<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</th>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
<th>RELATED LEGISLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Just Cause Eviction Standards: Adopt a Bay Area-wide requirement that landlords must cite specific "just causes" (both fault and no-fault) for an eviction. Landlords are required to cover relocation assistance in all “no-fault” evictions. Exemptions would apply.  
Objective: Protect tenants from arbitrary evictions. | CONCERN STATUS: Low, there is a potentially significant unfunded mandate if cities are responsible for administering/enforcing measures.  
CONCERNS  
- Disincentivizes property owners, who spend a large portion of total income on housing cost, from making housing available for rent on the open market if they are required to provide relocation assistance. | Monitor legislative progress of these elements. If efforts move forward, advocate for amendments that would allow:  
- Implementation to occur after new regional funding sources are available for administration.  
- Administrative responsibility to be assigned to an existing regional agency (no new regional bureaucracy).  
- Mediation to be required as a part of a person seeking their legal remedies for unfair eviction.  
- Provide exemptions for homeowners with ADUs and owner-occupied duplex and triplex units.  
- Restrict relocation assistance to tenants whose incomes qualify for low income housing. | (information; subject to change) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</th>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Rent Cap: Establish a Bay Area-wide emergency rent cap that limits annual rent increases to “reasonable” amount. For an emergency period (defined as 15 years), the annual cap would be no more than CPI+5%. Certain exemptions and banking provisions would apply. | CONCERN STATUS: Low, this element has the potential to be counterproductive to multi-family housing production (rent cap disincentivizes investment). CONCERNS  
- Production of housing units because it limits a project’s potential return on a high-risk investment;  
- Maintenance and improvement of the existing housing stock because property owners would be unable to recoup these investments.  
- Tenant turnover, leading to a potential “mis-match” between tenants and rental units, which could lead to a decrease in available housing stock. Once a tenant has secured a rent-controlled unit, s/he may not choose to move in the future and give up the rent-controlled unit, even if housing needs change. Research information source: https://www.brookings.edu/research/what-economic-evidence-tell-us-about-the-effects-of-rent-control  
- Rent control was recently defeated at the ballot box. | Monitor legislative progress of these elements. If efforts move forward, advocate for amendments that would allow:  
- Uninhibited production of new rental units and incentives for existing rental units to stay rental and not be converted to for-sale units.  
- Ensure landlords have ability to cover all necessary maintenance and administrative costs in a reasonable timeframe.  
- Allow a reasonable time period for newly constructed rental units not be subject to rent cap and then it can apply.  
- Designate administration/enforcement responsibilities to existing regional agency (i.e. counties) with existing social service infrastructure.  
- Identify resources for administration/enforcement. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</th>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
<th>RELATED LEGISLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Rent Assistance and Free Legal Counsel: Provide access to free legal counsel and emergency rent assistance for tenants with an urgent, temporary financial gap. Funding, policies and guidelines to be determined (presumably by the new regional housing authority) at a later time. **Objective:** Ensure right to legal counsel; provide funding for emergency/temporary rent gap. | **CONCERN STATUS:** Low, there is a potentially significant unfunded mandate if cities are responsible for administering/enforcing measures. **CONCERNS:**  
- Presumes all tenants lack resources to legal counsel while all landlords do not. The inverse could be true and result in abuse of the system on the part of tenants seeking to thwart a lawful eviction.  
- Increases the difficulty to evict tenants  
- Ignores the reality that the owners of rental properties may not have adequate resources.  
- Clarification is needed in law to specify that legal assistance is only available to low income tenants. This is a question that should be addressed along with the presumption that all tenants lack available legal resources. | **Monitor** legislative progress of these elements. If efforts move forward, advocate for amendments that would allow:  
- Implementation to occur after new regional funding sources are available for administration.  
- Administrative responsibility to be assigned to an existing regional agency (no new regional bureaucracy).  
- A “means test” (demonstration of need based on low-income status) to be required before receiving free legal assistance.  
- Restrict provisions to tenants facing no-fault evictions where the definition of “fault” should factor in the basis or reason for the eviction in order to accurately represent whether the tenant is at fault for the eviction. | **CONCERN STATUS:** To be determined (presumably by the new regional housing authority) at a later time. **CONCERNS:** To be determined. **RECOMMENDED APPROACH:** To be determined. **RELATED LEGISLATION:** To be determined. |
| 4. Remove Regulatory Barriers to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs): Extend existing state law to allow ADUs on single family lots and multiple ADUs in existing multi-family buildings with ministerial approval. Forforges code violations in grandfathered ADUs. Impact fees to be based on a square foot basis and only on net new living area >500 SF. **Objective:** Increase more affordable units, provide income source for cost-burdened homeowners. | **CONCERN STATUS:** Medium, cities have generally supported the production of ADUs by making it simpler, faster and cheaper to build these units. **CONCERNS:**  
- The amendments regarding multiple ADUs in multi-family buildings and collocating ADU/Junior ADU on single-family lots need to be studied further for impacts and be evaluated as to whether size limitations should also be imposed.  
