

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Andrea Leon-Grossmann

**Date Submitted:** 02/23/2026 07:56 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Council President and Members of the Los Angeles City Council, As an Angeleno, a Mexican immigrant, and an environmental justice advocate, I care deeply about whether the housing policies we adopt actually protect working families and communities of color, or whether they accelerate displacement under the banner of “abundance.” I strongly urge you to adopt Option 1 for SB 79 implementation. Los Angeles absolutely needs more housing. But the question is not simply how much we build, it is who benefits and who gets to stay. Recent national research, including the Georgetown Center on Poverty and Inequality’s report “Abundance for Who?”, shows that across major metropolitan areas, increases in housing supply have primarily benefited moderate- and higher-income households. The report makes clear that market-driven production, without strong affordability and anti-displacement protections, does not automatically reduce housing burdens for the lowest-income renters. In many cases, it deepens inequality.

<https://www.georgetownpoverty.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/AbundanceforWho.pdf> We cannot afford to pretend that volume alone equals justice. Option 3 leans heavily on broad, automatic upzoning near transit with minimal local tailoring. Without binding affordability requirements, preservation of existing rent-stabilized housing, and strong tenant protections, that approach risks accelerating gentrification in both lower-income and transit-adjacent communities. We have already seen how speculative pressure near transit corridors can push long-time residents out, replacing transit-dependent households with higher-income residents who are less likely to rely on public transportation. That is not climate justice. It is displacement. Option 1 gives the City the ability to do this responsibly. It allows Los Angeles to align SB 79 implementation with our Housing Element, community plans, infrastructure realities, and equity commitments. It creates room for stronger affordability requirements, preservation strategies, and renter protections. It respects the fact that planning should be rooted in community context, not imposed as a blanket entitlement overlay. Housing justice requires:

- Deeply affordable units at 30%, 50%, and 80% AMI
- Preservation of existing rent-restricted and rent-stabilized homes
- Robust tenant protections and anti-displacement measures
- Alignment with infrastructure capacity and public safety
- Climate resilience built into land-use decisions

On that last point, I must emphasize something that has repeatedly been raised but insufficiently addressed: flood plains. Los Angeles is facing increasing climate volatility. We know where FEMA-designated flood zones are located. We know that climate change is intensifying rainfall events. Yet flood plain considerations have not been meaningfully integrated into the SB 79 implementation framework. It is reckless to allow blanket upzoning in areas that carry elevated flood risk without explicit safeguards. At minimum, SB 79 implementation must exempt mapped flood plains from automatic upzoning triggers, or require rigorous, publicly accountable flood risk and infrastructure analysis before projects proceed. Growth should never come at the expense of life safety and long-term resilience. Environmental justice and housing justice are inseparable. Communities already burdened by pollution, heat, and underinvestment should not also bear disproportionate climate risk because we rushed a zoning framework without proper guardrails. Fair housing isn’t upzoning; fair housing is anti-displacement. Upzoning without protections accelerates displacement around transit. SB 79 overview confirms the law makes qualifying developments an “allowed use” near specified transit stops and takes effect July 1, 2026—i.e., it’s a permission structure, not an affordability guarantee. We shouldn’t confuse ‘allowed’ with ‘affordable.’” SB 79 is an entitlement framework; affordability outcomes require binding local requirements and preservation. This is not an argument against housing. It is an argument for doing housing right. Option 1 provides the path to responsible implementation, one that centers equity, safety, and genuine affordability rather than relying on market assumptions that evidence has repeatedly shown do not deliver for the lowest-income Angelenos. Please choose Option 1. Strengthen it with clear affordability, anti-displacement, preservation, and climate-resilience provisions — including a flood plain exemption. Our neighbors deserve stability, dignity, and real opportunity, not policies that

unintentionally push them out. Thank you for your consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sandra Madera

**Date Submitted:** 02/23/2026 06:23 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** PLUM Committee City Clerk, I am writing as part of YIMBY Los Angeles to urge the City of Los Angeles to adopt Option 3 for the implementation of SB 79. Los Angeles must take meaningful action to expand housing in transit-rich areas so more residents can live near jobs, schools, and essential services. Opening up access to these high-opportunity neighborhoods is critical to addressing our housing shortage and ensuring that more Angelenos can benefit from the City's investments in public transportation. Option 3 provides the strongest path forward to increase housing feasibility near transit while ensuring the City remains in compliance with state law. Option 3 most closely aligns with the intent as well as the letter of SB 79. Expanding housing opportunities in transit-accessible communities also advances the City's obligation to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by helping address historic patterns of exclusion and improving access to opportunity. For these reasons, we strongly support the adoption of Option 3 to expand housing near transit and ensure Los Angeles meets its obligations under SB 79.  
Sandra Madera smadera76@gmail.com 1122 W Kensington Rd  
Los Angeles, California 90026

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 02/23/2026 04:15 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please include the following comment letter in the Council file.  
Thank you.



