

**DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

MONIQUE LAWSHE
PRESIDENT

CAROLINE CHOE
VICE-PRESIDENT

PRISCILLA CHAVEZ
MARTINA DIAZ

SARAH JOHNSON
PHYLLIS KLEIN

BRIAN ROSENSTEIN
JACOB SAITMAN
ELIZABETH ZAMORA

**City of Los Angeles
CALIFORNIA**



KAREN BASS
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

HAYDEE URITA-LOPEZ
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

CRAIG R. WEBER
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

February 18, 2026

Los Angeles City Council
c/o Office of the City Clerk
City Hall, Room 395
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attention: Planning and Land Use Management Committee (PLUM)

Dear Honorable Members,

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO THE IMPACTS AND LOCAL
IMPLEMENTATION OF SENATE BILL (SB) 79 (CF 25-1083)**

I. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Instruct the Department of City Planning, in alignment with Approach C, to initiate a code amendment for either Option 1, 2, or 3 as described herein, to upzone single family and low-density zoned parcels that are located in Opportunity Stations and in higher and moderate opportunity sites ineligible for delay within Transit Oriented Development zones and areas citywide to facilitate local implementation of SB 79; as well as
2. Instruct the Department of City Planning, to delay effectuation of SB 79 citywide, as explicitly allowed by SB 79, through the initiation of a delayed effectuation ordinance for all eligible criteria including lower opportunity areas, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, sites and stations meeting capacity requirements, local historic resources, Sea Level Rise Areas, Industrial Employment Hubs, and sites more than one-mile walking distance from a station.

II. INTRODUCTION

Senate Bill (SB) 79, the Abundant and Affordable Homes Near Transit Act, was introduced by Senator Scott Wiener and signed by Governor Gavin Newsom on October 10, 2025. The bill will become effective on July 1, 2026. On November 4, 2025, the City Council adopted a motion (Council File 25-1083), instructing various departments to prepare reports related to the SB 79 (Government Code Sections (GCS) 65912.155-162), including a request for several reports from the Los Angeles City Planning (from here on referred to as “the Department”). On November 17, 2025, the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee discussed the Department’s first report, dated November 13, 2025, on key SB 79 provisions and options for local implementation. The subsequent PLUM Committee Report included several recommendations and was adopted by the City Council on December 2, 2025. This report responds to instruction #3 of the City Council’s December 2, 2025 action:

Instruct the DCP, based on the modeling analysis that will be completed and consistent with the instructions outlined in Recommendation No. 3f of the said PLUM Committee report, attached to the Council file, to report back on where and how the City may further delay effectuation of SB 79 through the potential adoption of upzoning ordinances alongside a delayed effectuation ordinance for certain areas, consistent with Approach C described in the DCP report dated November 13, 2025.

Furthermore, this report responds directly to the PLUM Committee’s discussion and direction to focus any rezoning proposals in higher opportunity areas (including areas eligible for delayed effectuation), particularly in areas with high quality transit, including historic districts, while exempting lower opportunity areas (additional detail on the PLUM Committee’s discussion can be found in Section V of this report). A future report will respond to Item 4 in the PLUM Committee Report dated November 17, 2025, requesting recommendations associated with the development of a local TOD Alternative Plan or “Alt Plan”).

III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides recommendations for the implementation of SB 79 that are informed by staff analysis on the composition of SB 79 eligible station areas (defined as Transit Oriented Development zones in the bill and hereon referred to as “TOD zones”); and preliminary modeling executed by the City’s consultant comparing SB 79 potential housing capacity to the City’s present capacity. These initial results of the model will continue to be refined and interpreted based on staff analysis and agency guidance. The report presents an analysis of local impacts at a station and citywide level, explores eligibility for delayed effectuation, and recommends several Upzoning Options for the City Council’s consideration. Overall, the report elevates the bill’s significant local impacts and provides analysis to inform discussion on a local implementation pathway.

Should the City choose to pursue a Delayed Effectuation Ordinance, which would temporarily “delay” effectuation of the bill (until approx. 2030), only certain types of sites are eligible to be “paused”, including those that meet development minimums, are located in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ), host local historic resources, or are classified as lower opportunity neighborhoods in the Opportunity Area Maps created by CTCAC/HCD (GCS 65912.161(b)). Within the delay period, Local Alternative Plans would need to be developed, analyzed as part of the upcoming 7th cycle Housing Element, and adopted for the 141 potential stations located within the city’s boundaries. Areas not eligible for a temporary delay could become subject to the bill in July or be rezoned to meet development minimums. The Upzoning Options described herein would enable the City to postpone implementation of SB 79 citywide and ensure residential growth is consistent with priorities of the 2021-2029 Housing Element with variability on the scale of intensity permitted.

The Upzoning Options presented by Planning were developed in response to the City Council’s December 2, 2025 instructions to the Department to report back with recommendations on an upzoning code amendment in order to expand delayed effectuation of SB 79 to cover the entire City, rather than only pausing the bill in currently eligible areas of the City. (More information on delayed effectuation and approaches to local implementation may be found in Section V of this report). Furthermore, the analysis and concepts articulated herein were further informed by PLUM Committee deliberations that directed any city initiated upzoning to occur in higher opportunity and transit rich areas, including sites that may host historic resources; to exempt lower opportunity areas;¹ and avoid concentrating added capacity in areas outside the city center where sites may be ineligible for delayed effectuation.

The City Council also directed the Department to work with a consultant to model housing capacity created by SB 79 and compare it to existing capacity available under present zoning rules and housing incentive programs. Overall, the model found that the City’s current zoning around TOD zones permits the construction of almost three times as many units as that available under SB 79. However, this zoning capacity is concentrated around only a portion of the TOD zones, with a focus on Downtown Los Angeles, Koreatown, Warner Center and North Hollywood, as well as in areas with more multi-family zoning like South Los Angeles and East Hollywood. Approximately a third of TOD zones permit more than half of the density and floor area available under SB 79 and would be eligible for delayed effectuation with its current zoning. Two-thirds of the City’s TOD zones, however, will fall short of SB 79 benchmarks.

In the short term, were the city to pursue a delayed effectuation ordinance, all lower opportunity sites would be eligible for delay. Based on the analysis, 88% of the City’s sites are currently eligible for delayed effectuation. Areas ineligible for delay include ten Orange line stations in the South and Northwest Valley, two Exposition Line Stations in West LA, three NoHo to Pasadena

¹ Throughout this report, lower and moderate opportunity areas will be used to refer to lower or moderate resource neighborhoods per the 2026 CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Maps. High opportunity area will be used to refer to high and highest resource neighborhoods per the 2026 CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Maps.

BRT Stations, ten other stations in the South Valley, Westchester, and Mid City areas of the City. It is important to note that, in response to PLUM discussion and direction at the November 13, 2025 meeting as well as Council direction, the options presented herein do propose potential upzoning on a portion of those sites that are currently eligible for delayed effectuation (as described further below). However, each option may be modified to expand or reduce its applicability, and potential upzoning may be further reduced to limit upzoning to the 12% of sites that are currently ineligible for delay.

In response to City Council direction, the Department has prepared three, targeted Upzoning Options to delay effectuation citywide until approximately 2030 so that the scale of housing development opportunity created under SB 79 will occur in areas identified for growth and still enable increases to restricted affordable housing through the city's value capture tools. A key component of the Upzoning Options involves rezoning single family zones as well as some low-density zones including duplex (R2), restricted density (RD) zones, and zones with densities less than half of SB 79. Commercial and multifamily zones near SB 79 eligible transit stops already offer density and floor area consistent with provisions SB 79. Given Los Angeles' development pattern, over half of eligible SB 79 TOD zones are predominantly low-density, therefore upzoning is needed to achieve a citywide delay in effectuation.

Table 1 below provides a brief summary of three options for an upzoning ordinance of single family and low-density properties in SB 79 TOD zones that would allow the City to temporarily delay effectuation of the bill (until approximately 2030). It is important to note that these three Upzoning Options would be achieved by updating the recently adopted Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP) ordinance² to include eligibility for single family properties and other low-density residential properties in the Corridor Transition (CT) and Transit Oriented Incentive Area (TOIA) incentive programs. In all three options rezoning would occur in areas deemed "Opportunity Stations" or TOD zones composed of mostly higher and moderate opportunity area census tracts, (which may include some lower opportunity census tracts). It is also important to note that all three options include upzoning of some parcels in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) non-hillside areas and offer limited incentives in historic areas. Additional details on the objectives and implications of each Upzoning Option can be found in Section VIII of this report.

² Ordinance Number 188,477 and 188,478

Table 1. Summary of Upzoning Options to be Eligible for a Citywide Delayed Effectuation

	Option 1: CT Expansion in SB 79 half-mile radius	Option 2:³ TOIA Expansion in SB 79 half-mile radius of Operational Rail	Option 3:⁴ TOIA Expansion in SB 79 half-mile radius
Description	CT incentives for single-family and low-density sites in Opportunity Stations ⁴ and in select ⁵ High and Moderate Opportunity Census Tracts	TOIA incentives for single-family and low-density sites in Opportunity Stations near Operational Rail + Option 1	TOIA incentives for single-family and low-density sites in all Opportunity Stations + Option 1
Density	4-16 units	Limited by FAR ⁶	Limited by FAR ⁶
FAR⁷	Incremental up to 2.9:1	Up to 4.5:1	Up to 4.5:1
Height⁷	2-3 stories	7 stories max	7 stories max

³ All areas qualifying for TOIA could also opt to use CT incentives in this option.

⁴ See Section VIII, "Upzoning Options" 'Geographic Applicability" for a more in depth explanation of the Opportunity Station concept.

⁵ Only high and moderate opportunity census tracts in majority low opportunity station areas ineligible for delay would be eligible.

⁶ Density allowances in Options 2 and 3 would supersede any limitations for low-density zones.

⁷ Projects may be eligible for additional FAR and height in exchange for provision of multi-bedroom units. CT program projects may access up to an additional 0.5:1 FAR and 11 feet in height. TOIA program projects may access up to 1.0:1 FAR and up to an additional 22 feet in height.

Upzoning Options 1, 2, or 3 may be modified by the City Council to increase or “grow” zoning capacity or “reduce” zoning capacity (see Table 2 below for a summary of ways the Upzoning Options could be modified). These additional options for modification or “levers” would further adjust which areas of the City are upzoned, and by how much. Based on analysis from the consultant, the addition of any of these modifications will still allow the entire City to be eligible for delayed effectuation under SB 79. Additional discussion on modification of these options can be found in Section VIII of this report. Important to note, the last lever in Table 2 would provide the minimum upzoning needed to qualify the city for delayed effectuation.

Table 2. Topic Areas for Modification to Upzoning

Applicable Option	Grow or Reduce	Topic Area	Modification Description
All	Grow	Lower Opportunity Areas	– Expand eligibility to single family and low-density zones in lower opportunity areas
All	Reduce	Lower and Moderate Opportunity Areas	– Remove low and/or moderate opportunity areas eligible for delayed effectuation
		Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones	– Remove incentives in all VHFHSZs (including non-hillside areas)
		Historic Resources	– Remove incentives on sites with historic resources
Option 3	Reduce	Bus Only Lane Eligibility	– Exclude stops created by bus only lanes that are not BRTs
Option 1	Reduce (Most Limited Upzoning Option)	Only Amend Zoning for Sites Ineligible for Delayed Effectuation	– For the most limited rezoning, Option 1 could be further reduced to only apply to sites that are ineligible for delayed effectuation.

These Upzoning Options, as well as potential modifications, would be paired with an SB 79 Delayed Effectuation Ordinance (described in more detail in Section VIII of the report) which would postpone implementation of SB 79 to areas eligible for modified implementation under the bill (GCS 65912.161(b)), depending on City Council's direction, including sites in:

- Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones
- One-foot Sea Level Rise Areas
- Lower Opportunity Areas
- Local Historic Resources
- Areas or TOD zones with high development potential (including areas rezoned through an option summarized in Table 1)

Based on the analysis presented in this report, the Department recommends pursuing an implementation approach summarized above given its alignment with the bill's intent to increase land available for housing development. Furthermore, it affords the city additional time to implement SB 79 citywide and carry out thoughtful public outreach to deliberately consider density increases in sensitive areas.

IV. SB 79 BACKGROUND

SB 79 establishes new development standards within specified distances of "transit-oriented development (TOD) stops" (as defined in SB 79) on land zoned for residential, mixed, or commercial uses. In particular, the bill extends guaranteed height, Floor Area Ratio (FAR), and density standards to encourage five to nine story buildings within a half mile of both existing and planned transit stations. If implemented in its entirety, the bill enforces affordability requirements for development with more than 10 units; compliance with labor standards for buildings greater than 85 feet; and limitations on industrial land, hotel uses, and lots with three or more units subject to the Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) occupied in the last seven years. For a comprehensive overview of SB 79 and an analysis of the bill requirements, please refer to the City Planning report submitted to Council File (CF) 25-1083⁸ dated November 13, 2025.

Since the November report, additional research on the bill and guidance from agencies including HCD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) have resulted in several new interpretations of SB 79's key provisions, described below. Note that guidance from HCD and SCAG informing this report is still in development and will likely evolve as additional resources and information become available. As SCAG is the responsible agency for SB 79 map production, final TOD zone location will be dependent on their map release and may vary from the stations identified in this report. For a detailed description of mapping modifications see Appendix A.