- This Element indicates a lack of understanding that cities serve as a collection point for many pass-through fees to other public agencies (such as utility connection and school district fees), which represent a significant amount of all fees imposed on an ADU.  
- Given their disproportionate percentage of the total fee amount, limitations and reduction should apply to ALL pass-through public agencies.  
- Removing energy efficiency requirements is contrary to established State Green House Gas (GHG) reduction goals. | **Full support and expansion** of this element by:  
- Extending the fee limitation/reduction to all pass-through fees (including utility connection fees and school district fees), provided that the fees remain proportionate to impacts generated.  
- Developing standardized ADU permit plans in a range of sizes, pre-approved at the State level, allowing for minimal local plan check requirements (reduced plan check time offsets fee limitations).  
- Allowing cities to count, by right, ADUs that are “affordable by design” in the RHNA process (examples: count ≤550 SF ADU as “Low” and 551-1,000 SF ADU as “Moderate” income units).  
- Advocate for standardized building codes for ADUs  
- Ensure existing structures are brought up to Code for legitimate Health and Safety reasons. | **CONCERN STATUS:** To be determined. **CONCERNS:** To be determined. **RECOMMENDED APPROACH:** To be determined. **RELATED LEGISLATION:** To be determined. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</th>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
<th>RELATED LEGISLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing fees across the board without an evaluation of the impacts to public services and infrastructure is contrary to the fiscal sustainability of each city.</td>
<td>“Impact Fees” should be defined as they are defined under state law, specifically as defined pursuant to section 66000 (b) of the Mitigation Fee Act and thus excluding processing, plan check and review fees.</td>
<td>Information; subject to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code violations should not be forgiven if they pose health and safety concerns.</td>
<td>Multiple ADUs in multi-family buildings and collocating ADU/Junior ADU on single-family lots needs to be studied further for impacts and be evaluated as to whether size limitations should also be imposed. Any increase in ADUs resulting from multiple ADUs on a property should not exceed 25 percent of the number of existing units on the property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</td>
<td>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</td>
<td>RELATED LEGISLATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **5. Minimum Zoning Near Transit: Establish state-wide minimum zoning for housing on all residential, commercial and institutional zones to allow ‘missing middle’ housing product types to be:** | **CONCERN STATUS:** High, as it ignores community context with the potential for significant displacement and land speculation near transit. **CONCERNS:** This is a one-size-fits-all approach that:  
- Ignores community context – creating potential land use incompatibility issues with tall developments immediately adjacent to low density areas or within historic districts/downtowns.  
- Contains policy approaches that may conflict with Element 6 and 7. For example, the objectives here generates impacts on local infrastructure (i.e., water, sewer, schools, traffic) while fee limitations proposed in Element 6 limits ability to mitigate those impacts.  
- Could encourage land speculation around transit zones, driving up land costs and in turn causing housing development costs to rise.  
- Requiring minimum height does not create density, as it is possible to build a tall multi-story project with lower density luxury units.  
- Unaware of the fact that transit service is not static in suburban cities and often is provided by regional agencies and outside the scope of cities’ regulatory controls; tying housing requirements to transit routes which may be eliminated due to budget cuts (or lowering demand) is problematic as it introduces density to areas that may not have any transportation.  
- Unaware of the fact that some commercially zoned properties are purposely zoned as such to serve predominately residential areas; as a State Green House Gas (GHG) reduction goal to lower vehicles miles traveled (VMT).  
- Does not include frequency thresholds or minimum headways for rail station or ferry terminal definitions.  
- Creates housing near transit but is unclear about proximity to jobs. | **Oppose unless amended** as follows:  
- Allow all cities (a time period to amend General Plans and Specific Plans to incorporate these requirements and obtain local feedback.  
- Focus requirement on density and not on height or FAR (as the latter two do not necessarily result in more units and allow cities to retain design quality control to facilitate local acceptance.  
- Establish realistic frequency thresholds to be considered for rail stations, specifically ACE or Amtrak train lines, which have very limited infrequent service.  
- Apply density increase as a percentage of adjacent land uses (example: 25% increase in density or height) in acknowledgement that not all communities take the same form near transit lines. For density increases near single-family homes, limit height increases to single story taller than single-family zoning.  
- Establish increases in density related to proximity to transit contingent on likelihood of continued (i.e. not less than five year time period of continuous transit funding) for bus routes, that the bus service does not depend on private funding including BIDS, that headways are 15 minutes or less during peak periods and that the bus stops are high usage stops.  
- Exempt historic districts/downtowns where high-density housing is not compatible with the historic context of the area. Also exempt coastal areas, and fire hazard areas or flood hazard areas.  
- Protect/exempt/credit local communities that have already taken significant steps, through updates or amendments to their General Plan, Specific Plans, and/or zoning provisions, to increase housing density near transit.  
- Include inclusionary requirement for projects that are 10 units or less. In-lieu fees should be held for use in the community where they are generated (instead of going to regional projects) | *(information; subject to change)* |

