous position: Oppose unless amended

Cal Cities’ position: Oppose

Cities Association of Santa Clara County: Oppose

League of Women Voters’ position: Support

SB 16:**Summary from the League of Women Voters (not endorsed by the Vice Mayor):**

“Would make every incident involving force that is unreasonable or excessive, and any sustained finding that an officer failed to intervene against another officer using unreasonable or excessive force, subject to disclosure. The bill would require records relating to sustained findings of unlawful arrests and unlawful searches to be subject to disclosure. The bill would also require the disclosure of records relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency that a peace officer or custodial officer engaged in conduct involving prejudice or discrimination on the basis of specified protected classes. The bill would make the limitations on delay of disclosure inapplicable until January 1, 2023, for the described records relating to incidents that occurred before January 1, 2022.”

NOTE: This bill proposes that “[a]n incident *involving a complaint that alleges* unreasonable or excessive force” would be disclosed.
(Emphasis added.)

Summary provided by the Vice Mayor:

Two of the primary changes in the current law.

1. Establishes new retention periods for information regarding certain complaints to be not less than 5 years for complaints not sustained and not less than 15 years for complaints that are sustained.
2. Revises one and adds one category of complaints that must be disclosed. Specifically “..the following peace officer or custodial officer personnel records and records maintained by a state or local agency

shall not be confidential and shall be made available for public inspection pursuant to the California Public Records Act.”

(b)(1)(A) A record relating to the report, investigation, or findings of any of the following:

(i) [no change] An incident involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or custodial officer.

(ii) [no change] An incident involving the use of force against a person by a peace officer or custodial officer that resulted in death or in great bodily injury.

(iii) [revised] An incident involving a complaint that alleges unreasonable or excessive force.

(iv) [new] A sustained finding that an officer failed to intervene against another officer using force that is clearly unreasonable or excessive.

Anticipated Impact on Los Altos:

Probably little to none. Los Altos has very few allegations of police impropriety.

Council’s previous position: None

Cal Cities’ position: Oppose

League of Women Voters’ position: Support

AB 989:

Summary from the League of Women Voters (not endorsed by the Vice Mayor):

“The Housing Accountability Act prohibits a local agency from disapproving, or conditioning approval in a manner that renders infeasible, specified housing development projects, including projects for very low, low-, or moderate-income households and projects for emergency shelters that comply with applicable, objective general plan, zoning, and subdivision standards and criteria in effect at the time the application for the project is deemed complete, unless the local agency makes specified written findings based on a preponderance of the evidence in the record. This bill would establish a Housing Accountability Committee, and would prescribe its membership.”

Summary provide by the Vice Mayor:

Excerpt from Legislative Counsel’s Digest, followed by select provisions about the composition of the proposed committee.

Legislative Counsel’s Digest

AB 989, as amended, Gabriel. Housing Accountability Act: appeals:

Housing Accountability Committee.

...

This bill would establish a Housing Accountability Committee, and would prescribe its membership. The bill would authorize an applicant who proposes a housing development project pursuant to the Housing Accountability Act, as described above, to appeal a local agency’s decision on the project application to the committee. The bill would prescribe the qualifications of proposed housing developments that would be eligible for appeals and timelines within which applicants,

the committee, and local agencies would be required to act. The bill would require, among other things, the local agency to transmit a copy of its decision and reasoning to committee.

This bill would require the committee to vacate a local decision if it finds that the local agency disapproved the housing development or conditioned the approval of the housing development in violation of the Housing Accountability Act. The bill would require the committee to order the local agency to issue any necessary approval for the development and, if applicable, to modify or remove any conditions or requirements that violate the act.

This bill would require a local agency to carry out a committee order within 30 days of entry, and if the local agency fails to do so, the bill would authorize an applicant to enforce the committee orders in court. The bill would entitle the applicant to attorney's fees and costs, and would additionally authorize the court to impose specified fines on the local agency. The bill would authorize the department to charge applicants a fee for an appeal, as specified, and if the committee orders approval of the proposed development or modifies or removes any conditions or requirements imposed upon the applicant, the bill would require a local agency to reimburse the applicant for the fee. By increasing the duties of local officials, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

....”

[End Legislative Counsel's Digest]

The 8-member committee would include the head of HCD and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (or their designees) as ex officio members. The other six would be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate:

“(A) Notwithstanding Section 1099, two members shall be a member of a city council or board of supervisors. One member shall represent a small jurisdiction and one member shall represent a large jurisdiction.