SB 79 will foundationally shift residential development patterns and construction trends in Los Angeles for years to come. With just over 140 TOD zones—the largest number of eligible transit


⁸ <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=25-1083>

development areas in the state—the bill touches almost every community and increases capacity throughout the City. The implementation of this transformational bill necessitates thoughtful consideration to ensure its application aligns to the maximum extent possible with Los Angeles' land use and equity goals and accounts for the City's distinct socio-economic and environmental conditions.

The 2021-2029 Housing Element identified priorities for housing stability and housing growth, aiming to shift development away from lower opportunity areas to higher opportunity areas consistent with an affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH) framework. Of the City's TOD zones, approximately 57% are made up of majority lower opportunity areas (per the 2026 California Tax Credit Allocation Committee [CTCAC] and California Department of Housing and Community Development [HCD] Opportunity Area Maps) meaning SB 79 disproportionately affects areas the state has identified as having higher rates of segregation and poverty that offer lower long term health, economic, and educational outcomes for children.

The bill also affects neighborhoods characterized by low-density development patterns and some of the City's most environmentally vulnerable areas, with 16% of all TOD zones intersecting VHFHSZs, including three station areas located wholly within a VHFHSZ. Of all the City's SB 79 TOD zones, 60% are comprised of majority low-density sites (zoned RD and more restrictive), indicating that many TOD zones are currently zoned for much lower densities than SB 79 would allow and that existing zoned capacity for higher density is concentrated in fewer station areas. The Department recognizes the urgency to realize SB 79's vision to address the City and State's housing affordability crisis, while also acknowledging the need for consideration of local priorities as outlined in the Housing Element.

Map 1. Draft Citywide Potential Eligibility with Revised Number of TOD Stops



V. APPROACHES TO LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION

As described in the November report, SB 79 empowers cities to tailor the timing and applicability of the bill's provisions. In particular, the Department previously identified four pathways or "approaches" the city could employ to implement the bill, including:

- Approach A: State SB 79 Implementation
- Approach B: Delayed Effectuation for Eligible Areas
- Approach C: Delayed Effectuation + New Upzoning Ordinance to Increase Capacity and Expand Eligibility to Delay
- Approach D: Local TOD Alternative Plan

These approaches can be used independently or in combination and offer flexibility for implementation. Cities can opt to implement the state version of the bill (Approach A), applying the scope of SB 79's development standards in their entirety, including allowances to treat newly permitted building volumes as base conditions for the purposes of utilizing State Density Bonus Law (GCS 65915-65918). The bill also affords cities the option to modify temporarily or "delay" effectuation (Approach B) of the bill only on certain types of sites including those that meet development minimums, are located in VHFHSZs host local historic resources, or are classified as lower opportunity neighborhoods in the Opportunity Area Maps created by CTCAC/HCD (GCS 65912.161(b)). Specifically, cities may postpone implementation of the bill on sites with half of the density and floor area SB 79 offers; on TOD zones primarily composed of CTCAC lower opportunity neighborhoods that provide at least 40% of the capacity otherwise granted through SB 79. TOD zones may also be excluded if at least 33% of sites within a zone permit half the density and floor area ratio as granted through SB 79, and the entire station area provides at least 75% of the capacity granted through the bill. Lastly, a temporary delay in effectuation may apply to all lower opportunity areas if a city can demonstrate it has at least half of the capacity created by SB 79. In all scenarios, sites located within an industrial employment hub⁹ as well as sites located beyond a one-mile walking distance from a station entrance can be permanently exempted from the bill's rules entirely through the adoption of an ordinance. A summary of these parameters may be found below in Image 1; in addition, a detailed description of the rules associated with implementation of Approach B is included in the November 2025 report. Analysis of the areas eligible for delayed effectuation is described below in Section VII of this report.

⁹ Paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of GCS 65912.160 defines an industrial employment hub as a contiguous area of at least 250 acres dedicated to industrial uses and designated as such in the local jurisdiction's general plan as of January 1, 2025.

Image 1. Summary of Rules to Delay Effectuation Consistent with GCS 65912.161(b)

Until 2030, or until an alt plan is adopted, a site or station may be exempt by ordinance when:	
A station, currently has a high development potential (33% of sites offer 50% of SB 79 incentives and 75% overall TOD density) At a site level, • A site is zoned Multifamily/commercial zoned and permits at least 50% density and FAR • Sites within VHFHSZ (as determined by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection), • One-foot Sea Level Rise Areas • Local Historic Resources (HCM/HPOZ) (before 1/1/25) • Sites more than one-mile walking distance away from a station entrance	Low Opportunity Areas: • Citywide, if a jurisdiction permits half the total SB 79 capacity and FAR across all TOD zones, Low Opp sites can be delayed. • Stations, If sites permit an aggregate 40% of the density allowed in a station area primarily comprised of Low Opp, then the station can be temporarily exempt.

At their meeting on November 17, 2025, the PLUM Committee directed the Department to refrain from implementing SB 79 in its entirety (Approach A) and from pursuing a standalone delayed effectuation ordinance in areas currently eligible for delay (Approach B), and to instead provide recommendations for delaying effectuation citywide through an accompanying upzoning program (Approach C). The PLUM Committee verbalized priorities for upzoning higher opportunity areas near high quality transit, even in areas eligible for delayed effectuation, applying incentives to sites with historic resources, exempting lower opportunity areas, and protecting sites vulnerable to extreme fire risks.

Given this direction, the Department has prepared three approaches or options for the City Council's consideration to increase capacity on single family and low-density zoned parcels located within ½ mile of an SB 79 station. Should the City Council wish to delay effectuation of SB 79 citywide, the Department recommends that the City Council select upzoning option 1, 2, or 3, directing the Department to initiate a code amendment, as well as instruct the Department to initiate a citywide Delayed Effectuation Ordinance. This SB 79 implementation strategy, described in further detail later in this report, allows the city more time to consider approaches for increased density in sensitive areas, including lower opportunity neighborhoods and geographies vulnerable to environmental risks, as part of a future Alt Plan per State of California GCS 65912.161(a) (Approach D), while still creating immediate opportunities for housing construction near high quality transit. Given the imminent effective date of the bill, direction on the City's approach to the implementation of the bill's provisions is critical to allow adequate time for the Department to

prepare materials for legislative review should the City Council desire a tailored local implementation option.

VI. ANALYSIS: TOD ZONE COMPOSITION AND TRENDS

As directed by the City Council, the Department has conducted analysis using Geographic Information System (GIS) tools on the composition of the City's anticipated 141 TOD zones citywide, as well as the impact of SB 79 on sites with RSO units, industrial zoned sites, and sites located in various types of environmentally sensitive areas; and information for each TOD zone related to VHFHSZs, areas impacted by sea level rise, lower opportunity areas, and locally and federally designated historic resources.

Key Citywide Trends

The following TOD zone analysis reveals the scale of SB 79's impact citywide, particularly in low-density zones, lower opportunity neighborhoods, and areas within local VHFHSZs. Of all the City's sites eligible for SB 79, 48% are currently eligible for existing local housing incentive programs including the Mixed Income Incentive Program (MIIP), and 68% of eligible sites are zoned RD and more restrictive, meaning the underlying zoning¹⁰ generally permits less than five units on an average lot (see Appendix B, Table 5). Overall, 15% of sites within SB 79 TOD zones are ineligible for the bill because they contain three or more RSO units (see Appendix B, Table 5). A summary of key TOD zone characteristics by Area Planning Commission (APC) is summarized in Appendix B, Table 6 and Table 7.

Environmental Considerations

Los Angeles hosts unique environmental conditions due to its coastal setting and location in close proximity to areas vulnerable to wildfire. Based on the revised map, TOD zones do not include parcels located within the Coastal Zone, areas vulnerable to one-foot of sea level rise, Tsunami Zone, or are in or near tsunami evacuation routes. As mentioned earlier in this report, a total of 23 TOD zones or 16% of TOD zones overall include parcels classified as VHFHSZ (a list of these TOD zones is included for review in Appendix B, Table 9). Of these TOD zones, 14 have a majority of parcels located in the VHFHSZ. Examples of these TOD zones are along the A Line in Highland Park and Mount Washington and along the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT in Eagle Rock, where some parcels may be located in hillside areas with limited ingress and egress.

Historic Considerations

The City's TOD zones include sites with local, state, or federal designated individual historic resources and historic districts. Properties in HPOZs affected by SB 79 represent 5% of all SB 79 eligible sites and 36% of sites included in HPOZs citywide. Approximately 25 of the City's TOD

¹⁰ Without inclusion of bonus units enabled in an incentive program.

zones, or 18%, overlap with 19 of the City's HPOZs, largely in Northeast LA, South LA, and Greater Wilshire. Of these HPOZs, 11 are located within majority moderate and higher opportunity TOD zones. Appendix B, Table 10 provides a list of HPOZs with sites located in TOD zones, and the proportion of parcels impacted in each. The table also includes the percentage of TOD zone area that overlaps with each HPOZ¹¹. The Highland Park - Garvanza, Miracle Mile, and Adams-Normandie HPOZs are the most impacted districts in terms of parcel count. Sites containing locally designated Historic-Cultural Monuments (HCMs) are also eligible for SB 79, with 578 HCMs located within TOD zones. Approximately 176 federally designated historic resources (both individual resources or National Register Historic Districts (NRHD)) are located within TOD zones, and approximately 925 state designated historic resources (both individual resources and districts) are located within TOD zones.

RSO Considerations

RSO units are found in TOD zones across the City but were found to be generally more prevalent in lower opportunity neighborhoods. Majority lower opportunity TOD zones have the highest proportion of sites with one to two RSO units, ranging from 16-36% of the TOD zone with the highest rates are generally located in South LA, Southeast LA, and Boyle Heights. Additional information about TOD zones with the highest percentage of sites with one to two RSO units including majority CTCAC designation and APC area can be found in Appendix B, Table 5 and 6. TOD zones with the highest number of sites with three or more RSO units, from 26-50% of the TOD zone, are generally located in lower opportunity areas such as Koreatown and East Hollywood.

Industrial Considerations

Industrial uses exist in various neighborhoods citywide that intersect with eligible TOD zones. Specifically, just over 10% of TOD zones contain at least 20% industrial zones (see Appendix B, Table 11 for a complete list) in areas including Downtown Los Angeles, South Los Angeles, Van Nuys, Chatsworth, and Pacoima. The Department is continuing to conduct analysis on whether these various concentrations of industrial zones qualify as industrial employment hubs¹² per the provisions of GCS 65912(e)(2), which would allow for a permanent exemption from SB 79.

¹¹ Per GCS 65912.161(a)(2)(C), in an Alt Plan, sites with historic resources may be exempt from eligibility so long as those sites do not exceed more than 10% of the area of the TOD zone.

¹² Paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of GCS 65912.160 defines an industrial employment hub as a contiguous area of at least 250 acres dedicated to industrial uses and designated as such in the local jurisdiction's general plan as of January 1, 2025.

VII. ANALYSIS: CAPACITY ANALYSIS


In late 2025, the Department contracted Psomas¹³ to prepare a capacity model to evaluate delayed effectuation eligibility and future local alt plan compliance. Initial model results were received in February 2026. As such, this delayed effectuation modeling is preliminary and will continue to be refined as staff evaluates data quality and as guidance from SCAG and the state becomes available. The delayed effectuation model compares current City housing capacity to that of SB 79 and evaluates at a site and station level compliance with eight delayed effectuation criteria provided in the bill. To calculate existing local capacity, the model uses the density and FAR associated with a site's underlying zone or, where applicable, the site's eligibility for existing housing incentive programs including the MIIP and the Los Angeles Housing Incentive Program. Local density in multi-family zones is often higher than in SB 79, partly because local housing programs offer densities limited by floor area, which often exceed the density allowances in SB 79. Discounts to floor area were applied to account for residential floor area in calculating local capacity and ineligible sites were removed from SB 79 capacity modeling altogether. Globally 138,270 lots were found eligible for SB 79 and 26,320 lots were found to be ineligible for SB 79 because they contain RSO sites with three or more units, or land which does not permit residential units including industrial land, open space, right of ways, and public facilities.

Overall, the model found that Los Angeles currently permits the construction of more than 2.8 times the number of units and slightly more overall floor area than what SB 79 offers. However, while the City's current overall capacity exceeds that offered through SB 79, at the site level, the model results show that capacity is concentrated on fewer sites than SB 79, with only 34% of eligible sites permitting more than half of what the bill allows (as shown in Map 2, below). This is reflective of the areas the City has historically prioritized for growth, including areas like Downtown LA, Koreatown, Warner Center, and North Hollywood; major corridors, and in areas with high concentration of multi-family zoning like South LA and East Hollywood (as shown in Map 2, below). This finding means that if the city is to pursue a Local Alt Plan, by 2030 upzoning may be required on up to 66% of eligible sites including single family and lower-density sites.


In the short term, as shown in Map 3 below, the City would be eligible to temporarily delay effectuation until approximately 2030 for up to 88% of eligible sites citywide. This is possible because, in addition to 34% of eligible sites having at least half of SB 79's zoning capacity, the city exceeds SB 79's requirements to allow delayed effectuation in lower opportunity sites and in stations that primarily comprise lower opportunity census tracts, which represent approximately 45% of eligible sites (as shown in Map 8 in Appendix D). Site level eligibility for delay is further described in Appendix C Table 15.

