

use restriction for 55 years for units that are rented or 45 years for units that are owned.

- b) The development satisfies both of the following:
- i) Is located in a locality that the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has determined, based on the last production report submitted by the locality to HCD, is subject on the basis that the number of units that have been issued building permits is less than the locality's share of the regional housing needs, by income category, for that reporting period. Specifies that a locality shall remain eligible until HCD's determination for the next reporting period. Provides that a locality is subject to this if it has not submitted an annual housing element report to HCD for at least two consecutive years before the development submitted an application for approval; and
 - ii) The development is subject to a requirement mandating a minimum percentage of below market rate housing based on either one of the following:
 - (1) The locality did not submit its latest production report to HCD by the time period required, or that report reflects that there were fewer units of above moderate-income housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that year. Requires, if the project contains more than 10 units of housing, the project seeking approval to dedicate a minimum of 10% of the total number of units to housing affordable to households making below 80% of the area median income, or higher as determined by a local ordinance;
 - (2) The locality did not submit its latest production report to HCD by the time period required, or that report reflects that there were fewer units of housing affordable to households making below 80% of the area median income that were issued building permits than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that year, and the project seeking approval dedicates 50% of the total number of units to housing affordable to households making below 80% of the area median income, or higher as determined by a local ordinance; or,
 - (3) The locality did not submit its latest production report to HCD by the time period required, or if the production report reflects that there were fewer units of housing affordable to any income level described in clause (1) or (2) above, that were issued building permits than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for

that reporting period, the project seeking approval may choose between utilizing clause (1) or (2), above.

- c) The development, excluding any additional density or any other concessions, incentives, or waivers of development standards granted pursuant to the Density Bonus Law, is consistent with objective zoning standards and objective design review standards in effect at the time that the development is submitted to the local government.
- d) The development is not located on a site that is any of the following:
 - i) A coastal zone;
 - ii) Either prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance or land zoned or designated for agricultural protection or preservation by a local ballot measure that was approved by the voters of that jurisdiction;
 - iii) Wetlands;
 - iv) Within a very high fire hazard severity zone or within a high or very high fire hazard severity zone;
 - v) A hazardous waste site, unless otherwise specified;
 - vi) Within a delineated earthquake fault zone, unless otherwise specified;
 - vii) Within a flood plain, unless otherwise specified;
 - viii) Within a floodway, unless otherwise specified;
 - ix) Lands identified for conservation in an adopted natural community conservation plan;
 - x) Habitat for protected species identified as candidate, sensitive, or species of special status by state or federal agencies;
 - xi) Lands under conservation easement.
- e) The development proponent has done both of the following, as applicable:
 - i) Certified to the locality that either of the following is true:
 - (1) The entirety of the development is a public work or,
 - (2) If the development is not in its entirety a public work, that all construction workers employed in the execution of the development will be paid at least the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for the type of work and geographic area, as specified, except that apprentices registered in programs approved by the chief of the division of Apprenticeship Standards may be paid at least the applicable apprentice prevailing rate.
 - ii) For specified developments, a skilled and trained workforce shall be used to complete the development.

- 2) Specifies, if a local government determines that a development submitted pursuant to the bill's provisions is in conflict with any of the objective planning standards listed in 1) above, that it shall provide the development proponent written documentation of which standard or standards the development conflicts with, and an explanation for the reason or reasons the development conflicts with that standard or standards, as follows:
 - a) Within 60 days of submittal of the development to the local government if the development contains 150 or fewer housing units; or,
 - b) Within 90 days of submittal of the development to the local government if the development contains more than 150 housing units.
- 3) Provides that the development shall be deemed to satisfy the objective planning standards listed in 2) above, if the local government fails to provide the required documentation pursuant to 2) above.
- 4) Provides that any design review or public oversight of the development may be conducted by the local government's planning commission or any equivalent board or commission responsible for review and approval of development projects, or the city council or board of supervisors, as appropriate. Requires that design review or public oversight to be objective and be strictly focused on assessing compliance with criteria required for streamlined projects, as well as any reasonable objective design standards published and adopted by ordinance or resolution by a local jurisdiction before submission of a development application, and shall be broadly applicable to development within the jurisdiction. Provides that design review or public oversight shall be completed as follows and shall not in any way inhibit, chill, or preclude the ministerial approval provided by this section or its effect, as applicable:
 - a) Within 90 days of submittal of the development to the local government if the development contains 150 or fewer housing units; or,
 - b) Within 180 days of submittal of the development to the local government if the development contains more than 150 housing units.
- 5) Includes a sunset of January 1, 2026.

