

October 15, 2026

Senator Catherine Blakespear
1021 O Street, Suite 7720
Sacramento, CA 95814

IN OPPOSITION of Senate Bill 20: Workforce Housing Transit Initiative

Dear Senator Blakespear of District 38,

Upon reading your proposed bill for secure housing and reliable transit, SB-20 revealed a concern of tenant or consumer protections. The sternness of the zoning laws and housing qualifications can unknowingly harm those said workers and non-corporate housing seekers.

The bill sounds like an idealistic system on the surface, but when questioned on job loss or fiscal responsibilities, it highlights a problem of displacement and distortion. A major part of SB-20 states to “[allow] employers operating in California a tax credit equal to 30 percent of qualified expenditures made to construct, master lease, or directly subsidize transit-oriented workforce housing for employees earning between 60 percent and 120 percent of Area Median Income.” However, this strictly limits occupancy to active employees and without general public access, it constitutes a closed-market—those who do not work in the facilitated spaces are not qualified to have housing there. I would like to know the scenario of what happens when a worker in that facilitated space loses their job—what ends up happening to their house?

Additionally, the dangers of using a major administrative loophole to cater to SB-20 wants is an oversight of certification and safety: “If the Department of Housing and Community Development does not act within 60 days, the application is deemed certified. Applications electing the transit pass bonus receive priority review within 30 calendar days.” This would mean that non-compliant projects or negligent employers could automatically receive millions in public tax breaks by default without ever undergoing a true regulatory review.

That said, I am in opposition to SB-20.

From all that is mentioned in the bill, I am worried for the financial safety and housing security of those who rely on their employer not just for their paycheck, but for their housing stability. Employer-provided tax-subsidized housing should not be a replacement for stable and available housing. I also wonder about the disproportionate impact it may have on independent tenant protections and their financial status if this bill were to be in place. As a supporter of legal accountability and transparency, I am tense on how SB-20 affects those in struggling job employment.

Sincerely,

Phoenix Wright

Phoenix Wright - Lobbyist
Consumer Attorneys of California



CONSUMER ATTORNEYS
OF CALIFORNIA