(B) Two members shall have extensive experience in the development of affordable housing.

(C) Two members shall be neither a member of a city council or county board of supervisors nor have extensive experience in the development of affordable housing.

(3) The appointed members shall serve for terms of two years each, at the pleasure of the Governor.

(4) The director of the department shall designate the chairperson.”

Anticipated Impact on Los Altos:

Unknown. Depends entirely on when and how proposed developments are denied.

Council’s previous position: None

Cal Cities’ position: Oppose

American Planning Association: Neutral (APA Calif. Chapter letter of neutrality is included with this report.

AB 1401:

Summary from the League of Women Voters (not endorsed by the Vice Mayor):

“Would prohibit a local government from imposing a minimum automobile parking requirement, or enforcing a minimum automobile parking requirement, on residential, commercial, or other development if the development is located on a parcel that is within one-half mile walking distance of public transit, as defined. The bill would not preclude a local government from imposing requirements when a project provides parking voluntarily to require spaces for car share vehicles. The bill would prohibit these provisions from reducing, eliminating, or precluding the enforcement of any requirement imposed on a new multifamily or nonresidential development to provide electric vehicle parking spaces or parking spaces that are accessible to persons with disabilities, as specified.”

Summary provided by the Vice Mayor

Very simple and straightforward. The city could not impose any minimum parking requirement on residential, commercial, or other development if the parcel is within one-half mile walking distance of public transit, except for electric vehicles and disabled parking. Key provisions quoted:

“SECTION 1.

Section 65863.3 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65863.3.

(a) A local government shall not impose a minimum automobile parking requirement, or enforce a minimum automobile parking requirement, on residential, commercial, or other development if the parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of public transit.

(b) When a project provides parking voluntarily, nothing in this section shall preclude a local government from imposing requirements on that voluntary parking to require spaces for car share vehicles.

(c) Subdivision (a) shall not reduce, eliminate, or preclude the enforcement of any requirement imposed on a new multifamily residential or nonresidential development to provide electric vehicle parking spaces or parking spaces that are accessible to persons with disabilities that would have otherwise applied to the development if this section did not apply.”

Anticipated Impact on Los Altos:

In the opinion of the Vice Mayor: Uncertain. If “public transit” is interpreted to include all bus routes, then it would apply to properties within ½-mile of routes along El Camino, San Antonio, and El Monte, and perhaps others.

In the opinion of Mr. Weinberg: Los Altos is not close enough to a qualified transit center for any of its’ lots to be affected by the current version of this bill.

Council’s previous position: None

Cal Cities’ position: Oppose

League of Women Voters’ position: Support

SB 9 – Council’s current position



1 North San Antonio Road
Los Altos, California 94022-3087

May 13, 2021

The Honorable Toni Atkins
President pro Tempore, California State Senate
State Capitol Building, Room 205
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 9 (Atkins) Increased Density in Single-Family Zones
Oppose Unless Amended (As Introduced 12/7/2020)**

Dear Senate President pro Tempore Atkins,

The City of Los Altos writes to express an Oppose Unless Amended position on your SB 9, which would require a local government to ministerially approve a housing development containing two or more residential units in single-family residential zones. Additionally, this measure would require local governments to ministerially approve urban lot splits.

Housing affordability and homelessness are among the most critical issues facing California cities. Affordably priced homes are out of reach for many people and are not being built fast enough to meet the current or projected needs of people living in the state. Cities lay the groundwork for housing production by planning and zoning new projects in their communities based on extensive public input and engagement, state housing laws, and the needs of the building industry.

While your desire to pursue a housing production proposal is appreciated, unfortunately, SB 9 as currently drafted would not spur much needed housing construction in a manner that supports local flexibility, decision-making, and community input. State driven ministerial or by-right housing approval processes fail to recognize the extensive public engagement associated with developing and adopting zoning ordinances and housing elements that are certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

Los Altos is a charming and unique city that is almost fully developed. Our community, staff, and City Council recognize that California faces a housing crisis and that the solution must be regional. We stand ready to do our part to cooperate with the State and our Council of Governments (ABAG). However, we respectfully request that you and your colleagues take note of the fact that we have the least parkland and green space of all our neighbors, that our community is one of the more mature in Santa Clara County, and that SB 9 will change the longstanding character of our neighborhoods significantly. We know that other cities are facing their own challenges in balancing the goals of SB 9 with their own, unique circumstances. SB 9 is, regrettably, another attempt to impose a one-size-fits-all requirement that will not necessarily achieve the beneficial

RE: SB 9 (Atkins) Increased Density in Single-Family Zones
Oppose Unless Amended (As Introduced 12/7/2020)
May 13, 2021
Page 2

results sought. We believe giving local jurisdictions incentives is the better approach and would best achieve the intended goals of SB 9.

