

Summary of Mixed-Use Ordinance Text Amendment Professional Advisory  
Group Meeting of Developers, Non-Profit Developers and Other Real  
Estate Professionals

September 15, 2020

1. Staff: Summary of purpose of the meeting – To discuss amendments to the City’s Mixed- Use Ordinance (Ordinance) in order to address adding an inclusionary component to address affordable housing production in the City for very low, low and moderate and workforce income levels. An inclusionary housing ordinance will provide one method among many being considered by the City to address affordable housing needs.
2. City staff and City consultant introductions  
Sol Blumenfeld – Community Development Director  
Michael Allen – Current Planning Manager  
Tevis Barnes – Housing Programs Administrator  
Lisa Pangelinan – Senior Management Analyst  
Kathe Head – Keyser Marston Associates (KMA)
3. Advisory Group introductions:
  - Con Howe - City View
  - Adam Perry - City View
  - Vivian Ramirez – Los Angeles Housing Partnership (LAHP)
  - Jim Suhr-James Suhr and associates
  - Kevin Reid - Bastion Development
  - Robert Hughes - Abode Communities
  - Tara Barauskas – Community Corporation of Santa Monica
  - Aaron Rank - Habitat for Humanity
  - Michael Downs - Karney Properties
4. Staff overview of draft Mixed Use Ordinance Text Amendment revisions. The draft Ordinance is focused on mixed use development along commercial corridors in order to create the greatest opportunities for affordable housing production, where density is highest and in areas that are best suited to accommodate increased density with nearby shops, services and transit. The draft ordinance mandates a percentage of affordable units in market rate mixed use development but also provides “carrots” as development incentives to ensure that projects are financially feasible, and that overall housing production is not diminished. The draft Ordinance layers State Density Bonus Law - SB1818 on

top of the City's local density incentive "Community Benefits". It also includes a density bonus for micro-units.

KMA prepared a Nexus study to examine the depth and percentage of affordability that could be required in market rate developments which has been recommended at 15% of the dwelling units in a mixed use project. That means that a project density increases from 35 units per acre to 50 units per acre with "community benefits" and within the City's Transit Oriented Development (TOD) District or within a Transit Priority Area (TPA) when a project is within ½ mile of a major transit line or bus line the density may increase to up to 65 units per acre. State Density Bonus also applies which will bring mixed use density in excess of to 80 units per acre.

A 14% micro unit density bonus is also proposed providing that the overall size of the project and project footprint is only marginally affected with the increase. These density bonuses are all codified in the draft ordinance.

Other proposed revisions address affordability restrictions for 55 years to conform with state law, an owner buyout provision with an equity sharing agreement with the City, a very low and low income unit replacement housing requirement to address current resident displacement for those located on a development site within the prior five years, levels of income qualification consistent with very low, low income requirements at not more than 80% and 50% of County median respectively and income qualifications for workforce units set at 80% and not more than 129% at County median. There is also a provision for first time home buyers for owner-occupied units in compliance with HUD definitions for first time homebuyers.

The draft Ordinance also contemplates the requirement for an Affordable Housing Plan conforming to city design requirements and an Affordable Housing Agreement with the developer setting forth the location and design of the affordable units to be recorded with property.

Ground floor retail area and retail use requirements have been made less restrictive, deleting the original provision requiring 25% gross floor area requirement to reflect the new retail environment and allowing other pedestrian generating ground floor uses, such as daycare or religious institutions and similar uses subject to City Council approval.

Finally, in-lieu affordability provisions have been included that require the first 10% of the units on site for the community benefit portion of the affordable units and, at the request of the developer, and at the City's sole discretion, all of the "Community Benefit" affordable units may be satisfied with an in lieu payment. The amount of the fee is calculated using a fee schedule to be adopted as part of draft regulations that will accompany the Ordinance and that those regulations would apply at the time of issuance of the first building permit for the project.

Half of the required in-lieu fee would be paid or letter of credit at permit issuance and the balance prior to C of O and deposited into the City's Low-Moderate Income Housing Trust Fund administered by the Housing Authority. In addition, land donations as an in-lieu provision are also contemplated subject to City discretion for some or all of the community benefit units and administrative fees are also contemplated to cover the costs for City administration of the Ordinance.

5. Comments and Questions –

- What does the replacement housing provision apply to?

Response: Very Low- and Low-Income units mirroring Density Bonus Law per 65915 of the Government Code.

