Meeting of the Gateway Cities Planning Directors

PLEASE ARRIVE AT 7:45 AM FOR CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

Wednesday, January 8, 2020 8:00 AM

Gateway Cities COG Offices
16401 Paramount Boulevard, Paramount
2nd Floor Conference Room

AGENDA

I. Self-Introductions

10 Min  II. Census 2020 Presentation

Cynthia Cortez
Associate Director,
Southeast LA (SELA) Collaborative

10 Min  III. Metro TOC Policy & Implementation Plan Presentation

Elizabeth Carvajal
Senior Director,
Metro

10 Min  IV. Discussion of Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities Proposal: SB 50 Alternatives

Committee

5 Min  V. GPAC Update

Jessica Serrano
Vice-Chair & Planning Manager,
City of Norwalk

5 Min  VI. Affordable Housing Production Assistance Workshop Update

Julia Stewart
Planning Director,
Gateway Cities COG

5 Min  VII. Climate & Regional Planning Update

Stephanie Cadena
Assistant Planner,
Gateway Cities COG

VIII. Discussion of Future Agenda Items

IX. Adjourn
SELA Collaborative Members
Presentation Overview

1. SELA Collaborative overview
2. Census 2020 Overview
3. How cities can get involved in Census 2020
4. Resources
Census Overview and Importance
What is the Census?

- **Goal**: Count of every person in the country that occurs every 10 years
- Mandated by the US Constitution
- The Census count affects:
  - Federal funding allocated to states. For California, the allocation estimate is more than 100 billion dollars
  - Political representation at the federal and state level
- **New**: For the first time, the Census can be completed online. Also, Census 2020 budget was reduced meaning less local census offices, field staff, and field "presence"
Census Process and Timeline

- 95% of households will receive their Census invitation in the mail
- Enumerators will only visit households that have not responded
- All households will have option to respond online, by mail, or by phone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 12-20</td>
<td>Invitation postcard to respond online to Census (some households will receive paper questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Census Day!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20-27</td>
<td>Final reminder postcard before bureau follows up in person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Nonresponse Follow Up Begins (Enumerators on the ground)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>Response period ends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Census in Southeast Los Angeles
Census 2010 Outcomes
Low Response Score (LRS) in SELA

Figure 1: LRS Map for the SELA Collaborative region

Low Response Score (LRS) is a measure created by the U.S. Census Bureau to predict areas that are less likely to respond to the Census. The higher the LRS, the more difficult it is to count that Block Group.

The Southeast Los Angeles Collaborative Region has 123 Census Block Groups with “Very High” LRS. (45.4% of all Block Groups in the SELA Collaborative Region)

The Southeast Los Angeles Collaborative Region has 126 Census Block Groups with “High” LRS. (46.5% of all Block Groups in the SELA Collaborative Region)
Conducts for attaining an accurate count for Southeast Los Angeles

Visibility

- Consistent, effective, and diverse messaging from diverse stakeholders
  - Municipalities and elected officials
  - Schools and government offices
  - Business community
  - Community-based organizations
  - Volunteer/grassroot organizations

Participation

- Government Distrust
  - Supreme Court ruling to NOT have citizenship question in Census 2020
  - Fear of data privacy and security

- Understanding significance of participation in daily life
Census 2020 Efforts in Southeast LA

- City of South Gate and Bell Gardens: Complete Count Committees

- We Count LA Regional Census Table
  - Cross promote
  - Coordinate
  - Collaborate

- California Community Foundation as the ACBO for Region 8 and funded Community-Based Organizations

Next Meeting: January 16, 2020
How can cities get involved in Census 2020
There are different ways you can get involved in Census 2020, see SELA Newsletter for more details

Train yourself and staff on Census 2020
- US Federal Bureau, LA County, and LA City have many resources (prints and social media)
- NALEO offers staff training on Census 101, Operations, and how to be an effective messenger.

Activate LA County's Census 2020 Resources for Cities
- Tap into city resources available in Option 1 (pooled) or Option 2 (contracted) and identify your city’s Census Lead
- Highlight: Cities of South Gate and Bell Gardens have formed a Complete Count Committee

Promote Census job opportunities for SELA
- South Gate/Commerce office has a recruitment target of 3000 SELA enumerators!
Which activities work best for you?

Connect with other Census outreach stakeholders

- Learn about and strategically combine passive and active Census 2020 outreach tactics at We Count LA Census Table, next meeting: January 16th

Promote Census Action Kiosk (CAKS) use

- LA County is releasing CAK locations to help households with limited internet access complete the Census. Identify the ones in Southeast LA and your city.

Communicate the importance of Census OFTEN

- Strategically combine passive and active Census 2020 outreach tactics
Resources

- SELA Newsletter and Informational Sheets

- Identify tools for different audiences and messengers:
  - State of CA: [https://census.ca.gov/](https://census.ca.gov/)
  - Los Angeles County: [https://census.lacounty.gov/census/](https://census.lacounty.gov/census/)
  - Community-based Organizations (AltaMed, Fenton Communications, NALEO, etc.)
    - Check out organizations themselves!
THANK YOU!

(213) 201-3929

sela@selacollab.org

www.selacollab.org

Follow us on Social Media: @SelaCollab
OUR VISION
An informed, engaged and empowered Southeast Los Angeles community.

OUR MISSION
To strengthen the SELA communities, build collective power, and encourage innovation to drive regional systemic change.

ABOUT THE COLLABORATIVE
The Southeast Los Angeles Collaborative is a network of organizations gathered to lead the area of Southeast Los Angeles into an era of increased vitality by bringing resources to build a robust infrastructure of local non-profits, to inform and engage residents for increased civic participation and to provide data and research specifically designed to explore the possibilities of this region. Currently composed of twelve core organizations, the Collaborative seeks to revitalize the communities of Bell, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Florence-Firestone, Huntington-ton Park, Lynwood, Maywood, South Gate, Vernon and Walnut Park. Core program areas include:

NONPROFIT CAPACITY BUILDING  CIVIC ENGAGEMENT  DATA-DRIVEN RESEARCH

OUR COLLABORATIVE MEMBERS

SELA Collaborative: Transforming Communities
For more information contact Wilma Franco, SELA Collaborative Director
wfranco@selacollab.org | (310) 462-0970 | www.selacollab.org

Connect with us. f  ©  Twitter  LinkedIn @selacollab
NUESTRA VISIÓN
Nuestra visión es una comunidad informada, comprometida e involucrada en las actividades cívicas del Sureste de Los Ángeles.

NUESTRA MISIÓN
Nuestra misión consiste en fortalecer las comunidades de SELA, edificar el poder colectivo y fomentar la innovación para impulsar el cambio sistémico regional.

ABOUT THE COLLABORATIVE
SELA Collaborative es una red de organizaciones reunidas para guiar al Sureste de Los Ángeles hacia una era de mayor vitalidad. La Colaborativa identificó tres áreas estratégicas: 1) Brindar recursos para forjar una infraestructura robusta de organizaciones sin fines de lucro locales; 2) aumentar la participación cívica de la comunidad; 3) proveer datos e investigaciones específicamente diseñadas para explorar las posibilidades de esta región. La Colaborativa, compuesta actualmente por doce organizaciones centrales, busca revitalizar las comunidades de Bell, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Florence-Firestone, Huntington Park, Lynwood, Maywood, South Gate, Vernon y Walnut Park. El enfoque de los programas centrales incluye:

CAPACITACIÓN PARA ORGANIZACIONES SIN FINES DE LUCRO
PARTICIPACIÓN CÍVICA
INVESTIGACIÓN BASADA EN DATOS

NUESTROS MIEMBROS COLABORATIVOS

SELA Collaborative: Transforming Communities
Para más información, comuníquese con Wilma Franco, directora de SELA Collaborative.
wfranco@selacollab.org  |  (310) 462-0970  |  www.selacollab.org

Conéctese con nosotros.  
Facebook  |  Instagram  |  Twitter  |  LinkedIn  |  Selacollab
A Strong Future Depends on You

- The census will be used to make important decisions that will affect you, your family, and your community for the next 10 years.
- The next generation is depending on you to stand up and say, “I am here and I matter.”
- It is very important that EVERYONE who lives with you is counted, including children, relatives, friends and roommates – regardless of citizenship status.

Your Privacy is Protected

- It is illegal to share your census information with anyone including the courts, IRS, police or immigration enforcement.
- Your answers will never be used to decide if you or your family receives benefits.
- There will be no citizenship question.

Census Day is April 1, 2020

Resources are Based on Population

The census helps decide how much money Los Angeles will get for important things like:

- Schools
- Hospitals
- Affordable Housing
- Job Programs

Each person counted in the census means more money will go to your community for the next 10 years. Participating in the census means you are claiming your community’s fair share of federal money.

