

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nancy Levin

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 12:42 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Council File CF 25-1083

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cory Birkett

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 11:57 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Thank you, Cory Birkett  
Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa PLUC member  
Westchester 90045 Resident

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Maria Pavlou Kalban

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 12:16 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** We support option C2 for the Implementation of SB 79 but it must be clearly stated that C2 impacted neighborhoods are not being rezoned/upzoned but incentivized to allow more density which will also allow the city to remove the incentive should SB 79 be amended or repealed. We also insist that every property owner and resident impacted by C2 must be notified by mail of the changes in density on their property. This is absolutely a must so that we have a well informed electorate. Maria Pavlou Kalban CoChair United Neighbors

United Neighbors support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option.

Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following:

1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an **“incentive”** program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed.
2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained.
3. All affected property owners and residents must receive **mailed notification** of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.

**Council File CF 25-1083**

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laurie Kelson

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 12:36 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** The PLUM Committee recommendation of the Chair needs clarification of language. Severe Fire Zones and HPOZ's should be left alone and never over zoned with more housing. Severe Fire Zones need evacuation routes that are safe and cannot take any more density. The Encino Hills are a prime example from the Palisades Fire of January 2025.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gordon S. Morris  
**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 01:02 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** i, Gordon Morris, supports the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Council File CF 25-1083

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Westside Neighborhood Council

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 02:13 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** The WNC supports the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Henry Smith

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 02:14 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** SB79 would allow greedy property developers to make lots of profit off of luxury apartment buildings placed in the neighborhoods of seniors in their long-time homes, who can't afford to move anywhere else. As the least worst alternative currently available, I urge you to include the following in option C2 (Council File CF 25-1083): 1. clearly define the proposed density changes as an "incentive" program, not a rezoning or upzoning, so the incentives can be withdrawn if/when SB 79 is amended or repealed; 2. maintain all existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning; and 3. all affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Terry Tegnazian  
**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 02:16 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Although I am filing this support for Option C2 as the best of a bad lot, I am opposed to SB 79 where the state is selectively imposing generic development rules on only 8 out of the 58 counties in California, regardless of individual situations, infrastructure capabilities, and already-existing compliance with Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), and I strongly urge the City of Los Angeles to sue the state or lobby to have SB 79 invalidated. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mariano Tissera  
**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 02:28 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Council File CF 25-1083

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laura Chapin

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 05:34 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Debbie Nussbaum

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 05:29 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** March 3, 2026 Subject: Council File CF-25-1083 The Westwood Hills Property Owner Association (WHPOA) supports the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Respectively yours, Debbie Nussbaum WHPOA - President Nussbaum3@earthlink.net

## Communication from Public

**Name:** LFIA  
**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 02:38 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-1083  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Please see attached letter of conditional support for SB 79 implementation.



advocacy and action  
for Los Feliz

**2025-2026**

**President**

Debra Matlock

**First Vice-President**

Amy Gustincic\*

**Second Vice-President**

Melody King

**Coordinating Secretary**

Donna Kolb

**Recording Secretary**

Madeline Weinstein-Avery

**Treasurer**

Donald Seligman\*

**Directors**

Marian Dodge\*

Matthew Eskander

Phillip Gasteier

Devin Homsey

Annie Jewell

Ray Hovsepien

Alex Kondracke

Chris Laib\*

Elizabeth Lovins

Deanne Paul

Joel Rochlin

Tiger Schenkman

Riley Schmidt

Karen Stetler

\*Past President

March 3, 2026

Los Angeles City Councilmembers

**RE: CF 25-1083 Impacts of SB 79 (Wiener) / Comprehensive Report / City Infrastructure and Utility Systems**

Dear Councilmembers,

The Los Feliz Improvement Association, representing all residents of Los Feliz since 1916, supports the Planning Department's Citywide Implementation Option C2 for the rollout of SB 79.

