Date of Hearing: July 2, 2025

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Matt Haney, Chair
SB 79 (Wiener) – As Amended June 23, 2025

SENATE VOTE: 21-13

SUBJECT: Housing development: transit-oriented development

SUMMARY: Makes housing development an allowable use within a ½ mile radius of a major transit stop, as defined, and allows transit agencies to adopt objective standards for both residential and commercial developments proposed to be constructed on transit-oriented land owned by the transit agency or on which the transit agency has a permanent operating easement. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Defines, for purposes of the bill, the following terms:

   a) "Commuter rail" means a rail transit service not meeting the standards for heavy rail or light rail, excluding California High-Speed Rail and Amtrak Long Distance Service.

   b) "Frequent commuter rail" means a commuter rail service with a total of at least 24 daily trains per weekday across both directions and not meeting the standard for very high or high-frequency commuter rail at any point in the past three years.

   c) "Heavy rail transit" means an electric railway with the capacity for a heavy volume of traffic using high-speed and rapid acceleration passenger rail cars operating singly or in multi-car trains on fixed rails, separate rights-of-way from which all other vehicular and foot traffic are excluded, and high platform loading.

   d) "High-frequency commuter rail" means a commuter rail service operating a total of at least 48 trains per day across both directions at any point in the past three years.

   e) "Housing development project" has the same meaning as defined in the Housing Accountability Act (HAA).

   f) "Light rail transit" includes streetcar, trolley, and tramway service.

   g) "Rail transit" means a rail mass transportation operation usually within an urban area, generally characterized by more frequent service over shorter distances than normally provided by commuter rail service or intercity rail service, and operating on a rail line without any or with very limited rail freight service.

   h) "Residential floor area ratio" means the ratio of net habitable square footage dedicated to residential use to the area of the lot.

   i) "Tier 1 transit-oriented development (TOD) stop" means a TOD stop within an urban transit county served by heavy rail transit or very high frequency commuter rail.

   j) "Tier 2 TOD stop" means a TOD stop within an urban transit county, excluding a Tier 1 TOD stop, served by light rail transit, by high-frequency commuter rail, or by bus service

meeting the separate right-of-way and 15 minutes or less services frequency standards for bus rapid transit specified in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

k) "Tier 3 TOD stop" means a TOD stop within an urban transit county, excluding a Tier 1 or Tier 2 TOD stop, served by frequent commuter rail service or by ferry service; or any TOD stop not within an urban transit county; or any major transit stop otherwise so designated by the applicable authority.

l) "TOD stop" means a major transit stop, which is a site containing any of the following: an existing rail or bus rapid transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 20 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods that is either existing or proposed in a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); which is served by heavy rail transit, very high frequency commuter rail, high frequency commuter rail, light rail transit, bus rapid transit as specified in CEQA, frequent commuter rail service, or ferry service, or otherwise designated by the authority.

m) "Urban transit county" means a county with more than 15 rail stations.

n) "Very high frequency commuter rail" means a commuter rail service with a total of at least 72 trains per day across both directions at any point in the past three years.

2) Requires TOD housing to be an allowable use on any site zoned for residential, mixed-use, or commercial use within ½ or ¼ mile of a transit-oriented stop, if the development complies with the following standards:

a) Within ¼ mile of a Tier 1 TOD stop:

i) Local governments may not impose:

(1) Height limits under 75 feet;

(2) Maximum densities under 120 dwelling units per acre (du/acre); and

(3) Development standards that preclude a residential Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 3.5.

ii) The project is eligible for three additional concessions under Density Bonus Law (DBL), if DBL requirements are met.

b) Within ¼–½ mile of a Tier 1 TOD stop:

i) Local governments may not impose:

(1) Height limits under 65 feet;

(2) Maximum densities under 100 du/acre; and

(3) Development standards that preclude a residential FAR of three.

ii) The project is eligible for two additional concessions under DBL.

c) Within ¼ mile of a Tier 2 TOD stop:

i) Local governments may not impose:

(1) Height limits under 65 feet;

(2) Maximum densities under 100 du/acre; and

(3) Development standards that preclude a residential FAR of 3.

ii) The project is eligible for two additional concessions under DBL.

d) ¼–½ mile of a Tier 2 stop:

i) Local governments may not impose:

(1) Height limits under 55 feet;

(2) Maximum densities under 80 du/acre; and

(3) Development standards that preclude a residential FAR of 2.5.

ii) The project is eligible for one additional concession under DBL.

e) Within ¼ mile of a Tier 3 stop:

i) Local governments may not impose:

(1) Height limits under 55 feet;

(2) Maximum densities under 80 du/acre; and

(3) Development standards that preclude a residential FAR of 2.5.

ii) The project is eligible for one additional concession under DBL.

f) ¼–½ mile of a Tier 3 stop:

i) Local governments may not impose:

(1) Height limits under 45 feet (unless outside an urban transit county, where local limits may apply);

(2) Maximum densities under 60 du/acre; and

(3) Development standards that preclude a residential FAR of 2.

3) Allows a local government to enact and enforce standards, including an inclusionary zoning requirement that applies generally within the jurisdiction, that do not, alone or in concert, prevent achieving the applicable development standards of 2) above.

4) Provides that a transit-oriented housing development project under this section may receive additional density through state DBL or a local density bonus program, using the density allowed under this bill as the base density. However, if a development proposes a height limit under this bill that exceeds the local height limit, then a local government is not required to grant a waiver, incentive, or concession pursuant to DBL for additional height beyond that allowed under this bill, except as specified in DBL.

5) Provides that, notwithstanding any other law, a transit-oriented housing development project that meets any of the eligibility requirements in 2) above and is immediately adjacent to a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 TOD stop shall be eligible for an adjacency intensifier to increase the height limit by an additional 20 feet, the maximum density standards by an addition 40 dwelling units per acre, and the residential FAR by 1.

6) Applies, to any city or county, for purposes of this bill, the provisions of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (HCA) that require a housing development project to create as many units as will be demolished and prohibits approval of a development project that requires the demolition of protected units unless certain conditions are met pursuant to the HCA.

7) Requires, pursuant to the requirements of this bill, a proposed development to:

    a) Comply with the fees or requirements of a local inclusionary ordinance or affordable housing fee; or

    b) Meet the requirements in a local density bonus ordinance or the minimum amount of affordability required for a proposed development to qualify for DBL.

8) Provides that a local government that denies a housing development project meeting the requirements of this bill that is located in a high-resource area shall be presumed to be in violation of the HAA and immediately liable for penalties, specified by HAA, unless the local government demonstrates, pursuant to the standards specified in the HAA, that it has a health, life, or safety reasons for denying the project.

9) Allows a transit agency to adopt objective standards for both residential and commercial developments proposed to be constructed on land owned by the transit agency or on which the transit agency has a permanent operating easement. These standards shall apply to land that is either:

    a) Within ½ mile of a TOD stop, if the land was owned by the transit agency on or before January 1, 2026; or

    b) Adjacent to TOD stop, as defined by the bill.

