
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 79
Author: Wiener (D), et al.
Amended: 9/5/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE: 6-2, 4/22/25
AYES: Arreguín, Cabaldon, Caballero, Gonzalez, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla
NOES: Wahab, Seyarto
NO VOTE RECORDED: Cortese, Durazo, Grayson

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 4-3, 4/30/25
AYES: Arreguín, Cabaldon, Laird, Wiener
NOES: Durazo, Choi, Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 4-2, 5/23/25
AYES: Caballero, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson
NOES: Seyarto, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 21-13, 6/3/25
AYES: Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Dahle,
Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Laird, McGuire, McNerney, Ochoa Bogh,
Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Umberg, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Blakespear, Choi, Durazo, Jones, Menjivar,
Niello, Seyarto, Stern, Strickland, Valladares, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Allen, Cortese, Limón, Reyes, Rubio, Smallwood-
Cuevas

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 41-17, 9/11/25 – Roll call not available.

SUBJECT: Housing development: transit-oriented development

SOURCE: Bay Area Council

California Yimby
Greenbelt Alliance
Spur
Streets for All

DIGEST: This bill requires a housing development project within a specified radius of existing or currently proposed major transit-oriented development (TOD) stop, as defined, be an allowable use on a site zoned for residential, mixed, or commercial development, if the housing development meets certain requirements. This bill also allows a transit agency to adopt TOD zoning standards for district-owned land located in a TOD zone.

Assembly Amendments of 9/5/25, among other things: (1) clarify the types of transit stops, including, among other changes, excluding application to high speed rail stops and airport people movers; (2) remove Tier 3 stops and limit Tier 1 and Tier 2 TOD projects between $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ mile to cities with a population of at least 35,000; (3) require TOD project units to average no more than 1,750 net habitable feet; (4) require TOD projects to include at least 5 dwelling unit and meet minimum densities, as specified; (5) require TOD projects with more than 10 units to include affordable housing and meet specified labor standards; (6) require a TOD project to comply with applicable local demolition and anti-displacement standards; (7) clarifies authorization for a local government to establish a TOD ordinance, reviewable by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), as specified; (8) clarifies authorization for a local government to adopt a “local TOD alternative plan” and a local transit agency to adopt transit “agency TOD zoning standards” on parcels owned by the transit agency, which supersede local zoning; and (9) delays implementation until July 1, 2026 and generally for local agencies and in unincorporated areas of a county until the 7th regional housing needs allocation cycle.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Requires, pursuant to State Density Bonus Law (DBL), each city and county to adopt an ordinance that specifies how it will implement DBL. Requires cities and counties to grant a density bonus when an applicant for a housing development of five or more units seeks and agrees to construct a project that will contain at least one of the following:

- a) 10% of the total units of a housing development for lower-income (LI) households;
 - b) 5% of the total units of a housing development for very low-income (VLI) households;
 - c) A senior citizen housing development or mobile home park;
 - d) 10% of the units in a common interest development (CID) for moderate-income households;
 - e) 10% of the total units for transitional foster youth, veterans, or people experiencing homelessness; or
 - f) 20% of the total units for lower-income students in a student housing development.
 - g) 100% of the units of a housing development for lower-income households, except that 20% of units may be for moderate-income households.
- 2) Requires a city or county to allow an increase in density on a sliding scale from 20% to 50%, depending on the percentage of units affordable to LI and VLI households, over the otherwise maximum allowable residential density under the applicable zoning ordinance and land use element of the general plan. Requires the increase in density on a sliding scale for moderate-income for-sale developments from 5% to 50% over the otherwise allowable residential density.
 - 3) Provides that the applicant shall receive between one and five concessions and incentives based on the percentage of affordable units included in the project.
 - 4) Defines “major transit stop” to mean 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.
 - 5) Provides that specified infill housing developments shall be subject to a streamlined ministerial approval process and not subject to a conditional use permit if the project has two or more units. Projects containing more than 10 units are required to provide 10% of the total number of units affordable to

households making below 50% AMI or 50% of the units making below 80% AMI, as specified. For developments in the San Francisco Bay Area, 20% of the units are affordable to families making 100% AMI with the average making at or below 80% AMI, as specified.

