

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1740
Author: Zbur (D), et al.
Amended: 7/2/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/23/26
AYES: Becker, Seyarto, Allen, Cabaldon, Grove, Laird, Stern

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 7/1/26
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Coastal resources: local coastal program: coastal development
permits: City of Santa Monica

SOURCE: City of Santa Monica
Streets for All

DIGEST: This bill requires the City of Santa Monica (City) to submit a complete proposed local coastal program (LCP) to the California Coastal Commission (commission) by January 1, 2029, and requires the commission to act on the proposal within six months, as provided. The bill would further require accelerated permitting for the conversion of certain roadways to active transportation uses in the coastal zone, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes, pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Coastal Act), the commission in the California Natural Resources Agency.

- 2) Includes legislative findings and declarations that the goals of the state for the coastal zone are to:
 - a) Protect, maintain, enhance, and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and artificial resources;
 - b) Ensure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources;
 - c) Maximize public access to and public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with resources conservation principles and rights of private property owners;
 - d) Ensure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast;
 - e) Encourage state and local initiatives and cooperation to implement coordinated planning and development for mutually beneficial uses; and
 - f) Anticipate, assess, plan for, and minimize or mitigate adverse environmental and economic effects of sea level rise. (Public Resources Code (PRC) §30001.5)
- 3) Requires each local government in the coastal zone to prepare a LCP for that portion of the coastal zone within its jurisdiction, as provided. Requires the precise content of each LCP to be determined by the local government in full consultation with the commission and full public participation. (PRC §30500)
- 4) Establishes a process through which a LCP may be amended by a local government including mechanisms by which amendments may be determined as minor or requiring rapid action and thereby not subject to normal review. (PRC §30501, 30514)
- 5) Authorizes the executive director of the commission to determine that an LCP amendment is *de minimis* if the director determines the amendment:
 - a) Would have no impact on coastal resources;
 - b) Is consistent with the Coastal Act's resources planning and management policies;
 - c) Does not propose any change in land use, water use, or the allowable use of property; and

- d) The local government has provided public notice at least 21 days prior to submission of the amendment to accept public comments on the proposed amendments.
- 6) Requires that *de minimis* amendments must be noticed in the agenda of the next regularly scheduled meeting of the commission, and, if three or more members of the commission do not object to the determination, the amendment shall become part of the LCP ten days after the meeting. (PRC §30514)
- 7) Requires a person planning to perform or undertake any development in the coastal zone to obtain a coastal development permit (CDP) from the commission or local government enforcing a certified LCP. (PRC §30600)
- 8) Prohibits the commission from exercising its review authority over any new development within the area to which the certified LCP, or any portion thereof, applies. (PRC §30519)
- 9) Provides that an application by a local government to convert an existing motorized vehicle traffic lane into a dedicated bicycle lane, dedicated transit lane, or a pedestrian walkway shall not require a traffic study for the processing of either a CDP or an amendment to a LCP, as provided. (PRC §30610.91)
- 10) Provides that an amendment to a LCP to authorize the conversion of an existing motorized vehicle travel lane into a dedicated bicycle lane, dedicated transit lane, or a pedestrian walkway within the developed portion of an existing road right-of-way shall be processed through a *de minimis* review if the commission's executive director determines that the project will provide additional public access benefits, as provided. (PRC §30610.91)

This bill:

- 1) On or before January 1, 2029, requires the City to submit to the commission a complete, proposed LCP for the portion of the City in the coastal zone.
 - a) Requires the commission to act within six months of the receipt of a submitted complete proposal, unless the City requests an extension. Require the proposed LCP to be processed as provided.
- 2) Requires the commission, within 45 days of receipt of a complete, proposed LCP from the City, to provide the City, in writing, a list of identified issues, if any, that require further refinement through suggested modifications for the LCP to be found consistent with the Coastal Act.