10) Provides that a local government is not required to approve any height limit established under 9) that is greater than the height limit specified in this bill for development adjacent to the relevant tier of a TOD stop. A transit agency shall not set a maximum height, density, or floor area ratio below that which would be allowed for the site under this bill.

11) Allows the board of a transit agency to vote to designate a major transit stop served by the agency as a Tier 3 TOD stop for the purposes of 9) and 10) above.

12) Provides that a housing development project proposed pursuant to 2) shall be eligible for streamlined ministerial approval pursuant to SB 423 (Wiener), Chapter 778, Statutes of 2023, except that:

    a) The project does not have to be in a jurisdiction that has not met its share of the regional housing needs for that reporting period or in a jurisdiction that did not adopt a compliant housing element; and

    b) The development does not have to be consistent with the object zoning, subdivision, and design review standards in effect at the time that the project is submitted to the local government or at the time a notice of intent was submitted, whichever occurs earlier.

13) Provides that any housing development proposed pursuant to this bill that does not seek streamlined approval under Government Code (GOV) 659134.4 shall be reviewed according to the jurisdiction's development review process and the HAA, except that any local zoning standard conflicting with the requirements of this bill shall not apply.

14) Requires HCD to oversee compliance with this bill, including promulgating standards on how to account for capacity pursuant to this bill in a city or county's inventory of land suitable for residential development pursuant to Housing Element Law.

15) Authorizes regional governments to create a map of TOD stops and zones designated under this bill.

16) Authorizes a local government to enact an ordinance to make its zoning code consistent with the provisions of this bill, which shall be subject to review by HCD. Allows the ordinance to designate areas within ½ mile of a TOD stop as exempt from the provisions of this bill if the local government makes findings supported by substantial evidence that there exists no walking path of less than one mile from that location to the TOD stop. Provides that the adoption of the local ordinance shall not be considered as a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

17) Requires a local government enacting an ordinance, as described in 16), to submit the ordinance to HCD for review, and establishes timeframes for that review process.

18) Allows a local government to enact a local TOD alternative plan (local plan) as an amendment to the Housing Element and Land Use Element of its General Plan, subject to review by HCD.

    a) Requires the local plan to maintain at least the same total increase in feasible zoned capacity, in terms of both total units and residential floor area, as provided by this bill across all TOD zones, as defined, within the jurisdiction. Further provides that:

        i) The local plan shall not reduce the capacity in any TOD zone in total units or residential floor area, by more than 50%;

ii) The local plan shall not reduce the maximum allowed density for any individual site on which the plan allows residential use by more than 50% below that permitted under this bill; and

iii) A site's maximum feasible capacity counted toward the plan shall be no more than 200% of the maximum density established by this bill.

b) Allows a local plan to designate any other major transit stop or stop along a high-quality transit corridor that is not already identified as TOD stop. A local plan consistent solely with adding additional major transit stops as TOD shall be exempt from the requirements of d) below.

c) Allows a local plan to consist of an existing local transit-oriented zoning ordinance, overlay zone, specific plan, or zoning incentive ordinance, provided that it applies to all residential properties within the TOD area and provides at least the same total feasible capacity for units and floor area as 2) above.

d) Requires a local government to submit a local plan to HCD for review prior to enacting the local plan, and requires HCD to assess whether the plan maintains at least an equal feasible developable housing capacity as the baseline well as the plan's effects on fair housing relative to the baseline established, and to recommend changes to remove unnecessary constraints on housing from the plan.

19) Exempts a jurisdiction from 2) above if a local government has a local plan that has been approved by HCD as satisfying the requirements of this bill in effect. HCD's approval pursuant to this subdivision shall be valid through the jurisdiction's Housing Element.

20) Finds and declares that the bill addresses state's housing crisis and is a matter of statewide concern, not a municipal affair, and therefore applies to all cities, including charter cities.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Establishes, pursuant to state Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Law, uniform statewide standards that compel every California jurisdiction to ministerially approve ADUs and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs) on residential lots, by establishing statewide planning standards and review shot clocks, and limiting local discretion. Single-family lots can now have up to three ADUs: one interior or conversion ADU, one detached ADU, and one JADU. Multifamily properties must allow at least one ADU within existing non-livable space (or up to 25 % of the number of existing units), two detached ADUs for new construction projects, and up to eight detached ADUs for existing multifamily buildings, so long as total ADUs do not exceed the number of existing units. (Government Code (GOV) 66310-66342).

2) Requires, pursuant to SB 9 (Atkins), Chapter 161, Statutes of 2021 the streamlined and ministerial approval by a local agency of a duplex in a single family zone (GOV 65852.21), and the urban lot split of a parcel zoned for residential uses into two parcels. (GOV 66411.7)

3) Establishes, pursuant to SB 423 (Wiener), Chapter 778, Statutes of 2023, a streamlined, ministerial approval process for certain infill multifamily affordable housing projects that are

compliant with local zoning and objective standards and that are proposed in local jurisdictions that have not met their regional housing needs allocation. (GOV 65913.4)

4) Establishes, pursuant to AB 2011 (Wicks), Chapter 647, Statutes of 2022, a streamlined, ministerial approval process, not subject to CEQA, for certain infill multifamily affordable housing projects that are located on land that is zoned for retail, office, or parking. (GOV 65912.100-65912.140)

5) Establishes, pursuant to SB 6 (Caballero), Chapter 659, Statutes of 2022, the Middle Class Housing Act of 2022, allowing residential uses on commercially zoned property without requiring a rezoning. (GOV 65852.24)

6) Establishes, pursuant to SB 684 (Caballero), Chapter 783, Statutes of 2023, a ministerial process for the subdivision of a lot to develop up to 10 residential units. (GOV 65852.28)

7) Establishes DBL, which:

   a) Requires local governments to grant a density bonus when an applicant for a housing development, defined as a development containing "five or more residential units, including mixed-use developments," seeks and agrees to construct a project that will contain at least one of the following:

      i) 10% of the total units of a housing development for lower-income households;

      ii) 5% of the total units of a housing development for very low-income households;

      iii) A senior citizen housing development or mobile home park;

      iv) 10% of the units in a common interest development for moderate-income households;

      v) 10% of the total units for transitional foster youth, veterans, or persons experiencing homelessness;

      vi) 20% of the total units for lower-income students in a student housing development; or

      vii) 100% of the units of a housing development for lower-income households, except that 20% of units may be for moderate-income households;

   b) Requires local governments, under DBL, to grant a density bonus ranging from 20% to 50% for rental developments that include a minimum percentage of units affordable to very low-, low-, or moderate-income households, with the bonus increasing on a sliding scale based on the level of affordability provided. For 100% affordable rental developments, the law provides a bonus of up to 80%, along with additional incentives such as increased height limits, reduced parking requirements, and modified development standards if the project is located within ½ mile of a major transit stop or in a low vehicle miles traveled (VMT) area. In certain cases, 100% affordable projects in qualifying areas may be allowed unlimited density;

   c) Permits DBL projects to receive concessions and incentives depending on the percentage of affordable housing included in the proposed development; and

d) Provides that, in no case may a local government apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by DBL. (GOV 65915)