February 23, 2026

PLUM Committee  
City Clerk  
Honorable Mayor and Council Members  
City of Los Angeles  
200 North Spring Street  
City Hall - Room 395  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Clerk.CPS@lacity.org  
Clerk.PLUMCommittee@lacity.org

RE: 25-1083, Agenda Item 11, PLUM Meeting of February 24, 2026

Dear Members of the Planning and Land Use Committee:

We commend staff for attempting to grapple with highly destructive effects of SB 79. SB 79 encourages the replacement of single-family homes with market rate and luxury apartment buildings and limits the ability of cities to encourage the production of affordable housing consistent with RHNA targets, which is one of our core goals. In addition, SB 79 works against the goal of increasing transit ridership and imposes significant unfunded mandates on cities.

We would therefore ask that you do four things as part of this agenda item:

1. Select Option B, and oppose options that would rezone areas, locking in SB 79's destructive effects.
2. Require notifications be sent to all property owners within ½ mile of major transit stops notifying them that their property will be impacted by SB 79 and explaining that SB 79 was a bill sponsored by Senator Weiner and signed by the governor.

3. Join with Los Angeles Metro, the largest transit agency in California, in asking that Metro's service area, all of Los Angeles County, be exempted from SB 79. A copy of the position approved by the Metro Board is attached. Support Metro in its request for changes to the bill as follows:

To ensure that Metro can continue advancing its Long Range Transportation Plan and improving transit service across the region, Metro recommends considering an alternative structure or a Los Angeles-specific exemption. These options could include:

- Limiting the bill's applicability to only those rail transit projects that are in revenue service.
  - Creating an incentive-based structure using state funds that allows local agencies to determine how best to locate density around transit infrastructure.
  - Delaying the effective date of the bill until implementation issues can be addressed.
  - Limiting the bill's applicability to the Bay Area as a pilot project for a set period of time.
  - Exempting Los Angeles County from SB 79, given the region's extensive and ongoing transit expansion efforts and the importance of maintaining strong local partnerships to advance these projects.
4. We request that you actively champion legislation to amend SB 79 /SB 677 /SB 908. The following amendments combine resident recommendations with the official legislative requests recently adopted by the Metro Board. Please support Metro's requested changes, and ours.

#### **I. Structural Exemptions & Scope (Aligned with Metro Board Position)**

- **Exempt Los Angeles County:** Explicitly exempt Los Angeles County from SB 79 to protect our region's extensive transit expansion efforts and maintain critical local partnerships.
- **Limit to Bay Area Pilot:** Restrict the bill's applicability to the Bay Area as a pilot project for a set period before expanding statewide.
- **"Revenue Service" Only:** Limit the bill's applicability transit projects that are currently in **revenue service**. It should not apply to "planned" projects or those merely identified in a Regional Transportation Plan.

- **Create Incentive-Based Structure:** Replace mandates with an incentive-based structure using state funds that allows local agencies to determine how best to locate density around transit.

## II. Technical Definitions & Feasibility

- **Fix "Light Rail" Definitions:** Amend definitions to accurately classify Metro's rail lines (A, C, E, and K). Currently, the law limits "light rail" to streetcars/trolleys, creating legal uncertainty for Metro's major corridors.
- **Strictly Define "BRT" (Tier 2):** Modify the definition of a "Tier 2" stop to require **all** features of Bus Rapid Transit defined in the Public Resources Code (e.g., dedicated lanes, signal priority, frequency of service).
- **Delay Implementation Deadline:** Delay the effective date until implementation issues are resolved and extend the compliance deadline for cities to match the 7th Cycle Housing Element timeline (2030).

## III. Local Planning & Infrastructure Protection

- **Mandate RHNA Compliance:** Replace SB 79's weak affordability requirements with a requirement that *all* projects match the local jurisdiction's specific RHNA affordability targets to ensure California and cities meet their housing goals.
- **Exempt Compliant Cities:** Explicitly exempt any jurisdiction that maintains a State-Certified Housing Element, as these cities have already completed the rigorous planning required to meet state housing needs.
- **Fund Infrastructure (DIFs):** Allow local jurisdictions to adopt Development Impact Fees (DIFs) to fund the specific sewer, power, and water upgrades necessitated by state-mandated density and provide State funding for the needed nexus studies.

SB 79, SB 677 and SB 908:

- work against the ability of cities to meet their affordable housing goals;
- will result in significant impacts to the ability of cities to fund adequate infrastructure to support development;
- represent a massive unfunded mandate;
- will place more residents in harm's way;
- provides cities with insufficient planning time;
- limits the ability of the middle-class to afford homes by upzoning land thus increasing the price of single-family homes; and,
- will generally degrade the quality of life in California.