This bill:

- 1) Eliminates the sunset on SB 35.
- 2) Authorizes SB 35 to apply in the coastal zone.

- 3) Subjects local governments to SB 35 streamlining if they fail to adopt a compliant housing element as determined by HCD, as specified.
- 4) Provides that if a local government requires units restricted to higher incomes than those required for SB 35 streamlining, that those units meet the affordable housing requirements.
- 5) Authorizes development on a wetland or protected habitat if authorized by any other state or federal law.
- 6) Requires a local government planning director or other equivalent local government staff to make determinations about compliance with the objective planning standards.
- 7) Prohibits a local government from requiring specified consultant studies for purposes of evaluating consistency with objective planning standards. Removes public oversight from the design review process.
- 8) Provides that the “objective planning standards” required for SB 35 streamlining do not include subsequent permits such as local building codes, fire codes, noise ordinances, or other codes that are evaluated with subsequent permitting processes.
- 9) Authorizes the Department of General Services, at its discretion, to act in the place of a locality or local government, for development on property owned by or leased to the state.

Labor Standards:

- 10) An applicant must certify to the local government that either of the following is true:
 - a) The entirety of the project is a public work, or
 - b) A development that contains more than 10 units and is not entirely a public work shall be subject to the following:
 - i) All construction workers employed in the execution of the development must be paid at least the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for the type of work and geographic area, as specified, except that apprentices registered in programs approved by the Chief of the Division of Apprenticeship Standards may be paid at least the applicable apprentice prevailing rate;

- ii) The developer must ensure that the prevailing wage requirement is included in all contracts for the performance of the work for those portions of the development that are not a public work; and
 - iii) All contractors and subcontractors for those portions of the development that are not a public work must maintain and verify payroll records, as specified, and make those records available for inspection and copying. This requirement does not apply if all contractors and subcontractors performing work on the development are subject to a project labor agreement that requires the payment of prevailing wages to all construction workers employed in the execution of the development and provides for enforcement of that obligation through an arbitration procedure.
- 11) Requires that the obligation of the contractors and subcontractors to pay prevailing wages are subject to the following enforcement provisions:
- a) They may be enforced by the Labor Commissioner, an underpaid worker, and a joint labor-management committee through a civil action, as specified;
 - b) If a civil wage and penalty assessment is issued, the contractor, subcontractor and surety on a bond issued to secure the wages covered by the assessment shall be liable for specified liquidated damages; and
 - c) These enforcement provisions do not apply if all contractors and subcontractors performing work on the development are subject to a project labor agreement that requires the payment of prevailing wages to all construction workers employed in the execution of the development and provides for enforcement of that obligation through an arbitration procedure.
- 12) The requirement that the employer pay prevailing wages does not apply to those portions of development that are not a public work if otherwise provided in a bona fide collective bargaining agreement covering the worker.
- 13) For a development of 50 or more housing units, the development proponent must require in contracts with construction contractors, and must certify to the local government, that each contractor of any tier who will employ construction craft employees or will let subcontracts for at least 1,000 hours must ensure all of the following:
- a) A contractor with construction craft employees must either participate in an apprenticeship program approved by the State of California Division of Apprenticeship Standards, as specified, or request the dispatch of apprentices from a state-approved apprenticeship program, as specified. A