8) Defines "major transit stop" to means a site containing an existing rail or bus rapid transit station, ferry terminal served by either bus or rail transit, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service of 20 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. (Public Resources Code (PRC) 21064.3)

9) Further defines, for purposes of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, a "major transit stop" as a stop meeting the definition in 7), except that it also includes major transit stops included in the applicable regional transportation plans. (PRC 21155)

10) Prohibits a public agency from imposing or enforcing any minimum automobile parking requirements on a residential, commercial, or other development project if the project is located within ½ mile of public transit. (GOV 65863.2)

11) Establishes the following household income categories:

a) Acutely Low Income (ALI), meaning those earning between 0% and 15% of the area median income (AMI);

b) Extremely Low Income (ELI), meaning those earning between 15% and 30% of the AMI;

c) Very Low Income (VLI), meaning those earning between 30% and 50% of the AMI;

d) Lower Income (LI), meaning those earning between 50% and 80% of the AMI;

e) Moderate Income (MI), meaning those earning between 80% and 120% of the AMI; and,

f) Above Moderate Income, meaning those earning more than 120% of the AMI. (GOV 65582)

12) Requires each jurisdiction to prepare and adopt a General Plan, including a housing element, to guide the future growth of a community. The housing element must identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs, including the jurisdiction's share of the RHNA; identify adequate sites with appropriate zoning to meet the housing needs of all income segments of the community; and demonstrate local efforts to remove governmental and nongovernmental constraints that hinder the jurisdiction from meeting its share of the regional housing need, among other requirements. (GOV 65583)

13) Establishes the Housing Accountability Act (HAA), which limits local governments from denying or reducing the density of housing projects that comply with objective standards, unless specific written findings based on health, safety, or state/federal law conflicts are made. (GOV 65589.5)

14) Establishes the "Builder's Remedy," which allows housing developments to bypass local zoning standards in jurisdictions that are out of compliance with Housing Element Law if they meet certain affordability, site, density, and other objective standards. (GOV 65589.5)

15) Establishes the Tenant Protection Act of 2019 (TPA) which prohibits affected cities and counties from approving a project that would demolish existing or recently demolished "protected units" unless the project meets strict replacement and tenant protection requirements. (GOV 66300-66301)

16) Grants the board of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) authority to adopt TOD zoning standards, provided that any housing development meets an affordability threshold of at least 20%. (Public Utilities Code (PUC) 29010.8)

17) Authorizes HCD to enforce state housing laws. (GOV 65585)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

Author's Statement: According to the author, "SB 79 tackles the root causes of California's affordability crisis by allowing more homes to be built near major public transportation stops and on land owned by transit agencies – bolstering transit use, slashing climate emissions, and supporting public transportation in the process.

SB 79 allows more homes near transit in two major ways. First, SB 79 allows for upzoning land for multi-family homes up to 75 feet within a half mile of specified major train stations and bus rapid transit stops. This change will ensure that transit oriented developments (TODs) are feasible and enhance access to transit. Second, SB 79 authorizes local transit agencies to develop on land they own. All TODs under SB 79 are eligible for the streamlined ministerial approvals process under SB 423 (Wiener, 2023) if they meet the law's environmental, labor, and affordability standards.

California needs to build millions of new homes in sustainable locations to meet state housing goals, slash climate emissions, and reduce the cost of living, but overly restrictive zoning codes make building such homes illegal. SB 79 allows building more homes near transit to lower costs for families while bolstering public transit use and supporting cash-strapped transit agencies."

California's Housing Crisis: California's housing crisis is a half-century in the making. [1] After decades of underproduction, supply is far behind demand, and housing and rental costs are soaring. As a result, millions of Californians must make hard decisions about paying for housing at the expense of food, health care, child care, and transportation, directly impacting the quality of life in the state. [2] One in three households in the state doesn't earn enough money to meet their basic needs. [3] In 2024, over 187,000 Californians experienced homelessness on a given night.[4]

To meet this housing need, HCD determined that California must plan for more than 2.5 million new homes, and no less than one million of those homes must be affordable to lower-income households, in the 6th Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) cycle. By contrast, housing

---

[1] California Department of Housing and Community Development, *A Home for Every Californian*: 2022 Statewide Housing Plan. March 2022, https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/94729ab1648d43b1811c1698a748c136
[2] IBID.
[3] IBID.
[4] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Point in Time Counts. https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/ahar/2023-ahar-part-1-pit-estimates-of-homelessness-in-the-us.html

production in the past decade has been under 100,000 units per year – including less than 10,000 units of affordable housing per year.[5] Increasing the overall supply of housing, both market-rate and deed-restricted affordable, is essential to reducing upward pressure on rents and home prices, and to creating a more stable, accessible housing market for Californians across income levels.

The state's housing crisis is not equally experienced by all Californians. Testimony by the UC Berkeley Terner Center to this Committee showed that the impacts of the housing crisis are significantly more severe for lower-income individuals, single-earner households, Black and Latino Californians, younger and older populations, and those who reside in, or aspire to live and work in, the state's highest-cost regions.[6]

California's Statewide Housing Plan: In 2022, HCD released its most recent update to the statutorily required Statewide Housing Plan (Plan). The Plan "lays out a vision to ensure every Californian has a safe, stable, and affordable home."[7] As part of that vision, HCD puts forward a statewide objective of *Producing More Affordable and Climate Smart Housing*. HCD writes:

> "We aim to increase the supply of housing at all affordability levels throughout the state and target production in the places where people need it the most, without displacing existing residents. This objective seeks to facilitate a greater diversity of housing models and typologies, outside of the status quo, to meet California's pressing and diverse housing needs. We must produce new housing in areas with high access to opportunities and services without displacing existing residents, mitigate the risk of climate change while developing new housing units, provide housing units that are affordable to all Californians, lower housing development costs, and continue to enforce existing housing laws to achieve results."[8]

Two of HCD's recommended actions associated with this objective are to:

1) Encourage greater diversity of housing types in all neighborhoods; and

2) Encourage new housing development in existing communities to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and mitigate climate change while simultaneously addressing housing need.

This bill seeks to facilitate the construction climate-smart housing by making housing an allowable use on all parcels within a ½ mile radius of existing TOD stops and transit stops included in a regional transportation plan, with varying development standards, further described below. In doing so, it both encourages a greater diversity of housing types near transit, and encourages climate-smart housing in existing communities. Under this bill, proposed developments would be required to comply with local inclusionary zoning standards, if they exist, or meet the minimum affordability requirements necessary to qualify for DBL for developments containing 10 or more units. This bill also requires proposed developments to comply with the anti-displacement provisions of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (SB 330, Skinner, Chapter 654, Statutes of 2019). Furthermore, under this bill, transit agencies would be authorized to establish development controls to promote residential and commercial development

---

[5] https://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/housing-challenges.shtml
[6] UC Berkeley Terner Center Testimony by Ben Metcalf, Managing Director, at the State Housing Production Legislation: Actions, Outcomes, and Opportunities Informational Hearing, February 12, 2025
[7] https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/94729ab1648d43b1811c1698a748c136
[8] IBID.

on land that they own or have a permanent operating easement on, within a ½ mile of transit or directly adjacent to a transit stop.