This bill:

1) Creates the following definitions:

- a) “Adjacent” means within 200 feet of any pedestrian access point to a transit oriented development stop. A parcel that meets any of the eligibility criteria under this bill and is adjacent to a Tier 1 or Tier 2, as defined below, shall be eligible for an adjacency intensifier to increase the height limit by an additional 20 feet, the maximum density standard by an additional 40 dwelling units per acre, and the floor area ratio by 1 prior to the application of density bonus law.
- b) “Bus service” means “bus rapid transit” or public mass transit service provided by a public agency or by a public-private partnership that includes all of the following features: i) Full-time dedicated bus lanes or operation in a separate right-of-way dedicated for public transportation with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods; ii) Transit signal priority; iii) All-door boarding; iv) Fare collection system that promotes efficiency; and v) Defined stations.
- c) “Heavy rail transit” means a public electric railway line with the capacity for a heavy volume of traffic using high-speed and rapid acceleration passenger rail cars operating singly or in multicar trains on fixed rails, separately rights-of-way from which all other vehicular and foot traffic are excluded, and high platform loading. “Heavy rail transit” does not include high speed rail.
- d) “High-frequency commuter rail” means a commuter rail service operating a total of at least 48 trains per day across both directions, not including temporary service changes of less than one month or unplanned disruptions, and not meeting the standard for very high frequency commuter rail, at any point in the past three years.
- e) “Housing development project” means consisting of residential units; mixed use developments, as specified; transitional housing or supportive

housing; and farmworker housing, except that it does not include any portion designated for hotel, motel, bed and breakfast in, or other transient lodging, as specified.

- f) “Light rail transit” includes streetcar, trolley, and tramway service. “Light rail transit” does not include airport people movers.
- g) “Residential floor area ratio” (FAR) means the ratio of net habitable square footage dedicated to residential use to the area of the lot. For the FAR provisions under this bill, a local government may not impose any other local development standard or combination of standards that would physically preclude the FAR established.
- h) “Tier 1 TOD stop” means a transit-oriented development stop with an urban transit county, served by heavy rail transit or very high frequency commuter rail.
- i) “Tier 2 TOD stop” excludes a Tier 1 stop, and means a transit-oriented development stop with an urban transit county served by light rail transit, by high-frequency commuter rail, or by bus service, as specified. “Urban transit county” means a county with more than 15 passenger rail stations.
- j) “TOD stop” means a major transit stop or a stop on a route for which a preferred alternative has been selected or which are identified in a regional transportation improvement program, served by heavy rail transit, very high frequency commuter rail, high frequency commuter rail, light rail transit, or specified bus service within an urban county. When a new transit route is planned that was not identified in the applicable regional transportation plan on or before January 1, 2026, these stops shall not be eligible as a TOD stop unless they would be eligible as Tier 1 TOD stops. If a county becomes an urban transit county subsequent to July 1, 2026, then bus service in that county shall remain ineligible for designation of a transit-oriented development stop.
- k) “Very high frequency commuter rail” means a commuter rail service with a total of at least 72 trains per day across both directions, not including temporary service changes of less than one month or unplanned disruptions, at any point in the past three years.

2) Provides that a housing development within a specified distance of a transit stop in a residential, mixed-use, or commercial zone shall be entitled to specified development standards pursuant to the table below. TOD housing development projects shall also meet the following requirements:

- a) The average total area of floor space for the proposed units in the transit oriented housing development project shall not exceed 1,750 net habitable square feet, and
- b) The housing development project shall include at least five dwelling units and meet the greater of the following:
 - a) A minimum density of at least 30 dwelling units per acre; or
 - b) The minimum density required under the local zoning, if applicable.