- contractor without construction craft employees must show a contractual obligation that its subcontractors meet these requirements.
- b) Each contractor with construction craft employees must make health care expenditures for each employee, as specified. A contractor without construction craft employees must show a contractual obligation that its subcontractors comply with this requirement. Qualifying expenditures are credited toward compliance with prevailing wage payment requirements.
 - c) A construction contractor is deemed in compliance with the requirements of (a) and (b), above, if it is signatory to a valid collective bargaining agreement that requires utilization of registered apprentices and expenditures on health care for employees and dependents; and
 - d) The development proponent is subject to reporting requirements, as specified.
- 14) Provides, for purposes of calculating the number of units in a development, the development shall include both of the following: (a) all projects developed on a site; and (2) all projects developed on sites adjacent to a site developed if, after January 1, 2023, the adjacent site has been subdivided from the site developed using SB 35 streamlining.

COMMENTS:

- 1) *Author's Statement.* "SB 423 removes the sunset on one of California's most successful housing laws, SB 35, which expedites the approval of new homes.

California has failed to create enough housing at all income levels. Currently, California ranks 49th out of 50 states in per capita housing units. The Legislative Analyst's Office recommends the state produce 100,000 units annually beyond the expected 100,000 to 140,000 units per year.

To help address this crisis, the Legislature passed SB 35 in 2017. The Turner Center reported that over 18,000 units have been proposed under SB 35, with 13,000 built. Of those proposed, 13,000 are affordable to very low- or low-income categories. The Mission Economic Development Agency utilized SB 35 for a 130-unit, 100% affordable project, and, decreased timelines between 6 months and 1 year. Although the bill has successfully increased affordable housing production, SB 35 under-performed producing market rate housing, something SB 423 seeks to address.

Without an extension, SB 35 will expire on Jan. 1, 2026. SB 423 makes SB 35 permanent, keeping a primary mechanism for streamlining housing production in place. This bill also helps California's construction workforce thrive.

Construction workers will be protected by the requirement to pay prevailing wages, and on projects over 50 units, contractors must offer apprentices employment and cover health care expenditures. This creates an economic base and opportunities for construction workers and provides our state with the highly skilled workforce it needs to build our future. SB 423 ensures California does not take a step back in addressing the housing crisis, but rather leans in to assist localities in streamlining much needed housing.”

- 2) *Housing needs and approvals generally.* Every city and county in California is required to develop a general plan that outlines the community’s vision of future development through a series of policy statements and goals. A community’s general plan lays the foundation for all future land use decisions, as these decisions must be consistent with the plan. General plans are comprised of several elements that address various land use topics. Seven elements are mandated by state law: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open-space, noise, and safety. Each community’s general plan must include a housing element, which outlines a long-term plan for meeting the community’s existing and projected housing needs, which are allocated through the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) process. The housing element demonstrates how the community plans to accommodate its “fair share” of its region’s housing needs. To do so, each community establishes an inventory of sites designated for new housing that is sufficient to accommodate its fair share. Communities also identify regulatory barriers to housing development and propose strategies to address those barriers. State law requires cities and counties to update their housing elements every eight years.

Cities and counties enact zoning ordinances to implement their general plans. Zoning determines the type of housing that can be built. In addition, before building new housing, housing developers must obtain one or more permits from local planning departments and must also obtain approval from local planning commissions, city councils, or county board of supervisors.

Some housing projects can be permitted by city or county planning staff ministerially or without further approval from elected officials. Projects reviewed ministerially require only an administrative review designed to ensure they are consistent with existing general plan and zoning rules, as well as meet standards for building quality, health, and safety. Most large housing projects are not allowed ministerial review. Instead, these projects are vetted through both public hearings and administrative review. Most housing projects that require discretionary review and approval are subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), while projects permitted ministerially generally are not.

In addition to bypassing the CEQA process and the potential for litigation, housing streamlining provides more certainty as to what is required for permitting approval, and generally also requires approval within specified timelines. This certainty and shortened approval timelines are particularly beneficial to affordable housing developers seeking funding from multiple federal, state, and local public funding sources. Additionally, this certainty provides more opportunities for multifamily developers to build in jurisdictions that are not housing friendly. Some local governments have intentionally made entitlement and permitting onerous to such a degree developers – and in particular affordable housing developers -- have avoided working in those jurisdictions altogether. Longer, uncertain permitting situations are risky for developers, and could kill projects all together. Streamlining unlocks more land opportunities, particularly in higher-resource, unfriendly housing cities.