If SB 9 were to move forward in its current form, then the City of Los Altos requests the following amendments in order to address our concerns and remove our opposition:

- Clarify that a property owner using SB 9 is limited to constructing no more than twice the number of units as would be permitted if the lot had not been split;
- Require a housing developer to acquire a building permit within thirty months of a recorded lot split, so that speculators do not sell lots and never build homes;
- Allow local governments to require adequate access for police, fire and other public safety vehicles and equipment;
- Prohibit developers from using SB 9 in very high fire hazard severity zones;
- Ensure HCD provides Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) credit for production of SB 9 units; and
- Allow local governments to continue to determine reasonable parking standards in accord with the spirit of the bill.

For these reasons, the City of Los Altos opposes SB 9 (Atkins) unless it is amended to address our concerns.

The City of Los Altos is committed to being part of the solution to the housing shortfall and will continue to work collaboratively with you to spur much needed housing construction. Thank you for considering the above amendments.

Sincerely,



Neysa Fligor, Mayor
City of Los Altos

- cc. Hon. Senator Scott Wiener, Chair, Senate Housing Committee
Hon. Senator Josh Becker
Hon. Assembly member Marc Berman
Jason Rhine, League of California Cities
Seth Miller, League of California Cities (Via email: cityletters@cacities.org)
Los Altos City Council Members

**SB 9 – Withdrawal of opposition unless amended;
Submitted for Consideration by the Council by Mr. Weinberg**

[Assembly Committees, as assigned]

**RE: SB 9 (Atkins) Increased Density in Single-Family Zones
Notice of Withdrawal of Opposition Unless Amended**

Dear Assemblymember _____:

The City of Los Altos is pleased to *withdraw its position of oppose unless amended* to SB 9. As currently amended, SB 9 would permit the owner of a parcel zoned for a single family residence to subdivide the lot and build no more than two units on each of the subdivided parcels (a duplex on each parcel). While the legislature has not incorporated every amendment we proposed in our May 13, 2021 letter, Los Altos neither opposes nor supports SB 9 as currently amended.

In summary, the City of Los Altos is now neutral on SB 9 as amended. If you have questions, or wish to discuss our position, please do not hesitate to contact me at nfligor@losaltosca.gov.

Sincerely,

SB 9 – Support; Submitted for Consideration by the Council by Mr. Weinberg

[Assembly Committees, as assigned]

**RE: SB 9 (Atkins) Increased Density in Single-Family Zones
Notice of Support**

Dear Assemblymember _____:

The City of Los Altos writes to express our support of SB 9, which would ease some of the barriers to building smaller homes by streamlining approval of single family lot splits as well as allowing two units on these newly created lots. ***This is a change from our former position (oppose unless amended).*** SB 9 promotes small-scale neighborhood development by allowing up to four units of housing on lots zoned as single-family.

This bill builds upon recent changes to accessory dwelling unit (ADU) law, which allow three units on a single-family parcel. At the request of the property owner, the local jurisdiction must allow all lots of at least 2,400 square feet to be split into two approximately equal lots by ministerial action; there could be a 40% / 60% split but neither lot could be smaller than 1,200 square feet.

California's housing crisis is fueled by restrictive zoning, as over 70% of our state is zoned as single-family residential. We currently have a statewide housing shortage of approximately 3.5 million homes. Homeownership in California is at its lowest rate since World War II. More and more often, home buying is becoming a privilege only available to the wealthiest. In most major California cities, fewer than 42 percent of households earn enough to purchase even the typical entry-level home. As a result, many renters will have little to no option to enter the housing market and begin to build equity. In addition, this problem has a disproportionate impact on Black and Latinx households.

The type of "missing middle" housing, or medium density housing, that this bill is

trying to incent is appropriate for renters or first-time homebuyers. The new housing must comply with local objective design standards, unless the standards would physically preclude either of the two units from being at least 800 square feet in area, so it should fit into existing neighborhoods. In addition, there are significant renter protections against displacement and short-term rentals are prohibited in these new developments.