Representation is Based on Population

The census also decides how many elected officials L.A. County will send to Washington, D.C.

- Being counted makes sure your voice will be heard.
- It is your chance to safely resist exclusion.

US CENSUS 2020

Why it Matters to You

because more people counted means more money for our community.
**US Census 2020**

**Important Facts About the Census**

**The Census is Safe**
- It is illegal to share your census information with anyone including the courts, IRS, police or immigration enforcement.
- Your answers will never be used to decide if you or your family receives benefits.
- There will be no citizenship question.

**Everyone Must be Counted**
- Once every 10 years, the census counts EVERYONE living in the U.S. – regardless of age, race/ethnicity or citizenship status.
- It is important that everyone living with you is counted – children, relatives, friends and roommates.

**Filling Out the Form is Easy**
- You can complete the census online, by mail, or by phone.
- You will be asked 10 simple questions, like your age, if you are married, and the number of children in your home.

**Your Family and Community will Benefit**

The census helps decide how much money Los Angeles will get for important things like:
- **Schools**
- **Hospitals**
- **Affordable Housing**
- **Job Programs**

Each person counted in the census means more money will go to your community for the next 10 years. Participating in the census means you are claiming your community’s fair share of federal money.

**This is Your Chance to be Heard**

The census also decides how many elected officials L.A. County will send to Washington, D.C.
- Being counted makes sure your voice will be heard.
- It is your chance to safely resist exclusion.

**Census Day is April 1, 2020**
Your responses to the 2020 Census are safe, secure, and protected by federal law. Your answers can only be used to produce statistics—they cannot be used against you in any way. By law, all responses to U.S. Census Bureau household and business surveys are kept completely confidential.

Respond to the 2020 Census to shape the future.

Responding to the census helps communities get the funding they need and helps businesses make data-driven decisions that grow the economy. Census data impact our daily lives, informing important decisions about funding for services and infrastructure in your community, including health care, senior centers, jobs, political representation, roads, schools, and businesses. More than $675 billion in federal funding flows back to states and local communities each year based on census data.

Your census responses are safe and secure.

The Census Bureau is required by law to protect any personal information we collect and keep it strictly confidential. The Census Bureau can only use your answers to produce statistics. In fact, every Census Bureau employee takes an oath to protect your personal information for life. Your answers cannot be used for law enforcement purposes or to determine your personal eligibility for government benefits.

By law, your responses cannot be used against you.

By law, your census responses cannot be used against you by any government agency or court in any way—not by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), not by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), not by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and not by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The law requires the Census Bureau to keep your information confidential and use your responses only to produce statistics.
There are no exceptions.

The law requires the Census Bureau to keep everyone’s information confidential. By law, your responses cannot be used against you by any government agency or court in any way. The Census Bureau will not share an individual’s responses with immigration enforcement agencies, law enforcement agencies, or allow that information to be used to determine eligibility for government benefits. Title 13 makes it very clear that the data we collect can only be used for statistical purposes—we cannot allow it to be used for anything else, including law enforcement.

It’s your choice: you can respond securely online, by mail, or by phone.

You will have the option of responding online, by mail, or by phone. Households that don’t respond in one of these ways will be visited by a census taker to collect the information in person. Regardless of how you respond, your personal information is protected by law.

Your online responses are safe from hacking and other cyberthreats.

The Census Bureau takes strong precautions to keep online responses secure. All data submitted online are encrypted to protect personal privacy, and our cybersecurity program meets the highest and most recent standards for protecting personal information. Once the data are received, they are no longer online. From the moment the Census Bureau collects responses, our focus and legal obligation is to keep them safe.

We are committed to confidentiality.

At the U.S. Census Bureau, we are absolutely committed to keeping your responses confidential. This commitment means it is safe to provide your answers and know that they will only be used to paint a statistical portrait of our nation and communities.

Learn more about the Census Bureau’s data protection and privacy program at www.census.gov/privacy.
SELA Collaborative News

- **NEW Staff – Census Coordinator**
  - Fredy Salguero has joined the SELA Collaborative as our Census Coordinator to deepen our capacity to conduct outreach and support regional coordination. He is excited to reach out to you with all things Census.

- **We Count LA Census Table, formally known as the Los Angeles Regional Census Table**
  - The SELA Collaborative is the regional co-convener for the We Count LA Census Table! This space convenes community-based organizations and other key stakeholders to coordinate Census 2020 outreach throughout LA County.
  - Date: Thursday, January 16, 2019 from 8:30am – 12:00pm
  - RSVP Here: [https://www.eventbrite.com/e/we-count-la-census-table-meeting-tickets-85582528647](https://www.eventbrite.com/e/we-count-la-census-table-meeting-tickets-85582528647)

- **SELA Collaborative Census Events Calendar**
  - It's arrived! View and post Census events happening in southeast Los Angeles! This is a great tool to get the word out about your Census events. We are here to help ensure our regional census efforts are coordinated.
  - Check it the calendar and submit your events here: [http://selacollab.org/censuscalendar/](http://selacollab.org/censuscalendar/)
  - Please reach out to Fredy Salguero, Census Coordinator, (323) 286-8059, fsalguero@selacollab.org for support

- **SELA Collaborative at the Joint Information Hearing: Assembly Select Committee and Senate Select Committee on the 2020 Census**
  - In December 2019, the SELA Collaborative in partnership with Long Beach Forward and California Community Foundation were able to speak to Senator Umberg, Senator Pan, Assemblymember Berman, and Senator Lena Gonzales at the Assembly and Senate Joint Committee Hearing on the Census. We spoke about community-based organization funding, engagement, and coordination in LA County.

- **Census 2020 Presentation with Huntington Park’s Faith-Based Leaders**
  - In October 2019, the SELA Collaborative delivered a Census 2020 presentation to the faith-based leaders convened by the City of Huntington Park. Did you know that there are over 250 faith-based organization in the SELA region and that they are considered one of the key trusted messengers in our community? Thank you for the collaboration Huntington Park!

- **LAUSD and SELA Collaborative Census 2020 Meeting**
  - In November 2019, the SELA Collaborative in partnership with LAUSD held a meeting with education-affiliated CBOs, schools, charters, and grassroots groups to learn about its upcoming launch of the “We are One: Census 2020” Campaign!
General Census 2020 News

- **Hiring Census Enumerators:** Please advertise widely – US Census Bureau is hiring enumerators. For SELA, Cirilo Castaneda is one of the US Census Bureau Recruiting Assistant working out of South Gate/Commerce Office. He has the capacity to provide trainings and inform our region on Census jobs. **We need bilingual, SELA folks to apply as the goal is to hire 3000 persons in the region!**
  - **Contact:** Cirilo Castaneda, cirilo.j.castaneda@2020census.gov
    - SELA (Commerce Office/South Gate ACO) Census Office Hours: 8-4:30pm
    - Pay rates for Los Angeles County which includes South Gate ACO [here](#)
  - **Hiring Non-Citizens:** Appropriations law requires that federal employees must be U.S. citizens.
    - The law permits the hiring of non-citizen translators as census takers if there are no available citizens who can be hired with the necessary non-English language skills.
    - **Note:** The Census Bureau will hire non-citizen translators who are legally entitled to work in the U.S. on an as-needed basis during the 2020 Census. For more information, please reach out to Cirilo.

- **Census Action Kiosks:** Trainings have been moved to 2020. The final list of locations will be released early 2020. The Finder Tool will help you locate them throughout LA County. The State of California has recently issued its own guidance around Questionnaire Assistance Kiosks (QAKs)/Questionnaire Assistance Centers (QACs) – thus, LA City and County will share update on QAKs and QACs soon. Next Meeting: January 2020, date TBA.
  - **City of LA Contact:** Erica Jacquez, Erica.Jacquez@lacity.org, (213) 675-4319
  - **LA County Contact:** Vanessa Gonzalez, VGonzalez@ceo.lacounty.gov, (213) 974-1261

- **Group Quarter Enumerations:** There is a lot of information share by the Federal US Census Bureau. Please reach out to contact: Adley.kloth@2020census.gov for more information and/or answers to your group quarter questions.

- **California Community Foundation (CCF) Funded Community Based Organizations:** CCF was named LA region's Administrative Community Based Organization (ACBO) by the State of California. In their grant making, they have funded several organizations serving the southeast. Some of them include:
  - Families in Schools, YMCA, AltaMed, COFEM, Human Services Association, CHIRLA, NALEO, CD Tech, South Asian Network
  - Be on the lookout for an updated list and more information on these organizations’ outreach strategies in the near future!