TOD Stop Type	Dist. from Stop (TOD Zone)	Standards for Project
Tier 1: Major transit stop, heavy rail transit, or very high frequency commuter rail	¼ mile from stop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max Height: 75 ft or 95 ft if adjacent to stop • Max Density: 30 - 120 units per acre (u/a) plus any density bonus or 160 u/a if adjacent to stop • FAR: 3.5 or 4.5 if adjacent to stop • Concessions pursuant to (8) below
	¼ - ½ mile from stop in city with population at least 35,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max Height: 65 ft • Max Density: 30 - 100 u/a plus any density bonus • FAR: 3 • Concessions pursuant to (8) below
Tier 2: Not Tier 1 major transit stops served by light rail transit, high-frequency commuter rail, or bus rapid transit	¼ mile from stop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max Height: 65 ft or 85 ft if adjacent to stop • Ma Density: 30 - 100 u/a plus any density bonus or 140 u/a if adjacent to stop • FAR: 3 or 4 if adjacent to stop
	¼ - ½ mile from stop in a city with a population at least 35,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max Height: 55 ft • Max Density: 30 - 80 u/a plus any density bonus • FAR: 2.5 • Concessions pursuant to (8) below

- 3) Provides that for projects with more than 10 units, the project shall comply with one of the following requirements:
 - a) Any of the following:
 - a) At least 7% are dedicated to extremely low-income (ELI) households.
 - b) At least 10% of the total units are dedicated to very low-income (VLI) households.
 - c) At least 13% of the total units are dedicated to low-income households.
 - b) If a local inclusionary housing requirement mandates a higher percentage or deeper level of affordability, then the local inclusionary housing standard shall apply.
 - c) All units dedicated to ELI, VLI, or low-income households shall have an affordable cost or rent, as defined, and ensure the continued affordability of those units for 45 years for ownership or 55 years for rental units.
- 4) Provides that a TOD project shall be eligible for a density bonus, concession and incentives, waivers and reductions of development standards, and parking ratios under density bonus law using the density allowed by this bill using the base density. A development shall be eligible for additional concessions if the development meets the density threshold for its location, as follows:
 - a) Three additional concessions for a development providing ELI units.
 - b) Two additional concessions for a development providing VLI units.
 - c) One additional concession for a development providing low-income units.
- 5) Prohibits a transit housing development from being located on either of the following:
 - a) 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 last seven years.
 - b) A site that was previously used for more than two units of housing that was demolished within seven years before the development proponent submits an application under this section any of the units were subject to any form of rent or price control.
- 6) Requires a TOD project to meet specified labor standards, including the provision of prevailing wages if the project is not entirely a public work, as

specified, and projects over 85 feet shall employ a skilled and trained workforce, as specified.

- 7) Authorizes a project constructed by the provisions under (2) and (3) above to be eligible for streamlined ministerial approval process, however projects are subject to a 10% VLI, or for projects in the San Francisco Bay Area, 20% of the units are affordable to families making 100% AMI with the average making at or below 80% AMI, as specified.
- 8) Provides that projects that demolish units shall comply with specified provisions of the Housing Crisis Act (HCA), including specified relocation assistance and replacement unit requirements for protected units, as defined. A development shall also comply with any applicable local demolition and anti-displacement standards established through a local ordinance.
- 9) Requires HCD to oversee compliance with this bill. Requires HCD to promulgate standards for how to account for capacity in a city or county's land suitable for development identified in its housing element by July 1, 2026.
- 10) Authorizes a local government to enact an ordinance to make its zoning consistent with the provisions of this chapter, subject to review by HCD, as specified. The creation of this ordinance shall not be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act. Provides that the ordinance may include objective standards, conditions, and policies, applying to TOD housing developments, that are demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence to not physically preclude, alone or in concert, the applicable development standards provided for in (2) above.
- 11) Provides that if a local government adopts an ordinance, it shall submit a copy to HCD within 14 days of adoption. HCD shall review and make a finding of compliance or not within 90 days, plus an additional 30 days if needed. If HCD does not meet that timeline, the ordinance shall be deemed compliant with this bill. If HCD finds that the local government does not comply with this bill, HCD shall provide the local government 60 days to respond.
- 12) Authorizes a TOD ordinance to designate areas within ½ mile of a TOD stop as exempt if:

- a) The local government makes findings supported by substantial evidence that no walking path exists less than one mile from that location to the TOD stop, or
 - b) The local government with at least 15 transit oriented stops designates the area as an industrial employment hub. An “industrial employment hub” shall be a contiguous area of at least 250 acres designated in the general plan by January 1, 2025 as an employment lands area primarily dedicated to industrial use and in which housing is not a permitted use.
- 13) Requires the MPO to create a map of TOD stops and zones established by this bill.
- 14) Provides that a local “TOD alternative plan,” defined as an amendment to the housing element or a program to implement the housing element—such as the adoption of a specific plan, adoption of a zoning overlay, or enactment of an ordinance; that brings the local agency into compliance with this bill —may be adopted provided it incorporates all of the following:
- a) The plan shall provide at least the same total zoned capacity in terms of both total units and FAR, as specified.
 - b) The plan shall not reduce the maximum allowed density for any individual site on which the plan allows residential use by more than 50%, except for sites meeting any of the following criteria:
 - i. Sites within a very high fire hazard severity zone, as determined by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, or within the state responsibility area, as defined.
 - ii. Sites that are vulnerable to one foot of sea level rise, as specified.
 - iii. Sites with a historic resource designation on a local register, so long as sites excluded from the density requirements of (18)(a) do not cumulatively exceed 10% of the eligible area of any TOD zone.
 - iv. Sites within ½ mile of a Tier 2 TOD stop shall not have a density below 30 units per acre with an FAR of 1.0 and should be considered for attached entry level owner occupied housing development opportunities.
 - c) The plan shall not reduce the capacity in any TOD zone in total units or FAR by more than 50%.

- d) The site's maximum capacity counted toward the plan shall not exceed 200% of the maximum density established under this bill. Any site excluded from the minimum density requirements in (14)(b) shall not be counted towards the plan's capacity.
- 15) Prohibits this bill from applying, prior to one year following the adoption of the seventh revision of the housing element, to any of the following for which the local government has adopted an ordinance indicating the sites exclusion:
- a) A site identified by the local jurisdiction that permits density and FAR at no less than 50% of the standards specified by this bill.
 - b) A site in a TOD zone in which at least 33% of the sites in the relevant TOD zone have permitted density and FAR at no less than 50% of the density authorized by this bill and which includes sites with densities that cumulatively allow for at least 75% of the aggregate density for the TOD development zone.
 - i. A site in a TOD zone around a TOD stop that is primarily comprised of a low-resource area which includes densities that allow for at least 40% of the aggregate density for the TOD zone in (2) above.
 - ii. A site in an area designated as low-resource on the most recently updated version of the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee and HCD's opportunity maps and within a jurisdiction that cumulatively allows for at least 50% of the total capacity for units and FAR across all TOD zones.
 - c) A site that is covered by a local TOD alternative plan adopted by the local government.
 - d) A site within an area designated as an industrial employment hub, as defined in (12)(b).
 - e) Sites within a very high fire hazard severity zone, as determined by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, or within the state responsibility area, as defined.
 - f) Sites that are vulnerable to one foot of sea level rise, as specified.
 - g) Sites with a historic resource designation on a local register as of January 1, 2025.
- 16) Authorizes, for the seventh and subsequent revisions of the housing element, a local government may include a local TOD alternative plan in any of the following ways:

- a) Include a local TOD alternative plan in the housing element, provided the plan include an analysis of how the plan maintains at least equal feasibly developable housing capacity at the baseline established by this bill.
 - b) A local government may adopt an ordinance outside of the housing element pursuant to (10)-(12) above.
- 17) Provides that, beginning on January 1, 2027, a local agency that denies a housing development project meeting the provisions of this bill shall be presumed to be in violation of the HAA and are immediately liable for specified penalties, unless the local government demonstrates that it has a health, life, or safety reason for denying the project, as specified.
- 18) “Agency TOD project” means a housing or mixed-use project that meets the following requirements:
- a) A minimum of 50% of the total square footage of the project is dedicated to residential purposes;
 - b) A minimum of 20% of the total number of units are restricted to lower income households and subject to a 55 year recorded affordability restriction.
 - c) The average total floor area of floor space for the proposed units shall not exceed 1,750 net habitable square feet.
 - d) The parcel or parcels is located on an infill site, as defined.
 - e) The TOD parcels were not acquired on or after July 1, 2025 by eminent domain.
 - f) The parcels are owned by the agency and either:
 - a) The parcels are adjacent to a TOD stop for which the agency operates service or form a contiguous area adjacent to a TOD stop.
 - b) At least 75% of the project area is within ½ mile of a TOD stop for which the agency operates service or plans to provide service and was owned by the agency on or before January 1, 2026.
- 19) A transit agency’s board of directors may adopt by resolution “agency TOD zoning standards” for district-owned real property located in a TOD zone. These standards shall establish minimum local zoning standards for height, density, FAR, and allowable uses, and shall apply to a TOD project, that shall

be consistent with this bill. The density and FAR may not be lower than what is provided for in this bill and the density shall not exceed 200% of what is provided for in this bill.

- 20) Requires the Board of Directors to hold a public hearing on the development standards in (19), as specified.
- 21) Authorizes a local government to adopt a local zoning ordinance to conform with zoning consistent with transit agency TOD zoning standards for a station if the station zoning is inconsistent with the local zoning. The local government shall not be required to approve any height limit in excess of the height contained in this bill.
- 22) Authorizes a local agency to adopt objective, written development standards, conditions, and policies that apply to development on district-owned property, provided they demonstrate their consistency with the transit agency TOD zoning standards. Provides that transit agency TOD zoning standards established by a transit agency shall control in the event that the transit agency and local objective planning standards, general plan, or design review standards are inconsistent.
- 23) Provides that, if a non-residential project is included in a transit agency TOD project, at least 25% of the total planned units shall be affordable to lower income households.
- 24) Delays implementation of this bill until July 1, 2026 unless a local government adopts an ordinance or local TOD alternative plan deemed compliant by HCD before July 1, 2026. Delays implementation to unincorporated areas of a county until the 7th regional housing needs allocation cycle.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

- 1) HCD estimates ongoing General Fund (GF) costs of at least \$955,000 annually, potentially higher depending on the number of jurisdictions that utilize the bill's provisions. These costs include additional resources to review ordinances enacted by jurisdictions to make their zoning consistent with the bill's TOD provisions, and to address additional technical assistance requests and complaints of potential violations from developers, housing advocates, and legal organizations. These costs also include additional staff to review TOD alternative plans adopted by jurisdictions as part of their housing elements,

within the bill's 60-day deadline for HCD to review local implementing ordinances.

- 2) Cost pressures (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) of an unknown but potentially significant amount to the courts to adjudicate additional cases filed as a result of the expansion of projects subject to provisions of the HAA. Actual costs will depend on the number of cases filed and the amount of court time needed to resolve each case. It generally costs approximately \$1,000 to operate a courtroom for one hour. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The fiscal year 2025-26 state budget provides \$82 million ongoing General Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund for court operations.
- 3) Costs to local agencies of an unknown amount to revise planning requirements and considerations for specified development projects near a TOD stop. These costs are not reimbursable by the state because local agencies have general authority to charge and adjust planning and permitting fees to cover their administrative expenses associated with new planning mandates.
- 4) Costs to each MPO of an unknown amount to create a map of TOD stops and zones designated pursuant to this bill. These costs are not reimbursable by the state because MPOs not eligible claimants with the Commission on State Mandates for state-reimbursement of local mandated costs.