Is the 15 % mandatory affordability taken off the base case units or off the total units with the community benefit?

Response: The 15% is taken off the total number of units with the community benefit.

- Is 10% the minimum in lieu affordable on-site requirement or can it all be paid in-lieu. Can the other 5% be paid in lieu as well? Response: Yes, it can all be paid in lieu with Council approval.
- How will the ordinance be administered? Will the mixed-use developments be by-right to avoid CEQA requirements and discretionary permits? What part will not be discretionary? What part can be ministerial? It would help the development process to allow projects ministerial approval up to a threshold and beyond that discretionary approval. This would help resolve the problems of litigation that may hold a project by a few dissatisfied people for an otherwise worthwhile project. This would be particularly helpful to non-profit developers who often get push back from those residents that don't want "those people living near me"

Response: Right now, there is no by-right mixed-use development contemplated, but the City may consider allowing projects up to a certain unit maximum to be permitted by right. This would require further refinement of development standards to avoid unintended consequences of poorly designed projects, but the City is certainly looking into this as part of a menu of additional affordable housing measures to comply with the City's RHNA allocations for the next planning period. If a project requires ministerial approval it would not require CEQA review.

- Is the 15% achieved in all three income categories? Also, it might be worthwhile looking at the City of LA TOC ordinance to see how they handle environmental clearance. Perhaps you can incorporate that into an inclusionary housing ordinance. Response: The draft ordinance provides for mandatory affordability for Very Low, Low, and Moderate-Income units but the 15% can also be all Workforce. If you're not using Workforce in a project, and if you're using State Density Bonus then you layer your State Density Bonus in at whatever income level you've chosen and then you subtract those units

from the 15% and that fulfills the Community Benefit requirement. We will look at the LA Ordinance related to

- If you are only doing the inclusionary housing ordinance, can you do all of them at 80% to 120% of AMI?

Response: You can do all at 129% of AMI under the draft Ordinance.

- What incentives are there in just the inclusionary housing ordinance to build low or very low-income units?

Response: The advantage or the carrot is we are allowing people to do is take the community benefit density. So, we started with a base density of 35 units per acre then depending on where you are in the mixed-use zone you can go to either 50 or 65 units as a Community Benefit zoning. We're then allowing people to take the State's Density Bonus under Government Code Section 65915 density bonus on top of that 50 or 65 units per acre and treating that as the base. So, what we're allowing is a double density bonus. That's the incentive.

- What if density bonus is not needed? Is there's no low or very low-income units required in the Ordinance?

Response: In general, all developers in Culver City want a density bonus, because they cannot achieve a realistic density otherwise given the City's maximum 56' height limitation. The City has never had a mixed-use development at 35 units per acre (which hasn't relied on the local density incentive - Community Benefits and State Density Bonus. It's hard to make the project work and you need the local density bonus and the state density bonus law to make it work. All the City's mixed-use development project have required the full density bonus that is layered in this manner. We provided an example of this layering for your information using the base of 35 units per acre. In the Study examples we assumed the project would require very-low income units because the math between very-low income units and low-income units, makes no sense at all. Using financial feasibility as the primary development criteria, one would always do the very-low income requirement because it's 11% at what is 50% of median income for rent. The low income is 20% at 60% of median income so the math just doesn't work. So, that's the number of state density bonus units that would be required across the board because we can only use state density bonus affordability requirements. That is why very low income is used in every one of the examples, where state density bonus is used. So, for the rest of the equations shown here we're focused on what happens between the community benefit density and then the community benefits plus a 14% additional density bonus if you wanted to use micro units. The Council was interested in adding an additional micro unit bonus, but they wanted to keep it as close to the original square footage as would have been built without it. So, in other words, you get 14% more micro units, but little extra project floor area. That's what is shown in the sample

project we are presenting. This ordinance is different than a more traditional inclusionary ordinance using a carrot and stick approach.

- When you look the replacement provision in the ordinance, you actually have to replace, the affordable, the very-low and low-income units. The in-lieu fee that is paid to the Low Moderate-Income Housing Trust Fund, could those would be targeted for low- and moderate-income levels (Up to 120% AMI)?

Response: Correct

- I really like the land donation provision. What would the land donation requirements be in terms of affordability? Do you count both the State density bonus and the local community benefits bonus units too?

Response: Yes, both are factored into the project density and the value of the land donation.