- **LAUSD:** LAUSD will be launching its “We are One: Census 2020” Campaign in early 2020 to help schools and families participate in the Census. Parents Centers will play a critical role in the campaign. More information will be shared as the campaign is launched.
Upcoming Events

- **Los Angeles County Office of Education**
  - Description: Lesson plans for CA teachers in grades 5, 8, 11, 12; Free Training
  - Date: January 15, 2020, 9am-3pm
  - Location: 700 S. Almansor St., Alhambra, CA 91801
  - Register Here: [http://lacoe.k12oms.org/1537-179010](http://lacoe.k12oms.org/1537-179010)

- **Census Bureau Operational Reference Timeline**
  - January 2020 – Enumeration of remote Alaskan communities takes place
  - March 12, 2020 – Census postcards are sent to all housing units
  - April 1, 2020 – Census Day
  - May 2020 – The Census Bureau begins visiting homes that haven’t responded to the 2020 Census to make sure everyone is counted.
  - By December 31, 2020 – Deliver apportionment counts to the president
  - By March 31, 2021 – The Census Bureau completes delivery of redistricting counts to the states
    - For more information, you may reach out to one of several (listed and unlisted here) US Census Bureau Federal and State Contacts serving the SELA Region.
      - David Tran, Partnership Specialist, [david.q.tran@2020census.gov](mailto:david.q.tran@2020census.gov)
      - Mariecris Treece, Partnership Specialist Team Lead, [mariecris.d.treece@2020census.gov](mailto:mariecris.d.treece@2020census.gov)
      - Sara Zapata Mijares, Partnership Specialist, [sara.b.zapata.mijares@2020census.gov](mailto:sara.b.zapata.mijares@2020census.gov)
      - Irving Pacheco, Regional Program Manager, California Complete Count – Census 2020, [irving.pacheco@census.ca.gov](mailto:irving.pacheco@census.ca.gov)

SELA Municipal News

- **Complete Count Committees**: The cities of South Gate and Bell Gardens have formed Complete Count Committees. Kudos! For folks interested in getting involved in their Complete Count Committee, please reach out to them:
  - South Gate Contact: Dianne N. Guevara, [dguevara@sogate.org](mailto:dguevara@sogate.org)
  - Bell Gardens Contact: Hailes Soto, [hsoto@bellgardens.org](mailto:hsoto@bellgardens.org)

- **Census City Funds**: Cities have been offered the opportunity to pursue funding that has been allocated to them by the state of California (Option 2) or pool it in a countywide general fund (Option 1). At the Countywide Complete Count Committee (CCC), LA County’s CEO office shared that about 2/3 of LA County cities opted for Option 1.
  - **Contact for cities who have opted in Option 1**: Myles Meshack, Principal Analyst, Chief Executive Office, [mmeshack@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:mmeshack@ceo.lacounty.gov); (213) 893-2086
  - 28 City departments in LA County turned in strategic plans
Highlighted Resources

- **We Count LA Communication Resources:**
  - Fenton Communications, the main Census 2020 communications firm for California Community Foundation is supporting messaging for CBOs by creating a wide variety of Census outreach tools.
  - Please check out the resources here: [https://wecountla.org/](https://wecountla.org/)

- **Families in Schools: All Children Count Toolkit**
  - Tool kit and training experience for parents, children, and early childhood education/preschool providers
  - For more information reach out to: Tina Ochoa, VP of Programs, tochoa@familiesinschools.org

- **NALEO Trainings** – NALÉO has created a 3-part series of train-the-trainer modules to help staff new to Census understand Census 2020 and ensure residents are counted.
  - For more information reach out to: Giovany Hernandez, ghernandez@naleo.org

- **We Count Kids Book**
  - Children’s book on Census available for order; e-version also available
  - [https://www.wecountkids.org/the-book](https://www.wecountkids.org/the-book)

Messaging Reminders

**Remember to communicate:**

- Everyone who lives at an address must be counted – whether it’s a single family, multiple families, or non-traditional household.
- Participating in the Census is safe – laws protect the privacy of the information. You can report false information to rumors@census.gov
- Strong Census participation helps bring money into communities and strengthens political power.
# 2020 Census Jobs Available in Los Angeles County

The U.S. Census Bureau is recruiting for various positions to assist with the 2020 Census count. Positions provide:

- Excellent Pay
- Flexible Hours
- Paid Training
- Close to home

**Multiple Positions available – One Application – www.2020census.gov/jobs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>Pay Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Clerks</td>
<td>Perform various administrative and clerical tasks to support various daily operations.</td>
<td>$17.00 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Operations Supervisors</td>
<td>Assist in the management of office functions and day-to-day activities.</td>
<td>$21.50 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Field Supervisors</td>
<td>Conduct fieldwork to support and conduct on-the-job training for census takers and/or to follow-up in situations where census takers have confronted issues, such as not gaining entry to restricted areas.</td>
<td>$23.00 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumerators</td>
<td>Some field positions require employees to work during the day to locate addresses on buildings. Other field positions require interviewing the public, so employees must be available to work when people are usually at home, such as in the evening and on weekends.</td>
<td>$21.00 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting Assistants</td>
<td>Travel throughout assigned geographic areas to visit with community-based organizations, attend promotional events and conduct other recruiting activities.</td>
<td>$23.00 per hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Apply Today!**

2020census.gov/jobs

Federal Relay Service: (800) 877-8339 TTY / ASCII
www.gsa.gov/fedrelay

1-855-JOB-2020 (1-855-562-2020)

The U.S. Census Bureau is an Equal Opportunity Employer
Low Response Score (LRS) is a measure created by the U.S. Census Bureau to predict areas that are less likely to respond to the Census. The higher the LRS, the more difficult it is to count that Block Group.

The Southeast Los Angeles Collaborative Region has 123 Census Block Groups with “Very High” LRS.
(45.4% of all Block Groups in the SELA Collaborative Region)

The Southeast Los Angeles Collaborative Region has 126 Census Block Groups with “High” LRS.
(46.5% of all Block Groups in the SELA Collaborative Region)
SELAA Collaborative Region Quick Facts

- Approximately 92% of all Census Block Groups in the SELA Collaborative Region are considered Hard-to-Count meaning that they have “Very High” and “High” Low Response Scores (LRS).
- In the SELA Collaborative Region, over 200,000 people live in “Very High” LRS Block Groups and over 200,000 live in “High” LRS Block Groups.
- In the hardest-to-count SELA Collaborative Region Block Groups (with “Very High” LRS), the average percentage of Renters was 75.9% (vs. 63.3% Regionwide), Population Living in Multi-Unit (10+) Housing was 13.9% (vs. 9.7% Regionwide), Below Poverty Level was 33.8% (vs. 27.5% Regionwide), Families with Child(ren) Ages 0-5 was 37.7% (vs. 33.5% Regionwide), Single Female Head of Households was 27.1% (vs. 24.2% Regionwide), and the Median Household Income was $34,317 (vs. $40,567 Regionwide).
- Compared to Census Block Groups in Los Angeles County overall, Block Groups in the SELA Collaborative Region have a higher average percentage of Renters; Non-High School Graduates, Population Below Poverty Level; Limited English Speakers; Families with Child(ren) 0-5; Population With No Health Insurance; and Population Ages 5-17.

Cities and Unincorporated Communities in the SELA Collaborative Region with Census Block Groups that have “Very High” LRS:
- Unincorporated Florence-Firestone (33)
- Huntington Park (24)
- South Gate (17)
- Bell Gardens (17)
- Lynwood (15)
- Cudahy (8)
- Maywood (5)
- Bell (4)

Cities and Unincorporated Communities in the SELA Collaborative Region with Census Block Groups that have “High” LRS:
- South Gate (28)
- Lynwood (23)
- Bell (18)
- Huntington Park (17)
- Maywood (11)
- Unincorporated Florence-Firestone (9)
- Bell Gardens (8)
- Unincorporated Walnut Park (6)
- Cudahy (4)
- Vernon (2)

The U.S. Census Bureau provides Block Group data on selected variables to provide socioeconomic and demographic characteristic profiles of areas. The following figures are averages of the Census Block Groups in the SELA region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>$40,567</th>
<th>Not High School Graduate</th>
<th>54.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>Limited English Ages 14+</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Population Ages 18-24</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>Population Ages 65+</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>Family Occupied Housing Units with Related Child Under Age 6</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>Multi-Unit (10+) Housing</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Ages 0-5</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>Population with No Health Insurance</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Ages 5-17</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>Single Female Head of Household</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2016 Planning Database

Impact of the Census

**MONEY:** California receives billions of dollars annually from Federal programs that use Census-derived data to determine funding allocations for health and human services, housing, nutrition, workforce development, transportation, and other services.

Source: Andrew Reamer, Research Professor, George Washington University Institute of Public Policy (FY 2016)

**REPRESENTATION:** After the 2010 Census, California failed to gain a Congressional seat for the first time since obtaining statehood in 1850.
Next stop: access to opportunity.