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD): TOD refers to compact, pedestrian-oriented development located within walking distance of high-quality public transit. A growing body of academic research points to a range of public benefits associated with TOD, particularly from increasing dense housing options near transit, including reduced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, lower vehicle miles traveled, and greater economic and social inclusion.

However, much of California's urban form reflects a century of auto-centric development, characterized by low-density suburban neighborhoods, wide streets, and land use patterns designed around vehicular access. Despite significant investments in transit infrastructure, ridership remains low across much of the state, and driving continues to dominate travel behavior. This is particularly true outside of dense urban cores, due in part to the lack of housing near high-frequency transit stops and the challenges of first- and last-mile connectivity.

According to a 2024 analysis by the Othering & Belonging Institute at UC Berkeley, a staggering 95.8% of all residential land in California is zoned exclusively for single-family housing, [9] severely constraining opportunities for infill development near transit. Even when lower-density unincorporated areas are excluded, over 82% of residentially zoned land in the state prohibits multifamily housing.[10] The state has taken some strides to facilitate additional housing typologies in exclusionary zoning districts, namely through State ADU Law and SB 9 (Atkins), Chapter 161, Statutes of 2021, effectively making single-family zoned parcels eligible to accommodate up to four dwelling units. However, much of California's residential land remains off-limits for denser development, regardless of how well-situated the land may be when it comes to access to jobs, transportation, and other opportunities.

One way to combat these exclusionary land use trends and discourage sprawling development patterns is to upzone land in infill locations near existing transit stops and job opportunities. Doing so can place more homes, and therefore more people, within easy walking distance of frequent transit. Proximity alone does not always shift travel behavior when parking is generally available, or included with your housing unit, making driving convenient even to those living near high-quality transit. However, when policies like this bill are coupled with complementary efforts such as AB 2097 (Friedman) Chapter 459, Statutes of 2022, which eliminated minimum parking requirements near transit, the effects can be significant. A 2020 UCLA Study by Manville & Pinski found that residents in buildings without bundled parking are substantially more likely to commute without a car, indicating that land use reforms that increase housing near transit and reduce guaranteed parking can lead to meaningful increases in transit ridership and reductions in car dependency.[11] By aligning land use patterns with transit investments, this bill seeks to advance the state's broader goals around climate, housing, and sustainable growth, while maximizing the public return on transit infrastructure spending.

---

[9] https://belonging.berkeley.edu/uc-berkeley-study-staggering-96-california-residential-land-zoned-single-family-housing
[10] IBID.
[11] Manville, M., & Pinski, M. (2020). *Parking behaviour: Bundled parking and travel behavior in American cities.* Land Use Policy, 91**,** 103853. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.02.012

SB 79 Development Standards: SB 79 makes housing development projects near existing and proposed TOD stops an allowable use on sites zoned for residential, mixed, or commercial, development.

TOD Stops: Under the measure, a TOD stop is defined as a major transit stop, excluding any stop served by rail transit with a frequency of fewer than 10 total trains per weekday. This includes sites containing an existing rail or bus rapid transit station, ferry terminals served by either bus or rail transit, or sites at the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service of 20 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. Furthermore, the definition of major transit stop used under this bill includes planned major transit stops, not just existing ones, so long as they are included in the applicable Regional Transportation Plans.

Development Tiers and Standards: There are three tiers of SB 79 TOD stops:

- Tier 1: Transit stops served by heavy rail transit or very high frequency commuter rail;
- Tier 2: Transit stops, excluding Tier 1, served by light rail transit, high-frequency commuter rail, or by bus rapid transit service; and
- Tier 3: Transit stops, excluding Tier 1 and Tier 2, served by frequent commuter rail service or by ferry service.

This bill establishes statewide maximum density, height, and minimum floor area ratio (FAR) standards for TOD, dependent on the transit tier and the proximity of the proposed development to the qualifying transit stop. Developments under this bill are also eligible to use DBL; however, if a project proposes a height above the local height limit, the local government does not have to grant additional height under DBL, unless the proposal is for a 100% affordable housing development. SB 79 projects are considered consistent, compliant, and in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirements, or other similar provision for purposes of the HAA.

SB 79 Development Standards

Location	Distance to Transit Stop (miles)	Max Height (feet)*	Maximum Density (dwelling units per acre (du/ac))	Minimum Residential FAR (du/ac)	Additional DBL Concessions
Tier 1	≤ ¼	75	120	3.5	3
	> ¼ and ≤ ½	65	100	3	2
Tier 2	≤ ¼	65	100	3	2
	> ¼ and ≤ ½	55	80	2.5	1
Tier 3	≤ ¼	55	80	2.5	1
	> ¼ and ≤ ½	45**	60	2	0
Adjacent to transit stop		+20	+20	+1	0

**If the local height limit is greater than SB 79 height, the local height limit applies.*
***Outside of an urban transit county, a local government may instead apply the local height limit.*

Affordability Requirements. Under this bill, proposed developments must comply with any applicable local inclusionary zoning ordinance or affordable housing fee. Where no local requirement exists, projects with 11 or more units must meet the minimum affordability threshold to qualify for DBL or a local density bonus program. For example, under DBL, developments with 11 to 20 units could meet this requirement by providing just one unit affordable to very low-income households.

Compared to previous state housing laws, this baseline affordability standard is relatively modest. AB 2011 requires rental developments to include either 15% lower-income units or a combined 13% very low- and extremely low-income units. SB 423 provides streamlining for projects with 10% affordable units in jurisdictions behind on market-rate goals, or 50% in those falling short on lower-income goals. While DBL starts at 5% for very low-income households, higher thresholds are required to access additional incentives. By comparison, SB 79 allows significantly increased height, density, and FAR in transit-served areas, and extra concessions, with a baseline affordability requirement of just 5%, unless a local requirement already exists.

This bill's minimal baseline affordability requirement may be viewed as a way to preserve financial feasibility in jurisdictions that do not currently impose affordability mandates. This approach may be particularly relevant in areas where rents are low or land values have not historically supported on-site affordable housing developments without public subsidy. SB 79 would operate statewide, and its development standards apply uniformly across regions with different housing markets, land costs, and economic outlooks. From that perspective, establishing a low default requirement may be an effort to avoid discouraging development in lower-cost areas where economics are especially sensitive to added requirements. Critics of inclusionary zoning policies maintain that the cost of the affordable units is ultimately passed on to market-rate renters of the future building, not borne by developers. Research shows that even modest inclusionary requirements can suppress market-rate housing production in lower-rent submarkets if not paired with meaningful incentives or subsidies.[12] Recent studies similarly emphasize the importance of calibrating affordability requirements to local conditions to avoid deterring investment. Striking the right balance between affordability and feasibility is particularly challenging in a statewide framework, where a single statutory threshold must account for significant variation in local market conditions.

