
From: Holly Osborne <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 3:33 PM
To: Regional Housing
Subject: Remarks for Appeals Board Jan 22, 2021. HQTAs and jobs.

Dear SCAG:

I made these remarks this morning. When I read them, I did not read the part in italics, because I had to get everything under 3 minutes. Please include this correspondence as part of the official record for the Jan 22 meeting.

These are general remarks as well as specific Redondo remarks.

Holly Osborne
Redondo resident.

Friday, Jan. 22, 2021

Good morning

This is Holly Osborne from Redondo Beach again. I spoke this past Tuesday on HQTAs corridors and mentioned problems that Redondo had with some "Blue" areas (where you expect us to build) not really being blue, they should have been white. Other cities also mentioned "Blue" areas that should have been white, most recently Huntington Beach. *[Recall, blue corridors are HQTAs areas where you expected us to build, and SCAG software projects a population for that area for 2045; and HQTAs RHNA is dependent on that population.]*

Correcting erroneous data was supposed to be a reason for granting an appeal.

Aside from the blue vs white issue, an unfortunate feature of the methodology is that while it makes RHNA projections relative to 2045, SCAG has expected the RHNA to be built by 2029, the end of the 6th cycle. If a metro is not going to be completed until 2045, building housing around currently non-existent stations makes no sense. The projections could set up cities to fail, and be punished undeservedly.

Returning to Redondo: I said before we had a cemetery in our "blue" area that should have been whited out; we do not intend to disinter. Your simulation must have assumed we would build there, because the SCAG population number was way too high.* We appealed. Our city planner counted every building in the HQTAs area both existing and planned, and came up with a projected 2045 population. You said he was in error; you did not like his method of counting. I am making a direct request that you rerun your simulation WITH THE CEMETERY WHITED OUT, and then we will see if the numbers are closer.

The cemetery is only part of the reason our population numbers may not agree. The Green Line makes metro stops at a number of high tech aerospace companies. and currently ends at Redondo's aerospace company. A neighboring city has THREE metro stops on the Green Line and an HQTAs RHNA of ZERO. Plainly, you are not expecting them to wreck the South Bay's tech complex by destroying their buildings, and building houses instead. Yet, when you get to Redondo's company, I found out you DO expect Redondo to do just that even though we are not zoned for it. I strongly protested. Too bad, you said, we could change the zoning. I asked you to run the HQTAs simulation with the Redondo half of that last metro station "whited out", the same as you had done for the neighboring city. *[I want to know how much of what is contributing to the difference in population between your simulation and what we got by actually counting dwellings is due to that fact.]* **Redondo should be treated the same as the neighboring city on the line.** *[The RHNA difference would be about 100 with both cemetery and metro corrections made.]*

[Every city that has a "white out" discrepancy with you should be entitled to have the simulation run with the blue area "whited out."]

2) And now on to another topic: jobs and retail. In listening to the appeals, especially those of smaller cities, I heard many say that the only way to get land to build what SCAG wanted was to rezone their commercial portions of the HQTAs corridor for residential; but this would destroy their sales tax base. *[One of you replied, well, you can use mixed use. We have found that the retail part of mixed use to in general is often not successful in smaller corridors.]* I believe that for some cities, it might be prudent to "white out" their best commercial spots, so they do not become bereft of their income. I realize that would be a change in methodology, but your policy of "destroying the city in order to save it" smacks to me of what was said about the US military strategy during the Vietnam war.

I have learned a lot listening to other cities; I hope they have learned something from me,

Thank you for your time

Holly Osborne

A city council member noticed early on in the methodology discussions, that the SCAG data bases had a supposed actual population figures for 2016, of around **7000 in the HQTAs area for Redondo. The councilmember, who had walked the district said NO WAY is that population correct. We counted, **it was closer to 6000**. If your software used your erroneous higher 2016 projection in any way to calculate a 2045 projection, it started off with an error bias of close to 1000 too high.*