



---

## CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

635 SOUTH HIGHWAY 101 • SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075 • (858) 720-2400 • Fax (858) 720-2455

---

[www.cityofsolanabeach.org](http://www.cityofsolanabeach.org)

January 20, 2026

The Honorable Scott Wiener  
1021 O St., Suite 8620  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 677 – Opposition**

Dear Senator Wiener,

The City of Solana Beach writes to express our concerns related to the recently amended SB 677. Since early last year, Solana Beach and many California cities have expressed disappointment that SB 79 disregards a City's compliance with, and completion of, their state-certified Housing Elements, a regular – annual and periodic – comprehensive (and costly) technical analysis and reporting of housing planning, allocation, and implementation. The bill also bestows land use authority to transit agencies and other private property owners without any coordination with the City as it relates to the provision of public safety, essential services, or asset planning and management of municipal infrastructure.

SB 79 has created a significant disconnect between the provision of housing and the necessary public services, public facilities, and infrastructure to support current and future residents. Further, important requirements such as a water supply assessment, public safety contracting, and educational facility planning would be foregone if this legislation moves forward as proposed. Instead, SB 677 will simply increase the financial burden that Cities may experience as it relates to infrastructure.

If enacted, SB 677 has the potential to bring significant, unmitigated, and detrimental impacts and strain on our City's public infrastructure facilities and assets. Solana Beach has a population of less than 13,000 residents—far less than the 35,000-population minimum identified in other provisions of the originating bill, SB 79—with street, sidewalk, and stormwater infrastructure that was built (or not built) before the City's incorporation and is simply not engineered to serve the population growth that SB 677 envisions. We find it disheartening that prior analysis of this bill recognizes this infrastructure challenge and the financial burden that it will bring to Cities. The state recommends Cities simply solve this unfunded mandate through “financing infrastructure improvements necessary to accommodate these high-density developments.” The immediate costs for these infrastructure enhancements and developments would be painfully and fully levied upon impacted Cities. But this strategy could have far-reaching impacts on the State as well as Cities like ours, which will look to Sacramento to fulfill its obligations to repay Cities for the cost of such mandates as prescribed in Prop 1A (2004).

As with many Cities of our size, Solana Beach has an outsized reliance on small, vibrant commercial areas within the City that generate the bulk of the tax revenue that supports municipal operations and obligations, especially our capital improvement programs that maintain, improve, and develop public infrastructure. In large part due to the small footprint of our 3.4-square-mile city, SB 677 would

capture significant portions of our small commercial areas, allowing for the transformation from reliable tax-generating businesses into limited tax-generating housing. And while we desperately need more Affordable Housing in our city and region, this legislation does not further affordability. Simply put, it would double the impact on our City by further straining our infrastructure while simultaneously reducing our ability to fund (or finance, as recommended) the public improvements needed to accommodate such housing, very little of which would be built as the Affordable units we need.

This legislation comes on the heels of prior and pending legislation that impedes sound municipal management practices that would otherwise rely on development impact fees to offset the type of exponential growth promoted by this bill. Such growth requires retrofits and additions to infrastructure and expansion of contracted and provisional services and facilities to maintain the public health and safety necessary for sound growth management. SB 677 would amend one of the most potentially significant housing policy laws in years before Cities have had even a single instance to observe its impacts or learn what is feasible, or experience the limitations with its implementation on affordability, infrastructure, and governance of existing and future residents. This rushing to amend speaks to the frustrating, disappointing, and problematic lack of collaboration with City leaders or willingness to analyze recently passed laws before they are expanded. We remain open and willing to share our experiences and solutions to improve the legislature's efforts to solve our housing affordability problem.

We respectfully request that the Senate refrain from considering SB 677 or any additional provisions that will further expand SB 79 applicability which fiscally impacts Cities and their ability to provide adequate and commensurate public infrastructure, facilities and services to their existing and future residents.

Sincerely,



Mayor Lesa Heebner



Deputy Mayor Jill MacDonald



Councilmember David A. Zito



Councilmember Jewel Edson



Councilmember Kristi Becker