Transit Oriented Communities (TOC)
Implementation Plan
Background

- Measure M (2016)
- **TOC Policy** (2018)
- Equity Platform (2018)
- Vision 2028 Strategic Plan (2018)
TOC Policy

1. Defined **TOCs**
2. Defined when Metro *leads* and when we *partner*
3. Defines **TOC activities** eligible for Local Return
What are TOCs?

- **Transit Oriented Communities** (TOCs) are places (such as corridors and neighborhoods) that, by their design, allow people to drive less and access transit more.

- A TOC maximizes equitable access to a multi-modal transit network as a key organizing principle of land use and holistic community development.
TOC Policy Goals

1. Increase transportation ridership and choice

2. Stabilize and enhance communities surrounding transit

3. Engage organizations, jurisdictions, and the public

4. Distribute transit benefits to all

5. Capture value created by transit
TOC Approach

WHERE METRO LEADS
Provides Mobility Services
Plans, Designs, Builds mobility lines/services
Protects and leverages real estate assets

WHERE METRO SUPPORTS
Encourages community development
Incentivizes land use planning and policies
Provides grant writing assistance
## TOC Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Within 3 miles of a Stop*</th>
<th>Within a half mile of a Stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>First/Last Mile Improvements</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/ Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Complete Street</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Consultants to implement TOC activities</td>
<td>Land Use Planning that promotes TOC goals</td>
<td>Small Business Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation related workforce training/education</td>
<td>Value Capture</td>
<td>Neighborhood Serving Amenities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stop:** High Quality Transit Stop Cleared Fixed Guideway Station or intersection of 2 buses w/ 15 min. headways or fewer at the peak.
The Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Implementation Plan (Plan) is the action plan for the Board adopted TOC Policy (2018)
TOC Implementation Plan Process

The Plan has been informed by a vigorous stakeholder engagement process:

- TOC Policy Working Group
- Focus group meetings with LA County municipalities
- Coordination with Metro staff leading concurrent/related planning efforts (e.g. LRTP, Sustainability Plan, and CBO Partnering Strategy)
Equity Focused Communities

Highways
Fixed guideway transit
EFC Communities
30% of LAC Population

Census Tract Thresholds
> 40% Low Income
> 80% Non-white
> 10% Zero Car

*Thresholds are based on:
1) Non-white AND Low Income, or
2) Low Income AND Zero Car
TOC Implementation Plan Organization

Organized by four Action Areas:

1. Complete TOC Corridor Baseline Assessments for each Measure M corridor
2. Continually Improve LA Metro TOC Programs
3. Improve Metro’s Internal Coordination
4. Strengthen coordination and collaboration with Metro’s partners
Action Area 1 (Baselines)

TOC Corridor Baseline Assessments (Baselines)

• Measure M Transit Corridor Projects
• Partnership with municipalities, with stakeholder engagement
• Resource of information that will:
  • Identify opportunities to leverage the transit investment
  • Identify potential community/corridor-level risks and vulnerabilities and
  • Recommended strategies, resources, and partnerships for municipalities to realize equitable TOCs in their communities
Action Area 1 (Baselines)

• **Demographic data** assessment and stakeholder engagement to ground-truth findings

• An **inventory and assessment of existing policies** that are integral to TOC realization

• **Recommended strategies and partnership opportunities** for municipalities to leverage the transit infrastructure for equitable TOCs
Action Area 2 (Metro TOC)

Continually Improving Metro’s TOC Programmatic Areas

a. Improve technical capacity and funding for TOC related activities by providing grant writing and technical assistance;

b. Implement Metro TOC Programmatic Areas programs and tools in alignment with Policy Goals; and

c. Improve effectiveness of existing TOC programmatic areas and respective programs and tools
Improving Metro’s Internal Coordination

a. Integrating TOC planning into the Measure M Corridor delivery process

b. Increasing equitable partnership opportunities with Community Based Organizations (CBOs)

c. Improving the accessibility of Metro resource and funding information for partners
Action Area 4 (External)

Strengthening Coordination and Collaboration with Metro’s Partners

a. Improving education and information around TOC issues and TOC supportive policies,
b. Supporting TOC supportive policy and funding legislation at the state level, and
c. Collaboration with partners to leverage Baseline corridor assessments to support TOC Implementation in measure M corridors
Plan Monitoring and Updates

- Annual Reports
  - Progress
  - Adjustments
  - Improvements

- Comprehensive Update at 5-year period
Next Steps

• December
  • Cities/County Focus Groups

• Early 2020
  • TOC Policy Working Group
  • Finalize Implementation Plan

• Spring 2020
  • LA Metro Board consideration
Draft Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Implementation Plan

Background

In 2016, Los Angeles County voters resoundingly approved Measure M, a $120 billion investment in the Los Angeles County public transit system, that over 40 years will transform how people travel as it expands access to opportunities and resources across the broader Los Angeles County region. To maximize the benefits of Measure M investments, in 2018 the Metro Board adopted the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Policy, a framework for Metro to achieve Measure M’s integrated goal of transit expansion and consideration of community impacts. The TOC Policy defined TOCs for Metro, defined “TOC Activities” that will be considered a “transportation purpose” eligible for funding with local return under Measure M Guidelines, and established criteria for when Metro leads and when Metro partners to realize TOCs across Los Angeles County.

What are TOCs?

Transit Oriented Communities (TOCs) are places (such as corridors or neighborhoods) that, by their design, allow people to drive less and access transit more. A Transit Oriented Community maximizes equitable access to a multi-modal transit network as a key organizing principle of land use planning and holistic community development. TOCs differ from Transit Oriented Development (TOD) in that a TOD is a specific building or development project that is fundamentally shaped by close proximity to transit.

TOCs promote equity and sustainable living in a diversity of community contexts by: (a) offering a mix of uses that support transit ridership of all income levels (e.g. housing, jobs, retail, services and recreation); (b) ensuring appropriate building densities, parking policies, and urban design that support accessible neighborhoods connected by multimodal transit; (c) elevating vulnerable users and their safety in design; and (d) ensuring that transit related investments provide equitable benefits that serve local, disadvantaged and underrepresented communities.

The TOC Policy set the following five goals to guide how Metro plans and implements new and existing corridors, supports community development and land use around corridors, and encourages/incentives partners to pursue the same goals:

1. Increase transportation ridership and choice
2. Stabilize and enhance communities surrounding transit
3. Engage organizations, jurisdictions, and the public
4. Distribute transit benefits to all
5. Capture value created by transit

TOC Implementation Plan Overview and Purpose

The TOC Implementation Plan (Plan) is an action plan for Metro that will build from the Policy by outlining the actions that will be realized to implement the Policy and create a process for tracking progress over time.
The Plan is intended to ensure that the realization of the public transit system equitably delivers upon the promise of Measure M from stakeholder engagement in planning and delivery of new public transit lines to partnering with local communities to catalyze equitable and holistic TOCs.

For cities and the County of Los Angeles, the Plan is a resource that outlines TOC collaboration opportunities with Metro to equitably maximize community benefits of the public transit investments, build capacity, receive technical assistance, and outline steps and funding opportunities that communities can pursue to realize community-specific visions of TOCs.

TOC Implementation Plan Organization

After the TOC Policy itself was adopted, Metro staff began preparing the Plan to ensure that the TOC Policy’s goals can be achieved. The draft Plan has been completed with input from a Working Group comprised of cities, L.A. County, several COGs, and multiple community-based organizations. Prior to taking the Plan to the Metro Board in Spring 2020, the Metro TOC team wants to present to strategy to its partner cities to familiarize them with the strategy and to solicit feedback.

This Plan identifies existing and new programs and corresponding actions that Metro will carry out either directly or through partnership to implement the Policy goals. Metro will monitor and report implementation progress through annual reports and conduct a more comprehensive Plan update after 5 years. The Plan is organized around four action areas:

- **Action Area 1 Creating TOC Corridor Baseline Assessments for all Measure M Transit Corridors:** A resource for municipalities, communities and Metro that will evaluate the potential changes to development patterns and market conditions that could negatively impact the character of communities with the arrival of a new transit line and to identify what tools and resources cities and other partners can best deploy to leverage the transit investment for community benefits and to address the potential challenges. See Attachment A for descriptions and examples of the demographic and policy assessments and more information about recommended strategies.

- **Action Area 2 Continually Improving Metro TOC Programmatic Areas:** Enables Metro to continue integrating TOC into its programs, providing resources and information to its partner cities through grant writing assistance, station areas planning assistance, case studies and tools, etc. and on an ongoing basis, continually improve upon TOC Programmatic areas. See Attachment B for Objectives, Actions, and Metro’s role in Action Area 2.

