Community, Economic, and Human Development (CEHD) Committee
List of Public Comments
Received **after** 5pm on Wednesday, November 4, 2026

	Date	Sender Name	Organization	Subject Matter
Agenda Item 3 – Regional Housing Needs Determination for the SCAG Region				
1.	2026-11-04	Petra Wilder-Smith	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
2.	2026-11-04	Jacob Pierce	Various Organizations	Urge to accept the RHND from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and to instead continue the important work of prepping for the 7th RHNA Cycle.
3.	2026-11-04	Tracey Alexander Ettinger	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
4.	2026-11-04	Atta Tarki	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
5.	2026-11-04	Claire O'Hanlon	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
6.	2026-11-04	Aryan Ray	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
7.	2026-11-04	Henry Fung		Oppose staff recommendation to appeal the HCD regional housing needs determination.
8.	2026-11-04	Jonah Linder	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
9.	2026-11-04	Casey Langwith	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California

				Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
10.	2026-11-04	Kiersten Stanley	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
11.	2026-11-04	Breanna Hurt	City of La Habra	The City of La Habra supports SCAG staff's and the RHNA Subcommittee's recommendation to appeal the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND).
12.	2026-11-04	Emmett Florence	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
13.	2026-11-04	Violet Carne	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
14.	2026-11-04	Henry van Moyland	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
15.	2026-11-04	LaTeira Haynes Zavala	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
16.	2026-11-04	Mimi Holt	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
17.	2026-11-04	Chris Tokita	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
18.	2026-11-04	Alison Klurfeld	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

19.	2026-11-04	Patrick Winters	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
20.	2026-11-04	Jonathan Chue	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
21.	2026-11-04	Elizabeth Edwards	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
22.	2026-11-05	Michael Woller	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
23.	2026-11-05	Geoff Regalado	SoCal Resident	Urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.
24.	2026-11-05	Justin J		Opposes effort to reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation

Outlook

OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation

From Petra Wilder-Smith <pwildersmith@everyactioncustom.com>
Date Wed 2026-11-04 5:01 PM
To ePublic Comment Group <ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov>

This Message Is From an External Sender
EXTERNAL: This email message was sent from outside our organization. Proceed with caution when opening links or attachments. Submit as spam if you are not sure it is safe.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the region's median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it's important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region's declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red

light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff's recommendation to object to HCD's sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California's housing needs.

Sincerely,
Dr. Petra Wilder-Smith
31201 Paseo Crucero San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675-5399
pwildersmith@gmail.com

Outlook

OPPOSE: CEHD Item 3, Regional Council Item 1 (RHND Objection)

From Jacob Pierce <jacob@abundanthousingla.org>
Date Wed 2026-11-04 5:03 PM
To ePublic Comment Group <ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov>; Marquez, Ray <rmarquez@chinohills.org>; rrhodes@simivalley.org <rrhodes@simivalley.org>
Cc Elizabeth Carvajal <carvajal@scag.ca.gov>; Ma'Ayn Johnson <johnson@scag.ca.gov>; Kevin Kane <kane@scag.ca.gov>; Michael Dietz <dietz@scag.ca.gov>; Elizabeth Hansburg P4H <elizabeth@peopleforhousing.org>; Zachary Pitts <zach@yimbyaction.org>; Mahdi Manji <MManji@innercitylaw.org>; Thomas Irwin <thomasirwin13@gmail.com>; Katie Hill <katie.hill@unionstationhs.org>; Shawn Morrissey <smorrissey@unionstationhs.org>; Jesse Zwick <jesse@housingactioncoalition.org>; Dexter O'Connell <dextero@safeplaceforyouth.org>; Scott Epstein <scott@abundanthousingla.org>; Azeen Khanmalek <azeen@abundanthousingla.org>

1 attachment (537 KB)
OPPOSE-Coalition Letter 7th Cycle RHND Objection 110426 (RC, CEHD).pdf;

This Message Is From an External Sender
EXTERNAL: This email message was sent from outside our organization. Proceed with caution when opening links or attachments. Submit as spam if you are not sure it is safe.