This tension is especially salient given the high cost of housing production in California. The Terner Center notes that construction costs have been driven up by inflation, high interest rates, labor shortages, and supply chain disruptions, all of which constrain access to capital and raise the financial risk for new housing proposals. A 2025 study found that California is the most expensive state for multifamily housing development, due in part to the extended timeline for project approval, more than 22 months longer than in Texas, which is strongly correlated with higher costs.[13] These dynamics underscore the challenge of securing deeper affordability without undermining financial feasibility, particularly for smaller projects or those in weaker markets.

---

[12] Phillips, S. (2024, April). *Modeling inclusionary zoning's impact on housing production in Los Angeles: Tradeoffs and policy implications*. Terner Center for Housing Innovation. https://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Inclusionary-Zoning-Paper-April-2024-Final.pdf

[13] Ward, J. M., & Schlake, L. (2025). *The high cost of producing multifamily housing in California: Evidence and policy recommendations* (Report No. RRA3743-1). RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA3743-1.html (rand.org)

At the same time, the scale of increased development capacity and incentives in SB 79 raises the question of whether stronger affordability standards are warranted, particularly in areas where land values are expected to rise as a result of upzoning. Many transit-served areas affected by the bill are located in historically underserved neighborhoods, where residents have faced decades of underinvestment and exclusion from economic opportunity. To promote equitable outcomes, the Committee may wish to consider how the bill's affordability requirements can be tailored to ensure that increased development capacity translates into meaningful access to new housing for low-income households across regions.

One potential refinement the Committee may wish to consider is to align SB 79's affordability requirement with the income tiers adopted in AB 1893 (Wicks) Chapter 268, Statutes of 2024, which allow a project to satisfy its obligation by providing 7% of units for extremely low income households, 10% for very low income households, or 13% for lower income households. To maintain financial feasibility for smaller developments, this requirement could only be applied to proposed developments containing more than 10 units. By using the AB 1893 affordability requirements, or the requirements under a local inclusionary ordinance, whichever is higher, this structure would allow some flexibility while ensuring that the public benefit better reflects the increased development capacity and concessions conferred by this bill.

Density near Transit. One goal of SB 79 is to facilitate greater housing production near high-quality transit, recognizing that these locations are well suited to accommodate infill development that advances the state's climate and equity goals. This bill aims to increase transit ridership by increasing the number of people living within walking distance. To that end, SB 79 establishes generous maximum height, density, and minimum FAR standards in three tiers of transit-served areas, aiming to expand the buildable envelope and reduce regulatory constraints to encourage denser housing forms.

However, as currently written, the bill includes no minimum density threshold or unit size parameters, leaving open the possibility that well-located, transit-accessible sites could be developed with relatively few, large units. Without a floor on density or guidance on unit sizing, the enhanced development standards envisioned in the bill could be used to produce projects that do not meaningfully advance the state's housing supply goals. Under SB 79, a local government would be unable to deny or revise a proposal to build a minimal density project, e.g., a duplex that complies with SB 79's objective standards, regardless of the underlying lot size.

Given the limited availability of land near high-frequency transit, the long-term nature of most residential construction, and the state's interest in meaningfully increasing housing production in transit-served areas, there is a strong policy rationale to ensure that SB 79 projects maximize their potential to deliver new homes. There are already existing tools established by the state that developers can use to build smaller multifamily housing typologies ranging from 1-4 units in residential areas, regardless of local zoning requirements, like ADUs and SB 9. Furthermore, some local governments may already have minimum density requirements that SB 79, as currently written, could inadvertently supersede.

To help ensure the bill fulfills its intended purpose, the Committee may wish to consider establishing a minimum density requirement. One option would be to require that projects

include the greater of: (1) five residential units; (2) a minimum density of 30 dwelling units per acre (the "mullin density" under Housing Element Law in urban areas); or (3) the minimum density allowed under local zoning, if applicable. This would help avoid the development of extremely low-yield proposals on well-located, transit-oriented sites.

The Committee may also wish to refine how the bill's additional DBL concessions are awarded. SB 79 currently allows up to three additional concessions for qualifying projects, simply for being SB 79 developments using DBL. While DBL concessions are often critical to helping a project pencil out and to accommodating denser developments with an affordable housing component on sites with local zoning regulations that might otherwise preclude them, it is not clear that all developments should be conferred these concessions, especially if they are not nearing the maximum density established by this bill. These concessions could be better targeted by tying eligibility to a project's density, rather than simply its location. For example, the bill could require projects to achieve a minimum density within the top quartile of the applicable tier's maximum, such that a project on a Tier 1 site with a 120 dwelling unit per acre maximum would need to reach at least 90 dwelling units per acre to qualify for all three concessions. This would create a clear incentive for higher-density development while preserving the existing structure of the bill.

Finally, to discourage proposals composed of only a few very large units, the bill could include a modest cap on average unit size. A reasonable limit, such as 1,750 square feet of net habitable floor area, as was done in SB 684 (Caballero), Chapter 783, Statutes of 2023, would maintain flexibility in unit mix while helping ensure that housing capacity on transit-rich sites is meaningfully utilized. This could also help to promote more affordability by design. Together, these amendments would strengthen the connection between the bill's stated goals and the outcomes it produces, encouraging appropriately scaled development near transit while remaining sensitive to local variation in project type and market demand.

Tenant Protections and Anti-Displacement Measures. All proposed developments under this bill must comply with the anti-displacement provisions in the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (HCA), established by SB 330 (Skinner), Chapter 654, Statutes of 2019. The HCA provisions prohibit cities and counties from approving a project that would demolish existing or recently demolished "protected units" unless the project meets strict replacement and tenant protection requirements. A "protected unit" includes any dwelling unit that was (1) subject to a recorded affordability covenant, (2) covered by rent or price controls, (3) occupied by lower-income households within the past five years, or (4) withdrawn from the market under the Ellis Act in the past ten years. Unless a narrow statutory exemption applies, every protected unit must be replaced on a one-for-one basis with a unit of equal bedroom count.

Under the HCA, if the original unit was occupied by a lower-income household in the past five years, deed-restricted affordable, or withdrawn under the Ellis Act within the past ten years, the replacement must also be deed-restricted for at least 55 years (rentals) or 45 years (ownership) at an equivalent or deeper affordability level. In contrast, if the unit was only subject to rent control and occupied by a moderate- or higher-income tenant, the local government may allow the replacement to be regulated under the same rent-control ordinance, without a new deed restriction and often at a new market-rate price.

If any protected units are occupied by lower-income households at the time of application, the developer must allow them to remain until no more than six months before construction begins,

provide relocation assistance, and offer a right of first refusal to a comparable, deed-restricted unit when the project is completed. Should the project be abandoned and the site re-rented, displaced tenants must be allowed to return at their prior rent. In doing so, the HCA establishes a strong tenant protection and anti-displacement framework.