- **Action Area 3 Improving Metro’s Internal Coordination:** Identifies a series of internal collaboration opportunities that Metro can realize to realize equitable TOCs in areas that are within Metro’s functional jurisdiction. See Attachment C for Objectives, Actions, and Metro’s role in Action Area 3.

- **Action Area 4 Strengthening Coordination and Collaboration with Metro’s Partners:** Many of the community development policies and programs that are integral to realizing TOCs are outside of Metro’s functional jurisdiction. Strengthening coordination and collaboration with Metro’s partners will include a series of strategies that Metro can effectuate to support
municipalities through coordination and collaborations to realize equitable TOCs. See Attachment D for Objectives, Actions, and Metro’s role in Action Area 4.

**Plan Monitoring and Updates**

The Plan is intended to be a living document that will evolve iteratively over time. Annual Reports will be utilized to report progress and lessons learned, adjustments made to existing efforts, and potential improvements. The Plan is the implementation tool of the Policy and is intended to be an actionable plan for direct focused, and near-term action. As such, the Plan will be updated every five years.

The Annual Reports that will detail progress made towards attainment of the four action areas objectives, actions, and metrics applicable to that reporting period. As a vehicle for continual improvement, lessons learned will be woven into the annual reporting including quantitative and qualitative assessment of the action outcomes. Specific details will be provided identifying what is working well and needed/planned improvements with implementation timelines. Specific feedback from municipalities and stakeholders will inform the contents of each report. Annual reporting will act as the core mechanism for near- and medium-term Plan performance assessments. The five-year update is intended to be more comprehensive and an opportunity to identify the need for deeper adjustments and continuity or a more substantial reformulation of Metro’s approach to implementing the Policy.

**Summary of Attachments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment A</th>
<th>Action Area 1: TOC Baseline Corridor Assessment Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>Action Area 2: Continually Improving Metro TOC Programmatic Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment C</td>
<td>Action Area 3: Improving Metro’s Internal Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment D</td>
<td>Action Area 4: Strengthening Coordination and Collaboration with Metro’s Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action Area 1: TOC Baseline Corridor Assessment Overview

The TOC Baseline Corridor Assessments (Baselines) will be a snapshot of existing demographic characteristics and inventory and assessment of existing policies around Measure M Corridors that will be developed in partnership with municipalities and local stakeholders.

The Baselines will provide municipalities with information, strategies and resources to maximize equitable TOC outcomes around Measure M transit corridors.

Baselines will be developed in partnership with municipalities and grounded in stakeholder engagement. Baselines will include the following three components:

1. **Data**

   A snapshot of existing TOC-related data sets that highlight existing community characteristics and vulnerabilities (ex):
   - Median HH income
   - Ethnicity
   - Car Ownership
   - Housing/Transportation Cost Burden
   - Employment in Place
   - Age
   - Crash Rate/Collisions

2. **Regulatory Plans, Policies and Programs**

   The data results will inform the regulatory inventory and assessment. The regulatory assessment includes various TOC-related topic areas (Active Transportation, Land Use, Housing (including Anti-Displacement and Gentrification), Economic Development, Equity, Stakeholder Engagement, Value Capture, etc.

   Each Baseline will assess whether a municipality has an adopted regulatory plan/policy in place and the attributes of the plan/policy. Through the Baseline, we will assess where there are gaps (no plan/policy), opportunities to update existing plans/policies to align with TOC Policy goals, or if there is a TOC supportive plan/policy in place.

3. **Recommended Strategies**

   The Baselines will be prepared by LA Metro for municipalities, in coordination with municipalities and local stakeholders. Each Baseline will result in a series of recommended strategies for municipalities and a series of programs, resources, and tools that Metro can offer to support municipalities in implementing TOC activities.
### Action Area #2: Continually Improving Metro TOC Programmatic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Objective</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>Metro Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Improve technical capacity and funding for TOC projects by providing grant writing and technical assistance</strong></td>
<td>1. Establish a grant writing and technical assistance program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Provide grant/technical assistance to municipalities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Implement Metro TOC Programmatic Area programs and tools in alignment with TOC Policy Goals.</strong></td>
<td>1. Meet Joint Development Policy Goal of 35% affordable housing on Metro projects</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2a. Develop First/Last Mile Plans for Metro transit projects</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b. Support municipalities in implementing First/Last Mile Plans</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c. Develop MAT administrative procedures and fund active transportation projects using the MAT program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2d. Support implementation of active transportation projects using MAT Program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2e. Pursue discretionary funding opportunities for Transit to Parks Strategic Plan activities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2f. Collaborate with LA County Parks and Rec to determine a baseline number of LA County residents who lack a 10-minute walk or ride to a park</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Conduct Design Review for # new Measure M stations as part of the Systemwide Design Process</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Deploy Metro Affordable Transit Connected Housing (MATCH) Program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Provide Technical Assistance around value capture to Measure M cities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Support TOD Planning Grant Program Grantees in advancing equitable transit supportive plans</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. In partnership with the Los Angeles County CDC, retain small businesses in the community by providing T.I. loans for ground floor businesses in Metro Joint Development Projects or other affordable housing developments 500 feet of a High Quality Transit Node</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Improve effectiveness of existing TOC programmatic areas and respective programs and tools</strong></td>
<td>1. Increase partner awareness of the existing programs and tools and establish process to receive stakeholder input on the effectiveness of TOC programs/tools and potential improvements</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use the Baselines to inform TOC improvement areas based on feedback received during the TOC Corridor Baseline Assessments</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action Area #3: Improving Metro's Internal Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Objective</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Metro Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Integrate TOC planning into the Measure M corridor delivery process</strong></td>
<td>1. Identify opportunity sites for Joint Development in each Measure M corridor.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate TOC Goals and tasks (ex FLM planning, SWD review) into contractor scopes of work for corridor delivery process.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Work with Corridors Group to improve Metro's coordination and with cities and community partners during the development of the TOC Corridor Baseline Assessments for Measure M Corridors.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Increasing equitable partnership opportunities with Community Based Organizations (CBOs)</strong></td>
<td>1. Work with Community Relations, County Counsel, Procurement and other Metro departments to develop an equitable, agency wide CBO Partnering Strategy.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Improve accessibility of Metro resources and funding opportunity information for Metro partners</strong></td>
<td>1. Work with the Grants Department, Policy and Programming, Strategic Financial Planning, OMB, Marketing, and others to develop a consolidated, user-friendly portal of Metro resources and funding opportunities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Objective</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>Metro Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. Improve education and information around TOC issues and TOC supportive policies | 1. Identify topics of community concern and develop educational resources that address concerns, using case studies/messaging guides that demonstrate the importance of TOC investments and/or TOC supportive policies.  
2. Through partnerships, convene partners and stakeholders to message around TOC issues and supportive policies. | X          |
| b. Support TOC supportive policy and funding legislation at the state level     | 1a. Identify state policy and funding efforts that would provide municipal partners with substantial policy and/or funding support to implement equitable TOCs in Los Angeles County. | X          |
|                                                                               | 1b. As appropriate, engage the Metro Board to support state policy and funding efforts that would provide municipal partners with substantial policy and/or funding support to implement TOCs. | X          |
| c. Collaborate with partners to leverage Baseline corridor assessments to support TOC implementation in Measure M corridors | 1. Support municipalities in realizing recommended strategies from TOC Corridor Baseline Assessments. | X          |
January 14, 2020

Honorable Scott Wiener
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5100
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 50 (Wiener) Planning and zoning: housing development: streamlined approval: incentives.
Oppose Unless Amended (as amended 1/6/20) as recommended

Dear Senator Wiener,

I write to you today in response to your January 6, 2020 amendments to SB 50. In line with you and other legislative leaders, the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities® (Division), representing 86 cities in the county, recognizes the urgent and unprecedented housing crisis that our state is facing and we commend you and other legislative leaders for your efforts to develop concepts to tackle this challenge. In this spirit, the Division has proactively made continued efforts to engage with you, beginning with our July 12, 2019 driving tour through Southeast Los Angeles County, to initiate consistent personal messages and most recently to produce our December 15, 2019 letter and white paper outlining our concerns with your bill. We offered viable and proactive solutions that could increase housing, provide affordability and sustain community services, in order to meet our state’s collective housing needs sooner rather than later.

Our Division Board was intentional and proactive in creating the SB 50 Working Group that developed our alternative proposal. Our group was comprised of mayors and council members with diverse backgrounds, political perspectives, professional disciplines, and represented different regions with varying populations in Los Angeles County. We invested an incredible amount of time and resources to demonstrate our genuine goal and sincerity to be a partner with you and provide viable solutions to the state’s housing crisis. Additionally, I took personal efforts to reach out to you with our proposal prior to distributing the letter to our Los Angeles Delegation and other stakeholders. This is why we are very disappointed that despite our efforts to create an open dialogue, our proposal, from the largest Division and group of cities in our state, was unanswered and not reflected in the amended version of your bill.