The harmful effect of SB 79 and the need for our recommended legislative changes is explained in more detail in the following video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EKwLuM0dsFg>

We therefore request that PLUM's action be expanded to include the requested items, and that the City of Los Angeles actively work against this destructive legislation which is harmful to both affordable housing development and transit in our region.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Sincerely,

Susan O'Carroll  
For: R-Land

## ATTACHMENT A

**BILL:** SENATE BILL 677  
AS AMENDED JANUARY 5, 2026

**AUTHOR:** SENATOR SCOTT WIENER (D – SAN FRANCISCO)

**SUBJECT:** HOUSING DEVELOPMENT: TRANSIT-ORIENTED  
DEVELOPMENT

**STATUS:** RE-REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSING JAN 5, 2026

**ACTION:** OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Adopt an OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED position on Senate Bill 677, as amended on January 5, 2026.

### **ISSUE**

SB 677 is intended to make technical and clarifying changes to SB 79 (Wiener, Chapter 512, Statutes of 2025), which establishes statewide standards for housing development near major transit stops.

As of the drafting of this report the bill:

- Makes technical changes to SB 79 (Wiener), specifically by making changes to the definitions of “urban transit county” and certain types of transit stops, as well as adding additional definitions. Specifically, the bill adds definitions for “high-frequency ferry service” and “rail transit station” while refining definitions for “major transit stop”, “high frequency commuter rail”, “Transit-oriented development stop”, “tier 2 transit-oriented development stop”, “urban transit county”, and “very high frequency commuter rail”.
- Exempts existing parcels or sites from SB 79 if those parcels or sites are subject to the Mobilehome Residency Law, Mobilehome Parks Act, the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law, and the Special Occupancy Parks Act.
- Provides that a transit agency may, among other things, establish floor area ratio (FAR) requirements generally in their zoning standards for district-owned property located in a TOD zone (as opposed to residential-only FAR standards).

While SB 677 makes limited technical adjustments, it does not address the core implementation challenges Metro has experienced with SB 79. The bill fails to clarify how Metro's rail lines are classified under the law, resolve inconsistencies in transit mode definitions, or address the growing local resistance to transit projects driven by SB 79's housing density provisions. As a result, SB 79 continues to create uncertainty for project planning, complicate coordination with local jurisdictions, and undermine local partnerships that are critical to delivering voter-approved transit projects in Los Angeles County. Because SB 677 does not resolve these issues, staff recommends an **OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED** position.

## **BACKGROUND**

The relationship between higher density and higher transit use is well-documented. As a result, Metro strongly supports transit-oriented development and operates one of the most robust joint development programs in the country. Through partnerships with local cities, community stakeholders, and private and nonprofit developers, Metro is working to deliver 10,000 housing units by 2031, with at least 50 percent of the units designated as affordable. Metro has already delivered more than 2,500 units, including nearly 400 units of 100 percent affordable housing in the last two years alone, with thousands more in the development pipeline. Metro also has another 2,000 units across four sites that are entitled and preparing for construction, with another 5,500 in the development pipeline.

SB 79 requires housing development projects within a specified radius of major transit-oriented development (TOD) stops to be allowed on sites zoned for residential, mixed, or commercial use, provided certain requirements are met. The law establishes minimum height, density, and floor area ratio (FAR) standards based on proximity to qualifying transit stops. The legislation directs Metropolitan Planning Organizations, including the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), to prepare maps identifying affected parcels within each jurisdiction, based on guidance from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). These maps are intended to assist local jurisdictions in implementing SB 79's requirements. SB 677 (Wiener) is intended to make technical and clarifying changes to SB 79, which will take effect on July 1, 2026.

On December 5, 2025, the Metro Board approved a 2026 Legislative Platform that includes pursuing amendments to SB 79 to ensure that its definitions and implementation support Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan and the continued delivery of high-quality transit service.

## **DISCUSSION**

Metro's transit expansion program is the largest in California, with approximately \$120 billion in planned investments funded by four voter-approved sales tax measures and federal support. Since 2022, Metro has delivered three rail expansion projects, has four

expansion projects under construction, and will open three more expansion projects by 2028, along with multiple bus rapid transit projects and quick build bus lanes.

Following the passage of SB 79, Metro has encountered significant challenges that directly affect the agency's ability to plan, deliver, and maintain critical transit infrastructure across Los Angeles County. Several of the bill's core definitions are unclear and inconsistent with industry standards. These ambiguities create legal and planning uncertainty for Metro projects and expose the agency to avoidable delays, disputes, and litigation risk.