Los Altos is a fully developed community, and we are fortunate to have neighborhoods of single-family residences with large lots. Our community wants to do its part to ease the housing crisis. If passed, SB 9 would give our residents more opportunities to be part of the solution.

For these reasons, Los Altos strongly supports SB 9 as an important step toward addressing the “missing-middle” problem and ameliorating California’s housing crisis. If you have questions, or wish to discuss our position, please do not hesitate to contact me at nfligor@losaltosca.gov.

Sincerely,

SB 16 – Oppose; proposed by the Vice Mayor

[Assembly Committees, as assigned]

SB 16 (Skinner) Peace Officers. Release of Records
Notice of Opposition (As Amended May 20, 2021)

Dear Assemblymember _____:

The City of Los Altos respectfully opposes SB 16. While the overly punitive imposition of fines and other monetary damages have been removed from the original bill, the measure remains excessive in the types of personnel records it makes subject to disclosures.

We support maintaining the confidentiality of personnel matters and protecting public safety personnel discipline records from public disclosure, as appropriate.

As amended, SB 16 would unjustifiably expand SB 1421 by providing for the disclosure of police personnel records for every incident alleging use of force, regardless of whether the officer was exonerated or if a complaint was not sustained. This provision is neither practical from an administrative standpoint nor helpful toward to objective of fostering trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. The release of officer records for every single incident involving any use of force, or an allegation of unreasonable or excessive force – especially those in which the officer is entirely within departmental policy – will generate the misperception that there was “something wrong” with the officer’s conduct.

Our communities can benefit from continued dialogue around law enforcement review and discipline. Unfortunately, this measure is not limited in how it would open police officer personnel records to the public. This policy imbalance that prioritizes public disclosure of records over an officer’s privacy, regardless of whether they were proven to have exhibited proper conduct, is disconcerting.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Agenda Item # 15

For these reasons, the City of Los Altos opposes SB 16.

If you have questions, or wish to discuss our position, please do not hesitate to contact me at nfligor@losaltosca.gov.

Sincerely,

SB 16 – Support; proposed by Mr. Weinberg

[Assembly Committees, as assigned]

SB 16 (Skinner) Peace Officers. Release of Records

Notice of Support (As Amended May 20, 2021)

Dear Assemblymember _____:

The City of Los Altos proudly writes to express its support of SB 16, which expands on SB 1421 to facilitate disclosure of records relating to use of force, wrongful arrests and searches, sexual assault, and dishonesty.

SB 16 requires disclosure of records related to incidents involving sustained prejudice or discrimination based on seventeen specified protected classes, thereby expanding transparency while preserving investigatory and safety interests of law enforcement. The bill requires complaints to be retained indefinitely and ensures that records are subject to release even if a peace officer resigns prior to completion of an investigation. Furthermore, the bill requires hiring agencies to review any files of misconduct prior to hiring a peace officer. Finally, it imposes fines if timely disclosure is not forthcoming.

Democratic government depends on the informed and active participation of its citizens and requires that government protect the citizen's right to know by making public records accessible. Citizens have the right to be informed, to be heard, and to be involved not only in, but beyond elections. The ability to monitor and act on information related to police misconduct also enables us to be informed participants in the development of policies and procedures to address and prevent abuses.

Los Altos is proud of the service our police department provides to the community. Our peace officers truly are public servants and are a vital to the success of our agency's mission. Our police are effective only to the extent residents trust their

DISCUSSION ITEM

Agenda Item # 15

professionalism. SB 16 seeks to increase transparency which can only increase that level of trust.

If you have questions, or wish to discuss our position, please do not hesitate to contact me at nfligor@losaltosca.gov.

Sincerely,

AB 989 – Support; proposed by the Vice Mayor

[Senate Committees, as assigned]

RE: Assembly Bill 989 (Grayson) Appeals. Housing Accountability Committee.
Notice of Opposition (As Amended May 3, 2021)

Dear Senator _____:

The City of Los Altos joins the League of California Cities in strongly opposing AB 989 (Gabriel), which would create a new state appeals committee within the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) composed of eight members, all appointed by the Governor, with a panel of five members hearing each appeal.

Housing affordability is a critical issue, and we are working to expand the opportunities for housing projects consistent with the numerous State laws that govern our Housing Element and relevant zoning standards. These laws include the Housing Accountability Act which allows a city – subject to proper notice, public hearings, and strict time limits – to impose conditions to mitigate the environmental impact of the project under CEQA and to require compliance with “objective quantifiable, written development standards, conditions and policies.” AB 989 allows a majority of the panel to overturn either or both of these actions if a developer argues they violate the HAA.

