

Communication from Public

Name: Spencer Kimes

Date Submitted: 09/26/2025 01:34 PM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: I am very disappointed to hear that the council is considering further complications and expenses to ED1. We do not need a handout to more groups in LA. We need housing. We especially need more affordable housing. ED1 could be an exceptional policy, but continuously degrading its value and making it less and less likely that projects will actually make economic sense will just reduce affordable housing. Affordable housing that the city doesn't even have to pay for. Please do not make it harder for people to build these units under the guise of "fair wages". We are in a housing crisis, please act like it.

Communication from Public

Name: Noah Schneider

Date Submitted: 09/26/2025 03:47 PM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: With housing production at its lowest level in a decade in the City of LA, why are we voting on something that could cut in half the amount of housing being built with ED 1? Though it has been substantially rolled back, ED 1 100% affordable housing developments are still being built. We are in a disastrous housing shortage and nowhere near our RHNA goals, so it is no wonder that Sacramento will continue to step in if we keep making housing production harder through local control only caring about current homeowners, already hugely subsidized by tax dollars from dense areas. This proposal would add costs to projects with 75+ units, which currently make up 49% of ED 1 units under construction. With these labor standards and red tape, most of these units will not pencil at all. This means fully affordable ED 1 housing will not be built as much in the future, pricing out even more working and middle class Angelenos to red states.

Communication from Public

Name: Andres Perkins

Date Submitted: 09/29/2025 01:34 PM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Union laborers are essential to our city and all deserve fair payment and job opportunities. However, these proposed requirements will likely undermine those goals by eliminating many of the positions they wish to secure by making projects less financially viable and discouraging development of larger projects that both workers and the city would benefit from. Besides decreasing the amount of homes and job opportunities Angelenos are begging for, these requirements also unfairly and unnecessarily secure what little work there is for a certain subset of laborers at the expense of the rest despite these projects being privately funded. On the bright side, should this pass, it will give the state more justification to step in on local housing policies and decisions since our city is already far behind target on building the new units we need and our current plans - even updated ones - are failing to deliver them. Then everyone might actually have a chance to live and/or work in Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 09/29/2025 11:09 AM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Unit count based labor standards as part of ED1 will do irreparable harm to the amount of housing that gets built in Los Angeles. This provision will make it unfeasible to actually build affordable housing in LA and will end up with fewer units being built. Please don't include it!

Communication from Public

Name: ARET KURIAN

Date Submitted: 09/29/2025 05:28 PM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: I am a developer based in Los Angeles and strongly oppose imposing union labor standards on ED1 projects over 75 units. The cost of materials and labor is already extremely high, and most of these projects barely make financial sense under current conditions. Adding labor requirements that increase costs by an additional 25–30% will make it nearly impossible for these projects to pencil out. If this bill passes, it will effectively stop larger ED1 developments from moving forward. At a time when the city is struggling to meet its housing needs, this legislation will only worsen the housing shortage and further impact affordability. The focus should be on reducing the cost burden of development—not increasing it. We need practical solutions that encourage housing production, not policies that hinder it. Keep in mind the unintended consequences of adding labor standards or other burdens — similar to what we’ve seen with Measure JJJ. Because of the standards required, many zone changes stalled, and the city lost both housing and revenue. A parallel can be seen with Measure ULA (“mansion tax”). After it took effect in spring 2023, high-value property sales over \$5 million dropped steeply. This led to a sharp decline in the expected revenue from property turnover and reassessments. So imagine having a project with 100% labor standards imposed. That kind of cost could be a tipping point making many projects financially unviable. Combined with burdens like JJJ, the result is fewer zone changes, fewer properties selling, lower reassessment activity, and hence, significantly less property tax revenue for the city and more importantly significantly less affordable units built.

Communication from Public

Name: Shaun

Date Submitted: 09/29/2025 11:00 PM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Please do not kill ED-1 with unit-count-based labor standards. There are other ways to be Pro-Union without hurting large housing (75+ Units) projects in the city. We will likely not have federal support in housing, so we need to keep projects as affordable and efficient as possible so we can locally finance them. It's disappointing we already have a city council that didn't supportive of SB79, please don't make this mistake as well.