Report Suspicious

Dear President Marquez, Chair Rhodes and local leaders:

The attached letter is intended for the written public comment files for two SCAG meetings tomorrow--the CEHD Committee and the Regional Council.

We urge to accept the RHND from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and to instead continue the important work of prepping for the 7th RHNA Cycle. The attached letter is signed by the following organizations:

- People for Housing Orange County
- Abundant Housing LA
- Inner City Law Center
- YIMBY Action
- Faith and Housing Coalition
- Union Station Homeless Services
- Housing Action Coalition
- Safe Place for Youth

Thank you,
Jacob Pierce

Housing Elements & Policy Analyst
Abundant Housing LA
@jacobpierceLA

Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Submitted via email to ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov

November 4, 2026

Re: Regional Housing Needs Determination for the SCAG Region (Nov. 5 meetings—CEHD item #3, Regional Council item #1)

Dear President Marquez, Chair Rhodes and local leaders:

We, the undersigned organizations, urge you not to recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). We appreciate SCAG staff's careful review and their agreement with HCD on nearly every component. However, the proposed objection to the cost-burden adjustment fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable, and would substantially understate the region's housing needs.

State Law Requires HCD to Consider Cost Burden at Every Income Level

Government Code section 65584.01(b)(1)(H) directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30 percent of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate of 43.19 percent, compared with 31.45 percent nationally, illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that approximately 57 percent of the cost-burden adjustment comes from moderate- and above

moderate-income households. Excluding them would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included.

Recent legislation reinforces this broad understanding of housing need. In SB 450 (2024), the Legislature encouraged the "development of housing affordable to households at all income levels." SB 684 (2023) found that the housing crisis "consumes an ever-growing share of the paychecks of working families" and, citing the Legislative Analyst's Office, acknowledged effects on "not only low-income residents," including overcrowding, longer commutes, and delayed homeownership. SB 1123 (2024) recognized that "The production of new market-rate housing frees up existing, more affordable housing elsewhere in the region." These findings reinforce the Legislature's recognition that California's housing shortage affects households across income levels.

HCD used a well-documented approach: it applied the gap between regional and national cost-burden rates to existing households, then deducted 259,849 units to avoid overlap with the overcrowding adjustment. SCAG staff accept a comparable approach for overcrowding yet they question whether additional housing will predictably reduce cost burden.

But an objection requires more than a lack of certainty. It requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that a different method would be possible. SCAG staff applied that standard to the vacancy-rate adjustment and found no basis for an objection. HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report also identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, while the region's median home value is 8.46 times its median household income. These facts support accounting for cost burden instead of excluding it.

Housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure.

Market-Rate Development Helps Produce Affordable Housing

The 7th Cycle RHND totals 1,359,750 homes, only 17,923 more than the 6th Cycle. Yet lower-income need has increased by 211,410 homes, from 41.6 percent to 56.6 percent of the regional total.

Income level	6th cycle (2021-2029)	7th cycle (2029-2037)	Change
Lower income (acutely, extremely, very low and low)	558,603 (41.6%)	770,013 (56.6%)	+211,410
Moderate	223,957 (16.7%)	124,839 (9.2%)	-99,118
Above moderate	559,267 (41.7%)	464,898 (34.2%)	-94,369
Total	1,341,827	1,359,750	+17,923

Meeting the resulting need for 770,013 lower-income homes will require public subsidy as well as affordable units and revenues generated through market-rate development. State Density Bonus Law and other tools to develop mixed income projects are dependent on a viable development pipeline. Planning for fewer moderate- and above moderate-income homes risks weakening these tools.