- Does the City plan to accept the land itself in the land donation or can it be donated directly to an affordable housing developer? It seems like the City wouldn't need to get in the middle and you can simplify the process. Why not have the City simply approve a land donation transaction with a non-profit developer who will be building the building? I think that your goal is to have an affordable project being built on that land and so I would look at the land donation as something the City has approved so obviously you're going to be concerned that it be a project that is financeable or will be financed by an applicant who can carry it out. But I just think that simplifies matters.

Response: Yes, that is a good comment - The City can ensure it has approval rights over the developer of the donated property based upon financial criteria that demonstrates they are financially viable and can carry out a project. There are more steps and more inertia created with the City holding the land and making it available for disposition. We should consider an alternative and look at setting up a method to directly transfer property to the affordable housing developer in the regulations section of the Ordinance.

- Are there examples of land donation where the donation is made as a fee directly to the non-profit developer? We have had offers for people to donate the money to us to do a development in the City that they're trying to get the density bonus in.

Response: Yes, that is an option to explore in the Ordinance regulations. This option could be used to supplement funding for a project or project developer who otherwise meets the requirements to develop an affordable project.

- Is the developer's responsibility for the low-income housing gone once that land is donated and deeded over to the third-party affordable developer?

Response: Yes, under the draft Ordinance provisions, subject to Council approval and that it is a financially viable transaction that provides the number of units and it is zoned appropriately for the development that needs to go on the site. So, it needs to be fully vetted before it's approved.

- I think it's really critical, that it's not just donated land – It must have the right zoning and General Plan designation for the affordable housing so that it can be entitled and can be built upon by a nonprofit developer.  
Response: That's correct. That must be built into the regulation provisions of the Ordinance. You couldn't just donate a residential property if it did not yield the same number of units as the mixed-use development site so the alternative site must generally be along the commercial corridors. Land donation is tough.
- I think the entitlement process for both the original development and the offsite development is critical. Can you develop residential in commercial zones in Culver City now? Can you develop residential in a commercial zone in Culver City? Response: You cannot currently develop residential in a commercial zone and it cannot be done now by-right. It is important to point out that the City is deep into a General Plan Update in which we will look at these kinds of land use issues and so this may change. We can also look at relaxing Zoning Code requirement for development permit for projects of a certain size so that they are ministerially approved. That would facilitate affordable housing development by reducing the time and costs and removing uncertainty in the process.
- How does AB 1763 which addresses the 100% affordable density bonus, play into this draft Ordinance. I think it's important to look at that since it provides greater incentives and streamlining for 100% affordable housing projects.  
Response: It makes sense to consider the affect to projects, though we don't get many 100% affordable projects.
- So, with the Community Benefit, aren't there, beyond density other development incentives that will be included or suggested? I assume there are some incentives in your local density bonus plus SB1818.  
Response: Yes, that is correct. Whatever the State law permits as a developer incentive is available to you under this proposed code change and for example, within the TOD District in the City or other qualifying areas within a TPA, 65 units per acre and relaxed parking restrictions are available.
- Are there additional benefits under the Community Benefits beyond density?  
Response: Yes, where applicable geographically, you can build at 65 per acre plus, under State law and you get up to three modifications to what otherwise are the land use regulatory controls of the Zoning Code, plus at developers' election you can avoid all guest parking for residential units
- Are there any additional affordability restrictions or affordability requirements within this additional 65 units per acre using Community Benefits?  
Response: The TOD is still 15% affordable of total units so by definition it's 15% of 65 units per acre, as opposed to State density bonus which is only measured against the base.
- As one comment, I think that's important to have good incentives because the whole goal is to encourage housing development and particularly fixed

income housing development and if the carrots aren't sufficient or don't exist then you know people just build in another jurisdiction. And you're surrounded by a market that is similar to Culver City, so I think it's important if you want to change the character of those commercial corridors and get housing to fill your housing element requirements etc. you need to really incentivize the development so making carrots work is really important.

- Are you giving consideration to reducing the 25% of site area retail requirement?

Response: The Mixed Use Ordinance was adopted more than 10 years ago and at that time, the ordinance sought to provide very restrictive ground floor commercial requirements, but in light of the changes in retailing now, we are amending the use provisions of the Ordinance, so you would just need a minimum 30 feet of ground floor level depth so that's usable ground level space and 10% of the lot area. The requirement no longer includes 30% of the gross floor area whichever is the greater. That should significantly help with projects meeting the ground floor requirements relative to retail. There is also a new provision to allow discretion on other ground floor uses when they are determined to be pedestrian generating by City Council resolution. So, for example, child care or other similar uses would be permissible even when they are not truly commercial use.