SUPPORT: (Verified 9/11/25)

Bay Area Council (Co-Sponsor)
California Yimby (Co-Sponsor)
Greenbelt Alliance (Co-Sponsor)
Spur (Co-Sponsor)
Streets for All (Co-Sponsor)
City of Santa Monica
21st Century Alliance
AARP
Abundant Housing LA
Accelerate Neighborhood Climate Action
Active San Gabriel Valley
Alexander Pedersen - Vice Mayor, Capitola
All Home
All Voting Members of The North Westwood Neighborhood Council
Bay Area Council

Being Alive/people With Aids Action Coalition
Bike Culver City
Bike East Bay
Bike LA
Bike Long Beach
Bikesd
Blue Hollywood Street Sanctuary
Brian Barnacle - Councilmember, Petaluma
Business for Good San Diego
CA Native Vote Project
Calbike
California Apartment Association
California Communiity Builders
California Community Builders
California Democratic Party
California Nightlife Association
Car-lite Long Beach
Casey Glaubman, Councilmember of Mount Shasta
Central Valley Urban Institute
Ceres Councilmember Rosalinda Viera
Chamber of Progress
Chambers of Commerce in Oakland
Chico Councilmember Addison Winslow
Chris Ricci - Modesto City Councilmember
Circulate San Diego
City of Berkeley Councilmember Mark Humbert
City of Berkeley Councilmember Rashi Kesarwani
City of Claremont, Mayor Jed Leano
City of Costa Mesa Councilmember Arlis Reynolds
City of Costa Mesa Councilmember Manuel Chavez
City of Culver City
City of Gilroy Council Member Zach Hilton
City of Mountain View Council Member Lucas Ramirez
City of Oakland
City of San Diego
City of Santa Monica Council Member Jesse Zwick
City of Santa Monica Councilmember Natalya Zernitskaya
City of South San Francisco Council Member James Coleman
Claremont City Councilmember, Jed Leano
Climate Action Campaign

Climate Hawks Vote
Costa Mesa Alliance for Better Streets
Council of Infill Builders
Cty Housing, INC.
Dap Health
Democratic Club of Claremont
East Bay for Everyone
East Bay Leadership Council
East Bay Yimby
East Valley Indivisibles
Eastside Housing for All
Emily Ramos - Vice Mayor, Mountain View
End Poverty in California, a Project of Tides Center
Environmental Protection Information Center
Everybody's Long Beach
Faith and Housing Coalition
Families for Safe Streets San Diego
Fathers and Mothers Who Care
Fieldstead and Company, INC.
Fremont for Everyone
Generation Housing
Glendale Yimby
Grow the Richmond
Hammond Climate Solutions Foundation
Holos Communities
House Sacramento
Housing Action Coalition
Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County
Housing Trust Silicon Valley
Housing Trust Silicon Valley
Humboldt Area Center for Harm Reduction
Icon CDC
Inclusive Lafayette
Indivisible Claremont/inland Valley
Initiating Change in Our Neighborhoods Community Development Corporation
Icon CDC
Inner City Law Center
Jamboree Housing Corporation
Jefferson Union High School District Trustee Andy Lie
Kiwa