For these reasons, we urge the CEHD Committee and the Regional Council to not recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle determination. Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California's housing needs.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hansburg
Cofounder and Director
People for Housing Orange County

Zachary Pitts
LA Director
YIMBY Action

Azeen Khanmalek
Executive Director
Abundant Housing LA

Mahdi Manji
Director of Policy
Inner City Law Center

Thomas Irwin
Director
Faith and Housing Coalition

Katie Hill
Chief Executive Officer
Union Station Homeless Services

Jesse Zwick
Southern California Director
Housing Action Coalition

Mary McGuire
Co-CEO
Safe Place for Youth

Outlook

OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation

From Tracey Alexander Ettinger <traceylalexander@everyactioncustom.com>
Date Wed 2026-11-04 5:05 PM
To ePublic Comment Group <ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the region's median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it's important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region's declining population.

We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. We will lose our foundational young Californian workforce who are struggling to survive here in a tough entry level job market impacted by AI. There is no affordable

housing for them. The cure is to build more homes, not less.

Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff's recommendation to object to HCD's sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California's housing needs.

Sincerely,
Tracey Alexander Ettinger
901 Kagawa St Pacific Palisades, CA 90272-3834
traceylalexander@gmail.com

From: atarki@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Atta Tarki
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:12:25 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Atta Tarki
818 14th St Apt 1 Santa Monica, CA 90403-1744
atarki@nobelinv.com

From: charm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Claire O"Hanlon
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:32:29 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Claire O'Hanlon
1801 Ocean Front Walk Unit E Venice, CA 90291-6104
charm@manyquarks.com

From: aryanray2006@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Aryan Ray
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:34:15 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Aryan Ray
24139 Sylvan Glen Rd Unit B Diamond Bar, CA 91765-1481
aryanray2006@icloud.com

From: Henry Fung
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: Regional Housing Needs Determination comment
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:34:20 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Hello SCAG regional council and committee members,
I oppose the staff recommendation to appeal the HCD regional housing needs determination. The new determination is not significantly different from the existing determination, unbuilt and vacant sites can be reused, and new laws allow for an assumed amount of housing to go on empty or underutilized locations. HCD, as staff notes, has the discretion to make their own determination on what is considered cost burdened.

It is important for SCAG staff to have a good working relationship with HCD. At the very minimum, Option 2, which rejects cost burdened as an adjustment completely, is non responsive and only encourage HCD, the new Governor, and the new state legislature to further scrutinize SCAG's role in regional housing. While I disagree with Option 1 I do think that staff can make a reasonable argument that Option 1 is at least plausible and compliant with state law. Option 2 would be a violation of RHND law which requires consideration of adjustments.

Please do your job on housing and reject Option 1 and Option 2 of the staff recommendation, not use anymore staff time on arguing with HCD, and move forward on planning to meet these requirements.

Sincerely,
Henry Fung

From: jonahlinder@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jonah Linder
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:34:42 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write strongly urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these many reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Jonah Linder
2917 W 82nd Pl Inglewood, CA 90305-1439
jonahlinder@gmail.com

From: clangwith@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Casey Langwith
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:42:23 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Casey Langwith
714 Pier Ave Apt 4 Santa Monica, CA 90405-4572
clangwith@gmail.com

From: kierstenstanley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kiersten Stanley
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:42:46 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Kiersten Stanley
4455 Coldwater Canyon Ave Apt 2 Studio City, CA 91604-5000
kierstenstanley@gmail.com

From: Breanna Hurt
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: Support for Appeal of HCD's 7th Cycle Regional Housing Need Determination
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:43:01 PM
Attachments: image001.png
20261104 SCAG RHND Regional Council.pdf

This Message Is From an External Sender
EXTERNAL: This email message was sent from outside our organization. Proceed with caution when opening links or attachments. Submit as spam if you are not sure it is safe.

Report Suspicious

Good Afternoon,

Please see the attached letter of support for appeal of HCD's 7th cycle RHND from the City of La Habra.

Thank you,

Breanna Hurt
Senior Management Analyst
Administration Department

(562) 383-4010
bhurt@lahabraca.gov
www.lahabraca.gov
110 E. La Habra Blvd.

City Hall is open Monday through Thursday, 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
City Hall is closed every Friday.