- Live-Work is not an option at the ground floor when it goes against your density count. Is there consideration about making that a non-density issue?

Response: That is clearly something to explore. The Ordinance doesn't currently carve out live-work from the density calculation. Live-Work has been difficult to implement, since it often just becomes housing and the "work" part may eventually disappear and there is little the City can do to effectively enforce that the ground floor restriction for commercial use is use. Perhaps this will change in light of the pandemic and reduced need for retail space in general.

The question of how much retail is appropriate and the type of ground floor use has been a reoccurring issue for the City. For larger projects it becomes a real hurdle and has unintended consequences when the retail is deep within a project and not really usable and there is vacancy. So, we need to look more broadly at this issue. The concept of "pedestrian generating" is one way to consider the ground floor requirement – since that was one of the primary reasons for adopting mixed use ordinances in the first place. If the use will be "pedestrian generating" – that is it supports pedestrian activity because it adds pedestrians to an area or creates visual interest – that requirement may be a good substitute for traditional retail.

- I have a couple of questions on the home ownership side. A couple of Ordinance provisions look like some of the policies have been lined up between affordable rental and affordable homeownership and for these

comments I'm considering people that are below 80 AMI. The challenge is often is that even the affordable units are required to pay prevailing wage and to pay the same amount of permitting fees and things like that and so they're not very affordable to sell because they're going to be built with the same fee structure as some of the market rate units, so that's one thing to consider.

The other is a 55-year affordability, typically lenders like to see that, first lenders like to see the secondary loans tracks in conformance with the first loan which is usually a 30-year loan and so that may inhibit buyers from being able to secure financing. And then my third comment is, did you say that a developer could build all their affordable units in a development as micro units? So, they would be like people would have these luxurious marketing units and there'd be like these little micro units are the only affordable ones?

Response: Responding to the last question first, no, you're only allowed under the mixed-use ordinance, not more than 25% of the units as micro units

- So, would all the micro units be affordable or will some of the market units be micro units?

Response: In all likelihood folks will designate micro units to fulfill affordability, but they can be both and that's another policy decision. Right now, we're assuming everything splits pro rata, but that could change as a policy matter.

- We have a project application that is based upon hitting the full 25% maximum in the Ordinance and the units are not planned as affordable and may rent at \$2,000 to \$2,200 a month and are sized at 500 sq. ft. – the size of a studio, not really a micro unit.

I think the important thing on the micro unit is, you don't have a balcony, you don't have a private space, which affords a lot of bonuses in terms of constructing the building. You know what I would I suggest is going above that 350 sq. Ft. You can get almost 4 micro units into the area of a two bedroom unit. And the way Culver City zoning works without a FAR restriction, you build to the envelope and its density. So that, you promote right now in the current Zoning Code the larger 2-bedroom units, and that's not solving your housing problem. So, I think you guys can make a big difference by allowing the micro unit size density bonus to be higher.

Response: One thing to keep in mind is the split among all the units. We have assumed 14% more units providing it doesn't significantly change the building footprint or size, not necessarily 14% additional micro units or micro unit square footage. Just assume its 14% more units for the project. If you get a chance take a look at how the density bonus, the 14% density bonus is working on my chart I prepared and let us know if you would change it to make it clearer. That would be very helpful.

- I wanted to circle back to my comment. I guess that I would be hesitant for any developer to be able to identify the affordable units as distinctly different than the rest of the units in the development. In other words, I wouldn't just say all micro units are affordable units. If all "affordable" families are small and can fit



into a micro unit, but also stigmatizing them in that development and I think you'd want all units of all sizes to have a mix of affordability.

- Response: That's how the feasibility report was written – to mixed affordability across the bedroom mix.

- I want to echo that for every micro unit that's market you should have the same number of affordable or something like that. So, it's spread out equally.

Response: The intent is that the units are distributed pro rata so that the 15% affordability is spread out among all the units.

