
From: Holly Osborne <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 11:35 AM
To: Regional Housing <Housing@scag.ca.gov>
Subject: Jan 19th 2021 Appeals Meeting: Truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Dear SCAG: These are the remarks that I made this morning on Jan 19th, at the Appeals Hearing. I am providing them so that you can have them for your records.

Thank you for allowing me to speak.
Holly Osborne

Good morning

This is Holly Osborne from Redondo Beach again. I spoke this past Friday on the absolute imperative of having an accurate overall RHNA allocation; and mentioned the new studies that computed a much lower RHNA requirement than 1.34 million. One of the board members summed up most succinctly our present course if we used the higher number: "We are being forced to design a city and forced to do it badly." Thank you to the board for its understanding of this issue,

Today, I have some other comments I call the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

I have sat through every single one of these briefings, and there are two sets of arguments to reject appeals which grate me every time I hear them.

1) The first is when lawyers who want to deny appeals, refer to the RHNA methodology as being "preceded by more than nine months of preparatory work", They totally ignore that significant changes were made to the methodology **at the 11th hour and were NOT fully discussed**. And they conveniently forget to report that the lopsided vote of passage was a result of 10 or 11 LA city council members showing up for the **first time** to the RHNA meetings and skewing the vote.

If there was no strict violation of the Brown act, there was definitely a violation of the spirit of the RHNA process. And that is because those people that suddenly showed up had not been to the meetings where the methodology was presented. They were voting in ignorance. That to me is the more serious violation, and you have seen where it led: a record number of appeals.

In my city, if people are on commissions, and don't show up. they are replaced. **Perhaps you should consider a similar policy.**

2) The second point that grates me concerns the HQTAs corridors. Those are the shaded blue areas on the maps. They follow major bus routes and extend a distance on either side. When those areas were initially discussed, I distinctly remember one city saying that the "blue area" crossed 10 lanes of a major freeway, and they did not want areas to be counted where it was absolutely impossible to build. They were assured the shaded blue would be removed. It was also mentioned that if the blue areas encompassed parks, etc. the "blue" would be removed.

I was listening VERY CLOSELY because Redondo had a cemetery in the blue area.. I got the coordinates of the cemetery and sent them in, saying that the dead did not rise to vote in Redondo, and asked that the cemetery area be removed. I was told the dead would rise to ride the bus, and the shaded blue remained.

Other cities have had similar problems with "blue areas". The reply when they appeal has been the same: "We did not say you have to build THERE. You have to show that you cannot build ELSEWHERE. You did not prove that."

At no time during the methodology discussion was it EVER indicated that if your "blue" area was unbuildable, you had to build somewhere else. **In fact the contrary was clearly indicated.**

You said that corrections to the data were a reason to appeal, but you have not adjusted any blue areas thus far. These areas should be CORRECTED.

I hope you succeed in reducing the overall RHNA; but either way the data should be corrected.

Thank you for your time.
Holly Osborne
Redondo Beach
(Private citizen, retired engineer.)