- Up to 36-feet tall within ½-mile of bus stops, with minimum 15-min headways (weekday peak) and 30-min headways (weekend)  
- Up to 55-feet tall (75’ with density bonus) within ¼-mile of a major transit stop, defined as a rail station or a ferry terminal)  

**Housing Overlay on Low-Density Commercial Sites:** Make housing an allowable use on large commercially-zoned parcels near job centers with high quality transit.  

**Tenant Protections:** Sites rezoned would be subject to tenant protections, demolition controls and “no net loss” provisions.  

**Affordable Housing:** Required at levels not less than state density bonus law. Projects with 10-20 units should have option to pay in-lieu fee as its affordable housing obligation.  

**Sensitive Communities:** receive an automatic 3-year deferral on implementation while the city develops a context-sensitive plan.  

**Objective:** Spur development near transit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</th>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
<th>RELATED LEGISLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- State density bonus standards will serve as the maximum required parking standard. To the extent a developer provides additional parking on top of that required by density bonus law, those spaces can be unbundled at developer’s discretion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- For current single family lots that are either within ¼ mile of high frequency/quality bus service as described above and or within ½ mile of transit (rail or light rail), the increase in density should factor in and be based on the lot size. Single family lots beyond these boundaries would not be subject to modified density.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor any legislation regarding the definition and requirements on “low density” commercial areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced Approach: Pursue and support policies that maintain the delicate balance of jobs, adequate affordable housing, and a robust transportation network to connect new housing to jobs and daily services. Actively discourage policies that favors one of these at the expense of the others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</td>
<td>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</td>
<td>RELATED LEGISLATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **6.** “Good Government” Reforms to Housing Approval Process: Focused on streamlining the permitting process and how residential impact fees are set and enforced. | **CONCERN STATUS:** High. This has the potential to significantly reduce public input in the review process which may lead to distrust and community concern. **CONCERNS:** This is a one-size-fits-all approach that:  
- Streamlining (zoning compliant projects <500 units): Includes “locking” rules, fees and historic status at the date of the “application completeness”; permits no more than 3 de novo hearings for each project.  
- Impact Fees: Impose a state standard for establishing and imposing impact fees using objective standards rather than current “reasonableness” test. Allow for fee deferral (pay some fees at a later point in the development process).  
- Inclusionary Zoning: Establish state law that precludes inclusionary programs from being ‘additive’ (density bonus, housing impact fees, and local inclusionary requirements). Requires in-lieu fees to be an option for fulfilling inclusion (i.e., ability to ‘buy’ out of providing onsite affordable housing).  
- Downzoning and Moratoria: State to set criteria for when these can be used locally.  
- Annual ‘Impositions’ Report: Recommends cities annually document any impositions (undefined) that would increase the hard cost (excludes labor and materials) of housing construction (such as fees and inclusionary zoning requirements). | **Oppose unless amended** as follows:  
- Require an “expiration date” for all fees and regulations locked at application completeness to ensure they are applicable to viable projects. Eliminates abuse by developers who might “lock” a future application to avoid addressing future federal, state or local requirements that may surface.  
- Require a “reset” should substantive project changes be introduced during the course of the development review process to avoid potential abuse of the system.  
- Maintain clear and objective standards and controls, and support fee deferral programs that ensure context sensitivity.  
- Allow additional time for cities to develop plans and incorporate requirements to implement the requirements from the legislation.  
- Clarify that, unless the project is seeking a General Plan or zoning code amendment, projects must be zoning compliant to receive fee and regulation locks. The fee and regulation locks would not apply to projects requiring a General Plan or zoning code amendment.  
- If fees are to be reduced, allow cities to negotiate community benefits that mitigate impacts.  