¹³ Contract Number C-144842

Map 2. Sites Eligible for Delayed Effectuation due to Existing Zoned Capacity




Map 3. Station and Site Level Eligibility for Delayed Effectuation Citywide



Example Stations

The Metro 234 - Ventura Boulevard TOD zone is an example of where existing zoning concentrates density within fewer sites in the station area. Based on existing zoning, the TOD zone has the potential to build approximately 93,023 units, whereas SB 79 would allow the development of approximately 28,474 units. Though the Metro 234 - Ventura Boulevard TOD zone allows for more than 3 times the capacity of SB 79, only 15.44% of individual sites meet at least half the capacity of what would be permitted under SB 79 as shown in the Map 4 below:

Map 4. Sites Eligible for Delayed Effectuation at Metro 234 - Ventura Boulevard TOD zone




This means the stop does not meet Delayed Effectuation 2, which requires that 33% of sites within a TOD zone have 50% of the density and FAR offered by SB 79, a criterion designed to ensure capacity is not concentrated on a few high density parcels within the TOD zone. As a result, the Metro 234 - Ventura Boulevard TOD zone is not eligible for delayed effectuation at a station level, and at an individual site level, approximately 55% of parcels within the TOD zone would be subject to SB 79. Additionally, 466 parcels (32%) are in the VHFHSZ. Though these parcels can all be temporarily exempted from SB 79, the TOD zone as a whole would still be disproportionately

affected by SB 79 as shown in Appendix D, Map 16 combining all delayed effectuation criteria. Capacity in the Metro 234 - Ventura Boulevard TOD zone is illustrative of broader historical land use patterns in Los Angeles, where density is concentrated in higher density commercial and higher density multi-family zones close to commercial corridors. See Appendix C, Table 14 for station level attribute breakdown of this TOD zone.

When looking at capacity by station level delayed effectuation criteria, a nuanced picture emerges of where capacity is not available, with areas throughout the Valley and select TOD zones in West and Central LA unable to meet capacity minimums. Appendix D, Map 9 shows that 83 stations (58%) are eligible for delayed effectuation based on their existing capacity. This concurs with concerns raised at the November 17, 2025 PLUM meeting about a direct delayed effectuation approach increasing capacity in areas of the City that were not recently prioritized for growth in the Citywide Housing Incentive Program. Appendix D, Map 8 shows TOD zones that are composed primarily of lower opportunity areas and can delay effectuation because they contain at least 40% of capacity offered in SB 79. Appendix D, Map 10 shows that almost all majority lower opportunity stations are eligible for delay based on their underlying zoning, reflecting that lower opportunity areas contain more housing capacity categorically.

Additionally, there are TOD zones that would face the prospect of high variability upzoning if a delayed effectuation ordinance without upzoning is pursued. For example the G Line – Woodman Station, shown below, illustrates that while the lower opportunity area census tracts in the Northwestern corner of the TOD zone would be eligible for delayed effectuation due to Delayed Effectuation Criterion 1 (citywide exemption for lower opportunity areas), the rest of the station area would become eligible for higher incentives because it does not meet station level delayed effectuation. Ultimately, only 28% of the station area is eligible for delay, meaning 72% of the station will become subject to SB 79 in July if no local action is taken upzone.

Map 5. CTCAC and Delayed Effectuation Breakdown of the G Line – Woodman Station



The Woodman G Line Station contains high, moderate, and lower opportunity tracts. Incentives applied by tract could lead to uneven development outcomes. As shown above on the image to the right, sites eligible for delayed effectuation (blue) generally align with low resource opportunity tracts (green).

In addition to low opportunity and capacity related delayed effectuation criteria, SB 79 extends exemptions and delayed effectuation provisions to local historic sites (6% of parcels citywide), sites in VHFHSZs (9% of parcels citywide), sites more than one mile walking distance from a station entrance, and industrial employment hubs. See Appendix C, Table 12 for a full citywide breakdown of sites meeting those site characteristics. As mentioned above, staff are currently working to identify industrial employment hub eligibility and as such industrial employment hubs are not yet included in delayed effectuation analysis.

Overall, if the City pursued Approach B to delay effectuation only on sites and TOD zones that already meet SB 79's delayed effectuation thresholds, 116 whole stations and 88% of sites would qualify. SB 79 would therefore become available in 25 station areas and on 13,069 sites with lower density underlying zoning in TOD zones including the Tampa, Woodman, Valley College, Sepulveda, Reseda, Pierce College, and Balboa G line Stations, the Westwood and Sepulveda Expo line stations, the Glendale Metrolink station, the proposed La Brea K-Line extension, and the Westchester K Line station. This is illustrated in Appendix D, Map 16 and a full list of stations ineligible for delay is included in Appendix C, List 1.

By taking a proactive approach that focuses growth in station areas that are primarily higher and moderate opportunity (see Upzoning Options 1-3 below in Section VIII), and applying incentives more evenly across those majority moderate/higher opportunity stations depending on quality of transit service rather than underlying zoning, the City will align its growth with quality infrastructure that can service greater residential intensity and remain consistent with public input and local objectives that informed the 2021-2029 Housing Element.

VIII. NEAR TERM IMPLEMENTATION: DELAYED EFFECTUATION ORDINANCE AND REZONING

Implementation of SB 79 presents an opportunity to increase land available for mixed income, multi-family development where it's needed most. Based on modeling and analysis, City Council direction, citywide housing priorities identified in the 2021-2029 Housing Element, and state goals to AFFH, the Department has prepared a two part strategy for the local implementation of SB 79 before July 1 including: 1) the initiation of an upzoning program to introduce a phased approach to SB 79 and facilitate a citywide delay in effectuation; and 2) the initiation of a Delayed Effectuation Ordinance consistent with GCS 65912.161(b). This approach could allow more time for the City to consider how to add capacity in sensitive areas, while also providing immediate rezoning in high and moderate opportunity transit rich areas consistent with the 2021-2029 Housing Element.

Citywide Upzoning Code Amendment Ordinance

The City may initiate an upzoning program in SB 79 TOD zones through a citywide code amendment that expands eligibility and development incentives for sites near transit and further delays effectuation across the city. The Department encourages City Council to instruct that any rezoning or upzoning occur as part of an amendment to the City's Mixed Income Incentive Program (MIIP) (LAMC Chapter 1 12.22 A.38) to ensure additional capacity created is done so in alignment with the goals and programs of the 2021-2029 Housing Element. The Department is currently developing targeted amendments to MIIP funded by the HCD Regional Early Action Plan (REAP) Grant, which could be expanded to include code amendments for Upzoning Options. The code amendment could contain targeted increases to density, height, and floor area for low-density zones, including single family, R2, RD, and zones that are not eligible for or have limited access to the City's existing incentive programs and do not presently meet the capacity-based delayed effectuation criteria described in the bill. By increasing development potential through a targeted upzoning, capacity increases would ensure site level eligibility for a citywide deferral of the bill. Due to the expansion of VHFHSZs by the State in 2025, the Department recommends restricting incentive access in areas that are both VHFHSZ and Hillside Area (consistent with the approach of the Affordable Housing Streamlining Ordinance [Ordinance Nos. 188,788 and 188,789]) while allowing incentive access in non-hillside VHFHSZ areas. This would maintain MIIP eligibility in areas like Ventura Boulevard, Colorado Boulevard, and Glendale Boulevard which would otherwise be impacted by the fire map expansion.

Higher density residential and commercial sites already included in the City's MIIP program almost always meet the delayed effectuation criteria of SB 79 and in many cases exceed SB 79's capacity. However, 60% of SB 79 TOD zones are majority composed of lower density zones. Based on the PLUM Committee discussion, the Department has prepared three options (summarized in Table 3 below) for a citywide code amendment that would permit single family, lower density, and sites ineligible for delay within applicable TOD zones access to MIIP's Corridor Transition (CT) Incentive Area and Transit Oriented Incentive Area (TOIA) development incentives. These proposed amendments ensure that all sites meet SB 79 delayed effectuation thresholds, and that capacity is distributed fairly and consistently with the goals of the 2021-2029 Housing Element, the rezoning program description in Program 121, and the recommended options in Exhibit D of the City Planning Commission (CPC) Staff Report for Council File 21-1230-S5. The Upzoning Options maintain strong value capture to ensure maximum on-site affordability and focus growth in high and moderate opportunity areas with access to high quality transit.

The CT and TOIA programs, adopted as part of the Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP) Ordinance and the Housing Element Rezoning Program in 2025, establish development incentives on multi-family and commercially zoned parcels near transit. Today, the CT program applies on sites zoned R2 and RD within 750 feet of designated "Opportunity Corridors"¹⁴ and encourages low rise middle scheme development typologies such as bungalow courts, row houses, and town homes, with incremental FAR provided per unit up to either 10 or 16 units. The TOIA program applies on multi-family zoned sites within a half mile of Major Transit Stops as defined in LAMC 12.03 and supports construction of five to seven story multi-family, podium style developments. Both programs allow for additional floor area and height in exchange for the provision of multi-bedroom units. Projects utilizing the TOIA program may seek additional incentives and waivers for relief from standards that might impede the larger building envelopes facilitated by the incentive program, while projects utilizing the CT program may not. Both programs are subject to eligibility requirements including setting aside percentages of overall units as affordable; disallowing projects in VHFHSZs, sea level rise areas, and industrial areas; and prohibiting the demolition of historic resources. Lastly, incentives associated with both programs are not applicable in the Downtown Los Angeles, Boyle Heights, or Harbor Community Plans. Rezoning through an expansion of MIIP incentive tools will prioritize value capture, ensure that incentives do not apply in areas with environmental hazards such as VHFHSZs or heavy industrial areas, and maintain safeguards for sites with historic resources while still encouraging transit oriented development.


¹⁴ Corridors served by frequent bus or high quality transit service; or within a half mile of a Metro Rail Station in a higher opportunity area.

Upzoning Options

Geographic and Zoning Applicability

Upzoning Options 1, 2, and 3 described later in this section are proposed to apply to specific geographic areas near transit and specific zones. All three Upzoning Options described below utilize the same geographic areas for expansion of development incentives, which include SB 79 TOD zones that are primarily (more than 50%) composed of higher and moderate opportunity areas, herein referred to as “Opportunity Stations.” These areas may include lower or moderate opportunity census tracts when lower or moderate opportunity areas represent the minority of available land in a station area. For example, the North Hollywood B Line station contains census tracts of all CTCAC areas but comprises a majority of moderate and higher opportunity areas, see Map 6 below. Furthermore, the Upzoning Options focus any upzoning on single family and low-density zones due to their limited existing density allowances in comparison to SB 79 standards. With this in mind, to comply with the rules for delayed effectuation contained in GCS 65912.161(b) for site level delayed effectuation, including having at least 50% of the capacity and FAR created by SB 79, a rezoning of single family sites remains the focus of the options presented.

Map 6. North Hollywood B Line Station with CTCAC Area Designations



The North Hollywood B Line Station (pink radius) contains highest, high, moderate, and lower opportunity tracts. Incentives applied by tract could lead to uneven development outcomes.

Considering the station in its entirety can provide opportunity for consistency in the built environment when census tracts divide corridors and neighborhoods. However, it is important to note that if the City Council wishes to exempt lower opportunity areas from potential upzoning (as SB 79 affords delayed effectuation provisions to these areas), they may modify any option to eliminate lower opportunity sites. Citywide analysis shows that 55 stations out of 141 (39% of all SB 79 TOD zones) can be classified as Opportunity Stations, see Appendix C, List One. In addition to Opportunity Station eligibility, higher and moderate opportunity census tracts that are located outside of Opportunity Stations and are ineligible for delay, are also proposed for CT eligibility in the options to ensure delayed effectuation minimums are met. Maps provided below for Options 1-3 (see Map 7 below and Appendix E, Maps 17-19) include all potential tracts that may apply to and are overly inclusive of tracts. The Department expects to be able to remove a substantial share of tracts outside of opportunity stations including tracts in South Los Angeles, once available revised maps will be posted online¹⁵.

The Department recommends that the City Council select one of the three Upzoning Options described herein to ensure citywide delayed effectuation eligibility. These options are designed to qualify the City for a temporary delay of SB 79 while still adding housing capacity in ways that

¹⁵ <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/480791d9b665485ea798986dcad61e86>

are consistent with local goals and the 2021-2029 Housing Element. Each option builds upon the next, with Option 1 offering the most limited approach of the three, while Options 2 and 3 offer a broader rezoning approach that may minimize the need to subsequently upzone as part of a future Alt Plan. Options vary based on the quality of transit (existing vs proposed) and the scale of incentives (CT or TOIA) available. Options were designed to incorporate feedback from the PLUM Committee discussion, public comment, and advocacy organizations, in addition to these options the Table 4 below offers optionality for greater and reduced rezoning, including an option for the bare minimum upzoning needed to ensure delayed effectuation. As described above, all three options include eligibility within HPOZs with reduced incentives and offer incentives in the non-hillside portions of the VHFHSZs. See Maps 17-19 in Appendix E for a visual demonstration of where these incentives would be extended to single family and low-density zones.