Research indicates that a multi-pronged strategy is most effective at addressing displacement. While new housing supply, particularly market-rate housing, can reduce displacement and exclusion pressures in some contexts in the long term, [14] it is insufficient on its own and may even exacerbate out-migration in hot markets.[15] Inclusionary zoning, which requires a share of new development to be affordable, has shown promise in increasing access to opportunity and mitigating exclusion.[16] Demolition controls, especially those that regulate the loss of rent-stabilized or affordable units, can help preserve the existing stock that low-income households rely on.[17] Together, these tools (expanded housing supply across income levels, affordability requirements, and regulations on demolition) can work in concert to stabilize communities and protect vulnerable residents from displacement.

Even with the strong tenant protections embedded in the HCA, some stakeholders maintain that a statewide upzoning bill like this should go further by explicitly prohibiting the demolition of rent-controlled and rent-stabilized units. This is because the HCA does not prevent all such demolitions; it allows protected units to be demolished and replaced so long as the jurisdiction verifies compliance with replacement standards. As a result, the rent-controlled replacement unit may return to the market at a higher rent once a new tenant moves in, particularly in vacancy decontrol jurisdictions, potentially diminishing long-term affordability. Furthermore, for protected units not currently occupied by lower-income households, key tenant protections like relocation assistance and a right of return do not apply, meaning that demolition of rent-controlled units may still lead to displacement, even if compliant with the HCA.

A demolition prohibition for rent-controlled and rent-stabilized housing, including units under AB 1482 (Chiu), Chapter 597, Statutes of 2019, could offer a stronger safeguard in communities where rent-stabilized units make up a critical share of the affordable housing stock. Many of these units are not deed-restricted affordable, but nonetheless provide stable below-market rents, particularly for long-term tenants. In high-opportunity or transit-rich areas slated for upzoning, the risk that these homes will be replaced by higher-cost units, even under a rent-control ordinance, raises equity concerns, especially for tenants unlikely to afford new construction rents. A narrowly tailored demolition restriction could serve as a complementary strategy to support neighborhood stability, while still allowing new development on underutilized residential sites and non-residential parcels. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to consider adding language to ensure that any local demolition and anti-displacement can continue to be enforced.

---

[14] Chapple, K., & Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (2021, February 28). *White paper on anti-displacement strategy effectiveness* (Agreement No. 19RD018). California Air Resources Board.
[15] Chapple, K., & Song, T. (2024). Can new housing supply mitigate displacement and exclusion? Evidence from Los Angeles and San Francisco. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2024.2319293
[16] Chapple, K., & Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (2021)
[17] IBID.

SB 35/423. This bill makes transit-oriented housing developments an allowable use and does not provide a blanket exemption from CEQA. However, qualifying developments may use the streamlined ministerial approvals process under SB 423 (Wiener, 2023) if they meet the law's environmental, labor, and affordability standards, and with some notable differences. Under this bill, SB 79 developments:

- Do not have to be in a jurisdiction subject to SB 35/423 streamlining, meaning that SB 35/423 can be used to provide a CEQA exemption even in jurisdictions that are on track to meet their RHNA targets; and

- Do not have to be consistent with objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards in effect at the time that the development is submitted to the local government.

Transit Agency Land. This bill also allows a transit agency to adopt objective standards for residential and commercial developments proposed on land it owns, or on which it holds a permanent operating easement, if the property is located within ½ mile of a TOD stop. This provision applies to land owned by the agency as of January 1, 2026, or land that is immediately adjacent to a TOD stop. The standards adopted by the transit agency must be objective and may not establish a maximum height, density, or FAR lower than what would otherwise be permitted under the bill.

The bill does not compel local governments to approve development standards that exceed those otherwise applicable under SB 79, but it provides transit agencies with the ability to set consistent or more permissive standards on their land. Additionally, a transit agency's board may vote to designate a TOD stop it serves as a Tier 3 stop for purposes of applying these provisions. In doing so, this bill seeks to increase residential and commercial development on land within walking distance to transit, in an effort to boost access to transit and increase ridership.

This approach builds on the framework established by AB 2923 (Chiu), Chapter 1000, Statutes of 2018, which authorized the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to implement its own TOD zoning on land owned by BART within a ½ mile radius of a transit station. A stated goal of AB 2923 was to help BART achieve its goal of enabling up to 20,000 new homes, including at least 7,000 affordable units, on BART-owned land. In contrast, SB 79 extends similar land use authority to additional transit agencies, but does not require the developments to be mixed-use with an affordable housing component. Instead, transit agencies under SB 79 could propose 100% commercial projects if the agency deems it advantageous for ridership or revenue.

Housing Elements and Local Land Use Authority. Planning for and approving new housing is primarily a local responsibility. The California Constitution allows cities and counties to "make and enforce within [their] limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws." It is from this fundamental authority, commonly called the police power, that cities and counties derive the ability to regulate behavior in order to preserve the public's health, safety, and welfare, including through land use regulation. Cities and counties exercise this land use authority through zoning regulations that shape and limit development, such as maximum housing densities, height limits, required setbacks, minimum parking requirements, and maximum lot coverage ratios. These ordinances can also impose conditions on development to address aesthetics, potential community impacts, or other site-specific considerations.

While local governments do not typically build housing, the restrictions they impose on new housing production have contributed to the state's severe housing shortage and sprawling land use patterns. Historically housing supply closely followed market demand. However, this alignment shifted with the emergence of local zoning, which became widespread just over a century ago. The most prominent form of zoning in California limits development to single-family homes on large lots.[18] This type of zoning effectively locks in low density, regardless of the actual demand for housing, even as that demand now exceeds millions of additional homes across the state. This mismatch drives up home prices and values, which benefits existing homeowners, who are disproportionately white.[19] At the same time, rising housing costs disproportionately harm communities of color, who are less likely to have generational wealth, own property, or afford escalating rents. [20]

Approximately every eight years, all jurisdictions in California are required to update the Housing Element of their General Plan, setting forth a blueprint for how they will meet the housing needs of current and future residents at all income levels. A key component of the Housing Element is the sites inventory, where jurisdictions must identify parcels with the potential to accommodate housing development that meets their share of the state-mandated RHNA. Jurisdictions must demonstrate that these sites are realistically developable, particularly for lower-income housing, and often must complete rezoning to allow for higher densities of residential uses if their existing zoning is insufficient. This process is overseen by HCD, which reviews and certifies Housing Elements for compliance with state law.

California is currently in its 6th Housing Element cycle. In this cycle, HCD determined that the state must plan for the development of 2.5 million new homes, including more than one million affordable homes. This has prompted an unprecedented volume of rezoning at the local level. However, housing advocates argue that significant improvements are still needed in the Housing Element review and rezoning process. For example, the City of Los Angeles' recent rezoning effort to accommodate over 250,000 new homes has drawn substantial criticism. Despite the fact that single-family neighborhoods make up the majority of the city's residential land, the plan largely excluded those areas from upzoning. Instead, much of the rezoning was concentrated in already dense, transit-rich, multifamily areas, particularly downtown and along commercial corridors. Critics contend that this approach perpetuates racial and economic segregation, misses an opportunity to equitably distribute growth, and places disproportionate pressure on communities that have historically borne the brunt of inequitable planning decisions.