What you're suggesting is good in general, but the problem at this point but becomes a quality versus equity. And the whole idea is to get more affordable units into your project. So, for example, at current code, I could build all 2-bedroom units at 1200 – 1400 sq. ft. Market wise it wouldn't be a great thing. So, my affordability on that would just be the straight 8%, extremely low, we're financially incentivized to keep things under current code affordable units down to minimize loss and maximize return. My notion would be it is that it's a bit of a negotiation with Planning and Housing Division staff. But you know those one bedroom and micro units for a low income person are extremely valuable and if you can provide 12 - 10% extremely low in a mix of one bedroom micro units, you're satisfying more people, you're getting more low-income people into housing and to me, that's really what you need and they're getting the benefit of all building amenities. On a one bedroom, one person can pay about \$675 a month and the qualification on that is \$30,000 a year. If that person has a partner that works more than likely they're going to get out, up over that \$30,000 but that's precisely the people that you need in the low-income housing. So, they're pricing themselves out. I mean again I think that is, let's not let equality get in the way of equity; getting people into housing that they can afford.

Response: I understand your point. Now I think both points have validity in their own way. I think though, if you go to a strategy where you don't do a pro rata mix throughout the unit mix, then the percentage has to go up.

- Perhaps you keep the pro rata but allow the matter to be taken to Council on a project by project basis.

Response: That's possibility, but you don't want to leave too many Ordinance issues unresolved or it will slow down the process.

- I just wonder if there is any consideration of incentivizing some of the lower income units? In Santa Monica there's sort of this sliding scale menu that offers developers, you know, a choice they can either do a certain percentage of which is usually lower of extremely low-income and that if they wanted, say moderate income then they have to provide more. So, that seems to work well, and I personally would like to see a little bit more on the extremely low-income side just because those are the really the harder units to build especially on the West side. My other, nomenclature comment, is that we're really starting to shy away from that word "workforce" for moderate income because that implies

that low-income people don't work. harder. So, you might consider changing the nomenclature to "moderate income" instead of "workforce".

Response: We can consider that, but it is commonly used now for affordable units slightly above moderate and below market rate. We've talked about the missing middle and that's we're trying to address with that term.

- Here is a question for the group – how do you feel about allowing minimal discretion and consequently creating CEQA review exemption with higher affordability levels?

Response: That is currently dictated by State code to some degree. State Code says you have to have a certain percentage of units it doesn't describe whether they pro rata distributed. LA created their own affordability distribution which I think everybody defers to because which is on a pro rata basis. Maybe you can look at it on square footage of the project.

Response: The TOC in LA is a good model and it works out proportionally at the different income levels; so that developers should be neutral as to which option they select in terms of extremely-low, very-low, low or moderate and it varies by different kinds of transit districts. I think if you want to go to a premise like that, I think that's a good ordinance to look at just in general. Now having said that, that is going to complicate a complicate a draft Ordinance even more than it is now.

Response: Maybe we can look at that as a future refinement since we are trying to get this to Commission and Council before the end of the year.

- Circling back to CEQA, I just would say where there is a discretionary action by the city government a CEQA review is required which means you should structure the Ordinance in a way that the LA TOC ordinance is done and its precursor, the density bonus ordinance. They have on-menu elements which means implementation is ministerial, not discretionary, and then there's off-menu which is the discretionary part. So, I'm just saying if you structure part of the Ordinance that way so that the base is ministerial, a formula which obviously requires Council formula approval, it should not be susceptible to CEQA review which can be a major time savings related to back and forth on environmental studies and review.
  - To that point, there would still be some discretionary aspect with Site Plan Review by the City and still have planning discretion in terms of addressing project design
- Response: A possibility would be to establish what's "on-menu" to eliminate the discretionary review for smaller projects. You know, you build to the envelope and you're good to go without discretionary approval and perhaps adding extremely-low income affordability– with removal of discretionary review as the incentive. That way, the City gets smaller projects with deeper affordability moving forward without discretionary review but retains it for larger projects.
- The problem is that you may not have the quality control for smaller projects that is required in Culver City.

- The other thing to think about when you look at the size of sites in Culver City is the size of projects, I mean you're going to significantly diminish the number of affordable units that can be supported the deeper the affordability you go. It just becomes a choice of number of units versus income. No right or wrong answer. You just have to understand that those are the implications.
- You have an Affordable Housing Plan required in the Ordinance, that's adding a layer of "process" into the process - how do you see that working?
- Also, I had a project in the City that was subject to the requirement for a Plan which I think had an unfortunate outcome where we had three very low-income units available to the public and ended up with 13,000 applicants. So, I think we need to dial back the amount of outreach that's required as part of the Plan, because it generates unfortunate negative pushback from the applicant pool. They're thinking "why don't I go buy a lottery ticket"?