Option 1 Corridor Transition (CT) Expansion: This option extends CT incentives to single family and lower residential parcels that are either in one of the 55 Opportunity Station half-mile buffers served by both existing and planned transit routes or are located in select higher or moderate opportunity census tracts ineligible for delay. The most impacted areas of the City would include Central, West LA, South Valley, and East LA Area Planning Commission (APC) areas. Since there are more low-density zones, particularly single family zones, within TOD zones in the South Valley, those areas face greater potential development changes despite the increase in development incentives occurring across TOD zones citywide. This option offers the lightest rezoning approach of the three Options and would ensure citywide delayed effectuation eligibility. However, following the delayed effectuation period, many of these areas would likely need to be further rezoned by 2030 to comply with local Alt Plan requirements of SB 79. Note that this option will necessitate substantive restructuring of the CT program given it expands incentive applicability to whole half mile buffers around eligible transit stations in contrast to the current program's applicability near Opportunity Corridors.

Option 2 Transit Oriented Incentive Area (TOIA) Expansion near Operational Rail + Option 1: This option is inclusive of Option 1 but also extends full¹⁶ TOIA incentives to single family and lower density parcels in Opportunity Stations along existing or operating rail lines. It would not include TOIA eligibility for BRT or planned routes. This criteria would qualify 25¹⁷ TOD zones that are primarily located in the Central and West APC areas for TOIA incentives. In this scheme, low-density zones surrounding all 55 Opportunity Stations would remain eligible for CT incentives. This option focuses higher intensity incentives in the central urban core of the City, while facilitating missing middle scale development in the South Valley, Northeast LA, and along corridors like Sepulveda on the Westside.

¹⁶ Current Restricted Density limitations would not apply, and sites would be eligible for unlimited density.

¹⁷ This count is inclusive of the purple line extension area, as it is expected to be operational in the near future.

Option 3 TOIA Expansion near all Transit + Option 1: This option is also inclusive of Option 1 and provides the broadest extension of TOIA incentives to single family and lower density parcels in Opportunity Stations across all SB 79 TOD zones including those served by both planned and existing transit lines. Within this option all 55 Opportunity Station buffers receive full TOIA incentives in addition to CT Incentives. This option offers the most generous application of incentives to prioritize development in Opportunity Stations in alignment with SB 79, the recommended options in Exhibit D of the CPC Staff Report for Council File 21-1230-S5, and Program 121 of the Housing Element.

Map 7. Upzoning Options






Table 3. Summary Options for Expansion of the Mixed Income Incentive Program to Lower Density Zones (R2, RD and Single Family)

	Option 1: CT Expansion	Option 2:¹⁸ TOIA Expansion near Operational Rail + Option 1	Option 3:²³ TOIA Expansion near all Transit + Option 1
Transit Status Applicability	All SB 79 Stops (planned and existing stops)	Existing Rail	All SB 79 Stops (planned and existing stops)
Opportunity Station Applicability	55 Opportunity Stations + Select ¹⁹ Higher and Moderate Opportunity Tracts receive CT incentives	23 ²⁰ Opportunity Stations receive TOIA Incentives & 32 Opportunity Stations + Select ²⁷ Higher and Moderate Opportunity Tracts receive CT incentives	55 Opportunity Stations receive TOIA incentives & Select ²⁷ Higher and Moderate Opportunity Tracts receive CT incentives
Density	4-16 units	Limited by FAR ²¹	Limited by FAR ²⁵
FAR²²	Incremental up to 2.9:1	Up to a 4.5:1	Up to a 4.5:1
Height²⁶	2-3 stories	7 stories max	7 stories max

Consistent with the MIIP framework, all three options require affordable units set aside in order to receive development incentives. Furthermore, the program's eligibility criteria includes protections for sites in VHFHSZs and Hillside Areas by excluding these sites from eligibility; and for sites with historic resources through limitations on building volume incentives for sites with Designated Historic Resources, in addition to restricting demolition (additional discussion on the implications for sites in VHFHSZs and with historic resources may be found below on page 33 and 34). None

¹⁸ All areas qualifying for TOIA could also opt to use CT incentives in this option.

¹⁹ Only High and Moderate Opportunity census tracts in majority low opportunity station areas ineligible for delay would be eligible.

²⁰ This count is inclusive of the D line extension area, as it is expected to be operational in the near future.

²¹ Density allowances in Options 2 and 3 would supersede any limitations for low-density zones.

²² Projects may be eligible for additional FAR and height in exchange for provision of multi-bedroom units. CT program projects may access up to an additional 0.5:1 FAR and 11 feet in height. TOIA program projects may access up to 1.0:1 FAR and up to an additional 22 feet in height.

of the recommendations would create new capacity in areas vulnerable to one foot of sea level rise or on sites in the Coastal Zone. Across all options (Appendix E, Maps 17-19), the eligible TOD zones are concentrated in the Central, West, and South Valley APC areas; while East Los Angeles and North Valley APCs would each have several TOD zones affected. The South Los Angeles APC would receive limited incentives for missing middle housing in a few moderate and higher opportunity tract areas; there would be no expansion of incentives in the Harbor APC.

If any of these options are desired, City Council can instruct the Department to initiate a code amendment for one of these options as is. Alternatively, these options may be further customized to achieve desired goals, as described in Table 4. Refinement options are informed by feedback received over the past year and allow flexibility to grow or reduce recommendations based on transit types, CTCAC category designation, historic resources, and VHFHSZ eligibility. Modifications beyond those described below would require evaluation to determine if Citywide delayed effectuation would be impacted, refinement options would not revise current eligibility for the MIIP program.

Table 4. Topic Areas for Modification to Upzoning

Applicable Option	Grow or Reduce	Topic Area	Modification Description
All	Grow	Lower Opportunity Areas	Expand eligibility to single family zones in lower opportunity areas
All	Reduce	Lower and Moderate Opportunity Areas	Remove low and/or moderate opportunity areas eligible for delayed effectuation
		Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones	Do not expand incentives in all VHFHSZs (including non-hillside areas)
		Historic Resources	Do not expand incentives on sites with historic resources
Option 3	Reduce	Bus Only Lane Eligibility	Exclude stops created by bus only lanes that are not BRTs
Option 1	Reduce (Most Limited Upzoning Option)	Only amend zoning for Areas Ineligible for Delayed Effectuation	For the most limited rezoning, Option 1 could be further reduced to only apply to sites and areas ineligible for delayed effectuation

Discussion on each topic area provided in Table 4 where modifications may be desired is provided in detail below:

Lower Opportunity Areas: Consistent with Program 121 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element, the options described focus capacity for new housing units in higher opportunity areas; however, the Upzoning Options include upzones to lower opportunity area tracts only when located within an Opportunity Station where more than 50% of a station is composed of higher and moderate opportunity areas. The rezoning approach for each option to focus on majority moderate and higher opportunity areas aligns with the aim to pause implementation of SB 79 in all lower opportunity areas consistent with rules of GCS 65912.161(b). City Council could opt to expand incentives into TOD zones in lower opportunity neighborhoods; however this could potentially hinder the City's ability to meet its state-level AFFH mandate. Furthermore, it could exacerbate redevelopment pressures in areas of the City that have produced more affordable housing over the last decade as a result of historic land use patterns.

Lower and Moderate Opportunity Areas: Another area for potential modification might be reducing incentive applicability in lower and moderate opportunity areas. Moderate opportunity areas often align with what are perceived as “gentrifying” areas of the City, as shown in the more recent CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map designation called “Neighborhood Change.”²³ Redevelopment in areas experiencing “neighborhood change” can increase housing availability and expand housing mobility. However, advocates have requested more modest upzoning in moderate and lower opportunity areas that are ineligible for delayed effectuation to provide time for tenant outreach and program development. Expanding incentive applicability utilizing the Opportunity Station tool could potentially increase redevelopment pressures in moderate and lower opportunity areas of the City as incentives would still apply in these tracts if in an Opportunity Station; although safeguards in place through the Resident Protections Ordinance (RPO) would still apply. Under the City’s new RPO, a new project must provide one to one replacement, relocation compensation, and right to return. As the City has continued to expand protections for tenants, the proposed Upzoning Options only include low and moderate opportunity areas when the majority of census tracts (more than 50% percent) within the TOD zone are composed of higher and moderate opportunity areas and areas ineligible for delay. This ensures consistent land use and design outcomes throughout a half mile buffer as opposed to census tracts with boundaries that bisect neighborhoods and corridors, such as station areas like the North Hollywood B Line station (discussed above) where a lower opportunity tract traverses the northern portion of the half mile buffer. However, if the City Council wants to prioritize development in higher opportunity areas to protect against displacement for the City’s most vulnerable populations, the Council could remove moderate and low opportunity census tracts eligible for delay from the Opportunity Station area and limit incentive to census tracts ineligible for delay.

Bus Only Lanes: Rezoning Option 3 applies TOIA incentives most broadly to all SB 79 transit types, including bus only lanes. These higher tier incentives could be removed along bus only lane stops if Council perceives this as a less quality transit service than the other types included in the bill. While bus only lanes offer frequent service, they might not eliminate the need for car transportation like proximity to a rail or BRT stop can.

Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones – Existing City policy inclusive of the CHIP Ordinance prioritizes residential growth in areas safe from fire and other environmental risks. The tragic Palisades Fire of early 2025 demonstrated that the homes of Angelenos are vulnerable to catastrophic fire destruction. Although the present Upzoning Options

²³ The Neighborhood Change Map identifies tracts that have undergone recent racial and/or economic changes, and where increasing rental costs in low and moderate-income communities of color may produce more change. The methodology identifies tracts that have experienced both substantial racial/ethnic demographic change (growth in the non-Hispanic white share of the population) and economic demographic change (growth in the share of high-income households), as well as markers of disproportionate housing need (rising median rents):
<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/sites/default/files/docs/planning-and-community/neighborhood-change-memo.pdf>

would contain an eligibility carve out for parcels in areas where VHFHSZs and Hillside Areas overlap (consistent with eligibility limitations contained in the recently adopted Affordable Housing Streamlining Ordinance), the City Council may further modify this criterion so that all single family sites in the VHFHSZ are ineligible for rezoning. This would result in all Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, including areas in non-hillside areas, being ineligible. However, it is important to understand that the state VHFHSZ maps represent fire “hazard” areas rather than fire “risk,” the latter of which is inclusive of mitigation measures. For that reason, the state VHFHSZ has expanded into paved and urbanized areas that are not as likely to burn as Hillside Areas but are experiencing higher temperatures and wind patterns increasing the likelihood of a fire hazard.²⁴ These areas have better access and connectivity and include geographies like Ventura Boulevard, Highland Park, and Atwater Village. The present Upzoning Options propose an eligibility criteria of where VHFHSZ and Hillside Areas overlap for three reasons: 1) Hillside Areas present unique evacuation concerns; 2) redevelopment in urbanized areas that have adequate ingress/egress improve the structural resilience of buildings; and 3) this criterion is aligned with other existing City policy such as the recently codified Affordable Housing Streamlining Ordinance.

Historic Resources: As presented, all options would apply incentives to sites with historic resources consistent with the eligibility criteria in today’s MIIP regardless of exceptions and delayed effectuation rules that may apply²⁵. This means sites with historic resources could qualify for the MIIP’s incentives but would be prohibited from demolishing any historic resource and would have a base incentive allowance of only one additional story of floor area and height. A total of 11 HPOZs intersect with the proposed Opportunity Station areas. This recommendation is consistent with the PLUM Committee’s discussion and public feedback recommending that the Department explore upzoning scenarios that could still extend modest bonuses to sites with historic resources. The City Council could opt to modify the options to exclude sites with historic resources from expanded MIIP eligibility, and instead include all historic areas without any zoning changes in a citywide delayed effectuation ordinance under the provisions of SB 79.

Limited Upzoning: Under Option 1, the City Council could take a more modest approach to upzoning by only including upzoning on sites located within TOD zones that are ineligible for delay. This would apply the CT program incentives to just over 13,000 single family and low-density sites in approximately 19 TOD zones predominantly in the South Valley and West LA. More information on the TOD zones and sites ineligible for delay can be found in Section VII of this report.

²⁴For more information on Cal Fire’s methodology for High Fire Severity Zones visit: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones>

²⁵ Per GCS 65912.161(b)(1)(F), delayed effectuation may apply to sites with historic resources on a local register designated as of Jan. 1, 2025. Delayed effectuation may not apply to sites with historic resources on a state or national register.

Rezoning Considerations

An action to upzone consistent with the options described above would significantly expand available sites for housing around 55 Opportunity Stations. Sites within those stations, which today generally permit less than five units, would be eligible to build multi-family housing ranging in density from 10 units to unlimited, with heights ranging from two to seven stories depending on transit adjacency. Increasing available land for housing may relieve redevelopment pressures on existing RSO housing stock in lower opportunity areas.

Overall, the Upzoning Options focus growth in higher and moderate opportunity areas, leaving 60% of the City's TOD zones located primarily in Southeast Los Angeles, South Los Angeles, Boyle Heights, and the Northeast Valley unaffected by the bill in the short term. This affords more time to conduct thoughtful community engagement in areas of the City that experience greater housing pressures. Though rezoning wouldn't be focused on these neighborhoods in the short term, it's important to note that capacity exists in these areas as a result of the City's historic zoning and present housing incentive programs. In fact, an assessment of eligible SB 79 sites reveals that just over half of sites eligible in lower opportunity zones are already eligible for the MIIP, while only 42% of eligible parcels in higher opportunity areas are due to a higher prevalence of single family zoning that is not eligible for the MIIP (see Appendix B, Table 5). The 2021-2029 Housing Element includes analysis showing that between 2009-2018, only 14% of covenanted affordable units were produced in higher opportunity areas, meaning lower opportunity areas have historically produced more affordable housing. The Housing Element sought to address this by steering growth and mixed income development into higher opportunity areas, consistent with the Upzoning Options presented for delaying effectuation of SB 79.