- Revise “no more than 5 de novo hearings for each project” to state “no more than 5 public hearings (or hearings with opportunity for public comment) for each project”; or, limit processing time to set period of months following complete application or preparation of required CEQA analysis (i.e. publication or draft EIR, draft Negative Declaration or determination that project is exempt from CEQA, similar to the Permit Streamlining Act.  
- Clarify proposed standardized methodology for calculating impact fees. If in-lieu fees are required to be an option for satisfying affordable housing requirements, require that the in-lieu fee be the one adopted by the city or county provided that such fee was established in compliance with state law. | (information; subject to change) |
<p>| <strong>Objective:</strong> Remove ‘regulatory uncertainty’ perceived to be a major cause of economically infeasible projects. |  |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</th>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
<th>RELATED LEGISLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Expedited Approvals and Financial Incentives: Another permit streamlining effort to accelerate approvals of zoning-compliant projects and enable on-site affordability with financial incentives.</td>
<td>CONCERN STATUS: High. The remaining developable lands in Walnut Creek are infill developments that generate impacts that rely on fees to mitigate. There should be no net loss of local funding. CONCERNS: This one-size-fits-all approach generates many of the same concerns as described in Element #6. Additionally:</td>
<td>• Monitor any legislation regarding the definition and requirements related to an “impositions report.”</td>
<td>(information; subject to change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlining: Applies to zoning compliant projects that restrict at least 20% of onsite housing units to middle-income households, defined as 80-150% of area median income (AMI). Projects granted a statutory CEQA exemption and limited discretionary review.</td>
<td>• Potential to reduce property tax allocations for each City. • Caps on impact fees to a “reasonable” level is currently undefined. • Further caps on impact fees would eliminate funding sources to provide services and infrastructure (example: school, transit, etc.). • Requirement to pay prevailing wage is inconsistent with the overall goal to lower housing construction costs. • Reducing tax allocations given to each city without an evaluation that the impacts generated continue to be covered is contrary to the fiscal sustainability of each city.</td>
<td>Oppose unless amended as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives include 15-year property tax increment abatement, cap on impact fees, parking standards reduced to 50% of local requirement. Projects to pay prevailing wage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• There should be no net loss of local funding. • Require outside agencies, not just cities, to cap/reduce fees to stimulate affordable housing. • Require an “expiration date” for all fees and regulations locked at application completeness to ensure they are applicable to viable projects. Eliminates abuse by developers who might “lock” a future application to avoid addressing future federal, state or local requirements that may surface. • Allow locked fees to increase by CPI or ENRI • Require a “reset” should substantive project changes be introduced during the course of the development review process to avoid potential abuse of the system. • Implement and maintain clear and objective standards and controls to ensure context sensitivity. • Consider middle income household definition of 80-120% of area median income (which is level of moderate-income), consistent with local standards (instead of 80-150% of AMI), which makes units more affordable. For residential units that are affordable and restricted to residents between 120% and 150% of AMI, which makes units more affordable. For residential units that are affordable and restricted to residents between 120% and 150% of AMI decrease the level and type of incentives that are provided for units that are available to residents who would qualify at 120% AMI or lower or alternatively require a higher percentage of affordable units within the 120-150 range to qualify for incentives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective: Build more moderate income housing units.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The 50% parking reduction incentive (where parking would be reduced to 50% of local requirement at the discretion of the developer) should initially be provided to qualifying projects with income-restricted units in transit-rich areas where high quality public transportation options are realistic and practical for residents in such areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
<th>RELATED LEGISLATION (information; subject to change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Unlock Public Lands for Affordable Housing: Promote use of “surplus” and “underutilized” public lands (undefined) for affordable housing through legislative and regulatory changes.

