

Communication from Public

Name: Dillon Foster
Date Submitted: 08/20/2025 01:32 PM
Council File No: 25-0002-S19
Comments for Public Posting: Comments for CF 25-0002-S19 in the attachment.

I am writing urging the council to support Senate Bill 79. Transit oriented development is necessary urbanistic change that is needed in Los Angeles to meet the moment in the climate crisis. The most effective way to increase access to public transit and public transit ridership which is necessary to meet our climate goals and would be illogical to dodge is transit oriented development. With the recent UN ruling that countries that fail to meet their climate goals have to pay reparations to other countries, it will be flat out embarrassing for Los Angeles City Council to be part of the reason that the United States would owe reparations to the rest of the world and it will be outside of the values of the majority of Angeleno's for that to occur. Additionally, meeting our climate goals is important because it will save lives both globally and in Los Angeles -- most of which are black, brown, and indigenous people but not just limited to people of color as no place or group of people is safe from effects of the climate crisis anymore as was witnessed in January of this year with the costly wildfire in the Palisades which effected a mostly white and wealthier community. Angelenos are most at risk of three devastating types of disasters that can take lives in mass amounts -- extreme heat, wildfires, and flash flooding. Economic and urbanistic solutions to cooling our planet such as increasing access and ridership of public transit (which SB 79 will help achieve) must be part of the solution even though it must not be considered the whole solution alone.

Collectively as a country and a world, we are at a moment in time where thousand year floods, mega wildfires, and record heat domes - all results of a heating planet at least in part (for heat domes and flash floods it is almost exclusively caused by a warmer atmosphere) have become the norm due to the climate crisis. We must do everything we can to take on the climate crisis and cool our rapidly heating planet in order to save lives, property, the city budget, and avoid owing reparations. Delays in getting people out of their cars and into public transit will result in more disasters that will compile costs, eventually becoming too costly to take action and/or help people affected by disaster. We must take action that includes but is not limited to changing the urbanism of the City of Los Angeles and the state of California to reduce car dependency and SB 79 is a part of that solution while also helping solve other issues like a housing shortage. In January, the Palisades was wiped out in a massive wildfire that cost the city at least \$250 billion due to the occurrence of a Santa Ana windstorm coupled with drought. It's not a stretch or alarmist to say that a disaster of this magnitude could happen (in any of the 3 forms previously listed) in any district of Los Angeles at any given time. For example, one of the biggest opponents of this bill, Council member Park's district is more susceptible to future disaster like floods and landslides due to large swaths of land that contain burn scars that make soil hydrophobic. If a storm were to stall over the west side of Los Angeles, her district would likely see a once in a thousand year flood comparable to floods that occurred this year where burn scars exist in New Mexico. In an area even less dense than the Palisades, entire homes were swept away and floods were extremely costly. There were multiple of these floods just this year. It is estimated that on any given day, with the atmosphere being warmed by climate change, the atmosphere holds up to 7 percent more moisture overall, causing more rainfall and heavier rainfall. However, in localized areas, that percentage of moisture can be up to 30 percent more than average. If a storm (or tropical storm [or remnants] from the Pacific) were to linger over Los Angeles' west side (or over any area along the LA river) which is not outside the realm of possibility (even in Los Angeles' ecosystems. Reference the tropical storm in 2023 for a recent example) with the jet stream typically being over the northern plains in the summer months,

there would be no force to kick it along meaning that it would stall (and stall for longer than the past due to human caused warming) until it ran out of precipitation or energy. In such a scenario, it would not take the usual 3 to 6 inches of rain that is required in a short amount of time in other places because the soil is hydrophobic like how the soil is in the Ruidoso region of New Mexico or the Big Country region of Texas (hydrophobic for non-wildfire reasons). Voting against supporting SB 79 is a vote to uphold a status quo that puts Angelenos already affected by disaster or living in flood zones at risk of further disaster.

SB 79 also maintains local control + protects against displacement. It will also help generate foot traffic + business necessary to help small businesses recover from Covid-19 & help close the budget shortfall.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/21/2025 02:22 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: SB79 is critical to solving the housing crisis. I don't think the city itself has done a good enough job to achieve this. We no longer have the privilege to choose to protect culture over building housing--furthermore there is already tenant protection in place added to the bill. Either way, protecting the past at the cost of rising rents and homelessness is a short sighted decision made from those who are privileged enough to not experience the housing/economic crisis first hand here in LA. Please support SB79 and work WITH the state to refine the bill. You're opposition to the bill does nothing but slap harding working LA in the place by ignoring the housing crisis.