Response: We have an obvious problem of huge need and demand and unfortunately not enough supply. The Plan requires some form of outreach to solicit residents for project selection – typically with a lottery. We tried to give preference to certain underserved groups in the lottery process.

Response: I know Santa Monica and I'm not sure if you can do this under State law, maybe you can designate whether employees or residents of Culver City or live within 20 blocks of the project, or some litmus test, to address whether the locals that are getting priced out of the market and where they go.

Response: With 13,000 applicants in the pool it seems impossible not to find local folks.

Response: You can do a preference, not a priority.

Response: About the required Affordable Housing Plan, let me just say we need some instrument to make sure that between the developer and the City and the Housing Authority, the developer is in compliance with the Ordinance in terms of everything from the affordable unit counts to the affordable unit design and location. This is completed early in the process.

- Can't you just show the information your project plans, between your title sheet and a designation on your full plan set that are being entitled. Identify it there versus providing the information on a written document that you're having to struggle through?

Response: I would just say the Affordable Housing Plan is not heavy on narrative -- it's more like a check list or lists and will be a quick reference for those in the Housing Division and Current Planning Division reviewing affordability requirements to ensure they are implemented.

- My request would be going forward for future projects is we have two documents: we have the Density Bonus Housing Agreement that is signed by all parties and recorded and then separately we had the Affordable Housing Plan. And I think there's a real benefit if those two can be merged into one; easier for staff, easier for developer.

Response: We can certainly address that in the Affordable Housing Plan as a policy implementation issues.

- Can you offer any insights as to where you are on the General Plan Update process relative to prevailing densities along the commercial corridors?

Response: We are finishing up the background studies related to visioning on land use, but we are still working through our understanding of density along the corridors and elsewhere. So, we are still early in the process that is expected to take 2-3 years.

- How do you look at the Mixed-Use Inclusionary Housing Ordinance working with PD zoning?

- Response: The PD zoning, for all of you who are unaware, is our most flexible zone and it applies to properties that are one acre or larger so if you have a very large mixed-use project you can take advantage of it. It requires producing a detailed "Comprehensive Plan". For certain projects it makes a tremendous amount of sense, like the 14 acre "Innovation Project" prepared for Culver Studios. But for smaller projects, particularly residential mixed-use project(s), not so much. So, PD zoning with a Comprehensive Plan may not always makes sense and there is some significant investment in producing a Comprehensive Plan. In that case you may just process a project through Site Plan Review. As a mixed use project processed with a Comprehensive Plan, you would still be subject to the draft Ordinance provisions.

- What is your Site Plan Review threshold for discretionary review?

Response: Anything over 5,000 sq. ft. of gross new floor area is subject to Site Plan Review. But it could be administrative. Its mandatory discretionary review that goes to the Planning Commission over 15,000 sq. ft.

- Well I'm just going to point out, if there's anything discretionary then you're into CEQA, but you could link a higher threshold for Site Plan Review with this draft Ordinance, so it doesn't apply to you elsewhere. And similarly, you could codify the things you really care about, like you know, no curb cuts on the major street, or whatever. So, don't give up design concerns just because you know you want to catch a lot of things on Site Plan Review. In the City of Los Angeles, it's 50 units or more so your threshold is much much lower at the moment.

Response: One of the ideas we are looking at is to increase the threshold for ministerial review to 25, 30 units or 35 units. This is not currently part of the draft Ordinance but could be a future Text Amendment to our Site Plan Review provisions in the Zoning Code.

- Much of Culver City is in Transit Priority Area. I think I understood that a lot of projects now are being processed through SB 375; how does that work relative to CEQA?

Response: CEQA is a land mine for affordable housing and it's no longer necessarily a tool for ensuring environmental quality. It's a landmine and remember things that you really care about, you know, like maybe no curb cuts on the front of the building or whatever, you can write into the code.

Response: I like the menu idea and I think to the extent we can use it to serve an important public purpose like for example deeper levels of affordability then I think the community would be supportive as well. We have to look more closely at how SB 375 and other recent State legislation impacts on City environmental review.

- It looks like, are there aren't other comments or questions. Thank you all very much for your time this has been helpful, and we'll circle back and determine how best to use your input today.