While this report focuses on the impact of rezoning on the built environment of the City, adding capacity citywide would likely also have positive fiscal impacts through increases in property tax revenue and real estate transactions, especially if growth is focused in higher opportunity areas and market tiers.²⁶ Additionally, new development may help fund infrastructure improvements using project fees and conditions, in accordance with the City's broader value capture framework. A forthcoming report from the Chief Legislative Analyst's office will speak more to these impacts.

²⁶ Streets for All conducted an analysis on how direct implementation of SB 79 could impact the fiscal projection for the City of Los Angeles here: https://data.streetsforall.org/blog/sb79_zoning_budget.

Delayed Effectuation Ordinance

In addition to upzoning, the Department recommends immediate initiation of an ordinance to delay effectuation citywide consistent with SB 79's rules for delayed implementation based on available capacity and site characteristics. In particular, this ordinance would secure a pause in implementation of SB 79 by affirming compliance with the criteria described in GCS 65912.161(b)²⁷ including sites allowing at least half of SB 79's development potential on individual sites and maintaining over 50% of SB 79's overall capacity citywide (as shown in Appendix C). A delayed effectuation ordinance, consistent with the provisions of the bill, would also affirm exemptions for sites located in industrial employment hubs.²⁸ The Department is working on identifying hubs in areas such as Downtown Los Angeles, Van Nuys, Canoga Park, South Central Los Angeles, and Chatsworth. Furthermore, this ordinance would exempt any sites further than one-mile walking distance from an identified TOD stop. When coupled with a rezoning option discussed in the preceding section, this Delayed Effectuation Ordinance could accomplish a citywide pause in implementation. Alternatively, should City Council abstain from selecting a rezoning approach, the Delayed Effectuation Ordinance would not prevent SB 79 from going into effect in areas including at ten G Line Stations in the South and Northwest Valley, Expo Sepulveda and Expo Westwood/Rancho Park in West LA, and CRN-La Brea/Beverly in Mid City. As discussed in Section IV of this report, a delayed effectuation ordinance requires effectuation prior to SB 79's July 1, 2026 effective date and may be subject to HCD review. Per the bill, the delayed effectuation ordinance would only be valid through one year following the adoption of the seventh cycle of the Housing Element, which would be approximately 2030 for the City of Los Angeles.

IX. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

This report provides insights into both the scale of SB 79's impact as well as how the City can act to ensure the bill applies in a way that furthers local land use and equity goals. Consistent with previous instructions adopted by the City Council, if the City Council wishes to implement a citywide delayed effectuation of SB 79 through upzoning ordinances while the City evaluates density increases to sensitive communities such as lower opportunity areas, neighborhoods in VHFHSZs, and those with higher concentrations of historic and cultural landmarks, the Department recommends that the City Council instruct the Department to create an ordinance to expand applicability of housing incentive programs. Moving forward with these recommendations could expand land available for multifamily development near transit, in alignment with the goals of the bill and would also advance objectives of the 2021-2029 Housing Element to AFFH and maximize value capture through provision of on-site affordable housing. The modeling discussed in this report as well as the eligibility mapping will continue to be refined in coordination with SCAG

²⁷ For further detail on delayed effectuation criteria for eligible areas, see pages 12-13 of the City Planning report dated November 13, 2025.

²⁸ Paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of GCS 65912.160 defines an industrial employment hub as a contiguous area of at least 250 acres dedicated to industrial uses and designated as such in the local jurisdiction's general plan as of January 1, 2025.

and may result in different outcomes than described herein. The Department will report back to City Council on modeling updates and will continue to maintain and update, as needed, the eligibility map available for public review online²⁹. Furthermore, the Department will continue to monitor any new legislation proposed, including SB 908 (Weiner) aimed at refining and clarifying SB 79's regulations.

Sincerely,



VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Director of Planning

VPB:AV:jm:bs:tt:ec:wi:cb:am

Appendices:

- A. TOD Zone Interpretations
- B. TOD Zone Analysis
- C. Delayed Effectuation Analysis
- D. Delayed Effectuation Maps
- E. Rezoning Maps and Additional Materials

²⁹ <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/480791d9b665485ea798986dcad61e86>

APPENDIX A: TOD ZONE INTERPRETATIONS

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Stop Definition and Mapping Updates

The Department released preliminary mapping³⁰ of potential SB 79 TOD stops and associated TOD zones that included 150 stops along both existing and planned transit routes identified in SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (Metro) Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP). As a result of review of the TOD stop definition (GCS 65912.156(p)), which includes a requirement that any eligible planned transit stop be on a route which has a preferred alternative selected or is included in the RTIP, and evaluation of plans for future lines that may comprise the City of Los Angeles' transit network, the Department refined the number of stops along planned routes to ensure consistency with the bill's provisions. A revised draft map of eligible TOD stops, and TOD zones can be found in Map 1 above.

Revised maps remove planned routes lacking a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) based on an interpretation of the bill that a planned route is considered to have an LPA if there is documentation of an approved action to certify an environmental document or to fund a project from the Metro Board or similar transportation authority or regulatory body. This interpretation informed removal of the Lincoln Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Vermont Short Corridor (distinct from the Vermont Transit Corridor BRT project), B Line Extension, and East San Fernando Valley Light Rail Transit northern segment. On Jan. 22, 2026, the Metro Board approved an LPA³¹ for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, therefore the stations have been retained, reclassified as Tier 1, and added to the revised draft map. The Metro Board is anticipated to vote on an LPA for the K Line Northern Extension in March; therefore, the preliminary station locations included in SCAG's RTP/SCS in the City's draft map will be updated when an LPA is formally selected by the Metro Board.

Additional mapping updates include the removal of three Metrolink stations as TOD zones and updated station locations for the Vermont BRT based on the final Metro Board report approved in March 2025. In particular, the Burbank Airport North, Burbank Airport South, and Van Nuys Metrolink³² stations were removed from the City's preliminary map of SB 79 TOD zones because they do not meet the 48-trains per day across both directions threshold for Tier 2 nor the 72-trains per day threshold for Tier 1. Additionally, the Department has revised maps to group transit hubs, stops that may be served by multiple types of lines (e.g., an intersection of heavy rail (Tier 1) and light rail (Tier 2) by their highest tier. The aforementioned changes and consolidations resulted in a new citywide total of 141 TOD stops or zones.

³⁰ <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/480791d9b665485ea798986dcad61e86>

³¹ Modified Alternative 5 was approved as the LPA.

³² Note that a TOD zone remains adjacent to the Van Nuys Metrolink stop due to the presence of an eligible East San Fernando Valley Light Rail Transit stop.

Review by the California Department of Housing and Community Development

The Department continues to actively coordinate with state agencies, regional agencies, and other municipalities to refine interpretations on key provisions including those applicable to the adoption and implementation of local ordinances. After further review it was determined that delayed effectuation ordinances become effective immediately upon their operative date, therefore allowing the City until June 30, 2026, to effectuate any ordinance associated with Approaches B or C (discussed in Section III above). Following adoption, any implementing ordinance would be subject to HCD review, pursuant to the procedures and timelines described in GCS 65912.160 including a maximum 120-day review period, that may result in the need for corrections. The City remains in communication with HCD to minimize the need for any future corrections to legislative actions.

2025 and 2026 CTCAC Opportunity Map Data

The CTCAC and HCD Opportunity Area Map for 2026 was adopted in December 2025. Therefore, the analysis of TOD zones included in this report is based on the 2026 Opportunity Area Maps. Within the newly issued maps, approximately 99 census tracts have changed opportunity area categories, including 29 tracts which were reclassified as lower opportunity, 52 tracts which were reclassified as moderate opportunity, and 18 tracts which were reclassified as higher opportunity. Within TOD zones, areas reclassified as lower opportunity include Montecito Heights, Van Nuys, and parts of South Park. Those now designated as moderate opportunity include Highland Park and Koreatown, and those now designated highest or high opportunity include Highland Park, North Hollywood, and Chinatown.

APPENDIX B: TOD ZONE ANALYSIS

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Considerations

Taking a deeper look at the bill's AFFH impacts, Table 5 explores characteristics of sites located in TOD zones based on their CTCAC designation. Percentages in each row are reflective of each opportunity area's characteristic or the citywide ratio. As mentioned above, 57%³³ of the City's TOD zones have a majority of sites within designated lower opportunity areas, these TOD zones fall largely within South and the eastern parts of Central Los Angeles. Conversely, about 30%¹³ of the City's TOD zones are majority higher opportunity, which are predominantly located in West LA, the western parts of Central Los Angeles and South Valley.

³³ This percentage is based on area calculations of an entire TOD zone by CTCAC designation, including areas designated as "insufficient data."

Table 5. SB 79 Eligible Sites by CTCAC Designation

Opportunity Area	Count of SB 79 Sites³⁴	Percent of SB 79 Sites³⁴	Percent Single Family³⁵	Percent RD and more Restrictive³⁵	Percent MIIP Eligible³⁵	Percent 1-2 RSO Units³⁵	Percent 3+ RSO Units³⁵	Percent VHFHSZ³⁵	Percent Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ)³⁵
Lower	78,807	57%	36%	68%	52%	13%	16%	2%	3%
Moderate	14,896	11%	40%	60%	49%	9%	18%	14%	12%
Higher	43,906	32%	54%	70%	40%	12%	13%	19%	8%
Overall	137,609	100%	42%	68%	48%	12%	15%	9%	6%

³⁴ Numbers and percentages for low, moderate, and higher opportunity areas in this column are summed in the overall row at the bottom of the table.

³⁵ Percentages for low, moderate, and higher opportunity areas are based on the count of parcels for that category. The overall percentage is based on the number of eligible SB 79 parcels citywide.

Table 6. SB 79 TOD zone Characteristics by APC Area*

Area Planning Commission (APC)	Total Number of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zones	TOD zones that have a majority of parcels zoned for Low-density (RD or more restrictive) TOD zones	TOD zones that have a majority of parcels zoned Single Family	TOD zones with more than 10% of parcels containing 1-2 Rent Stabilized Ordinance Units	TOD zones with more than 10% of parcels located within a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone	TOD zones located within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
Central Los Angeles	40	6.5	2	10	7.5	7
East Los Angles	12.5	12	5	9.5	4	9
Harbor Area	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Valley	10.5	9.5	8.5	3	0	1
South Los Angeles	35	26.5	8	25	4.5	0
South Valley	28.5	23.5	23.5	3	2	4
West Los Angeles	14.5	6	4	.5	0	2
TOTAL	141	84	52	51	18	23

*Note that TOD zones which are split across multiple APCs are counted as 0.5 toward each APC total.

Table 7. SB 79 TOD zone Majority CTCAC Designation by APC Area*

Area Planning Commission (APC)	Total Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zones	Majority Lower Opportunity TOD zones	Majority Moderate Opportunity TOD zones
Central Los Angeles	40	21.5	5
East Los Angeles	12.5	5.5	2
Harbor Area	0	0	0
North Valley	10.5	8.5	0
South Los Angeles	35	34	0
South Valley	28.5	10.5	3
West Los Angeles	14.5	4	0
TOTAL	141	84	10

*Note that TOD zones which are split across multiple APCs are counted as 0.5 toward each APC total.

Table 8. 20 Transit Oriented Development (TOD) zones with the highest percentage of sites with 1-2 Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) units

Area Planning Commission (APC)	TOD zone Name	Percent of Sites with 1-2 RSO Units (%)	Majority CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Map Designation*
Central	K Extension - La Brea/Beverly	22	Higher
	D Extension - Wilshire/Fairfax	22	Higher
	D Extension - Wilshire/La Cienega	21	Higher
East LA	E-Indiana	29	Lower
	Metrolink – Glendale	24	Higher
	E-Soto	23	Lower
	E-Mariachi Plaza	18	Lower
	A-Heritage Square	16	Lower
South LA	Vermont BRT - Slauson Ave	26	Lower
	E - Expo/Western	25	Lower
	A – Vernon	24	Lower
	Vermont BRT - Vernon Ave	22	Lower
	A – Slauson	21	Lower
	E - Expo/La Brea	20	Lower
	K - Crenshaw/Adams	19	Lower
	Vermont BRT - W Adams Blvd	18	Lower
	E - Expo/Vermont	17	Lower

Central, East LA	B/Vermont BRT - Vermont/Sunset	17	Mixed
Central, South LA	K Extension - Pico/San Vicente	36	Higher
	A - San Pedro St	16	Lower

*TOD zones with a CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map designation of “Mixed” do not have a single map category that exceeds 50% of the TOD zone area.