Kiwa (koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance)
LA Forward
LA Voice
Laura Nakamura - Vice Mayor, Concord
Leadingage California
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis
Lisc San Diego
Los Angeles Walks
Lucas Ramirez - Councilmember, Mountain View
Mark Dinan - Vice Mayor, East Palo Alto
Matthew Solomon, Councilmember - Emeryville
Mayor of West Hollywood Chelsea Byers
Midpen Housing Corporation
Monterey Park Councilmember Thomas Wong
Mountain View Whisman School District Trustee Charles Difazio
Mountain View Yimby
Napa-solano for Everyone
National Independent Venue Association of California
Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services INC
Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services, INC.
New Life Community Church
New Way Homes
Nonprofit Housing Association of Northern California
Northern Neighbors
Oakland City Councilmember Charlene Wang
One Voice
Our Time to ACT
Palo Alto Councilmember George Lu
Palo Alto Councilmember Julie Lythcott-haines
Path
Path (people Assisting the Homeless)
Pathway to Tomorrow
Peninsula for Everyone
People for Housing - Orange County
People for Housing Oc
People for Housing Orange County
Petaluma City Council Member Brian Barnacle
Phoebe Shin Venkat - Councilmember, Foster City
Princess Washington, Councilmember of Suisun City
Prosperity California

Rebecca Saltzman, El Cerrito Councilmember
Redlands Yimby
Remake Irvine Streets for Everyone
Ridesd
Sacramento Councilmember Caity Maple
Safe Place for Youth
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
San Fernando Valley for All
San Francisco County Supervisor Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco County Supervisor Danny Sauter
San Francisco County Supervisor Matt Dorsey
San Francisco County Supervisor Myrna Melgar
San Francisco Yimby
San Gabriel Valley Consortium on Homelessness
San Jose Councilmember Pamela Campos
San Mateo County Economic Development Association
Santa Cruz Yimby
Santa Rosa Yimby
Sergio Lopez - Mayor, Campbell
Sierra Business Council
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Sloco Yimby
South Bay Forward
South Bay Yimby
South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth
South San Francisco Councilmember James Coleman
St. Joseph Center
Streets are for Everyone
Streets are for Everyone
Strong Towns Poway & Rb
Strong Towns San Diego
Strong Towns Santa Barbara
Student Homes Coalition
Thai CDC
Thai Community Development Center
The People Concern
The Sidewalk Project
UC San Diego Housing Commission
Ucla Undergraduate Student Association Council
Union Station Homeless Services

Unite Here Local 11
United Way Bay Area
United Way of Greater Los Angeles
University of California Student Association
Ventura County Yimby
Walk Bike Berkeley
Walk San Francisco
West Hollywood/hernan Molina, Governmental Affairs Liaison
Westside for Everyone
Wildlands Network
Yimby Action
Yimby Democrats of San Diego County
Yimby LA
Yimby Los Angeles
Yimby Slo

OPPOSITION: (Verified 9/11/25)

City of Lafayette
City of Mission Viejo
City of Palo Alto
City of Simi Valley
Albany Neighbors United
Allied Neighborhoods Association (of Santa Barbara)
Baldwin Hills Estates Hoa
Burton Valley Neighborhoods Group
California Cities for Local Control
California Contract Cities Association
California Policy Center
California Preservation Foundation
California State Association of Counties
Catalysts for Local Control
Cheviot Hills (los Angeles) Neighborhood Association
Citizens Planning Association of Santa Barbara
Citizens Preserving Venice
City of Agoura Hills
City of Anderson
City of Artesia
City of Artesia, California
City of Azusa
City of Bakersfield

City of Bell
City of Bellflower
City of Belvedere
City of Beverly Hills
City of Brentwood
City of Calimesa
City of Camarillo
City of Carlsbad
City of Chino
City of Chino Hills
City of Claremont, Sal Medina, Councilmember
City of Cloverdale
City of Clovis
City of Colton
City of Commerce
City of Concord
City of Corona
City of Cotati
City of Cudahy
City of Cupertino
City of Downey
City of Downey
City of Duarte
City of Encinitas
City of Exeter
City of Fairfield
City of Fairfield
City of Folsom
City of Folsom, California
City of Fullerton
City of Garden Grove
City of Glendora
City of Grand Terrace
City of Hermosa Beach
City of Hesperia
City of Hidden Hills
City of Highland
City of Huntington Beach
City of Indian Wells
City of La Mirada