   This would also create a database listing all publicly owned land in the Bay Area, limit approval process to no more than two years, and deploy 10 percent of underutilized/surplus public land to affordable housing development on an annual basis.

   Element also calls for policies to help expand the housing construction labor pool, including requiring trained apprentices and prevailing wages. Exceptions would apply to temporary housing built to address an emergency.

   **Objective:** Encourage re-use of public land for mixed income/affordable housing units.

   **CONCERN STATUS:** Low.

   **CONCERNS:**
   - Ignores community context – creating potential land use incompatibility issues with tall developments immediately adjacent to low density areas or within historic districts/downtowns.
   - Ignores the fact that not all public lands have the same value for affordable housing development, as some large tracts of public land are located at the urban fringe, away from transit and is inappropriate for housing development that leads to sprawl.
   - Ignores the fact that ability to deploy land is driven by market forces, which cities do not control.
   - Disregards the efforts underway by local communities to plan vacant lands around transit in a context-sensitive manner.
   - Limits a city’s ability to use good design and planning techniques to integrate new affordable housing into the fabric of a community, which will likely result in further community resistance to affordable housing development.
   - Lacks a definition for surplus and underutilized land and how this proposal relates to the existing Surplus Land Act requirement to offer surplus land to affordable housing developers and other public agencies.

   **Support with amendments** as follows:
   - Allow all cities (not just Sensitive Communities) to develop context sensitive community plans that achieves the overall goal of providing affordable housing around transit.
   - Provide clear and objective standards for the definition of “surplus land” and for determining whether a public land is developable for affordable housing.
   - Should prioritize land around existing or approved transit stops.
   - Require projects to be consistent with locally adopted land use plans that are already in place (e.g. specific plans) and consistent with objective local standards instead of granting land use authority to such agency landowners.
   - For transit agency properties, ensure continued public access to transit service, including parking for patrons.
   - Monitor any developing legislation regarding the definition of “surplus/underutilized” lands. As appropriate, advocate for amendments that would allow:
     - Cities to partner with the public entity which owns the surplus land to ensure projects are developed in a manner consistent with local plans and design standards.

9. Funding and Financing the CASA Compact: Raise $1.5 billion new revenue annually from broad range of sources including (but not limited to) property taxes, ½-cent sales tax, head tax, and General Obligation Bonds (reissued every 5 years). Of the total $1.5 billion, $300 million

   **CONCERN STATUS:** High. Though not included in the Compact, the Governor has already suggested withholding SB1 funds from cities that do not meet their RHNA assignment. Most cities do not meet the RHNA assignment for at least low and very low units, mostly because such affordability requires