- 3) Requires the City and the commission, following receipt of the commission's list of issues, to coordinate expeditiously and in good faith to reach agreement on any suggested modifications within six months of receipt of the submitted complete proposal.
 - a) Requires the commission, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to reimburse the City for reasonable costs associated with the time spent coordinating on the suggested modifications, if the commission fails to act on the city's submitted complete LCP within six months of receipt.
 - b) Requires the commission to provide quarterly written updates to the Legislature describing the reasons for the delay, a summary of the remaining steps necessary to place the LCP on the commission's meeting agenda, and an estimated timeline for approval and certification of the City's LCP if the commission fails to act on the City's complete, proposed LCP within six months of receipt unless the City asks for an extension.
- 4) Requires the City to immediately assume CDP issuance authority subsequent to the effective certification of the City's LCP and acceptance of the LCP by the City, as provided.
- 5) States legislative intent to expedite the provision of safe, multimodal travel within urbanized areas of the coastal zone for the purpose of increasing public access, limiting vehicle miles traveled, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, as specified.
- 6) Recasts the requirement that a traffic study not be included in an application for a CDP or LCP amendment to convert an existing motorized vehicle travel lane into a dedicated bicycle lane, dedicated transit land, or a pedestrian walkway.
- 7) Modifies the requirement that a LCP amendment be processed as *de minimis* by the commission executive director for a proposal to convert the developed portion of an existing road right-of-way into a bicycle right-of-way, transit right-of-way, or pedestrian walkway to include both part or all of the developed portion and a combination of the new uses, as specified, and that the proposal will provide commensurate or enhanced public access to the coast.
 - a) Requires the commission executive director in making the *de minimis* determination to consider the public access benefits of enhanced transit infrastructure, and bicycle and pedestrian access. Require that projects

removing public parking are not precluded from being eligible for *de minimis* processing.

- 8) Requires the commission executive director to waive the CDP requirement for an application for a CDP to convert part or all of the developed portion of an existing road right-of-way that is not a state highway into a bicycle right-of-way, transit right-of-way, pedestrian walkway or a combination thereof, if the executive director determines that, on balance, the project will provide commensurate or enhanced public access to the coast.
 - a) Requires the commission executive director in making the determination to waive the CDP requirement to consider the public access benefits of enhanced transit infrastructure, and bicycle and pedestrian access. Require that projects removing public parking are not precluded from being eligible for *de minimis* processing.
- 9) Requires the commission executive director to maintain and make available for public review records of all applications submitted pursuant to 7) and 8).
 - a) On or before January 31 or each year, requires the commission to post on its internet website and transmit a legislative report for the preceding calendar year that includes, at a minimum, all of the following:
 - i) The total number of applications received pursuant to 7) and 8) and the relevant application numbers.
 - ii) The number of applications where a CDP was waived, including a brief project description and the basis for the determination, as provided.
 - iii) The number of applications denied a CDP waiver and the reason for the denial.
 - iv) The number of applications pending review as of December 31 of the reporting year.
 - v) Any geographic or jurisdictional patterns identified in the distribution of applications, waivers, or denials.
 - b) Requires the records to be retained for no fewer than 10 years from the date the application is submitted, and to be made available to the public in a machine-readable format. Requires nothing to be construed to delay or otherwise affect the timeline for processing an individual application under 7) and 8).

c) Sunsets 9) on December 31, 2032, as provided.

- 10) Provides that a special statute is necessary, as provided. Requires reimbursement for certain state-mandated costs to local agencies and school districts, as specified.

Comment

Possibly outdated opposition letters. Opposition letters were submitted for an earlier version of this bill, and amendments taken in Senate Committees appear to address concerns raised. No letters were received indicating a change in position following the amendments by these organizations.

[NOTE: For additional information regarding this bill, see the Senate Natural Resources and Water, and Local Government Committees' analyses.]