- 3) *SB 35 (Wiener, 2017)*. In 2017, SB 35 (Wiener) created a streamlined approval process for infill projects with two or more residential units in localities that have failed to produce sufficient housing to meet their RHNA. The streamlined approval process requires some level of affordable housing to be included in the housing development. To receive the streamlined process for housing developments, the developer must demonstrate that the development meets a number of requirements including that the development is not on an environmentally sensitive site or would result in the demolition of housing that has been rented out in the last ten years. Localities must provide written documentation to the developer if there is a failure to meet the specifications for streamlined approval, within specified a period of time. If the locality does not meet those deadlines, the development shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements for streamlined approval and must be approved by right.

Existing law requires HCD to determine when a locality is subject to the streamlining and ministerial approval process in SB 35 (Wiener) based on the number of units issued building permits as reported in the annual production report that local governments submit each year as part of housing elements. Streamlining can be turned on at the beginning of the term of housing element (generally eight years but in some cases five) and turned off halfway through if a local government is permitting enough units to meet a proportional share of the RNHA at all income levels (low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income). If a local government is not permitting enough units to meet its above moderate and its lower income RHNA, a development must dedicate 10% of the units to lower income in the development to receive streamlined, ministerial approval. If the jurisdiction is permitting its above moderate-income and not the lower

income RHNA, then developments must dedicate 50% of the units for lower income to have access to streamlining.

- 4) *SB 35 impacts to date.* According to data provided by local governments in their annual progress reports (APRs) between 2018 and 2021¹ statewide, SB 35 has resulted in 19,239 units, 60% of which are affordable to lower income households. This is like an undercount, as some cities have shared with the author and committee that more projects have been approved than HCD has data. For example, San Francisco has received 26 total SB 35 project applications, for a total of 3,404 units, 2,970 of which are affordable. One affordable housing developer, Related, testified in a joint oversight hearing of the Senate Housing Committee and Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee on February 28th, 2023 that they have entitled 818 Units in seven projects, with another 1176 in process — some just months away. In the same hearing, a representative of San Francisco testified that SB 35 has reduced housing permitting times in San Francisco by four times (3-6 months versus 18-24 months). The committee received examples from a regional affordable housing group that their members reduced approval timelines between six and 24 months, depending on the jurisdiction. Clear timelines for affordable housing permitting is particularly critical as affordable developers often require between eight and 12 different sources of funding to make an affordable housing development pencil financially, and any delays risk the loss of available public funds.
- 5) *Adopting AB 2011 (Wicks) labor standards.* SB 35 requires a developer to certify that projects utilizing SB 35 are either (1) entirely a public works, or (2) all workers on the development are paid prevailing wages, except that apprentices registered in specified apprenticeship programs are paid the applicable apprentice prevailing wage rate. Additionally, a skilled and trained workforce is required to complete projects with more than 50 units located in a coastal or bay county with a population of 225,000 or more, and projects with more than 25 units located in a jurisdiction with a population of fewer than 550,000 and not located in a coastal or bay county. A skilled and trained workforce is not required on 100% affordable housing projects.

This bill replaces the existing labor provisions with new labor provisions. These new provisions require prevailing wages for all construction workers on projects with 10 or more units, and with enforcement provisions by private sector labor management committees. Additionally, in projects with over 50 units, all construction workers are entitled to healthcare benefits and paid

¹ 2022 APRs are not due to HCD until April 1, 2023, so 2022 data is not yet available.

prevailing wages. These larger projects also require all contactors to either participate in state approved apprenticeship programs or request the dispatch of apprentices. In other words, projects move forward if one trades apprenticeship programs cannot or will not dispatch apprentices. According to the sponsors, half of California's 300,000 housing construction workers rely on Medi-Cal or are uninsured. These provisions will allow affordable housing projects to move forward only if they provide high wages and, for larger projects, full healthcare benefits. Additionally, the sponsors note the goal is to increase demand for workers who can meet more specific "skilled and trained" standards in the future.