City of La Quinta, Riverside County, California

City of LA Verne

City of Lakeport

City of Lakewood

City of Lakewood CA

City of Larkspur

City of Lathrop

City of Lawndale

City of Lomita

City of Los Alamitos

City of Los Banos

City of Manhattan Beach

City of Manteca

City of Marina

City of Merced

City of Milpitas

City of Modesto

City of Monrovia

City of Montclair

City of Moorpark

City of Moreno Valley

City of Murrieta

City of Napa

City of Newport Beach

City of Norwalk

City of Norwalk

City of Oakley

City of Oceanside

City of Ontario

City of Orange

City of Orinda

City of Palm Desert

City of Palmdale

City of Palmdale

City of Palos Verdes Estates

City of Paramount

City of Pasadena

City of Perris

City of Pico Rivera

City of Pleasanton

City of Porterville
City of Rancho Cordova
City of Rancho Cucamonga
City of Rancho Mirage
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
City of Redding
City of Redlands
City of Ripon
City of Riverbank
City of Rolling Hills
City of Rolling Hills Estates
City of Rosemead
City of Roseville
City of San Fernando
City of San Juan Capistrano
City of San Luis Obispo
City of San Marcos
City of San Rafael
City of San Rafael/marin County Council of Mayors & Council Members
City of Sausalito
City of Scotts Valley
City of Solana Beach
City of South Gate
City of Stanton
City of Thousand Oaks
City of Torrance
City of Tustin
City of Upland
City of Vernon
City of Visalia
City of Vista
City of Walnut Creek
City of Whittier
City of Yorba Linda
City of Yucaipa
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council
Communities for a Better Environment
Contra Costa County Fire Protection District
Crescenta Highlands Neighborhood Association 2025

Crescenta Valley Community Association 2025
Del Rey Residents Association
Disability Rights California
Foothill Communities Association
Friends of Loma Alta Creek
Fullerton Heritage
Grayburn Avenue Block Club
Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council
Hill 200 Friends of the Hills
Hollywoodland Homeowners Association, United Neighborhoods
Homies Organizing the Mission to Empower Youth
Jamacha Neighborhood Council
Jelani Killings - Mayor of City of Pittsburg
Lafayette Homeowners Council
League of California Cities
Los Angeles City Attorney
Mental Health Advocacy Services
Mission Street Neighbors
Neighborhoods United Sf
Neighbors for a Better California
Neighbors for a Better San Diego
New Livable California Db a Livable California
Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Palisades Community Council
Pacific Palisades Residents Association
People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights
Poder Sf
Race & Equity in All Planning Coalition
Rise Economy
San Diego Community Planners Committee
San Francisco Anti-displacement Coalition
San Francisco Tenants Union
San Juan Chamber of Commerce
Santa Monica Rent Control Board
Save Lafayette
Scripps Ranch Planning Group
Small Business Forward
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Spaulding Square Historical Preservation Overlay Zone
Sunnyvale United Neighbors

Town of Apple Valley
Town of Mammoth Lakes
West Hills Neighborhood Council
West Toluca Lake Residents Association
Westwood Hills Property Owners Association
Wilshire Montana Neighborhood Coalition
Young Community Developers

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: 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 will ensure that TODs are feasible and enhance access to transit. Second, SB 79 authorizes local transit agencies to develop at the same or greater density 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 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.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties, and other local governments are opposed to a prior version of this bill because it “defies cities’ general plans and provides transit agencies unlimited land use authority on property they own or have a permanent easement, regardless of the distance from a transit stop. This broad new authority applies to both residential and commercial development. Transit agencies could develop 100% commercial projects — even at transit stops — and not provide a single new home, while simultaneously making the argument that more housing must be constructed around transit stops.” Some local tenant organizations and equity groups are opposed to a prior version of the bill, citing concerns over displacement and the demolition of rent-controlled and other housing affordable to lower-income tenants.

Prepared by: Alison Hughes / HOUSING / (916) 651-4124
9/11/25 18:14:20

**** **END** ****