

Communication from Public

Name: Dillon Foster

Date Submitted: 09/16/2025 11:03 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: While I think that the intention of this motion is to try to intimidate the governor into not signing SB 79 (even though he should not be intimidated by this report in the slightest), I ultimately welcome the findings of this report set out in this motion as I think the findings will be more favorable than the specific council members moving this motion believe and want to thank these council members for putting together a report that puts all of these favorable facts in one place and additionally thank the council for creating more official maps than the ones that have been floating around social media for the past few months in regards to SB 79. Ultimately, I hope those maps are also of higher quality and would love for them to be interactive and accessible online. This report will clear up the misinformation and lies spread around this bill including those spread by council members that were trying to kill the bill. While I anticipate that nearly all (if not all) of the findings will be incredibly favorable to the bill itself, I want to point out some of the most glaringly positive facts I know will be found in this report. First, the fees that the City of Los Angeles charges developers for each development covers the costs of infrastructure updates and public services (including staffing)/ utilities that comes with a new development and said increase in density where an increase in density exists (which every council member should know -- including those that moved this motion). While I agree that broadly the city fails to maintain its infrastructure, that is hardly caused by new development. Any new infrastructure as well as staffing and services required stemming from new development under SB 79 will be payed for by developer fees just like any other development past and present and this report will find that. Nearly all of the costs that the city could incur that are listed in this motion for a report are covered by developer fees meaning that the city will not incur these costs. Second, in the case of a tsunami, the safest type of evacuation in said situation is a "vertical evacuation" where occupants of a medium or high density building in a tsunami zone during a tsunami would all shelter on the higher floors of the building. The small handful of eligible lots in tsunami zones under the criteria of SB 79 become safer when redeveloped to the maximum extent allowable under SB 79. Third, this report will find that most (almost all) of the

sites eligible for SB 79 in the City of Los Angeles will be outside of zones that are particularly at risk for wildfires (there are some exceptions). Furthermore, not a single site eligible for SB 79 is located in the Pacific Palisades despite the misinformation around this spread by many (including a D-list celebrity that lives in the Palisades and is very politically loud). This will be especially satisfying because one of the council members moving this report spread this lie in order to try to kill the bill. I must say thank you to that council member for clearing up the misinformation that you spread and setting the record straight in the most official capacity that you can even though it exposes that you lied and made misleading claims. While there are more facts that will be found by this report that I did not mention or talk about (for the sake of keeping this short and to the point) that will be favorable, I want to thank the council members moving this motion for clearing up any misinformation surrounding the bill including misinformation spread by opponents of the bill -- including by members of this council. This is a very good step to take and regardless of intention, this motion does a good job protecting facts.