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The Honorable Timothy S. Grayson

California State Senate

1021 O Street, Room 7250

Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Senate Bill 315 – Quimby Act – Notice of Opposition (As Amended March 17, 2025)**

Dear Senator Grayson:

I am writing to express my opposition to Senate Bill (SB) 315. This bill would limit the amount of land dedication that a local agency can require of a developer to no more than 25% of the total acreage of an infill housing development. The bill would limit the number of acres of land used to calculate a park in-lieu fee, also known as a Quimby fee, to the proportional amount. SB 315 would also prohibit a Quimby fee altogether if the development is located within ½ mile of an existing park.

The Quimby Act’s original objective was to ensure that urban expansion would be accompanied by adequate open spaces, designed to promote the health, safety, and general welfare of growing communities. This foresight has resulted in the extensive park system that millions of Californians enjoy every day. Quimby fees are structured to directly benefit the residents of the developments from which they are generated, creating a direct link between new housing and essential recreational spaces. The Quimby Act continues to play a crucial role in maintaining the balance between urban development and accessible green spaces across California. The vast majority of California’s regional parks would not have come into existence without the Quimby Act. SB 315 is therefore striking at the fundamental basis for recreation and park facilities in California.

SB 315 proposes significant benefits to developers without implementing corresponding transparency measures. In recent years, numerous legislative measures have been enacted to reduce, cap, postpone, or defer development-related fees. However, these initiatives have not been accompanied by requirements for developers to demonstrate how these cost savings translate into lower prices for buyers or reduced rents for tenants. The lack of empirical evidence showing a direct correlation between these “developer giveaways” and decreased housing costs for consumers is concerning. Quimby fees, which typically constitute a low single-digit percentage of a project’s overall cost, play a crucial role in maintaining the high standard of park amenities that residents have enjoyed for decades.

Parks are not luxuries but necessities, serving multiple vital functions beyond recreation. They act as gathering spaces, emergency staging areas during crises like school shootings and wildfires, and even as natural firebreaks. During recent Los Angeles wildfires, parks saved lives by providing safe havens and impeding flame spread. By potentially limiting park development, SB 315 not only threatens community well-being but also overlooks parks’ critical role in public safety and disaster resilience. This policy approach demonstrates a profound lack of understanding of the multifaceted importance of parks in our increasingly urbanized society.

Reducing parkland available to California’s most vulnerable communities will only exacerbate physical and mental health disparities. Parks need to be able to provide spaces and services to improve the health of the most disadvantaged Californians. Parks need funding to thrive and do what they’re meant to do: serve residents and improve lives. We’ve been led to believe that access to green space is a luxury when, in fact, it is a *necessity* for all Californians to live happy and healthy lives—something that the California State Legislature should prioritize.

For these reasons, I must oppose SB 315. Should you have any questions, please contact me at contact information.

Sincerely,
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Organization Name

CC: Members and Staff of the Senate Local Government Committee