We are left with no alternative but to continue to oppose SB 50 unless amended not only on its lack of sound planning and real affordability measures, but because our good-faith efforts to work with you have not been reciprocated.

Our alternative proposal to SB 50 is updated below. We have also attached our white paper that includes an expanded discussion based on the proposed amendments.

**Recommended Locally-Led Alternatives to Addressing the Housing Crisis**

- **Create entitlement certainty for multi-family housing.** The “local flexibility plan” developed under the amended version of SB 50 is duplicative of existing
planning processes, and establishes hypothetical development baselines that depend on a city speculating developer interest in equitable community incentives.

*Alternative:* A mandatory local entitlement process (entitlement incentives) for multi-family housing developments, in areas selected by local governments (transit corridors, commercial corridors, downtown districts, and other locally defined areas) could give certainty to the development community while preserving local control and protecting community engagement. A process similar to SB 540 (Roth, 2017), which created a voluntary entitlement program and was sponsored by the League of California Cities, could be replicated and required.

- **Density must be combined with long-term funding tools.** SB 50 does not provide funding for local governments to sustain exponential long-term density.
  
  *Alternative:* Incentives should be offered that provide permanent, ongoing funding sources for multi-family and affordable housing projects to ensure their sustainability and success. These can include housing block grants or tax increment programs like SB 795 (Beall/Portantino/McGuire) that provide a long-term financing tool for cities to address increased vital services for infrastructure, park, public safety and other community priorities resulting from the greater demand for such services that occurs with new construction. We recognize the state’s effort to provide funding through SB 2 and AB 101/SB 102. However, those funding sources are either one-time uses or insufficient to sustain the state’s housing goals.

- **Affordability must be prioritized and sensitive communities must be protected from displacement.** SB 50 gives generous “equitable community incentives” to a developer within a specified radius of a “transit rich or “jobs rich” area. However, the affordability requirement in SB 50 does little to address rising housing costs that affect our communities’ most vulnerable residents.
  
  *Alternative:* Multi-family housing developments must provide a minimum of 25% inclusionary housing, unless a local agency has enacted a higher minimum, to receive any development incentives and entitlement certainty incentives for multifamily developments. The State should also encourage the development of more local Housing Authorities to facilitate construction of affordable housing.

**Why SB 50 (as amended 1/6/20) is Not a Practical Solution to the Housing Crisis**

Notwithstanding the alternatives to SB 50 recommended above, there continues to be unsustainable flaws to the bill in its current form:

- **The Local Flexibility Plan established under the amended SB 50 is duplicative of existing planning process.** This Plan lacks any real local flexibility and would establish a hypothetical development baseline that depends on a city speculating developer interest in and use of various equitable community incentives. The Division remains concerned that “one size fits all” metrics of SB 50 do not work in real world circumstances that exist in many of our communities. Cities and California’s Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) have an established Housing Element process created through state law along with financial penalties for non-compliance. The Housing Element process requires significant city resources to develop, obtain public input, and receive approval from HCD. SB 50 would require cities to use precious time and resources to create a duplicative process that competes with the Housing Element.
  
  *Alternative:* The Division proposes amending SB 50 to “create entitlement certainty for multi-family housing” in urban areas of California. The mandatory local entitlement process (entitlement incentives) for multi-family housing developments, in areas selected by local governments (transit corridors, commercial corridors, downtown districts, and other locally defined areas) would give entitlement certainty to the development community, while preserving local control and protecting community engagement. A process similar to SB 540 (Roth, 2017), which created a voluntary entitlement program and was sponsored by the League of California Cities, is proposed to be replicated and required in SB 50.
- **Carve outs must have merit.** The proposed carve-outs in SB 50 are arbitrary and will do little to solve the crisis.  
  *Alternative:* While the Division believes that the entire state should contribute to solving our unprecedented housing crisis, we believe that carve outs should only be carefully considered for the most dense and sensitive areas of the state, as well as coastal zones and historical districts. Carve outs for coastal zones recognizes the unique landscape in these areas and carve outs for historical districts would prevent the demolition of historic resources and protect the planning and architectural character of neighborhoods with a high number of historic residences and other historically significant buildings.

- **Focus Should be on Multi-Modal Transportation Options.** Definitions of “transit rich” areas in SB 50 are poorly defined, in many cases, based on routes that were established decades ago and in some cases, temporary in nature.  
  *Alternative:* Access to transit varies widely throughout the state, including providing limited or no weekend services, which do not fulfill the mobility needs for residents to reach employment or other destinations. Local leaders are in the best position to address transportation options and transit access as part of the multi-family housing development planning process.

- **Jobs Accessibility Areas should be defined by the local agency.** Current definitions of “jobs rich” is loosely defined in SB 50.  
  *Alternative:* Replace the ambiguous “jobs rich” definition with the locally defined “jobs accessibility areas”. Local leaders have the most intimate knowledge of their communities to map these areas based on real local data that will take into account local zoning, the safety and appropriate co-location of jobs and housing, and to successfully connect them with effective transportation options and development.

- **Recent State legislation already eliminates Single Family Residential (SFR) neighborhoods.**  
  Four-plexes or other small developments in former SFR zones are unnecessary as new legislation currently allow up to three units of housing in existing SFR neighborhoods. Further, none of these units are required to have an affordability requirement.  
  *Alternative:* Remove language related to four-plexes to allow local governments to implement Accessory Dwelling Unit legislation.

- **Commercial/Multi-Family areas need flexible ratios to accommodate different neighborhoods.**  
  SB 50 requires commercial/multi-family ratios that may not be logistically or financially feasible in some communities.  
  *Alternative:* Allow a lower residential threshold that may expand the number of commercial developments open to mixed-use residential uses.

**Conclusion**

The state and our region have faced many housing crises. The causes of the latest crisis are multi-faceted and complex. There is no single solution. Our discussion on solutions cannot happen in a vacuum without tackling various related issues such as CEQA obstacles, potential revisions of the housing element and zoning laws and practices. It will take a long-term effort of engagement, education and consensus building with all stakeholders. It is our hope that our proposal is included in that spirit of open dialogue and cooperation.

Again, we acknowledge your and other state leaders’ bold efforts to tackle our state’s housing crisis. We appreciate efforts to work with all stakeholders to ensure that the goals of any housing solutions are balanced with community essentials like equity, infrastructure, and public safety, among other important values. We continue to be prepared to work with the legislature in January 2020 and beyond to find long-term, viable and sustainable solutions to this crisis, and look forward to discussing our proposals with you in greater detail and context in the near future. Despite the aforementioned lack of response from you, I continue to be hopeful that, through a collaborative and sincere approach in resolving our state’s comprehensive housing needs,
together we can all contribute towards solving this problem and especially help those most vulnerable in our mutual communities.

If you have any questions, please contact Division Staff, Jennifer Quan at jquan@cacities.org or 626-786-5142.

Regards,

Juan Garza  
President, Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities  
Mayor, City of Bellflower

cc: Office of Governor Gavin Newsom  
Los Angeles County Legislative Delegation

Attachment: Goals and Objectives for Amendments to SB 50 as approved by the Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities, November 22, 2019
Goals and Objectives for Amendments to SB 50  
as approved by the Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities  
November 22, 2019

Provide Local Government with the flexibility, tools and resources to meet their housing needs

- SB 50 should be amended to provide cities with the flexibility, planning tools and resources they need to meet the housing shortage

The Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities supports the concepts in SB 50. However, the State of California is too large and diverse for a “one-size fits all” solution to the housing shortage. Cities know their communities best and require planning flexibility in order to locate multi-family housing in areas that are most conducive to community acceptance and support. In order to be effective, cities will require additional planning tools and financial resources in order to facilitate additional multi-family housing.

There are rural areas in Los Angeles County and the State where SB 50’s requirements will not work. In order to be successful, SB 50 should be amended to encourage maximum flexibility for cities to meet their housing needs. There are many good examples of how this planning flexibility has been organically occurring in a number of Los Angeles County cities, including in Bellflower\(^1\), Carson\(^2\), Los Angeles\(^3\), Pasadena\(^4\), and Signal Hill\(^5\).

Create Entitlement Certainty for Multi-Family Housing Developments

- Assist cities in meeting multi-family housing goals
- Streamline the entitlement process for the development community
- Provide a defined public hearing process for addressing community concerns and the need for neighborhood input
- Respect the CEQA process, but eliminate CEQA challenges at the project level

Discussion

SB 50 should be amended to establish a mandatory local entitlement process for multi-family developments that will substantially reduce the uncertainty for all stakeholders. Developers are reluctant to invest the time and resources when there is a great degree of development uncertainty in the local planning process and at the project level. Local officials are often called to mediate between developers, community stakeholders and apply local, regional and state development policies and regulations in a transparent manner. The current multifamily entitlement process can take years and require multiple steps, including and up to litigation.