In response to the lack of progress at the local level, the state has taken an increasingly active role in expanding housing opportunities regardless of the underlying zoning. Recent legislative efforts have made ADUs allowable uses in any residential zone, allowed up to four residential units on single-family parcels (SB 9), allowed for up to 10 units to be built on vacant parcels in single-family areas (SB 684), allowed for dense development along commercial corridors (AB 2011), and provided a streamlined and ministerial review process for housing developments in

---

[18] UC Berkeley Terner Center, 2018, *Land Use in California* survey of cities and counties: https://californialanduse.org/
[19] UC Berkeley Terner Center, 2018, *Land Use in California* survey of cities and counties: https://californialanduse.org/
[20] Bhutta et al, 2020, *Disparities in Wealth by Race and Ethnicity in the 2019 Survey of Consumer Finances*, US Federal Reserve: https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/notes/feds-notes/disparities-in-wealth-by-race-and-ethnicity-in-the-2019-survey-of-consumer-finances-20200928.htm

jurisdictions falling short of their RHNA targets (SB 35/423), among many others. Some local governments contend that these statewide upzoning efforts may run counter to their locally crafted plans. This bill furthers that trend by making housing an allowable use within a ½ mile of transit, and overriding local development standards as they pertain to density, FAR, and height limits.

The bill allows jurisdictions to adopt a local ordinance aligning their zoning code with SB 79's provisions, subject to review by HCD. Local governments may also exempt areas from SB 79's requirements if they make findings, supported by substantial evidence, that no walking path of less than one mile exists between a site and the qualifying TOD stop.

SB 79 also provides local governments with additional flexibility to implement the upzoning near transit provisions. Jurisdictions may adopt a local TOD alternative plan as an amendment to their Housing and Land Use Elements, also subject to HCD review. Such a plan must include all residential sites within TOD areas and maintain at least the same total "feasible zoned capacity," in terms of both total units and residential floor area, as provided under SB 79. The plan may not reduce capacity by more than 50% in any TOD zone, and cannot count inflated density above 200% of what SB 79 otherwise allows. Before adopting the plan, jurisdictions must submit draft zoning amendments, objective design standards, and a feasibility and fair housing analysis for HCD's review. If approved, the alternative plan exempts the jurisdiction from SB 79's default standards through the next Housing Element update.

While this option exists to provide added flexibility to local governments, updating a Housing Element is a significant undertaking that requires technical analysis, public engagement, and formal adoption procedures. This includes getting buy-in from the community, appointed, and elected officials. It is also subject to legal challenge, particularly if HCD determines the plan does not meet statutory requirements or if stakeholders disagree with the local government's findings. As a result, jurisdictions may find it more feasible and palatable to implement the local option provided by SB 79 through a local ordinance update, rather than a full mid-cycle general plan amendment.

Arguments in Support: Supporters of this bill, including co-sponsors Bay Area Council, California YIMBY, Greenbelt Alliance, SPUR, Streets for All, as well as various local housing and transit advocacy organizations, argue that SB 79 will help address California's housing and climate crises by enabling more housing near high-quality transit. They emphasize that allowing denser development in transit-rich areas can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, lower household transportation costs, and expand access to opportunity. Supporters also highlight the bill's potential to strengthen public transit systems by increasing ridership and housing options for workers, and note that it preserves local inclusionary zoning and CEQA compliance while providing jurisdictions with flexibility through alternative TOD plans.

Arguments in Opposition: Opponents of this bill, including equity-focused nonprofits, tenant advocacy groups, and local governments, express concern that SB 79 lacks adequate safeguards to prevent displacement, preserve affordability, and maintain local planning authority. Equity groups argue the bill could enable redevelopment of rent-controlled or low-cost housing near transit without sufficient tenant protections or affordability requirements, particularly given the scale of upzoning it allows. Some also contend that SB 79 would undercut more ambitious local programs, like Los Angeles's TOC incentives, while failing to deliver comparable affordability benefits. Local governments oppose bill for overriding local housing elements and planning

processes, and for giving transit agencies broad land use authority without guarantees that housing will be produced. Opponents call for amendments to strengthen affordability standards, require tenant protections, and better align the bill with local planning efforts.

Committee Amendments: The Committee may wish to consider the following amendments:

1) **Minimum Density.** Establishing a minimum density so that SB 79 projects must include the greater of: at least 5 units, a density of 30 du/acre, or the minimum density allowed under local zoning (if applicable).

2) **Concession Structure.** Require SB 79 developments to achieve a density within the top quartile of the allowable maximum density in order to access the 1-3 additional concessions under DBL.

3) **Average Unit Size.** Specify that the average total area of floorspace for the proposed units in an SB 79 development shall not exceed 1,750 net habitable square feet.

4) **Affordability.** Strike the requirement to achieve the minimum density required under DBL or a local density bonus ordinance, and instead require an SB 79 project to either achieve the affordability requirements under a local inclusionary ordinance, or the following affordability requirements, whichever is provides a higher or deeper affordability level:

    a) 7% of the units affordable to ELI households;

    b) 10% of the units affordable to VLI households; or

    c) 13% of the units affordable to LI households.

5) **Demolition Protection.**

    a) Add language allowing local governments to enforce any local anti-displacement or demolition protections established by a local ordinance;

    b) Clarify that local governments may implement any anti-displacement requirements under SB 330 in accordance with local procedures; and

    c) Prohibit SB 79 developments from being located on either of the following:

        i) A site containing more than two units where the development would require the demolition of housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power that has been occupied by tenants within the past 5 years; and

        ii) A site that was previously used for more than two units of housing that were demolished within 5 years before the development proponent submits an SB 79 application and any of the units were subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power.

6) **Transit Stop Measurement.** Specify that the distance to a transit-oriented development stop is measured in a straight line from the nearest edge of the parcel containing the proposed

project to any point on the parcel or parcels that make up the property upon which a TOD stop is located.

7) **Density Bonus Clarification.** Clarify the language allowing SB 79 developments to use DBL.

Related Legislation:

SB 50 (Wiener) of 2020 would have established a streamlined, ministerial approval process for "neighborhood multifamily projects" in "job-rich" or "transit-rich" areas. The bill failed on the Senate Floor.

SB 827 (Wiener) of 2018 would have preempted local land use requirements for a "transit-rich housing project" near certain transit stops. The bill was held in the Senate Committee process.

AB 2923 (Chiu), Chapter 1000, Statutes of 2018, gave BART the ability to adopt TOD zoning standards to facilitate housing development on BART-owned land.