City of La Habra
"A Caring Community"

OFFICE OF THE CITY COUNCIL

110 E. La Habra Boulevard
Post Office Box 337
La Habra, CA 90633-0785
Office: (562) 383-4010
Fax: (562) 383-4474

November 4, 2026

Southern California Association of Governments
Attn: Regional Council and the Community Economic and Human Development Committee
Sent via Email: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov

Re: Support for Appeal of HCD's 7th Cycle Regional Housing Need Determination

Dear Regional Council and CEHD Committee;

The City of La Habra supports SCAG staff's and the RHNA Subcommittee's recommendation to appeal the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND).

The Subcommittee recommended Option 1, which would limit the cost-burden adjustment to lower-income households. We respectfully urge the Regional Council to pursue staff's Option 2, which would remove the adjustment entirely and result in a regional determination of 855,123 units. The staff report explains that HCD's 504,627-unit adjustment is not based on an economic analysis or model showing how many additional homes would reduce cost burden by a measurable amount. More housing may help affordability, but the report also recognizes that the relationship is not one-to-one. Without that analysis, the adjustment does not establish a transparent, supported connection between the identified cost burden and the number of units added to the RHND.

More broadly, HCD's choices among available assumptions, such as the vacancy adjustment and population projections, repeatedly increased the region's housing need. The rationale for those choices, and how the added units address that need, is unclear. The resulting RHND risks penalizing cities that have made good-faith efforts to plan for and produce housing by requiring them to identify still more sites and zoning capacity. This further erodes local control and places added pressure on commercial properties, which provide jobs and generate the economic activity that sustains our communities - even as HCD seeks to locate housing near employment.

The City urges the Regional Council to select Option 2. If the Council proceeds with Option 1, La Habra still supports filing the objection rather than accepting HCD's determination without challenge.

Sincerely,

José Medrano
Mayor, City of La Habra

cc: Kevin Kane, Planning Supervisor, kane@scag.ca.gov
Ma'Ayn Johnson, Manager, SCAG, johnson@scag.ca.gov
Kome Ajise, Executive Director, SCAG, ajise@scag.ca.gov
Maggie Aguilar, Clerk of the Board aguilarm@scag.ca.gov
La Habra City Council

From: emmettflorence@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Emmett Florence
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 5:52:44 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Emmett Florence
449 S Kingsley Dr Los Angeles, CA 90020-3290
emmettflorence@gmail.com

From: violetcarne@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Violet Carne
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 6:52:48 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Mg. Violet Carne
1742 1/2 S New England St Los Angeles, CA 90006-5312
violetcarne@gmail.com

From: henryvanmoyland@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Henry van Moyland
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 7:18:00 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Henry van Moyland
546 S Curson Ave Los Angeles, CA 90036-3253
henryvanmoyland@gmail.com

From: lateira.haynes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of LaTeira Haynes Zavala
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 7:29:46 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
LaTeira Haynes Zavala
1058 Geraghty Ave Los Angeles, CA 90063-1768
lateira.haynes@gmail.com

From: mimi_holt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mimi Holt
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 7:48:41 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Mimi Holt
1218 Meadowbrook Ave Los Angeles, CA 90019-2869
mimi_holt@yahoo.com

From: christopher.tokita@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Chris Tokita
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 8:03:07 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Chris Tokita
1836 Colby Ave Apt 311 Los Angeles, CA 90025-6771
christopher.tokita@gmail.com

From: afklurfeld@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alison Klurfeld
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 8:48:47 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Alison Klurfeld
541 N Crescent Heights Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90048-2207
afklurfeld@gmail.com

From: wintersarchitect@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrick Winters
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 9:28:02 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Mr. Patrick Winters
11410 Biona Dr Los Angeles, CA 90066-3308
wintersarchitect@gmail.com

From: everyaction+abundanthousingla@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jonathan Chue
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 9:51:52 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Chue
3719 Wellington Rd Los Angeles, CA 90016-5823
everyaction+abundanthousingla@jchue.anonaddy.me

From: ms.eliedwards@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Edwards
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 9:59:02 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a Los Angeles resident and renter, I write to urge SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I plead with the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Edwards
10001 Venice Blvd Apt 200 Los Angeles, CA 90034-6495
ms.eliedwards@gmail.com

From: wollermi000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Woller
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Thursday, November 5, 2026 12:00:14 AM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Michael Woller
1960 S Holt Ave Los Angeles, CA 90034-1469
wollermi000@gmail.com

From: gregalado74@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Geoff Regalado
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Thursday, November 5, 2026 12:26:13 AM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a southern California resident, I write urging SCAG to accept the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the region issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and to reject staff's recommendation to object to the number.

Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on this Thursday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. As such, it fails to meet the criteria for an objection. This item (#1 on the Regional Council agenda and #3 before the CEHD Committee) would also substantially understate the region's housing needs.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Staff's recommendation is to significantly reduce this metric as a factor in California's RHND allocation. There is no justification for this in California statute. State housing law directs HCD to consider the share of very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households paying more than 30% of their income toward housing. Southern California's cost-burden rate is 43%, compared with 31% nationally. That statistic illustrates the scale of the problem. SCAG's analysis indicates that about 57% of the cost-burden adjustment in the allocation comes from households in the moderate- and above moderate-income brackets. Excluding them from the calculation—as the current staff recommendation proposes—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included. It must also be stated that housing needs are interconnected: when middle-income households cannot find homes they can afford, they compete for older, lower-cost housing, increasing pressure on lower-income residents. Planning across income levels can help relieve that pressure. Recent legislation, including SB 450 (Atkins - 2024), SB 684 (Caballero - 2023) and SB 1123 (Caballero - 2024), reinforces an evidence-based understanding of critical housing needs for Californians of all income levels.

The law makes clear that an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions. Arguing that another methodology is possible does not meet the statute's threshold for an objection. Furthermore, HCD's California's Housing Future 2040 report identifies cost burden as an indicator of pent-up demand, with the

region’s median home value 8.46 times its median household income. The facts support accounting for cost burden in a robust fashion, rather than diminishing its contribution to the RHND. Finally, it’s important to note that the RHND issued by HCD is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, too, were it not for the region’s declining population. We must highlight that high housing costs are the primary factor motivating community members to move away from our region. Reductions in projected population growth are a flashing red light that should motivate leaders to welcome more housing, not less. We do recognize that the RHNA Subcommittee avoided recommending a more extreme option to eliminate cost burden as a factor entirely. Still, there is no basis for the existing staff recommendation. All residents experiencing housing cost burden deserve to be counted and considered.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee and the Regional Council to embrace the RHND issued by HCD, and to reject staff’s recommendation to object to HCD’s sound methodology for arriving at the determination. Thank you for your consideration. Advocates look forward to working with SCAG on a 7th Cycle RHNA methodology that addresses Southern California’s housing needs.

Sincerely,
Mr. Geoff Regalado
531 E Elmwood Ave Burbank, CA 91501-3447
gregalado74@hotmail.com

From: justinj1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin J
To: ePublic Comment Group
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation
Date: Thursday, November 5, 2026 2:50:13 AM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

How to fix LA in 4 steps:

1) Cheap but not FREE parking anywhere. Solves RVs and junk cars. Use funds from parking fines and freeway congestion pricing to fund transit.

2) Put the jails and free drug clinics in the desert. Give away methadone and adderall for free: outside the city. Addicts cannot be involuntarily confined (they'll be abused) so let them get high away from schools and parks. No confinement, just put the free services and tax-payer funded housing outside the city on affordable land. People have a right to do drugs, and tax payers have a right to public parks and sidewalks.

3) Offer mental health services and if refused, enforce no camping on city streets and in parks. Bus them out, let them walk back. No forced confinement, and sidewalks are clear.

4) Vacancy/dereliction tax on the hundreds of under-used commercial lots. Tax them until they sell or build market-rate housing. Market-rate not tax-payer subsidized housing. Everyone in the world will move to LA if we give away taxpayer funded housing. ty

Sincerely,
Mr. Justin J
3711 Baldwin St Los Angeles, CA 90031-2965
justinj1@hotmail.com