Table 9. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zones with Sites in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZs)

TOD Zone Name	Percentage of TOD zone within VHFHSZs by Lot Area (%)*	Count of Sites in TOD zone within VHFHSZs by Lot Area
A-Southwest Museum	100	1951
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Colorado Boulevard	100	875
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-E Broadway	100	33
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-W Alameda Avenue	96	5
B - University City/Studio City	87	724
A-Heritage Square	86	1854
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Eagle Rock Boulevard	82	1494
SP-UCLA Ackerman Union	81	28
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Townsend Avenue	78	1612
A-Lincoln/Cypress	77	465
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-W Riverside Drive	73	15
A-Highland Park	56	1103
SP - Ventura Blvd	53	729
A-Chinatown	51	347
B/K Extension - Hollywood/Highland	49	718
Metro 234 -Ventura Boulevard	35	504
B - Hollywood/Vine	33	457
B - Hollywood/Western	31	459
D Extension/SP - Westwood/UCLA	28	1
D/Vermont BRT - Vermont/Sunset	8	212
Metrolink - Glendale	7	40
G Line - Nordhoff	4	28

TOD Zone Name	Percentage of TOD zone within VHFHSZs by Lot Area (%)*	Count of Sites in TOD zone within VHFHSZs by Lot Area
Metro 70 - N Spring Street	3	27

*Note that the above percentages only account for sites within TOD zones that are located within the City of Los Angeles.

Table 10. Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) with Sites in Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zones

Historic Preservation Overlay Zone	Number of Intersecting Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zones	Number of HPOZ Sites in TOD zones	Percentage of HPOZ Area in a TOD zones	Percentage of Land in a TOD zone Designated as an HPOZ (%)
Adams-Normandie	1	717	97	Vermont BRT - W Adams Blvd: 38
Carthay Circle	2	450	99	D Extension - Wilshire/Fairfax: 17
				D Extension - Wilshire/La Cienega: 17
Carthay Square	1	61	18	D Extension - Wilshire/Fairfax: 4
Hancock Park	2	393	32	K Extension - La Brea/Beverly: 14
				D Extension/K Extension - Wilshire/La Brea: 6
Highland Park - Garvanza	3	2907	74	A-Heritage Square: 26
				A-Highland Park: 79
				A-Southwest Museum: 38
Hollywood Grove	1	87	63	B-Hollywood/Western: 6
Jefferson Park	1	35	2	E-Expo/Western: 1
La Fayette Square	1	95	40	K Extension - Pico/San Vicente: 5
Lincoln Heights	2	263	27	A-Heritage Square: 6
				A-Lincoln/Cypress: 25
Miracle Mile	3	847	64	K Extension - Pico/San Vicente: 3
				D Extension/K Extension - Wilshire/La Brea: 20
				D Extension - Wilshire/Fairfax: 29

Historic Preservation Overlay Zone	Number of Intersecting Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zones	Number of HPOZ Sites in TOD zones	Percentage of HPOZ Area in a TOD zones	Percentage of Land in a TOD zone Designated as an HPOZ (%)
Adams-Normandie	1	717	97	Vermont BRT - W Adams Blvd: 38
Carthay Circle	2	450	99	D Extension - Wilshire/Fairfax: 17
				D Extension - Wilshire/La Cienega: 17
Miracle Mile North	2	482	81	D Extension - La Brea/Beverly: 22
				D Extension/K Extension - Wilshire/La Brea: <1
Pico-Union	8	190	23	A/E - Pico: 4
				A - Grand/LATTC: <1
				Metro 81 - Pico Boulevard: 15
				Metro 81 - Venice Boulevard: 17
				Metro 81 - W 12th Street: 6
				Metro 81 - W Washington Boulevard: 8
				B/D - Westlake/MacArthur Park: 2
				Vermont BRT - Pico Blvd: 2
South Carthay	1	41	11	D Extension - Wilshire/La Cienega: 3
University Park	8	576	88	A - Grand/LATTC: 17
				E - Jefferson/USC: <1
				E - LATTC/Ortho Institute: 23

Historic Preservation Overlay Zone	Number of Intersecting Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zones	Number of HPOZ Sites in TOD zones	Percentage of HPOZ Area in a TOD zones	Percentage of Land in a TOD zone Designated as an HPOZ (%)
Adams-Normandie	1	717	97	Vermont BRT - W Adams Blvd: 38
Carthay Circle	2	450	99	D Extension - Wilshire/Fairfax: 17
				D Extension - Wilshire/La Cienega: 17
				Metro 81 - Pico Boulevard: <1
				Metro 81 - Venice Boulevard: 19
				Metro 81 - W 23rd Street: 37
				Metro 81 - W Washington Boulevard: 33
				Vermont BRT - W Adams Blvd: 13
Van Nuys	3	255	100	ESFV/SP- Van Nuys/Oxnard: <1
				ESFV-Van Nuys/Vanowen: 15
				ESFV-Van Nuys/Victory: 13
West Adams Terrace	1	115	23	K Extension - Crenshaw/Adams: 5
Whitley Heights	1	124	52	B/K Extension - Hollywood/Highland: 8
Wilshire Park	1	102	20	D - Wilshire/Western: 8
Windsor Square	1	65	6	D - Wilshire/Western: 5

Table 11. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zones with 20% or Greater Zoned Industrial

Area Planning Commission	TOD zone Name	Percentage of Industrial Area (%)	Majority TCAC Designation*
Central	A/B/D/Metrolink - Union Station	27	Mixed
	K Extension - La Brea/Santa Monica	22	Higher
South Los Angeles	A – Vernon	39	Lower
South Los Angeles, Central	A – Washington	79	Lower
East LA, Central	E Pico/Aliso	30	Lower
North Valley	G – Nordhoff	57	Mixed
	ESFV-Van Nuys/San Fernando	36	Lower
	G – Chatsworth	27	Higher
	ESFV-Van Nuys/Roscoe	20	Lower
North Valley, South Valley	Metro 234 - Roscoe Boulevard	32	Lower
	G – Roscoe	28	Lower
South Valley	ESFV/SP-Van Nuys	56	Lower
	Metro 234 - Saticoy Street	25	Lower
West	C/K - Aviation/Century	26	Moderate
	K Line-Westchester/Veterans	21	Higher
	C - LAX/Metro Transit Center	21	Higher

*TOD zones with a CTCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map designation of “Mixed” do not have a single map category that exceeds 50% of the TOD zone area.

APPENDIX C: DELAYED EFFECTUATION ANALYSIS

Table 12. Delayed Effectuation Eligibility Summary Table

	Local and SB79 Allowable Capacity				Delayed Effectuation (DE) Eligibility Criteria									
	Local Max. Potential Units	79 Max. Potential Units	Local Floor Area ¹	79 Floor Area ²	Lower Opportunity Areas ³	Station Area Density and FAR ⁴	Majority Lower Opportunity Stations ⁵	Site Level Density and FAR ⁶	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones ⁷	1 foot Sea Level Rise ⁸	Local Historic Resources ⁹	1-mile walking distance ¹⁰	Parcels Eligible for any DE Criteria	Parcels Statutorily Exempt from SB79
Number of City Parcels	6,876,877	2,447,945	3,391,921,016	3,165,270,568	62,922	53,699	59,839	38,689	10,620	0	6,760	294	98,981	26,320
Percent of City Parcels					56.16%	47.92%	53.40%	34.53%	9.48%	0.00%	6.03%	0.26%	88.34%	19.02%
Number of Stations						83	79							

1 Maximum allowable building volume that could be developed under local zoning rules.

2 Maximum allowable building volume that could be developed under SB79.

3 Sites eligible for delayed effectuation of SB79 due to being located in a lower opportunity area as designated by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC).

4 Station Hubs where both (a) at least 33 percent of lots produce at least 50% of density and FAR of SB79 and (b) lots estimated to produce at least 75% of the density of SB79.

5 Station Hubs where (a) at least 50% of station area is designated as TCAC lower opportunity area and, (b) 40% of the aggregated density of SB79.

6 Sites meeting 50% density and FAR of SB 79.

7 Sites that are in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ).

8 Sites that are in areas vulnerable to one foot of sea level rise.

9 Sites contain historic resources designated before January 1, 2025 on the City's local register.

10 Sites that are beyond one-mile walking distance from the SB79 TOD stop.

CF 25-1083 Appendix B, Table 13_Delayed Effectuation Eligibility by Station Area

Table 13. Delayed Effectuation Eligibility by Station Area

Station Hub	Local Maximum Potential Units	79 Maximum Potential Units	Local Floor Area	79 Floor Area	Parcels in Lower Opportunity Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Station Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation Due to Existing Capacity	Lower Opportunity Station Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Eligible for Delayed Effectuation Due to Existing Capacity	Parcels in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels in One-Foot Sea Level Rise Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Designated as a Local Historic Resource Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels within 1-mile Walking Distance of a Station Entrance Eligible for SB 79 Exemption	Total Parcels in Station Area	Parcels Statutorily Exempt from SB79	Total Parcels Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Eligible for SB 79	Percent of Station Area Eligible for Delay
A-Chinatown	166,511	27,436	18,395,829	35,985,157	57	Yes	No	544	277	-	16	-	821	202	619	0	100.00%
A-Heritage Square	15,954	31,354	23,676,058	40,876,985	816	No	Yes	355	1,589	-	514	53	2,034	300	1,734	0	100.00%
A-Highland Park	35,659	25,916	36,048,055	33,468,935	339	Yes	No	954	892	-	1,493	-	2,327	464	1,863	0	100.00%
A-Lincoln/Cypress	27,144	22,208	30,397,116	28,979,650	762	Yes	Yes	384	319	-	184	-	1065	273	792	0	100.00%
A-Little Tokyo/Arts District	212,727	23,300	24,358,356	30,506,447	301	Yes	No	450	-	-	23	-	594	134	460	0	100.00%
A-Southwest Museum	12,507	27,243	15,782,159	35,311,559	210	No	No	154	1,736	-	567	41	1,949	213	1,736	0	100.00%
A/RED/PUR/Metrolink-Union Station	148,493	27,948	16,671,197	35,695,172	63	Yes	Yes	267	-	-	9	-	565	263	302	0	100.00%
BLU-103rd St/Watts Towers	16,549	29,920	31,079,135	38,753,371	2121	No	Yes	380	-	-	2	-	2,291	170	2,121	0	100.00%
BLU-Firestone	1,595	2,970	2,339,924	3,844,435	60	No	Yes	42	-	-	-	-	81	21	60	0	100.00%
BLU-Grand/LATTC	225,946	27,551	64,116,710	35,333,458	621	Yes	Yes	612	-	-	108	-	890	222	668	0	100.00%
BLU-San Pedro St	95,010	21,794	39,052,186	28,456,369	804	Yes	Yes	726	-	-	3	-	1,581	477	1,104	0	100.00%
BLU-Slauson	8,366	10,216	15,929,209	13,282,436	677	Yes	Yes	469	-	-	-	-	765	88	677	0	100.00%
BLU-Vernon	10,843	14,544	21,639,932	18,710,234	1306	No	Yes	770	-	-	1	-	1,770	464	1,306	0	100.00%
BLU-Washington	9,171	6,714	8,728,237	8,678,816	367	Yes	Yes	269	-	-	-	-	1253	829	424	0	100.00%
BLU/EXP-Pico	632,608	34,992	128,428,457	45,079,341	425	Yes	Yes	662	-	-	36	-	725	61	664	0	100.00%
BLU/EXP/RED/PUR-7th St/Metro Center	860,279	46,607	177,256,396	59,306,448	463	Yes	Yes	677	-	-	93	-	728	48	680	0	100.00%
BLU/GRN-Willowbrook/Rosa Parks	6,154	16,253	13,614,334	21,323,991	971	No	No	94	-	-	-	-	1014	31	975	8	99.19%
CRN-Crenshaw/Adams	25,040	24,142	31,703,004	31,211,708	1734	Yes	Yes	914	-	-	107	-	2,172	422	1,750	0	100.00%
CRN-La Brea/Beverly	51,557	31,079	24,289,204	40,388,943	0	No	No	263	-	-	760	-	2152	177	999	976	50.58%
CRN-La Brea/Santa Monica	94,530	12,842	28,383,153	16,692,621	0	Yes	No	611	-	-	4	-	1379	508	871	0	100.00%
CRN-Pico/Rimpau	75,018	25,741	41,978,709	33,243,590	26	Yes	No	857	-	-	144	-	2,104	494	1,610	0	100.00%
E-Indiana	5,062	11,110	10,288,960	14,261,212	924	No	Yes	0	-	-	-	-	1109	185	924	0	100.00%
E-Mariachi Plaza	16,735	21,334	21,089,849	27,572,921	839	No	Yes	0	-	-	2	-	1390	471	919	0	100.00%
E-Pico/Aliso	32,173	18,437	14,645,312	24,023,220	468	No	Yes	36	-	-	3	-	928	424	504	0	100.00%
E-Soto	19,832	20,356	23,795,389	26,297,130	1220	No	Yes	0	-	-	5	-	1,996	654	1,342	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/Arleta	6,110	29,653	11,553,898	38,299,074	1614	No	No	26	-	-	-	-	1,647	33	1,614	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/Laurel Canyon	9,296	33,112	11,011,164	42,983,928	2013	No	No	54	-	-	-	-	2,036	23	2,013	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/Northhoff	41,235	32,508	95,151,066	42,813,881	1107	No	Yes	224	-	-	-	-	1,231	104	1,127	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/Roscoe	37,343	30,565	47,463,680	39,701,374	1343	No	Yes	201	-	-	-	-	1,528	185	1,343	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/San Fernando	11,029	26,555	12,179,950	34,412,236	1543	No	Yes	164	-	-	1	-	1,645	102	1,543	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/Sherman	36,161	33,550	33,438,118	43,604,624	1630	No	Yes	284	-	-	-	-	1,748	118	1,630	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/Vanowen	37,975	34,152	32,057,358	44,266,900	1358	Yes	Yes	417	-	-	243	-	1,622	133	1,489	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/Victory	42,916	25,212	35,820,354	32,771,149	1001	Yes	Yes	736	-	-	206	-	1,574	397	1,177	0	100.00%
ESFV-Van Nuys/Woodman	20,409	32,695	52,527,969	42,748,759	1289	No	Yes	73	-	-	-	-	1,408	34	1,374	0	100.00%
ESFV/SP-Van Nuys	13,774	16,217	14,709,193	20,658,121	710	No	Yes	82	-	-	-	4	994	284	710	0	100.00%
ESFV/SP-Van Nuys/Oxnard (Orange)	48,923	32,022	34,081,795	40,447,666	809	Yes	Yes	689	-	-	10	-	1,937	491	1,446	0	100.00%
EXP-Culver City	68,317	9,817	20,669,259	12,735,781	0	Yes	No	478	-	-	1	-	851	262	589	0	100.00%
EXP-Expo Park/USC	61,774	29,648	48,298,903	38,002,487	338	Yes	Yes	312	-	-	4	-	504	166	338	0	100.00%
EXP-Expo/Bundy	94,797	17,045	27,774,572	22,134,311	0	Yes	No	490	-	-	-	-	1,277	242	1,035	0	100.00%
EXP-Expo/Crenshaw	26,960	31,166	33,949,511	40,161,771	1169	Yes	Yes	650	-	-	1	-	2,325	254	2,071	0	100.00%
EXP-Expo/La Brea	30,118	28,967	45,591,697	37,823,542	1466	Yes	Yes	990	-	-	6	-	1,825	339	1,486	0	100.00%
EXP-Expo/Vermont	56,583	30,728	51,588,503	39,437,275	784	Yes	Yes	719	-	-	3	-	1156	372	784	0	100.00%
EXP-Expo/Western	15,012	28,499	26,762,480	36,631,012	2503	No	Yes	866	-	-	34	-	2,868	365	2,503	0	100.00%
EXP-Farmdale	25,164	25,180	36,240,846	32,349,756	1270	Yes	Yes	799	-	-	-	-	1,960	220	1,740	0	100.00%
EXP-Jefferson/USC	60,042	29,505	42,636,382	37,934,301	292	Yes	Yes	265	-	-	13	-	704	412	292	0	100.00%
EXP-La Cienega/Jefferson	35,946	25,232	46,482,934	32,835,038	806	Yes	Yes	378	-	-	1	-	1,154	135	1,019	0	100.00%
EXP-LATTC/Ortho Institute	47,979	24,062	41,551,132	31,035,060	493	Yes	Yes	507	-	-	162	-	1014	453	561	0	100.00%
EXP-Palms	136,326	22,074	40,166,148	28,827,446	0	Yes	No	455	-	-	-	-	1,675	561	1,114	0	100.00%
EXP-Westwood/Rancho Park	41,929	31,798	17,309,938	41,055,695	0	No	No	215	-	-	-	-	2245	64	215	1966	9.86%
EXP/SP-Expo/Sepulveda	66,431	26,945	20,878,094	33,858,227	0	No	No	231	-	-	-	-	1690	271	231	1188	16.28%
GRN-Avalon	11,914	21,229	22,971,364	27,243,261	1717	No	Yes	616	-	-	-	-	1,876	159	1,717	0	100.00%
GRN-Aviation/LAX	0	0	0	0	0	No	No	0	-	-	-	-	38	38	0	0	100.00%
GRN-Harbor Freeway	12,584	19,744	21,779,674	25,636,975	1508	No	Yes	431	-	-	-	-	1,711	203	1,508	0	100.00%