Double-referred: This bill was also referred to the Assembly Committee on Local Government where it will be heard should it pass out of this Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

21st Century Alliance
AARP
Abundance Network
Abundant Housing LA
Accelerate Neighborhood Climate Action
Active San Gabriel Valley
Alexander Pedersen - Vice Mayor, Capitola
All Voting Members of the North Westwood Neighborhood Council
Bay Area Council
Bike Culver City
Bike East Bay
Bike Long Beach
Brian Barnacle, Council Member - Petaluma City
CalBike
California Apartment Association
California Community Builders
California Council for Affordable Housing (CCAH)
California Democratic Party Rural Caucus
California YIMBY
Car-Lite Long Beach
Casey Glaubman, Councilmember of Mount Shasta
Central Valley Urban Institute
Chico Councilmember Addison Winslow
Circulate San Diego

City of Emeryville
City of Malibu
City of Santa Monica
Climate Action Campaign
Costa Mesa Alliance for Better Streets
Culver City Democratic Club
East Bay for Everyone
East Bay YIMBY
Eastside Housing for All
Emily Ramos - Vice Mayor, Mountain View
Everybody's Long Beach
Families for Safe Streets San Diego
Fieldstead and Company
Fremont for Everyone
Generation Housing
Glendale YIMBY
Greenbelt Alliance
Grow the Richmond
House Sacramento
Housing Action Coalition
Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County
Housing Trust Silicon Valley
Inclusive Lafayette
James Coleman, Councilmember - City of South San Francisco
Jed Leano, Councilmember - Claremont City
Jesse Zwick, Councilmember - City of Santa Monica
Laura Nakamura - Vice Mayor, Concord
LISC San Diego
Lucas Ramirez, Councilmember - City of Mountain View
Mark Dinan - Vice Mayor, East Palo Alto
Matthew Solomon, Councilmember - Emeryville
Mountain View YIMBY
Napa-Solano for Everyone
Natural Resources Defense Council
Northern Neighbors
Pathway to Tomorrow
Peninsula for Everyone
People for Housing - Orange County
People for Housing OC
People for Housing Orange County
Phoebe Shin Venkat - Councilmember, Foster City
Rashi Kesarwani, Councilmember - City of Berkeley
Rebecca Saltzman, Councilmember - El Cerrito
Redlands YIMBY
Remake Irvine Streets for Everyone (RISE)
Ride San Diego
San Bernardino County Young Democrats
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
San Fernando Valley for All

San Francisco YIMBY
Santa Cruz YIMBY
Santa Rosa YIMBY
Sergio Lopez - Mayor, Campbell
SloCo YIMBY
South Bay YIMBY
SPUR
State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond
Streets are for Everyone
Streets for All
Strong Towns Poway & SB
Strong Towns Santa Barbara
Student Homes Coalition
SV@Home Action Fund
The San Fernando Valley Young Democrats
The Two Hundred
USGBC California
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Ventura County YIMBY
Walk San Francisco
Walk San Francisco Foundation
Westside for Everyone
YIMBY Action
YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County
YIMBY Los Angeles
Zach Hilton, Councilmember - City of Gilroy
Zillow Group
Individuals (2)

Opposition

Albany Neighbors United
Baldwin Hills Estates HOA
Brentwood Homeowners Association
Build Affordable Faster CA
Burbank City Council
California Cities for Local Control
California Contract Cities Association
Carlsbad Citizens for Community Oversight (C2O)
Catalysts for Local Control
Cheviot Hills (Los Angeles) Neighborhood Association
Citizen Marin
Citizens Preserving Venice
City of Artesia
City of Bakersfield
City of Bell
City of Bellflower
City of Beverly Hills
City of Coalinga

City of Commerce
City of Corona
City of Cudahy
City of Del Mar
City of Downey
City of Encinitas
City of Fullerton
City of Hesperia
City of Huntington Beach
City of Inglewood
City of Inglewood City Hall
City of LA Mirada
City of Lafayette
City of Laguna Beach
City of Lakewood
City of Mission Viejo
City of Modesto
City of Moorpark
City of Morgan Hill
City of Morro Bay
City of Murrieta
City of Newport Beach
City of Norwalk
City of Oceanside
City of Orange
City of Orinda
City of Palo Alto
City of Paramount
City of Pico Rivera
City of Pleasanton
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
City of Redlands
City of Santa Ana
City of South Gate
City of Sunnyvale
City of Vernon
City of Visalia
City of Whittier
Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council
Comstock Hills Homeowners Association
Cow Hollow Association
Crescenta Highlands Neighborhood Association 2025
Crescenta Valley Community Association 2025
Encino Property Owners Association
Equitable Land Use Alliance (ELUA)
Friends of Loma Alta Creek
Friends of Sunset Park
Glendale Homeowners Coordinating Council
Grayburn Avenue Block Club

Hancock Park Homeowners Association, Est. 1948
Hills2000_friends of the Hills
Hollywoodland Homeowners Association, United Neighborhoods
Indivisible Marin
Jordan Park Neighborhood Association
LA Brea Hancock Homeowners Association
Larchmont United Neighborhood Association
League of California Cities
Livable Mountain View
Los Feliz Improvement Association
Mayor's and Councilmembers'' Association of Sonoma County Legislative Committee
Miracle Mile Residential Association
Mission Street Neighbors
Neighborhoods United Sf
Neighbors for a Better California
Neighbors for a Better San Diego
New Livable California Dba Livable California
No 710 Action Committee
One Voice Westchester
Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Palisades Community Council
Park LA Brea Impacted Residents Group (PLBIRG)
Rancho Verdugo Estates HOA
San Diego Association of Governments
San Francisco Tenants Union
Save Lafayette
Save Osage
Save Sacramento Neighborhoods
Shadow Hills Property Owners Association
Sherman Oaks Chamber of Commerce
Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association
Small Business Forward
South Carthay Neighborhood Association
South Pasadena Preservation Foundation
Spaulding Square Historical Preservation Overlay Zone
Sun - Sunset United Neighbors
Sunnyvale United Neighbors
Sunset Square Neighborhood Organization
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
United Neighbors
Village At Sherman Oaks Business Improvement District
Wake Up California
West Hills Neighborhood Council
West of Westwood Homeowners Association
West Toluca Lake Residents Association
West Torrance Homeowners Association
Westside Regional Alliance of Councils
Westwood Gardens Civic Association, INC.
Westwood Hills Property Owners Association

Westwood Homeowners Association
Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. Homeowners Association
Wilshire Montana Neighborhood Coalition

Individuals (300)

Oppose Unless Amended

Alliance for Community Transit-Los Angeles (ACT-LA)
Butterfield-Riviera East Community Association
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Communities for a Better Environment
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Disability Rights California
East Bay Housing Organizations
Elder Law and Disability Rights Center
Esperanza Community Housing Corporation
HOMEY
Housing California
Kennedy Commission
LA Forward
Lafayette Homeowners Council
Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability
Little Tokyo Service Center
Long Beach Forward
Mental Health Advocacy Services
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles
PODER SF
Protect Point Loma
Public Advocates
Public Counsel
Public Interest Law Project
Public Law Center
Race & Equity in All Planning Coalition
Rise Economy
Sacred Heart Community Service
Santa Monicans for Renters' Rights
South Bay Community Land Trust
Southeast Asian Community Alliance
Strategic Actions for a Just Economy
Urban Habitat
Western Center on Law & Poverty
Young Community Developers

Analysis Prepared by: Dori Ganetsos / H. & C.D. / (916) 319-2085