---

\(^5\) [https://www.cityofsignalhill.org/611/Heritage-Square](https://www.cityofsignalhill.org/611/Heritage-Square)
Current general plan law requires that local governments identify “sufficient sites” for a range of housing income types through the housing element update process. This general plan requirement eliminated some development uncertainty, by identifying sites. However, a great deal of development uncertainty remains for all stakeholders even with sites being identified. The recommended next step in the process should be a step where communities ensure that new multi-family projects are not only properly located, but that projects are designed and mitigated in an efficient planning process.

Local governments should be required to prepare multi-family area plans consistent with their housing elements. Cities with existing plans that address multi-family development and meet RHENA projections would be substituted for these plans. SB 50 includes a provision to financially assist cities in revising their housing elements. This financial assistance should be extended to local governments as they fund the preparation of the multi-family area plans. The State should also provide funding for the planning staffing and services that each city will require to expedite multi-family projects.

The multi-family area plans could take the form of community level plans, such as transit corridor plans, downtown plans, conversion of obsolete strip commercial zoned areas, properly remediated brownfield and former industrial sites, identification of surplus governmental properties, such as school sites, State facilities and other neighborhood plans. The multi-family area plans would address development standards, infrastructure needs, urban design and planning issues unique to each community, such as historic preservation or parking needs.

The multi-family area plans would provide for public and stakeholder input prior to the approval of the plan. The plans would include appropriate development standards to mitigate concerns over setback, height, parking and other community issues. The plans would include implementation of housing incentives and development bonus programs.

The multi-family area plans would be accompanied by the appropriate Master CEQA document that would identify and mitigate environmental issues. Future multi-family projects, that are consistent with the general plan, the development standards in the multi-family area plan and the master environmental document, would receive expedited development review and would be exempted from further CEQA review. Additional public hearings would be limited to ensuring that the development standards have been implemented to protect surrounding properties.

**Improve the Housing Element Certification Process**

- Establish time frames for HCD to complete their review of housing elements
- Provide financial resources to cities to complete their Housing Elements and the Multi-Family Area Plans

**Discussion**

SB 50 includes a series of financial penalties should cities fail to receive HCD approval of their housing elements. SB 50 amendments should address HCD’s responsibilities in the housing element review process, which can be a complex and multi-year effort. During this multi-year review time the requirements can change and the individual HCD staff reviewing the element can change. Draft housing elements can be outdated by the time HCD comments are provided back to the city.

The housing element review process would be improved if housing elements were required to meet the requirements of the statutes when they are submitted. SB 50 amendments should include a processing timeline for HCD to submit their comments and for the cities to respond, with an initial review and a recheck by HCD. There should be consequences for HCD failing to meet the review deadlines. One consequence may be the automatic approval of the housing element.
Mitigate the Long-Term Impacts that Multi-Family Developments place on critical Local Services and Infrastructure

✓ Provide a new State subvention/ or an adjustment to existing subventions to help cities mitigate the impacts on local services from multi-family developments

Discussion

Property taxes in many communities are insufficient to support basic municipal services. Additional multi-family residential development will place new demands on municipal services that are currently strained in our communities. Providing police or sheriff services, along with fire and paramedic services can be as much as 70% of a city’s entire general fund budget. There are rare mixed-use projects that provide a combination of revenues to support their municipal service costs; however, the majority of multi-family housing for moderate and low-income families does not provide sufficient revenues to offset their service demands.

SB 50 should include a new or adjusted State subvention to provide revenues to support local services. Another approach may be to reduce the existing county share of property tax revenues from multi-family projects to fund safety service. This may require amendments to AB 1197 or to AB 8 implementation. It is important that the new funding source for multi-family developments be secured and not subject to State “take-aways” as in the past. The new revenues should be applied to all ADUs. The State should also consider making the new revenues available to serving existing multi-family developments as well.

AB 50 should be amended to address affordable housing needs

✓ With Federal housing support being limited, California should establish a housing block grant program to provide consistent revenue to local governments on an annual basis for the construction of affordable housing
✓ Require that cities in metropolitan areas adopt a housing authority to address affordable housing issues, for receiving State and federal grants and other funds and for working with developers and non-profit affordable housing providers
✓ Regional housing authorities based on JPA’s or COG’s can be formed to create economies of scale.
✓ Staffing for housing authorities should be funded through property tax revenues or a State subvention

Discussion

The planning and construction of affordable housing requires commitments of time and consistency in planning and funding. When the State disbanded redevelopment agencies in 2011, it also dismantled the local organizations and funding that was producing affordable housing projects, including city staffing working on these projects. Effective affordable housing projects can require time consuming land assembly, complex financing mechanisms and city staff with knowledge of the process.

SB 50 should include a housing block grant for local government. SB 50 should be amended to require that local governments in metropolitan areas adopt housing authorities to address affordable housing issues unique to their communities. These authorities would be empowered to receive State and Federal grants and funds, issue housing bonds and negotiate incentives to developers of multi-family housing. Housing authorities can also be used to address specific homeless issues in each community. The housing authorities would be a logical agency for the SB-5 funds. The housing block grant program should assist cities in funding the staffing and resources necessary to operate the housing authority.

Providing Effective Multi-Modal Transportation Options for Multi-Family Projects

✓ The transit provisions in SB 50 simply do not work for many communities in Los Angeles County and may inadvertently limit multi-family housing locations
Reductions in parking standards should be carefully considered by each community based on available street parking and neighborhood car ownership rates, as well as access to transit.
Cities should be allowed to establish reasonable parking minimums when they prepare their multi-family area plan.
SB 50 should be encouraging alternatives to expensive onsite construction of parking, such as centralized parking and fee payments.
Studies conclude that the quality of life for low income residents is improved by car ownership, since they can more easily reach and maintain their employment.

Discussion

A recent University of Minnesota study reported that less than 1% of Los Angeles County residents can reach their job by transit in 30 minutes, by car 33% can reach their job in 30 minutes. The average commute in Los Angeles County is 28 minutes by car and 51 minutes by transit. Eighty-four percent of employees in Los Angeles County drive to work. Transit ridership in the county is lower now than it was in 1990 and continues to fall despite $16 billion in investment in rail construction since 1990.6

The transit headway concept in SB 50 does not work in Los Angeles County, since it does not account for the multiple transfers necessary for transit users to reach their place of employment. SB 50 ignores weekend ridership, when people need to reach their employment or other destinations in a reasonable time frame.

A variety of factors limit effective transit to many Los Angeles County communities. SB 50 amendments should recognize that multi-family projects should not be permitted to be “under parked” if public transit is providing inadequate service to the area. Under parking projects in these circumstances will only result in public backlash.

Issues with the “Jobs Rich” Definition in SB 50 – The Problems of Relying on Census Tract Information

SB 50 relies on Census Tracts as the planning unit for locating multi-family projects. This is the wrong planning guideline.
Local communities are in the best position to locate multi-family projects.
Census tract planning should be eliminated from SB 50.

Discussion

SB 50 defers the defining of “jobs rich” to a “black box” process that HCD will undertake in the future. Cities need to understand what areas in their communities will have local zoning and general planning overridden by SB 50 in advance of the bill being supported. SB 50 implies that job rich areas will be measured relying on U.S. Census Tracts. The use of census tracts for SB 50 implementation will prove to be extremely problematic, creating major inconsistencies with local general plans, zoning and transit.

Census tracts are too small of a geographic unit to complete effective community planning, which calls for larger, more comprehensive geographic areas to plan for increased residential density.

In order to test this concern- that Census Tracts are the wrong planning unit – the Working Group examined three census tracts in the San Gabriel Valley, using the Mapping Opportunity tool. We examined the bus lines serving three census tracts in order to determine if they met the current transit definition in SB 50.

Census Tract – Cal State LA – City of Alhambra

The Mapping Opportunity tool identifies this census tract as “jobs rich.” This is understandable, since the university has 2,100 faculty and staff. The census tract is a small 20-block area, with the campus as the largest single land use. The campus is surrounded by single family homes on small lots. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. The university is served by METRO 258 and meets the peak time headways identified in SB 50. The University is also the location of a Metro Link station.

Census Tract – SCE Headquarters – City of Rosemead

SCE’s Corporate Headquarters is identified as a “jobs rich” census tract, as would be expected. The corporate headquarters is located on Walnut Grove Avenue. However, it is surrounded by single-family neighborhoods. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. Transit access is provided from Walnut Grove and Garvey Avenue. The headquarters is served by METRO Rapid Line 770.

