

**Regional Council (RC)  
List of Public Comments**

Received after 5pm on Wednesday, February 3, 2021

	Date	Sender Name	Organization	Agenda Item (AI #)	Notes	Subject Line
1.	February 3, 2021	Henry Fung	Covina, CA	RC Closed Session AI #1 - Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation	Discouraging SCAG from pursuing litigation on the Regional Housing Needs Determination	Comment to be read at February 4, 2021 Regional Council meeting
2.	February 4, 2021	Holly Osborne	Resident of Redondo Beach, CA	RC Closed Session AI #1 - Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation	Remarks about density and HCD count of 1.34 million	Feb 4 speech for 12:30 meeting, about RHNA

**From:** Henry Fung <calwatch@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:08 PM  
**To:** ePublic Comment Group <ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** Comment to be read at February 4, 2021 Regional Council meeting

This should be under three minutes; if it is not, feel free to stop at this point.

-----

Dear members of the Regional Council,  
I commented last month regarding discouraging SCAG from pursuing litigation on the Regional Housing Needs Determination, but wish to reiterate these comments again in light of the letter received on February 3 from the Mission Viejo City Attorney.

The City Attorney asks what they feel are four key questions, but I have three other questions that Regional Council members should consider before making their minds on litigation.

The first is how much will this cost SCAG to litigate? How many other SCAG programs will be terminated or curtailed if litigation is pursued? What risk is there to raising SCAG dues, and thus either forcing cities to drop SCAG membership or otherwise cut community-serving programs or use voter approved tax revenue for purposes not originally intended?

The second is what is the likelihood SCAG will win? Will they have to reimburse the State for their legal costs?

The third is what will the legislature, the governor, and the public perceive when SCAG takes legal action? What will the tens of thousands of unhoused people see when cities around the region are using the cloud of legal action to not zone for homes? What will adult children who want to start families of their own, people who need to form new households because of divorce or domestic violence, and those who want to move to Southern California to contribute to our economy perceive when their regional government acts against their interests? What other bills could the legislature, or executive action taken by the governor, could be taken that would render SCAG's actions moot, or put them in a worse position compared to collaboration and discussion?

The Regional Housing Needs Determination reflects existing and projected need, which is why it is so high. Existing need is people in the region who want to move out or move on but can't because of high housing costs.

I continue to urge that the current position of SCAG's leadership to collaborate and discuss with state leaders on ways to resolve our region's housing crisis together, be maintained. Adversarial action has consequences that I don't want our region to face.

Sincerely,  
Henry Fung  
Covina, CA

**From:** Holly Osborne <nredschoo@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:56 PM  
**To:** ePublic Comment Group <ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** Feb 4 speech for 12:30 meeting, about RHNA

Dear Scag:

I made these remarks during the public comment period, before the start of the closed session. Could you please make them part of the record.

Thank you  
Holly Osborne  
-----

Good afternoon:

My name is Holly Osborne, I am a resident of Redondo Beach, but I am also a retired engineer, and licensed PE in California. In short, my whole career has been analyzing numbers, and algorithms, and it is from that point of view I am addressing you. Nothing to do with Redondo Beach.

As I mentioned in my remarks before the CEHD meeting this morning, I listened to all of the RHNA appeals these past 3 weeks. In my opinion, the city that got shafted the worst by the overinflated RHNA is also the city where the city planner made the most intelligent remark on RHNA to the appeals board. This city manager was from one of the densest cities in SCAG, at 20,000 people per sq. mile. This was in a small city of 3 sq miles. He had 15,000 households Over 4 people per household. Lots of crowded ,crowded places. He had 74% renters. He had absentee landlords. Almost no parks. And you know what one of the board members said to him was "If your houses are so crowded you need to build more."

He replied, "If I build more dwellings, more people will come, and it will not solve anything. It will make things worse" I consider that the most brilliant comment that was made. That guy deserved a 0 RHNA.

Then I listened to your presentation at CEHD this morning, saying that that what makes cities "dense" is the number of people per household, and not the number of households. You presented a picture stacking units higher and higher on top of each other. You mentioned nothing about the increased infrastructure requirements that would bring, regarding schools and parks. You should have talked to that city planner of whom I just referred. And dwellings stacked higher and higher will also contribute to cross contamination between dwellings due to elevators, or stairwells, or inadequate ventilation. The presenter this morning noted a correlation between dense dwellings and deaths, and COVID and the pandemic, You do not need a PhD to discern that. I grew up in a household with 9 kids; when one gets sick, they all get sick. That is common sense.

However, having made the remark about dense dwellings, what did the presenter plan to do about it? An elephant in the room that has never been discussed is enforcing rules about the maximum number of people a landlord can rent to, based on the number of bedrooms. Such a rule would be hard to enforce retroactively, but it absolutely, absolutely must be addressed going forward. Otherwise, you will continue to witness the tragedies of deaths that have been written about over and over in the *LA Times*.

And please hold the HCD accountable. They double counted in computing that RHNA. The appeals board said repeatedly that the 1.34 million was crazy, and they would have granted appeals if they could. Listen to them. One of them said that with the current high RHNA number, "We are being forced to design a city, and forced to do it badly."

Thank you for your time.  
Holly Osborne