- 6) *Expanding the applicability of SB 35 provisions.* This bill would expand the applicability of SB 35 to additional jurisdictions that, to date, have been excluded. First, this bill eliminates the exemption for SB 35 to apply to local governments in the coastal zone. Since the passage of SB 35, three notable streamlining measures were passed that did not exclude local governments in the coastal zone: AB 2162 (Chiu, Chapter 753, Statutes of 2018), SB 9 (Atkins, Chapter 162, Statutes of 2021), and AB 2011 (Wicks, Chapter 647, Statutes of 2022). Eliminating this exemption would align SB 35 streamlining with those streamlining measures.

Second, this bill would provide that SB 35 streamlining applies in cities that have failed to adopt housing elements that HCD has determined substantially comply with state housing law. Specifically, in the 6th housing element cycle, SB 35 streamlining applies to jurisdictions that fail to adopt a compliant housing element (as determined by HCD) until such time as that jurisdiction adopts a compliant housing element. Starting in 7th cycle, a jurisdiction that has not adopted a compliant housing element by the deadline is subject to SB 35 for the full reporting period. This will incentivize locals to adopt a compliant housing element on time, or provide an incentive to adopt a substantially compliant housing element in the first place, during the 5th and 6th cycles. For the 7th cycle, the goal is to incentivize locals to adopt on time.

- 7) *Clarifying changes to the SB 35 process.* As with the creation of any new program, the Legislature was not able to anticipate all scenarios that might arise as the SB 35 process was implemented. Several questions and potential loopholes have arisen since the bill's enactment. In order to realize the author and Legislature's intent when SB 35 was enacted, as well as help ensure that projects contemplated by this bill are approved, the bill also makes the following changes to the SB 35 process:

- a) Clarifies that eligibility for SB 35 streamlining does not rely on receiving a density bonus waiver.
 - b) Clarifies that local governments cannot request specified building standard permits during the SB 35 (design review) permitting phase, but rather can request those permits during subsequent permitting phases (such as the post-entitlement phase).
 - c) Provide that permitting timelines apply to all local permitting agencies.
 - d) Provide that compliance with the “objective standards” in SB 35 shall be left to a Planning Director or other staff level position, rather than the city council.
 - e) Clarify the scope and purpose of design review/public oversight hearings, particularly that they are not intended to determine compliance with objective standards.
 - f) Allow sites that have been cleared by the relevant federal or state agency to be developed under SB 35.
 - g) Allow specified state excess sites to be eligible for SB 35 streamlining if the relevant state housing agency approves.
 - h) Clarify that lower-income units count toward a moderate-income housing requirement.
 - i) Clarify that lower-income units are subject to the rent limits stipulated by the public program providing financing to the development.
- 8) *Opposition.* Several labor groups, including the State Building and Construction Trades Counsel, are opposed to the replacement of the existing safety and construction training standards on certain streamlined housing projects, and more specifically that certain projects use graduates of state-approved apprenticeship programs. They request that projects utilize a skilled and trained workforce in addition to prevailing wage requirements. The League of California Cities is opposed to this bill because it proposes a “one size fits all solution” without allowing for public input or environmental review. California Contact Cities Association oppose due to concerns over loss of local control and assertion that this bill would disregard local zoning and land use planning policies as well as bypass CEQA. The City of Montebello is opposed unless amended to impose a sunset of January 1, 2030 and to exempt cities with an adopted compliant housing element.

9) *Double referral.* This bill is also referred to the Governance and Finance Committee.

RELATED LEGISLATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POSITIONS: (Communicated to the committee before noon on Wednesday, March 15, 2023.)