Census Tract – Avocado Heights – Industry

This census tract is identified as “job rich” and primarily consists of heavy industrial and warehouse uses. The tract is served by Foothill Transit’s Line 194, which meets SB 50 headway times. The tract contains single family homes to the west of the industrial area and is surrounded on the north by single family neighborhoods in La Puente. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. The tract is bounded by the Pomona Freeway on the south side.

SB 50 should be exploring mechanisms that create regional opportunities for housing for communities that have existing uses incompatible with housing. Beginning in 1992 the City of Industry was authorized by State law to transfer its CRA’s housing set aside funds to the Los Angeles County Housing Authority. Prior to the dissolution of RDA’s by the State in 2011, the City of Industry had transferred approximately $239 million in housing funds, resulting in the construction of 8,700 units, with 6,700 deed restricted to low income and special needs housing groups.

Account for the Demographic Aging Trends in California

✓ Provide cities and counties with residential unit credits for assisted living developments, since these residents are moving from homes and apartments into these facilities, freeing up existing housing stock.
✓ Provide credits for long-term rental for single-room occupancies

Discussion

There are a series of credible studies arguing that public policy is focused on the wrong metrics and we are ignoring the rapid growth of an aging population, where government should be focusing its problem solving. California’s Department of Aging reports that the State’s population over the age of 60 is expected to grow by more than three times the rate of the general population from 2010 to 2060. Los Angeles County will experience a 171.3% population growth in adults over the age of 60 in this time period.7 By 2030 the State will be home to over 10 million persons over the age of 60.8

We are also finding that older residents will take in room mates by renting bedrooms. This should be encouraged and counted towards providing housing. Cities can keep track of long term rentals by requiring a low-cost business license and reporting annually to HCD the long term rentals in their communities.

7 https://www.aging.ca.gov/Data_and_Reports/Facts_About_California%27s_Elderly/
8 https://www.aging.ca.gov/download.ashx?Ie0rcNUV0zbUy1iwYmWKng%3D%3D
Encourage Mixed Use Development

✓ Many cities have been encouraging mixed use commercial/residential developments in their communities, including their historic downtowns. SB 50 should not discourage mixed use development and allow communities to protect historic resources.

Discussion

SB 50 currently defines a mixed-use development as a project where two-thirds of the floor area is devoted to residential development. This provision should be eliminated from SB 50, giving communities more flexibility to plan mixed use projects or convert existing commercial buildings that might not meet the proposed two-thirds rule in SB 50. We should be encouraging all types and sizes of mixed-use developments.

Freeze on Additional State ADU Regulations

✓ SB 50 proposed that four units be allowed in single-family neighborhoods by right, with no parking required. This will prove to be disruptive to established neighborhoods, where property owners do not fully understand that 2 ADUs are already permitted.

Discussion

The State has passed a series of new regulations on ADUs, which cities are attempting to comply with. We have received reports that the HCD review of local ADU ordinances has backlog and cities are required to default to the State’s regulations. The State’s ADU requirements are not well understood by the general public and we remain concerned that when a significant number of ADU’s are constructed, further negatively impacting residential neighborhoods, that the public will grow increasingly concerned. Cities need time to develop ADU regulations that address the specific issues in their communities.
Outline of SB 50 (Wiener) Planning and Zonings. Housing Development Incentives.
As Amended 01/06/2020

Key Elements of SB 50 as Amended 01/06/2020

- Allows developers of certain types of housing projects to override locally developed and adopted height limitations, housing densities, and parking requirements. These overrides are called “equitable communities incentives (ECI).” [Please see pages 2-3 for more detail].
- SB 50’s requirements are applied differently based on city population and the population of the county in which the city is located.
- Requires all cities to allow up to fourplexes in single-family neighborhoods through a streamlined, ministerial approval process unless project would have specific, adverse impact upon public health or safety.
- Allows “sensitive communities” identified by councils of governments to develop a community plan, as prescribed, and not be required to grant an ECI as long as the “community plan” achieves similar objectives and goals.
- Allows cities to develop a HCD-approved “local flexibility plan”, as an alternative to the requirements in SB 50.

The “Local Flexibility Plan:” Amendments adopted on January 6, 2020

The amendments offer an alternative: Cities and counties can adopt a “local flexibility plan” approved by HCD by January 1, 2023 or be required to grant ECI overrides of density, height and parking) of SB 50.

A “local flexibility plan” submitted on or after July 1, 2021 to HCD, must do all of the following:
- Affirmatively further fair housing, as that term is defined in Section 8899.50, to an extent as great or greater than if the local government were to grant an ECI.
- Achieve a standard of transportation efficiency as great or greater than if the local government were to grant an ECI.
- Increase overall feasible housing capacity for households of lower, moderate, and above moderate incomes, considering economic factors such as cost of likely construction types, affordable housing requirements, and the impact of local development fees.

On or before July 1, 2021, OPR, in consultation with HCD, will develop guidelines for the submission and approval of a local flexibility plan. Rules, regulations and guidelines may be adopted with limited public process.

A local flexibility plan is an alternative to granting an ECI. A local flexibility plan does not exempt a city from ministerial approval of a fourplex in a single-family zone.

Comments Regarding the Amendments Adopted on January 6, 2020

- It appears that the intent of the amendments is to provide local governments with an opportunity to develop their own plans to meet the goals and objectives of SB 50.
- Unfortunately, the amendments, as drafted, raise the following concerns:
  - OPR and HCD are tasked with developing “rules, regulations, or guidelines for the submission and approval of a local flexibility plan” without sufficient Legislative direction. This rulemaking process is exempt from the Administrative Procedures Act, thus allowing OPR and HCD to craft rules, regulations, or guidelines with little to no public input or oversight.
The elements of the plan are not clear: “Achieve a standard of transportation efficiency as great or greater than if the local government were to grant equitable communities incentives.” SB 50 does not contain any language regarding “transportation efficiency.” Therefore, it is not possible to determine how HCD, OPR or a local government will determine how to meet this standard.

“Increase overall feasible housing capacity for households of lower, moderate, and above moderate incomes, considering economic factors such as cost of likely construction types, affordable housing requirements, and the impact of local development fees.” SB 50 does not contain any language regarding “feasible housing capacity for households of lower, moderate, and above moderate incomes,” nor does it address “economic factors such as cost of likely construction types, affordable housing requirements, and the impact of local development fees.” Therefore, it is not possible to determine how HCD, OPR or a local government will determine how to meet this standard.

Without clearly identified criteria, we are unable to evaluate whether the “local flexibility plan” is actually an alternative planning option.

The Community Plan: Sensitive Communities

Unchanged by the amendments are SB 50’s alternative for “sensitive communities.” Sensitive communities are determined by councils of governments (or by MTC in the ABAG region). The ECI provisions of SB 50 will apply to a “sensitive community” after January 1, 2026 unless the community adopts a “community plan” aimed toward increasing residential density and multifamily housing choices near transit stops. The community plan must:

- Permit increased density and multifamily development near transit with all upzoning linked to onsite affordable housing requirements;
- Include provisions to protect vulnerable residents from displacement;
- Promote economic justice for workers and residents; and
- Be developed in partnership with a nonprofit or community organization.

Equitable Communities Incentives

City must grant an Equitable Community Incentive (ECI) to “jobs-rich” or “transit-rich” project on a site zoned to allow housing with certain site exclusions as described below unless city makes finding that incentive would have a specific, adverse impact on any real property or historic district. Project must comply with city’s conditional use or other discretionary permit approval process and with certain affordability requirements (or local inclusionary ordinance) and is subject to CEQA review.

Counties with a population less than or equal to 600,000: Cities with population OVER 50,000

- Equitable Community Incentive to a jobs-rich or transit-rich housing project located within ½ mile of a major transit stop with a minimum density of 30 units/acre in “metropolitan” community or 20 units/acre in “suburban” community:
  - 1 additional story or fifteen feet in height.
  - Waiver of 0.6 Floor Area Ratio.
  - Maximum 0.5 parking spots per units; and no minimum parking requirement if within ¼ mile of rail transit station in city with population greater than 100,000.
  - Waiver of maximum controls density.
- Site exclusions: architecturally or historically significant district; special flood hazard area.
- Mandatory inclusionary housing requirements apply.
- Existing Density Bonus Law may be applied to the project.

Counties with a population over 600,000: All cities (except those under 50,000 in the coastal zone)
- Equitable Community Incentive to a jobs-rich or transit-rich housing project:
  - Waiver of maximum controls on density.
  - 0.5 parking spots per unit.
  - Within 1/2 mile of a major transit stop – height up to 45 feet, Floor Area Ratio of 2.5, and no parking requirements.
  - Within 1/4 mile of a major transit stop – height up to 55 feet, Floor Area Ratio of 3.25, and no parking requirements.
- Mandatory inclusionary housing requirements apply.
- Existing Density Bonus Law may be applied to the project.