Most notably, SB 79 and SB 677 fail to accurately classify Metro's A, C, E, and K rail lines. The current definition of "light rail transit" is limited to streetcar, trolley, and tramway systems, which do not accurately reflect Metro's rail operations. As a result, it is unclear whether major Metro rail corridors qualify as eligible transit stops under the statute. This lack of clarity undermines the consistent application of the law, complicates coordination with local jurisdictions, and weakens Metro's ability to advance transit-oriented development on and around its own infrastructure. Additionally, SB 79 adds another hurdle to the effort to expand our bus system throughout the County and improve service for our transit-dependent riders. Dedicated bus lanes traditionally face greater local opposition because they can remove parking or general purpose lanes and SB 79 adds an additional obstacle to providing high quality bus service throughout LA County.

In addition to technical flaws, SB 79 has become a catalyst for local opposition to Metro's transit projects. By linking increased housing density to both existing and future transit investments, the law has intensified resistance from some cities and community groups that now view new transit projects as a trigger for state-mandated upzoning. This unintended consequence results in transit being the "stick" for upzoning instead of the "carrot". This has already begun to erode previously strong local partnerships and has created new political and permitting obstacles for voter-approved projects that have already completed environmental review.

Metro's transit expansion program depends on strong, consistent cooperation with cities throughout Los Angeles County. When SB 79 fuels local opposition, it directly threatens Metro's ability to secure permits, coordinate construction, and maintain project schedules. These delays increase costs, jeopardize federal funding timelines, and ultimately slow the delivery of transit service to communities that rely on it most.

The consequences of these barriers are real. Eighty-nine percent of Metro riders are very low income, and 85 percent are transit dependent. Delays to rail, bus lanes, and bus rapid transit projects disproportionately harm the region's most vulnerable populations by limiting access to jobs, education, and healthcare. SB 79's current structure risks undermining the very transit infrastructure the Legislature intended to leverage for housing production and climate goals.

SB 677, as amended on January 5, 2026, does not resolve these fundamental issues. While it makes limited technical adjustments, it fails to address core definition

inconsistencies and the growing local resistance to transit projects driven by SB 79's unilateral density provisions. Without targeted amendments, SB 79 will continue to hinder Metro's ability to deliver voter-approved transit projects, maintain local partnerships, and meet regional mobility, housing, climate, and equity goals.

To ensure that Metro can continue advancing its Long Range Transportation Plan and improving transit service across the region, Metro recommends considering an alternative structure or a Los Angeles-specific exemption. These options could include:

- Limiting the bill's applicability to only those rail transit projects that are in revenue service.
- Creating an incentive-based structure using state funds that allows local agencies to determine how best to locate density around transit infrastructure.
- Delaying the effective date of the bill until implementation issues can be addressed.
- Limiting the bill's applicability to the Bay Area as a pilot project for a set period of time.
- Exempting Los Angeles County from SB 79, given the region's extensive and ongoing transit expansion efforts and the importance of maintaining strong local partnerships to advance these projects.

For these reasons, staff recommend an **OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED** position on SB 677.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Should the Board adopt an **OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED** position on the legislation, staff will formally communicate the Board's position and requested amendments to the bill's author and relevant legislative offices. Staff will also continue to monitor the bill's progress throughout the legislative session and provide the Board with timely updates on any developments, amendments, or changes that may affect Metro's interests.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Tony Gittelson  
**Date Submitted:** 02/23/2026 11:13 AM  
**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a Board member on the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council (GWNC), I am also author & co-founder of the "Livable Communities Initiative" which, at the direction of the full City Council, LA City Planning recently prepared an implantation report. I am writing as an individual, however, not on behalf of either organization. Regarding City Planning's Feb 18, 2026 Report on the delayed effectuation of SB79, I would urge City Planning, PLUM & the City Council to consider the following HYBRID model that combines Option 1 and Option 3: for all 55 designated Opportunity Stations provide the full (less dense) Corridor Transition (CT) incentives within a half-mile, but allow the more dense TOIA incentives \*only\* for the first 1/4-mile. Under the current map, most zoning density is clustered around the 55 Opportunity Stations within a 1/4-mile, so it is absolutely appropriate to upzone those areas; it's the next 1/4-mile where housing becomes less dense and more residential. For those zones it is fair to ask neighborhoods to accept gentle density 2-4 story town homes and/or bungalow courts. This hybrid model (of Options 1 & 3) should provide ample capacity for the City to qualify for SB79 delayed effectuation, at the same time, allow for significant upzoning around transit, and allow the City to transition into a more nuanced and workable SB79 implantation plan over the next 5 years. I hope the City will give consideration to this suggestion. Arguably, it is a reasonable middle path between a minimalist and a "maximalist" approach.