   **Oppose unless amended** to eliminate any reduction in current property tax or transportation funding to cities and amended as follows:
   -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</th>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
<th>RELATED LEGISLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will come from local communities (former RDA set aside and future tax increment).</td>
<td>significant local subsidies to even get built – the private market simply don’t build these units on its own.</td>
<td>In lieu of regional agency, authorize local agencies on a countywide level to raise and retain revenue through combination of voter approved potential taxes or bonds to fund the programs identified in CASA Elements 1-8 within the respective counties and to manage and distribute those funds within the counties. Require a portion of these funds to be allocated Regionally if a city or unincorporated portion of the County does not zone enough land to meet its RHNA obligation or adopt zoning changes to implement the new housing law requirements set for in laws adopted pursuant CASA Elements 4-7 within a reasonable period.</td>
<td>(information; subject to change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New revenue allocation formula:</td>
<td>- Up to 10% for local jurisdiction incentives</td>
<td>- In lieu of regional agency, authorize local agencies on a countywide level to raise and retain revenue through combination of voter approved potential taxes or bonds to fund the programs identified in CASA Elements 1-8 within the respective counties and to manage and distribute those funds within the counties. Require a portion of these funds to be allocated Regionally if a city or unincorporated portion of the County does not zone enough land to meet its RHNA obligation or adopt zoning changes to implement the new housing law requirements set for in laws adopted pursuant CASA Elements 4-7 within a reasonable period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remainder to tenant protection, preservation, housing subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New revenue distribution formula:</td>
<td>- 75% to county of origin (“return to source”)</td>
<td>Regional “fair share” housing assignment (RHNA process) is correlated to level of funding received (i.e., the less regional funding a city receives, the lower the regional housing assignment) (e.g., we do not want to be donor cities).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 25% to regional program (“revenue sharing”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue collection and disbursement would be managed by a new regional housing authority (described in Element 10).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective: Fund elements of the Compact that requires public subsidy (e.g., rental assistance, free legal counsel, financial incentives, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No “return to source” formula at the city-level, resulting in a greater perception of some communities being “donor communities” without having resources to meet its assigned housing obligation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vacant property tax could be punitive to small property owners, particularly if vacancy is beyond their control. Potential unfunded mandate if responsibility for enforcement falls upon local cities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commercial fees/taxes may be counterproductive if it drives employers out of the region and suppresses business retention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The property tax “set aside” is punitive to those cities whose tax base is largely from property taxes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wide range of new taxes and fees may limit a city’s taxing capacity (limit its voters’ appetite to pass local funding measures).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fails to address what happens if some cities/counties approve funding measures while others do not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Board of the new regional housing agency is not directly elected and does not have authority to pursue revenue measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: High.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Propose alternative approach as follows because this element as drafted is not representative of each city and includes taxation without representation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Regional Housing Enterprise (RHE): Establishes a new independent regional housing agency – formed through state legislation - to implement the Compact. It would have the authority to collect and distribute revenue, issue debt,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN STATUS: High.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do not create an unrepresentative layer of oversight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creating an entity that is not comprised of elected officials does not allow it to be accountable to the voters or local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the following sustainable funding sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Statewide voter-approved sales tax or General Obligation bonds for affordable housing to pay for housing initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walnut Creek Housing Policy Framework - (April 2019)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF CASA ELEMENT</th>
<th>CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buy/lease/hold land, and track/report on local progress. No regulatory or enforcement powers.</td>
<td>needs, and appears to be structured to exclude local government input.</td>
<td>Consider initiating the housing agencies at the county-level. Sacramento could then “authorize” self-help housing counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition: independent board with representation from MTC, ABAG, and stakeholder groups that created the Compact.</td>
<td>• Creating a regional entity introduces another bureaucracy with its own unique set of requirements; takes staff time away from facilitating housing production and committing it to report production (in addition to the ones filed with State HCD and Department of Finance).</td>
<td>○ County supervisors have authority to place funding measures on the ballot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective: Administers the Compact.</td>
<td>• Creates taxation without representation.</td>
<td>○ Counties and cities have a track record of working together on housing and homeless issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing agencies that could do the same functions, with additional funding, are not being considered instead of a new public agency.</td>
<td>○ Self-help transportation counties have demonstrated track record of working together on significant issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ Brings issues closer to community level to address community concerns; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ Do not form a new entity without clear and complete sources of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ Allow for a consistent approach across the State.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF WALNUT CREEK
RESOLUTION NO. 19-33