CF 25-1083 Appendix B, Table 13_Delayed Effectuation Eligibility by Station Area

Table 13. Delayed Effectuation Eligibility by Station Area

Station Hub	Local Maximum Potential Units	79 Maximum Potential Units	Local Floor Area	79 Floor Area	Parcels in Lower Opportunity Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Station Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation Due to Existing Capacity	Lower Opportunity Station Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Eligible for Delayed Effectuation Due to Existing Capacity	Parcels in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels in One-Foot Sea Level Rise Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Designated as a Local Historic Resource Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels within 1-mile Walking Distance of a Station Entrance Eligible for SB 79 Exemption	Total Parcels in Station Area	Parcels Statutorily Exempt from SB79	Total Parcels Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Eligible for SB 79	Percent of Station Area Eligible for Delay
GRN-Vermont/Athens	5,008	13,177	7,709,381	17,034,441	829	No	No	85	-	-	-	-	929	97	829	3	99.64%
GRN/K Line-Aviation/96th St	17,481	10,142	22,858,722	13,426,424	0	Yes	No	38	-	-	-	-	231	155	76	0	100.00%
GRN/K Line-Aviation/Century	15,054	9,644	20,543,650	12,756,993	0	Yes	No	12	-	-	-	-	181	127	54	0	100.00%
K Line-Crenshaw/Exposition	27,563	32,208	34,445,487	41,530,284	1157	Yes	Yes	634	-	-	1	-	2,375	249	2,126	0	100.00%
K Line-Crenshaw/MLK	34,788	27,090	25,132,446	34,991,977	749	No	Yes	195	-	-	4	-	1,639	270	1,369	0	100.00%
K Line-Crenshaw/Slauson	28,860	30,773	31,235,333	39,950,737	2089	No	Yes	440	-	-	2	-	2,468	284	2,184	0	100.00%
K Line-Crenshaw/Vernon	26,777	18,464	18,541,908	23,679,964	928	Yes	Yes	301	-	-	2	-	1,261	272	989	0	100.00%
K Line-Florence/Hindly	2,977	11,176	4,905,922	14,443,663	0	No	No	93	-	-	-	-	859	46	93	720	11.44%
K Line-Florence/West	18,583	38,662	18,541,951	50,421,904	709	No	Yes	358	-	-	1	-	952	221	731	0	100.00%
Metro 234 - Parthenia Street	31,208	28,644	55,701,638	37,596,514	598	Yes	Yes	192	-	-	-	-	892	183	709	0	100.00%
Metro 234 - Roscoe Boulevard	25,770	25,993	44,896,349	33,854,544	810	No	Yes	123	-	-	-	-	1013	153	860	0	100.00%
Metro 234 - Saticoy Street	17,425	25,277	19,394,800	32,786,771	1060	No	Yes	118	-	-	-	-	1,209	149	1,060	0	100.00%
Metro 234 - Sherman Way	23,303	33,066	31,796,148	42,810,782	1338	No	Yes	133	-	-	-	-	1,410	72	1,338	0	100.00%
Metro 234 - Vanowen Street	21,880	32,091	27,298,747	41,608,063	1185	No	Yes	90	-	-	-	-	1,468	114	1,354	0	100.00%
Metro 234 - Victory Boulevard	15,555	26,175	18,426,323	33,842,432	971	No	No	87	-	-	-	-	1352	159	997	196	83.57%
Metro 234 - Ventura Boulevard	93,023	28,474	30,981,615	37,250,978	0	No	No	220	466	-	-	-	1425	87	641	697	47.91%
Metro 33 - Venice Boulevard	101,455	11,682	32,701,587	15,135,992	0	Yes	No	469	-	-	1	-	1200	472	728	0	100.00%
Metro 70 - N Spring Street	152,524	18,623	17,307,910	24,279,536	104	Yes	Yes	318	14	-	14	-	540	194	346	0	100.00%
Metro 78 - N Spring Street	284,198	22,589	40,525,999	29,254,049	238	Yes	Yes	349	-	-	24	-	464	102	362	0	100.00%
Metro 81 - Olympic Boulevard	799,560	36,272	165,420,261	46,877,674	338	Yes	Yes	566	-	-	42	-	625	58	567	0	100.00%
Metro 81 - Pico Boulevard	517,163	32,452	114,760,246	41,651,828	459	Yes	Yes	623	-	-	83	-	750	126	624	0	100.00%
Metro 81 - Venice Boulevard	360,609	28,874	89,339,150	36,903,147	495	Yes	Yes	528	-	-	177	-	761	193	568	0	100.00%
Metro 81 - W 12th Street	633,746	33,512	131,076,216	43,234,663	387	Yes	Yes	603	-	-	42	-	692	87	605	0	100.00%
Metro 81 - W 23rd Street	41,805	21,722	37,897,546	28,053,151	387	Yes	Yes	446	-	-	221	-	889	374	515	0	100.00%
Metro 81 - W Washington Boulevard	244,908	27,972	74,170,216	35,765,005	465	Yes	Yes	498	-	-	224	-	800	237	563	0	100.00%
Metro 910 - N Spring Street	301,506	22,054	43,963,352	28,466,931	260	Yes	Yes	350	-	-	32	-	464	102	362	0	100.00%
Metro 910 - S Figueroa Street	705,913	31,265	150,103,468	41,037,033	361	Yes	Yes	502	-	-	65	-	541	38	503	0	100.00%
Metro 910 - W Aliso Street	193,640	20,112	24,270,915	26,077,175	155	Yes	Yes	296	-	-	19	-	460	144	316	0	100.00%
Metro 910/70 - N Spring Street	298,735	21,637	43,915,619	27,933,011	277	Yes	Yes	359	-	-	35	-	474	104	370	0	100.00%
Metrolink - Glendale	15,022	16,406	7,743,717	21,144,927	0	No	No	126	7	-	-	168	1273	166	300	807	27.10%
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Colorado Boulevard	13,323	15,566	6,261,776	20,228,504	0	No	No	60	830	-	6	-	866	36	830	0	100.00%
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-E Broadway	347	487	311,229	628,762	0	No	No	0	28	-	-	-	32	4	28	0	100.00%
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Eagle Rock Boulevard	58,452	29,828	19,828,990	38,749,710	0	No	No	330	1,425	-	11	-	1,892	147	1,609	136	92.21%
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Hesby Street	240,571	27,997	70,626,340	36,702,750	0	Yes	No	906	-	-	4	-	1,655	381	1,274	0	100.00%
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Townsend Avenue	31,201	33,934	15,200,989	44,158,139	0	No	No	182	1,557	-	6	-	2,197	79	1,619	499	76.44%
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-W Alameda Avenue	2	550	135,312	747,086	0	No	No	0	2	-	-	2	4	2	2	0	100.00%
NOHO to Pasadena BRT-W Riverside Drive	5,671	5,204	2,662,253	6,899,915	0	No	No	46	4	-	-	1	287	4	47	236	16.61%
Orange Line - Balboa	4,799	42,354	4,313,167	53,102,081	563	No	No	44	-	-	-	2	657	26	566	65	89.70%
Orange Line - Canoga	54,623	41,165	61,449,367	54,246,243	319	Yes	No	131	-	-	-	-	416	65	351	0	100.00%
Orange Line - Chatsworth	243,419	33,759	66,723,459	44,750,493	0	No	No	259	-	-	2	13	887	29	272	586	31.70%
Orange Line - De Soto	35,886	34,678	40,104,679	45,359,748	535	No	No	79	-	-	-	-	627	53	570	4	99.30%
Orange Line - Laurel Canyon	132,340	24,966	42,543,166	32,600,253	0	Yes	No	343	-	-	2	-	1,743	372	1,371	0	100.00%
Orange Line - Nordhoff	143,160	36,123	39,030,959	48,148,775	145	Yes	No	100	24	-	-	-	403	64	339	0	100.00%
Orange Line - Pierce College	3,255	23,277	6,976,493	30,476,918	674	No	No	12	-	-	2	-	1257	16	676	565	54.47%
Orange Line - Reseda	146,074	28,344	61,036,944	37,274,511	47	No	No	103	-	-	-	-	1177	104	106	967	9.88%
Orange Line - Roscoe	32,786	28,479	32,039,005	37,639,837	1069	No	Yes	72	-	-	-	-	1,192	123	1,069	0	100.00%
Orange Line - Sepulveda	14,523	11,927	8,598,764	15,394,629	394	No	No	37	-	-	-	-	668	137	407	124	76.65%
Orange Line - Sherman Way	38,698	28,294	36,358,161	37,101,289	1230	Yes	Yes	462	-	-	2	-	1,407	177	1,230	0	100.00%
Orange Line - Tampa	12,329	37,622	15,725,364	49,312,714	4	No	No	30	-	-	-	-	1680	39	33	1608	2.01%
Orange Line - Valley College	17,168	27,374	11,130,626	35,533,202	0	No	No	68	-	-	1	-	1602	86	69	1447	4.55%