Option C2 offers a thoughtful and measured framework by postponing implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs), and areas vulnerable to sea level rise until 2030. At the same time, it establishes a voluntary pathway for qualifying single-family neighborhoods to consider modest multifamily development—allowing three-story residential buildings with approximately 4 to 16 units—in lieu of the seven-story buildings otherwise contemplated under SB 79. Importantly, this approach preserves the ability for fully SB 79-compliant projects to proceed near existing rail stations.

We understand from the Planning Department's presentation that Option C2 is not intended to constitute a broad rezoning or upzoning initiative, but rather a targeted implementation strategy. Our support is grounded in that understanding and is expressly conditioned on the following:

1. The proposed density provisions must be clearly structured and codified as an **incentive-based program**—not as a rezoning or upzoning of affected neighborhoods—and must allow for withdrawal or modification should SB 79 be amended or repealed.
2. All existing setback requirements established under current zoning must remain fully in effect.
3. The City must provide **mailed notice** to all impacted property owners and residents regarding the proposed changes to ensure meaningful outreach beyond online postings.

We believe Option C2, with these safeguards, strikes an appropriate balance between advancing state housing objectives and respecting the safety and infrastructure constraints of established neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
The Board of Directors of LFIA

Debra Matlock  
President

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Roy Nwaisser

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 03:06 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three-story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. My support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Robert Bonfiglio

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 03:07 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I, Robert Bonfiglio, a homeowner, support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. My support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Council File CF 25-1083

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James Dastoli

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 03:53 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. My support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chris Ann Maxwell

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 03:55 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. My support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Susan Collins

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 03:59 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please supports the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. My support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Thank you, Susan Collins

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 05:44 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** We support the City Attorney's law suit against this horrible 'Developer Dictatorship' bill that will destroy this city and it's cherished neighborhoods. We feel the City of L.A. should roll up it's sleeves and go to work and come up with its own 'Alternative PLAN' We feel any councilmember who supports this horrible, dangerous, damaging to many bill, should be fired/recalled... Certainly NOT EVER become Mayor! We witnessed mayoral candidate CD4 try to sabbotage any SB79 recommendation going to city council from the PLUM committee. She lost. But because of her, who did not vote against SB79 with the rest of city council, or vote to support the PLUM Chair's proposal, it's a 'Chair Recommendation' not the 'PLUM Committee recommendation' She has no shame and is playing her games with our lives and our families and our neighborhoods. Why pay a salary to councilmembers so willing to take away our rights, to disrespect us and our communities, and hand us all over to developers. This is NOT what you got elected to do! And to be a Warrior against single family homes and communities, calling them all 'racist', you should be REQUIRED to have grown up in, and live in apartments, not grow up in beautiful single family homes in toney suburb of Massachusetts as this woman of privilege did, or live and raise her children in a beautiful large single family home now, that she wants to deny others of living and raising children in, with nothing but land and views, with plans to demo it for a mansion. She would NEVER get away with this in her hometown, toney suburb in Massachusetts. Neither would Scott Wiener, who grew up in a single family home in a toney suburb of New Jersey and calls SF homeowners and neighborhoods "racist, immoral, and wasting space" They have no shame. If it's impossible for this city to come up with it's own plan...and where there IS a will there IS a way!!...then.. We support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 but not only delay, but forever EXCLUDE implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, single family neighborhoods, very high fire severity zones, cherished Historic HPOZs, and Historic Districts, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively "incentivizes" qualifying single-family neighborhoods, which should be excluded from SB79, to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment

buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. And only rail stations, not bus stops should qualify for SB79 projects descending upon and ruining communities. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. When the State approved LAs Housing Element( that CD4 also opposed saying “The State is Wrong ” ) they said there is more than enough space to build here to State Requirements WITHOUT carving into single family and historic neighborhoods and districts. So WHY would this CITY not fight SB79 tooth and nail.. And tell the State and Scott Wiener to stay out of this city’s single family neighborhoods, treasured Historic Neighborhoods (HPOZs), and Districts, and Very High Fire Severity Zones FOREVER! Council File CF 25-1083

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mark Brown

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 10:32 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/03/2026 10:24 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. My support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.