SUPPORT:

California Conference of Carpenters (Co-Sponsor)

California Housing Consortium (Co-Sponsor)
California YIMBY (Co-Sponsor)
Inner City Law Center (Co-Sponsor)
21st Century Alliance
Abundant Housing LA
All Home
Bay Area Council
California Apartment Association
California Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies
California Community Builders
California Community Economic Development Association (CCEDA)
California Home Builders Alliance
Carpenter Local Union 1599
Carpenters Local 152
Carpenters Local 1607
Carpenters Local 213
Carpenters Local 323
Carpenters Local 35
Carpenters Local 562
Carpenters Local 619
Carpenters Local 661
Carpenters Local 701
Carpenters Local 714
Carpenters Local 721
Carpenters Local 951
Carpenters Local Union #1109
Carpenters Local Union 1789
Carpenters Union Local 180
Carpenters Union Local 217
Carpenters Union Local 405
Carpenters Union Local 46
Carpenters Union Local 505
Carpenters Union Local 605
Carpenters Union Local 713
Carpenters Union Local 751
Carpenters Union Local 805
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 007
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 101
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 1904
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 417
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 710
Carpenters Women's Auxiliary 91

City & County of San Francisco
Climate Action Campaign
Community Coalition
Construction Employers' Association
Council Member Zach Hilton, City of Gilroy
Culver City for More Homes
Cupertino for All
Destination: Home
Devine & Gong, INC.
Drywall Lathers Local 9109
Drywall Lathers Union Local 9068
Drywall Lathers Union Local 9083
Drywall Local Union 9144
East Bay for Everyone
East Bay YIMBY
Eden Housing
Fremont for Everyone
Generation Housing
Grow the Richmond
Industrial Carpenters Union Local 2236
Lisc San Diego
Livable Communities Initiative
Mercy Housing
Merritt Community Capital Corporation
Midpen Housing Corporation
Millwrights Local 102
Mountain View YIMBY
Napa-Solano for Everyone
Neighborhood Housing Services of Los Angeles County
Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California (NPH)
Nor Cal Carpenters Union
Northern Neighbors Sf
Novin Development Corp.
Peninsula for Everyone
People for Housing - Orange County
Pile Drivers Local 34
Progress Noe Valley
Resources for Community Development
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)
San Francisco YIMBY
San Luis Obispo YIMBY
Santa Cruz YIMBY

Santa Rosa YIMBY
South Bay YIMBY
South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth
Southside Forward
Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters
Streets for All
Summerhill Housing Group
Sustainable Growth Yolo
The San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund
The United Way of Greater Los Angeles
Union Station Homeless Services
Urban Environmentalists
Urban League of San Diego County
Ventura County Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice
Ventura County YIMBY
YIMBY Action

OPPOSITION:

Bricklayers and Allied Crafts Local 3
Building and Construction Trades Council of Stanislaus, Merced, Tuolumne and Mariposa Counties
California Contract Cities Association
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Pipe Trades Council
City of Montebello
Coalition of California Utility Employees
District Council of Iron Workers of The State of California and Vicinity
Heat and Frost Insulators and Allied Workers Local 16
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 6
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 40
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 428
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 440
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 595
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 302
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 413
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 441
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 569
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 639
International Brothers of Electrical Workers Local 569
International Union of Elevator Constructors Local 8

International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 18
International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 8
International Union of Operating Engineers, Cal-Nevada Conference
International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, District Council 36
Iron Workers Local 229
Iron Workers Local 377
Iron Workers Local 378
Iron Workers Local 433
League of California Cities
New Livable California Db a Livable California
Orange County Council of Governments
Orange County Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
Plumbers and Pipe Fitters, United Association Local 447
Plumbers and Pipefitters Local Union 403
Plumbers and Pipefitters Local Union 38
Sacramento-Sierra Building and Construction Trades Council
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
State Building and Construction Trades Council of CA
Teamsters Local 166
Tri-Counties Building and Construction Trades Council
United Association Local 159
United Association Local 250
United Association Local 669
United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers and Allied Workers Local 40
Western States Council of Sheet Metal Workers
Western States Council Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation
1 Individual

-- END --