The HAA further allows a city – again with proper notice, public hearings, and strict time limits – to deny a project because it would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety. AB 989 again allows majority of the panel to substitute their judgment about the public health or safety of a community and overturn the denial following procedures that are not subject to public review and comment.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Agenda Item # 15

Adding a hearing by the Executive Branch of State Government will not get housing built faster. Rather, it will slow development, increase conflict, and add time to the process. For these reason, the City of Los Altos OPPOSES AB 989.

If you have questions, or wish to discuss our position, please do not hesitate to contact me at nfligor@losaltosca.gov.

Sincerely,

AB 1401 – Support; proposed by Mr. Weinberg

[Senate Committees, as assigned]

RE: AB 1401 (Friedman) Residential and Commercial Development. Parking Requirements.

Notice of Support if Amended (As Amended April 19, 2021)

Dear Senator _____:

The City of Los Altos writes to express its support for AB 1401. AB 1401, as amended on April 6, would prohibit a local government from imposing or enforcing minimum automobile parking requirements for both residential and commercial developments, if such developments are located within a ½ mile of qualified public transit.

Los Altos supports the goals of this bill and other efforts that encourage developing walkable communities, enhance high-quality transit options that serve the needs of residents, and reduce reliance on private automobiles throughout cities and counties statewide. With these goals in mind, Los Altos is also supportive of encouraging housing, particularly affordable housing, and planning for the needs of all community members that may or may not rely on a car. As the state continues to focus on greenhouse gas reduction goals, reductions in vehicle miles traveled and a shift to fully electric vehicles, automobiles, whether gas or electric, will still be a part of our transportation network. Planning to ensure access to robust transit, EV infrastructure, support for other modes of transportation and options for some level of parking, depending on the development and community, are all important aspects that must be kept in mind.

As is provided for in California's density bonus law, a local jurisdiction can initiate and fund a parking study to determine if hazards or other local conditions could cause demand that indicates more parking is required than what a development is actually proposing. This language was specifically agreed to in prior changes to the density bonus statute and we believe it would be an important concept to

DISCUSSION ITEM

Agenda Item # 15

incorporate into AB 1401 so jurisdictions would have the opportunity to tailor parking reductions to local context if necessary. With this amendment, the City of Los Altos would proudly support AB 1401.

If you have questions, or wish to discuss our position, please do not hesitate to contact me at nfligor@losaltosca.gov.

Sincerely,

AB 1401 – Oppose; proposed by the Vice Mayor

[Senate Committees, as assigned]

RE: AB 1401 (Friedman) Residential and Commercial Development.

Parking Requirements.

Notice of Opposition (As Amended April 19, 2021)

Dear Senator _____:

The City of Los Altos respectfully opposes AB 1401 (Friedman), which would prohibit a local government from imposing a minimum automobile parking requirement, or enforcing a minimum automobile parking requirement, on residential, commercial, or other development if the development is located on a parcel within one-half mile walking distance of public transit.

AB 1401 would essentially allow developers to dictate parking requirements in large areas of our city because the definition of public transit includes entire bus corridors, not just high frequency bus stops or major transit stops. Restricting parking requirements within one half- mile walking distance of a high-quality transit corridor does not guarantee that individuals living, working, or shopping on those parcels will have access to public transit since proximity to a corridor does not equate to a convenient bus stop.

Further, AB 1401 would give both developers and transit agencies the power to determine parking requirements. Transit agencies would be able to dramatically alter local parking standards by shifting transit routes and adjusting service intervals, with no guarantee that such service would even be in place at the time a given project is completed or thereafter.

AB 1401 could negatively impact the application of the State's Density Bonus Law by providing developers parking concessions without also requiring developers to include affordable housing units in the project. The purpose of the Density Bonus Law is to provide concessions and waivers to developers in exchange for affordable

housing units. Such a reduction in our ability to compel the inclusion of affordable housing is contrary to the interests of California to increase the availability of such housing.

We recognize that amendments have allowed for imposition of some requirements regarding electric vehicles. However, as amended, and while well intended, AB 1401 prevents local jurisdictions from establishing appropriate parking requirements based on community needs. A one-size fits all approach to an issue that is project and location specific just does not work. For these reasons, we ask for your NO vote on AB 1401 on the Assembly Floor.

If you have questions, or wish to discuss our position, please do not hesitate to contact me at nfligor@losaltosca.gov.

Sincerely,