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WALNUT CREEK
SUPPORTING THE CONTRA COSTA COUNTY JURISDICTIONS’ HOUSING AND
POLICY FRAMEWORK ON HOUSING MATTERS

WHEREAS, the Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ recognize and respect the local needs
and character of each community, and have a shared interest in maintaining local control of
decision-making related to all aspects of the management of each jurisdiction, including but not
limited to financial, land use and development, and growth-related matters; and

WHEREAS, in January of 2017, the State of California published a report titled
“California’s Housing Future: Opportunities and Challenges,” which documented the negative
consequences of the historic underproduction of housing in California, including an increasing
affordability gap, falling rates of homeownership, disproportionate rates of homelessness, and
issues such as urban sprawl and traffic congestion. Collectively, these issues have been identified
by legislators as part of a statewide “housing crisis”; and

WHEREAS, in September of 2017, California Governor Jerry Brown signed into law the
“Housing Package” consisting of 15 new bills focused on funding, permit streamlining, and
increased enforcement and accountability for local governments with respect to implementation
of the Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, in 2018, State legislators approved, and the Governor signed into law several
additional housing bills; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission formed the Committee to
House the Bay Area (CASA) to address the housing challenges in the Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, in December 2018 the Committee to House the Bay Area released an
ambitious 10-point plan, known as the CASA Compact, to serve as state legislative research data
for future housing legislation; and

WHEREAS, the State’s focus on the affordable housing challenges is likely to continue
for the foreseeable future with new legislation that will impact local Jurisdictions’; and

WHEREAS, the Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ recognize the substantial challenge
of providing adequate and affordable housing opportunities in the region, and the shared
responsibility of all communities across the State to help address these needs; and

WHEREAS, there is a unique opportunity for the Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ to
work together, to develop a collaborative response to influence legislative efforts at the State
towards outcomes that address housing needs, while respecting community character and desire
for local control of decision making; and
WHEREAS, the Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ affirm their interest in and commitment to shaping housing policy outcomes in a constructive manner, through a proactive and nuanced approach to advocacy and engagement on the topic of housing that will result in better outcomes for the region and the individual communities; and

WHEREAS, the Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ Housing and Policy Framework provides a comprehensive approach, reflecting the following Key Themes:

- Balanced Solutions – Housing, Jobs, and Transportation;
- Provide, Promote, and Protect Affordability;
- Context Sensitive Housing;
- Infrastructure and Services; and
- Funding and Resources; and

WHEREAS, the Key Themes are topic areas where there is consensus among the Contra Costa County and its respective cities, and which can be used to inform, influence, respond, and advocate, on the topic of housing at the local, regional and State level; and

WHEREAS, the overall approach identifies and addresses common areas of concern, while recognizing that each city can and will continue to pursue individual areas of interest that are specific to their community’s needs; and

WHEREAS, the Walnut Creek City Council met on May 7, 2019 to consider and discuss the Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ Housing and Policy Framework.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE WALNUT CREEK CITY COUNCIL DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DECLARE, DETERMINE AND ORDER THE FOLLOWING:

Section 1. The Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ Housing and Policy Framework is hereby supported on matters related to housing legislation.

Section 2. The Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ may from time-to-time revisit the Contra Costa County Jurisdictions’ Housing and Policy Framework to ensure that the approaches and topics discussed within the report remain relevant and appropriate.

Section 3. The Mayor and City Manager are authorized to take positions on behalf of the City in regard to pending legislation consistent with the Contra Costa Jurisdictions’ Housing and Policy Framework and to communicate those positions to interested parties on behalf of the City Council.
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Walnut Creek at a regular meeting thereof held on the 7th day of May 2019 by the following called vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: Francois, Wilk, Haskew, Mayor Silva

NOES: Councilmembers: Wedel

ABSENT: Councilmembers: None

\[Signature\]
Cindy Silva
Mayor of the City of Walnut Creek

Attest:

\[Signature\]
Suzie Martinez, MMC
City Clerk of the City of Walnut Creek