



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-1083

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: jramos@arletanc.org, Clerk.CIS@lacity.org

Fri, Mar 20, 2026 at 1:44 PM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the to Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or rResolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Arleta

Name: Jesus Ramos

Email: jramos@arletanc.org

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(8) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 03/17/2026

Type of NC Board Action: For

Impact Information

Date: 03/20/2026

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-1083


City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: RE: Council File 25-1083 Dear Councilmembers: The Arleta Neighborhood Council and the City of Los Angeles faces 3 bad choices regarding the implementation of Senate Bill 79 (2025); of those choices the Arleta Neighborhood Council is forced to select Approach C, Option 2, delayed effectuation (until 2030) as the other options do not provide the municipality with more flexibility (targeted density) on its implementation. But it is erroneous to assume that those that take up residence in newly constructed multi-family units next to or in the vicinity of heavy rail, Bus Rapid Transit routes/stops, or light-rail transit stations will employ public transit for everyday or occasional use. New York City and

Chicago still have highly congested streets despite the presence of mass transit—which is evidence that many people still choose to drive automobiles after all these decades in those cities. Furthermore, SB 79 allows for the construction of residential complexes (whether they are apartment units, condominiums, or other multi-unit complexes) without parking spaces. Senate Bill 79, as it is written, assumes that new tenants of future housing within a half-mile radius, or buffer, of a mass transit station/route will move into a new residential complex without owning automobiles already or acquiring an automobile in the future. So if they have automobiles already or plan to purchase an automobile and live in these new complexes. . . where are they going to park those automobiles? SB 79 does not prohibit the ownership of automobiles and nor are future tenants conditioned to not own automobiles either; however, we shall see if a materialized state imposed vehicle mileage tax achieves that for all Californians among other existing and future taxes (federal, county, municipality, school district, and the State of California). According to SB 79 the State of California will not provide funding of anything to meet the demands of the bill—unfunded liabilities for counties....

 **ANC_CIS_CF_25-1083_APPROVED_20260317.pdf**
178K

Arleta Neighborhood Council

Raymond Duran, President
Jaime Gallo, Vice-President
Burton Hunter, Secretary
Jesus "Jesse" Ramos, Treasurer
Geovani Escobar, At-Large Rep
Gary Gallon, Senior Rep
Christianna Hartwell, Animal Welfare Rep
-----, Home/Condo Rep
David Hunt, CBO Rep
Ronald Pacheco, CBO Rep
Robert Yaffe, Senior Rep
-----, At-Large Rep
Moises B. Bazan, Business Owner Rep
-----, At-Large Rep

CALIFORNIA



ARLETA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

Attention: Arleta NC
9300 Laurel Cyn.Bl., 2nd Floor
Arleta, CA 91331
www.arletanc.org

ARLETA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
Community Impact Statement

March 17, 2026

RE: **Council File 25-1083**

Dear Councilmembers:

The Arleta Neighborhood Council and the City of Los Angeles faces 3 bad choices regarding the implementation of Senate Bill 79 (2025); of those choices the Arleta Neighborhood Council **is forced to** select *Approach C, Option 2*, delayed effectuation (until 2030) as the other options do not provide the municipality with more flexibility (targeted density) on its implementation.

But it is erroneous to assume that those that take up residence in newly constructed multi-family units next to or in the vicinity of heavy rail, Bus Rapid Transit routes/stops, or light-rail transit stations will employ public transit for everyday or occasional use. New York City and Chicago still have highly congested streets despite the presence of mass transit—which is evidence that many people *still choose to drive automobiles* after all these decades in those cities. Furthermore, SB 79 allows for the construction of residential complexes (whether they are apartment units, condominiums, or other multi-unit complexes) **without parking spaces**. Senate Bill 79, as it is written, assumes that new tenants of future housing within a half-mile radius, or buffer, of a mass transit station/route will move into a new residential complex *without owning automobiles already* or acquiring an automobile in the future. So if they have automobiles already or plan to purchase an automobile and live in these new complexes. . . **where are they going to park those automobiles?**

SB 79 does not prohibit the ownership of automobiles and nor are future tenants conditioned to not own automobiles either; *however*, we shall see if a materialized state imposed vehicle mileage tax achieves that for all Californians among other existing and future taxes (federal, county, municipality, school district, and the State of California).

According to SB 79 the State of California will not provide funding of anything to meet the demands of the bill—unfunded liabilities for counties and cities in other words.¹ The words: sewer, water, and electrical needs/studies are absent from SB 79, among other things, and yet new housing *imposes* physical spacing/presence, the consumption of natural resources, and energy demands upon any county or municipality. No appeals process nor public input process outside Sacramento was entertained in the bill—*how was that democratic in any shape or*

¹ Senate Bill 79, Chaptered October 10, 2025. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260SB79

APPROVED
March 17, 2026
8 Yea 0 No 2 Absent 0 Abstain

form? It's practically authoritarian. Our general plans have been overwritten by the State of California despite all of the years of hard work between the City and community members to get them agreed upon, updated, and adopted.

Moreover, it is unconscionable to believe that people with some type of disability (or anyone in need of medical care (particularly those with severe pain)) really want to travel by bus or rail to get medical attention. Ride-sharing services are not quite affordable (nor available at all times) and operators do decline *short distance transport requests* due to insignificant financial returns for their service. Also, nobody wants to be billed \$2,000+ for paramedic service and transport on top of their medical attention if they can avoid it. Therefore, the acquisition of an automobile becomes paramount as it provides an unmatched level of freedom that public transit cannot provide especially at 10 p.m., or thereafter, when public transit service is severely limited or non-operational until the following morning; as if nefarious/belligerent people are also not at bus stops and/or train stations too at night.

Lastly, we have a water crisis already and the states of Nevada, Wyoming, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah and California need to cutback and conserve water supplies that are drawn from the Colorado River and elsewhere given that the river flow has shrunk 20 percent.² New housing requires all resources that existing housing already requires and upgrades/replacements to existing underground and aboveground infrastructure to meet the expansion—well the State of California provides no funding for those needs and nor do Californians want to be taxed more to make them happen either.

Given the aforementioned the Arleta Neighborhood Council is forced to select Approach C, Option 2. This state law should have never passed and legislators that supported it are not bound to remain nor sleep in the district they represent or represented at the conclusion of their terms. Yet Angeleno property owners (homeowners, industrial, commercial, multi-family, hybrid type) typically are anchored—for the rest of their lives—to their Angeleno homes and Angeleno businesses with the environment the State of California created.

Respectfully,

The Arleta Neighborhood Council

² Los Angeles Times February 26, 2026. <https://www.latimes.com/environment/newsletter/2026-02-26/boiling-point-things-to-know-colorado-river-crisis>

APPROVED

March 17, 2026

8 Yea 0 No 2 Absent 0 Abstain