CF 25-1083 Appendix B, Table 13_Delayed Effectuation Eligibility by Station Area

Table 13. Delayed Effectuation Eligibility by Station Area

Station Hub	Local Maximum Potential Units	79 Maximum Potential Units	Local Floor Area	79 Floor Area	Parcels in Lower Opportunity Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Station Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation Due to Existing Capacity	Lower Opportunity Station Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Eligible for Delayed Effectuation Due to Existing Capacity	Parcels in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels in One-Foot Sea Level Rise Areas Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Designated as a Local Historic Resource Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels within 1-mile Walking Distance of a Station Entrance Eligible for SB 79 Exemption	Total Parcels in Station Area	Parcels Statutorily Exempt from SB79	Total Parcels Eligible for Delayed Effectuation	Parcels Eligible for SB 79	Percent of Station Area Eligible for Delay
Orange Line - Van Nuys	43,852	25,995	30,331,734	33,232,114	774	Yes	Yes	611	-	-	1	-	1,707	444	1,263	0	100.00%
Orange Line - Woodley	6,179	45,045	9,896,061	56,644,164	715	No	No	89	-	-	-	-	814	98	715	1	99.86%
Orange Line - Woodman	22,928	29,220	18,796,255	38,026,766	365	No	No	147	-	-	-	-	1797	164	458	1175	28.05%
PUR-Wilshire/Normandie	102,047	30,029	107,699,492	37,941,692	366	Yes	Yes	495	-	-	13	-	1072	537	535	0	100.00%
PUR-Wilshire/Western	133,255	29,292	88,989,991	37,080,846	143	Yes	No	566	-	-	150	-	1245	493	752	0	100.00%
PURex-Century City	200,380	31,843	56,165,855	40,494,356	0	No	No	110	-	-	2	-	609	38	110	461	19.26%
PURex-Westwood/VA Hospital	57,208	32,477	19,526,435	41,721,910	0	Yes	No	130	1	-	-	-	265	130	135	0	100.00%
PURex-Wilshire/Fairfax	153,218	32,175	51,712,716	40,576,878	0	Yes	No	328	-	-	690	-	1,610	290	1,320	0	100.00%
PURex-Wilshire/La Cienega	76,075	18,840	24,844,722	23,773,329	0	Yes	No	284	-	-	250	-	1,320	257	1,063	0	100.00%
PURex/CRN-Wilshire/La Brea	161,260	34,123	49,822,031	43,358,896	0	Yes	No	301	-	-	387	-	1,646	334	1,312	0	100.00%
PURex/SP-Westwood UCLA	196,105	37,803	56,139,471	47,958,905	0	Yes	No	339	-	-	9	-	932	134	798	0	100.00%
RC-1st/Central	254,178	25,841	29,440,864	33,850,639	367	Yes	Yes	580	-	-	26	-	711	124	587	0	100.00%
RC-2nd/Broadway	449,402	23,130	71,697,626	30,054,074	412	Yes	Yes	469	-	-	57	-	565	93	472	0	100.00%
RC-2nd/Hope	401,511	23,406	89,721,775	30,752,917	183	Yes	Yes	330	-	-	44	3	388	50	338	0	100.00%
RED-Hollywood/Vine	67,170	29,547	55,025,886	37,591,578	341	Yes	No	508	252	-	25	-	1151	383	768	0	100.00%
RED-Hollywood/Western	51,004	27,204	48,292,726	34,640,713	459	Yes	Yes	513	358	-	90	-	1434	574	860	0	100.00%
RED-Universal City/Studio City	72,550	41,829	19,977,887	53,235,676	0	No	No	172	678	-	2	5	969	75	731	163	81.77%
RED-Vermont/Beverly	51,918	18,644	42,622,400	23,611,209	114	Yes	No	713	-	-	2	-	1552	769	783	0	100.00%
RED/CRN-Hollywood/Highland	140,354	31,571	68,130,553	40,096,136	192	Yes	No	668	498	-	162	-	1,546	440	1,106	0	100.00%
RED/Orange Line-North Hollywood	189,236	32,441	62,427,816	41,099,651	251	Yes	No	812	-	-	3	-	1,489	309	1,180	0	100.00%
RED/PUR-Civic Center/Grand Park	431,467	29,547	69,612,566	37,433,874	307	Yes	Yes	426	-	-	47	-	561	127	434	0	100.00%
RED/PUR-Pershing Square	826,956	42,321	134,980,120	53,523,608	632	Yes	Yes	788	-	-	120	-	867	76	791	0	100.00%
RED/PUR-Westlake/Macarthur Park	79,720	27,969	75,155,403	35,675,014	706	Yes	Yes	710	-	-	20	-	1191	430	761	0	100.00%
RED/PUR/Vermont BRT-Wilshire/Vermont	113,219	33,580	104,279,935	42,643,771	399	Yes	Yes	577	-	-	12	-	1122	505	617	0	100.00%
RED/Vermont BRT-Vermont/Santa Monica	89,042	29,367	56,311,825	36,967,573	763	Yes	Yes	927	-	-	-	-	2,085	789	1,296	0	100.00%
RED/Vermont BRT-Vermont/Sunset	120,814	31,338	56,451,091	39,536,646	354	Yes	No	714	154	-	2	-	1,817	698	1,119	0	100.00%
SP-Santa Monica	182,017	18,522	63,064,712	23,469,937	0	Yes	No	494	-	-	1	-	1285	463	822	0	100.00%
SP-UCLA Ackerman Union	36,398	8,354	15,246,612	10,747,994	0	Yes	No	111	21	-	7	2	370	146	224	0	100.00%
SP-Ventura/Van Nuys	161,161	37,151	45,441,848	47,300,117	0	Yes	No	337	660	-	1	-	1,501	155	1,346	0	100.00%
Vermont BRT - Athens	4,732	12,694	7,366,736	16,405,183	796	No	No	81	-	-	-	-	890	91	796	3	99.62%
Vermont BRT - Century Blvd	7,422	13,165	12,134,181	16,987,969	1256	No	Yes	388	-	-	-	-	1,410	154	1,256	0	100.00%
Vermont BRT - Florence Ave	71,441	56,151	75,834,100	72,335,034	2973	Yes	Yes	1513	-	-	4	-	3,725	752	2,973	0	100.00%
Vermont BRT - Pico Blvd	52,209	19,479	46,349,055	25,434,753	1040	Yes	Yes	1007	-	-	14	-	1,730	690	1,040	0	100.00%
Vermont BRT - Stauson Ave	21,110	26,494	37,332,350	34,152,381	2242	Yes	Yes	1625	-	-	3	-	2,742	500	2,242	0	100.00%
Vermont BRT - Vernon Ave	23,220	23,052	33,776,571	29,936,680	1758	Yes	Yes	1131	-	-	-	-	2,364	606	1,758	0	100.00%
Vermont BRT - W 3rd St	73,524	17,484	60,389,835	23,004,905	191	Yes	No	544	-	-	5	-	1276	689	587	0	100.00%
Vermont BRT - W Adams Blvd	27,770	18,702	37,015,530	24,170,899	1085	Yes	Yes	786	-	-	671	-	1,862	659	1,203	0	100.00%
Vermont BRT - W Manchester Ave	21,507	18,359	29,083,049	23,724,640	1414	Yes	Yes	751	-	-	-	-	1,803	389	1,414	0	100.00%

Footnote: Parcels may be eligible for more than one Delayed Effectuation criteria, (i.e. located in both a Lower Opportunity Station Area and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone), and parcels may appear more than once.

Table 14. Station Level Attribute Summary - Metro 234 Ventura Boulevard

	Local Max Unit Total	SB 79 Max Unit Total	Number of Parcels in Transit Oriented Develop ment (TOD) Zone	Number of Parcels Equal to or Greater than 50% of SB 79 Density and Floor Area	Percent of Parcels Equal to or Greater than 50% of SB79 Density and Floor Area	Eligible for DE5 (VHFHSZ)	Total Parcels Exempt ³⁶ from SB 79	Total Parcels Eligible for Delay
<i>Metro 234 -Ventura Boulevard</i>	93,023	28,474	1425	220	15.44%	466	87	641

Table 15. Breakdown by Site Characteristics

Delayed Effectuation/Exempt Sites by Characteristics:	Count and Percentage of Eligible Sites
Sites in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone	10,620 sites (9%)
Locally Designated Historic Resources ³⁷	6,760 sites (6%)
Sites in a Sea Level Rise Area	0
Sites exempt because they are more than 1 mile from a station entrance	294 sites (.002%)

³⁶ Including sites containing three or more RSO units, or land which does not permit residential units including industrial land, open space, right of ways, and public facilities.


³⁷Inclusive of HPOZs and HCMs

Table 16. TOD zones Ineligible for Delay at Station Level


	Station Hub	Percent of Station Area Eligible for Delay
1	<i>BLU/GRN-Willowbrook/Rosa Parks</i>	99.19%
2	<i>CRN-La Brea/Beverly</i>	50.58%
3	<i>EXP-Westwood/Rancho Park</i>	9.86%
4	<i>EXP/SP-Expo/Sepulveda</i>	16.28%
5	<i>GRN-Vermont/Athens</i>	99.64%
6	<i>K Line-Florence/Hindry</i>	11.44%
7	<i>Metro 234 - Victory Boulevard</i>	83.57%
8	<i>Metro 234 -Ventura Boulevard</i>	47.91%
9	<i>Metrolink - Glendale</i>	27.10%
10	<i>NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Eagle Rock Boulevard</i>	92.21%
11	<i>NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Townsend Avenue</i>	76.44%
12	<i>NOHO to Pasadena BRT-W Riverside Drive</i>	16.61%
13	<i>Orange Line - Balboa</i>	89.70%
14	<i>Orange Line - Chatsworth</i>	31.70%
15	<i>Orange Line - De Soto</i>	99.30%
16	<i>Orange Line - Pierce College</i>	54.47%
17	<i>Orange Line - Reseda</i>	9.88%
18	<i>Orange Line - Sepulveda</i>	76.65%
19	<i>Orange Line - Tampa</i>	2.01%
20	<i>Orange Line - Valley College</i>	4.55%
21	<i>Orange Line - Woodley</i>	99.86%
22	<i>Orange Line - Woodman</i>	28.05%
23	<i>PURex-Century City</i>	19.26%
24	<i>RED-Universal City/Studio City</i>	81.77%
25	<i>Vermont BRT - Athens</i>	99.62%

APPENDIX D: DELAYED EFFECTUATION MAPS


Map 8. Low Resource Sites Eligible for Delayed Effectuation due to Existing Zoned Capacity Citywide




Map 9. Stations Eligible for Delayed Effectuation due to Existing Zoned Capacity




Map 10. Low Resource Stations Eligible for Delayed Effectuation due to Existing Zoned Capacity




Map 11. Sites Eligible for Delayed Effectuation due to Existing Zoned Capacity




Map 12. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Sites Eligible for Delayed Effectuation




Map 13. Local Historic Resource Sites Eligible for Delayed Effectuation




Map 14. Low Resource Sites and Low Resource Stations Eligible for Delayed Effectuation



Map 15. Site Level Eligibility for Delayed Effectuation (Includes sites meeting 50% of SB79 Capacity, Low Opportunity Area sites, and sites designated as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, One-Foot Sea Level Rise Areas, Local Historic Resources, and One-Mile Walking Distance Sites)




Map 16. Station and Site Level Eligibility for Delayed Effectuation Citywide



APPENDIX E: REZONING MAPS AND ADDITIONAL MATERIALS


Map 17. Corridor Transition Expansion Area (in Low Density Zones)



38


³⁸ High and moderate opportunity census tracts in majority low opportunity station areas will be removed if the station area is eligible for delay.

Map 18. Transit Oriented Incentive Area and Corridor Transition Expansion Areas (in Low Density Zones)³⁹



³⁹ High and moderate opportunity census tracts in majority low opportunity station areas will be removed if the station area is eligible for delay.

Map 19. Transit Oriented Incentive Area and Corridor Transition Expansion Areas (in Low Density Zones)⁴⁰



⁴⁰ High and moderate opportunity census tracts in majority low opportunity station areas will be removed if the station area is eligible for delay.

List 1. Opportunity Stations

1. A-Highland Park
2. A-Southwest Museum
3. B - Hollywood/Vine
4. B - Universal City/Studio City
5. B -Vermont/Beverly
6. B/G Line-North Hollywood
7. B/K Extension - Hollywood/Highland
8. C - LAX/Metro Transit Center
9. C/K - Aviation/96th St
10. C/K - Aviation/Century
11. D Extension - Century City
12. D Extension - Westwood/VA Hospital
13. D Extension - Wilshire/Fairfax
14. D Extension - Wilshire/La Cienega
15. D Extension/K Extension-Wilshire/La Brea
16. D Extension/SP-Westwood/UCLA
17. D Line - Wilshire/Western
18. D/Vermont BRT - Vermont Sunset
19. E-Culver City
20. E-Expo/Bundy
21. E-Palms
22. E-Westwood/Rancho Park
23. E/SP-Expo/Sepulveda
24. G Line - Balboa
25. G Line - Canoga
26. G Line - Chatsworth
27. G Line - De Soto
28. G Line - Laurel Canyon
29. G Line - Nordhoff
30. G Line - Pierce College
31. G Line - Reseda
32. G Line - Sepulveda
33. G Line - Tampa
34. G Line - Valley College
35. G Line - Woodley
36. G Line - Woodman
37. K Extension - La Brea/Beverly
38. K Extension - Pico/San Vicente
39. K Extension -La Brea/Santa Monica
40. K Line-Westchester/Veterans
41. Metro 234 - Victory Boulevard
42. Metro 234 -Ventura Boulevard

- 43. Metro 33 - Venice Boulevard
- 44. Metrolink - Glendale
- 45. NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Colorado Boulevard
- 46. NOHO to Pasadena BRT-E Broadway
- 47. NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Eagle Rock Boulevard
- 48. NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Hesby Street
- 49. NOHO to Pasadena BRT-Townsend Avenue
- 50. NOHO to Pasadena BRT-W Alameda Avenue
- 51. NOHO to Pasadena BRT-W Riverside Drive
- 52. SP-Santa Monica
- 53. SP-UCLA Ackerman Union
- 54. SP-Ventura/Van Nuys
- 55. Vermont BRT - W 3rd St