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: Yes

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- The Coastal Commission estimates annual costs of about \$98,000 (General Fund) for a period of five years to implement the annual reporting requirement in the bill.
- To the extent the Commission on State Mandates determines that the provisions of this bill create a new program or impose a higher level of service on local agencies, local agencies could claim reimbursement of those costs, which could have a General Fund impact. The bill would create a new duty for the City of Santa Monica.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/13/26)

City of Santa Monica (co-source)
 Streets For All (co-source)
 AARP California
 Abundant Housing LA
 Abundant Housing Pasadena
 Abundant Housing Sunset
 Alhambra Urbanists
 Bay Area Council
 Burbank Abundant Housing
 California Apartment Association

California Attractions and Parks
 Association
 California Building Industry
 Association
 California Chamber of Commerce
 California Coastal Commission
 California Council for Affordable
 Housing
 California Downtown Association
 California Mobility and Parking
 Association

California Restaurant Association
 California Travel Association
 California YIMBY
 Central Valley Urban Institute
 Circulate San Diego
 City of Culver City
 City of Long Beach
 City of San Diego
 Climate Resolve
 County of Los Angeles
 Downtown Los Angeles for All
 Downtown Santa Monica, Inc.
 Eastside Housing for All
 Environment California
 Fieldstead & Company
 Glendale YIMBY
 Greenbelt Alliance
 Housing Action Coalition
 Independent Hospitality Coalition
 LISC San Diego
 Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator

Los Angeles County Business
 Federation
 MidPen Housing
 Move LA
 New Way Homes
 Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce
 Santa Monica Forward
 SPUR
 Streets Are For Everyone (SAFE)
 The Brig Bar and Restaurant
 The Honorable Rex Richardson,
 Mayor, City of Long Beach
 The Honorable Traci Park,
 Councilmember, 11th District, City of
 Los Angeles
 The Wish You Were Here Group
 Urban Environmentalists Los Angeles
 Venice Chamber of Commerce
 Westside Council of Chambers of
 Commerce
 Westside for Everyone

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/14/26)

Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood
 Council
 Generations at Virginia Avenue
 North of Montana Association
 Northeast Neighbors
 Santa Monica Architects for a
 Responsible Tomorrow (SMa.r.t.)
 Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable
 City

Santa Monica Democratic Club
 Santa Monica Helping Hub
 Santa Monica Neighbors
 Santa Monica Wilshire Montana
 Neighborhood Coalition
 Santa Monicans United
 Surfers Who Serve
 Venice Neighborhood Council

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, “AB 1740 provides the City of Santa Monica, in coordination with the California Coastal Commission, clear timelines, accountability measures, and reporting requirements designed to ensure the LCP for Santa Monica is completed and implemented. In addition to part of the bill specific to the Santa Monica LCP, the revised bill also establishes a statewide, streamlined process for approving bike, pedestrian, and transit improvements that enhance public access to and within the coastal zone. The bill

also requires the Coastal Commission to collect and report data on approvals, denials, and pending applications for the new expedited process. That transparency will give the public and the Legislature the information needed to evaluate whether good bike, transit, and pedestrian projects are being approved under the streamlined authority.”

“This agreement reflects the countless conversations by the many stakeholders who came to the table in good faith, and demonstrates that ambitious legislation can create the momentum needed to solve problems that go unresolved for years.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Opposition letters were submitted for an earlier version of this bill, and amendments taken in Senate Committees appear to address concerns raised. No letters were received indicating a change in position following the amendments by these organizations.

The Generations at Virginia Avenue writing in opposition notes that “the California coast belongs to everyone. [...] AB 1740 would exempt numerous projects from Coastal Development Permit requirements within the City of Santa Monica. While some projects may seem limited in scope, their cumulative impacts can affect public access, visitor-serving amenities, transportation, neighborhood character, and the overall experience of the coast. The Coastal Development Permit process exists to evaluate these impacts and provide transparency before changes occur.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 5/27/26

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hoover, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patterson, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Addis, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Connolly, Hart, Irwin, Muratsuchi, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Celeste Rodriguez, Rogers, Sharp-Collins

Prepared by: Katharine Moore / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
8/15/26 11:52:46

**** END ****