

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Committee

List of Public Comments

Received **after** 5pm on Friday, October 23, 2026

	Date	Sender Name	Organization	Subject Matter
Agenda Item 3 - Regional Housing Needs Determination for the SCAG Region				
1.	10/23/26	Jacob Pierce	Various Organizations (See email)	Respectfully urge you to reject the staff recommendation for an objection to the Final RHND allocation from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
2.	10/23/26	David Kitani	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
3.	10/23/26	Alex Kennedy	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
4.	10/23/26	Ibrahim al-Jaylat	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
5.	10/23/26	Kelly Henderson	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
6.	10/23/26	Kelly Henderson - Duplicate	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
7.	10/23/26	P.A. Brown		Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
8.	10/23/26	Inge Wagner	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND)

				issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
9.	10/23/26	Jessamyn Prince	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
10.	10/23/26	Alex Dobbs	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
11.	10/23/26	Thomas Tai	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
12.	10/23/26	Auguste Miller	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
13.	10/23/26	William Finch	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
14.	10/24/26	Justin Jones		Opposes effort to reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3) and provides 4 steps on how to fix LA.
15.	10/24/26	Tom Boat		Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
16.	10/24/26	Humaira Afzal	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
17.	10/24/26	Alison Klurfeld	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
18.	10/24/26	Stephen McFarland	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND)

				issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
19.	10/24/26	Aaron McCain	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
20.	10/24/26	Jonathan Amirkhan	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
21.	10/24/26	Marcos Rodriguez Maciel	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
22.	10/24/26	Clark Han	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
23.	10/24/26	Brian Trautman	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
24.	10/25/26	Matt Stauffer	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
25.	10/25/26	Jonathan Chue	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
26.	10/25/26	Alex Fineman	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
27.	10/25/26	Allison Lee	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

28.	10/26/26	Brian Kohan	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
29.	10/26/26	Alicia Andre	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
30.	10/26/26	Christopher Rhie	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
31.	10/26/26	Alicia Velasco	City of Cypress	On behalf of the City of Cypress, attached letter supports staff's recommendation to appeal HCDs 7 th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination.
32.	10/26/26	David Kitani	SoCal Resident	Urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
33.	10/26/26	Isaac Bravo	City of Murrieta	On behalf of the City of Murrieta, attached letter supports appealing HCDs 7 th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination.
34.	10/26/26	Nate Farnsworth	City of Yorbalinda	Yorba Linda City staff support SCAG pursuing an objection to HCD's seventh-cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination, focused on the cost-burden adjustment.



COALITION LETTER: Agenda Item 3, RHND for the SCAG Region - Oppose (October 26, 2026 meeting)

From Jacob Pierce <jacob@abundanthousingla.org>

Date Fri 2026-10-23 5:03 PM

To cbeyers@weho.org <cbeyers@weho.org>; tdoby@cityoflosalamitos.org <tdoby@cityoflosalamitos.org>; rrrhodes@simivalley.org <rrrhodes@simivalley.org>; mfinlay@cityofduarte.ca.gov <mfinlay@cityofduarte.ca.gov>; Gary Gardner <ggardner@cityofdhs.org>; supervisor.hagman@bos.sbcounty.gov <supervisor.hagman@bos.sbcounty.gov>; Vianey.lopez@venturacounty.gov <Vianey.lopez@venturacounty.gov>; smanos@lake-elsinore.org <smanos@lake-elsinore.org>; Shapiro, David J. <dshapiro@cityofcalabasas.com>; tran_he@sbcity.org <tran_he@sbcity.org>; awarren@fontana.org <awarren@fontana.org>

Cc ePublic Comment Group <ePublicComment@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 (541 KB)

Joint Letter-Oppose Item 3, 7th Cycle RHND Objection.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 Chair Rhodes and members of RHNA Subcommittee,

Attached is a joint letter from the following organizations in response to Item 3 on Monday's agenda:

- 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

Together, our organizations respectfully urge you to reject the staff recommendation for an objection to the Final RHND allocation from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). In summary, we ask that you please consider the following:

1. Staff's questions about the housing cost burden calculations do not meet the criteria for an objection, under the state of California; an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is "not a reasonable application" of the statutory methodology and assumptions.
2. As established by state law, housing cost burden is an important consideration for RHND allocations; HCD's 7th Cycle allocation follows both the letter and the intent of the law.

We appreciate SCAG's diligence and investigation into these matters, but we respectfully urge you to NOT adopt the recommended motion and to instead continue the important work of prepping for the 7th RHNA Cycle.

Thank you,
Jacob Pierce

Housing Elements & Policy Analyst
Abundant Housing LA
@jacobpierceLA



The Honorable Rocky Rhodes, Chair
RHNA Subcommittee
Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Submitted via email to ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov

October 23, 2026

**Re: Agenda Item 3, Regional Housing Needs Determination for the SCAG Region
(October 26, 2026 meeting)**

Dear Chair Rhodes and Members of the Subcommittee:

We, the undersigned organizations, urge the RHNA Subcommittee 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 i 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. An objection requires demonstrating that HCD’s determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is available. 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.

Under the proposed lower-income-only adjustment, we estimate above moderate-income need would fall to approximately 27 percent of the revised determination, compared with 34.2 percent under HCD's current determination and 41.7 percent in the 6th Cycle. A further reduction in planned market-rate capacity could make the region's lower-income housing goals harder to achieve.

Both Alternatives Would Reduce Planned Housing Need

Eliminating the cost-burden adjustment would remove approximately 504,600 units, reducing the 7th Cycle RHND to about 855,000—far below the 6th Cycle's 1,341,827 units. Limiting the adjustment to lower-income households would still remove roughly 277,800 units. Either reduction would carry through to RHNA allocations and local housing elements, resulting in fewer homes planned across SCAG's six-county region.

For these reasons, we urge the Subcommittee not to 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

From: dkitani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [David Kitani](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 5:03:29 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
David Kitani
2724 Cincinnati St Los Angeles, CA 90033-3116
dkitani@gmail.com

From: avkenned@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Alex Kennedy](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 5:05:47 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Alex Kennedy
111 W 7th St Los Angeles, CA 90014-3931
avkenned@gmail.com

From: iceljeilat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Ibrahim al-Jaylat](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 5:27:44 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Ibrahim al-Jaylat
11048 W Olympic Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90064-2099
iceljeilat@gmail.com

From: kellyozz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Kelly Henderson](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 6:17:23 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Kelly Henderson
10526 Troon Ave Los Angeles, CA 90064-4429
kellyozz@yahoo.com

From: kellyozz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Kelly Henderson](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 8:11:14 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Kelly Henderson
10526 Troon Ave Los Angeles, CA 90064-4429
kellyozz@yahoo.com

From: pbrown_dos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [P.A. Brown](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 8:26:29 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

As a parent of two 20-something daughters in low paying jobs who depend on me to help them pay rent, I write urging the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

As my family and others like us can witness, Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to please oppose the item.

We need abundant housing. Period. Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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. We used to pay about half our income in rent to live near a good school. That 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—would omit income categories the Legislature expressly included.

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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply

that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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.

I am particularly concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Why? Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For all these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle determination. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
P.A. Brown
330 Cordova St Unit 360 Pasadena, CA 91101-4661
pbrown_dos@yahoo.com

From: ingebwagner@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Inge Wagner](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 8:57:28 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Inge Wagner
335 S Berendo St Los Angeles, CA 90020-2055
ingebwagner@gmail.com

From: jessamynmidoriprince@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Jessamyn Prince](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 9:19:20 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Jessamyn Prince
573 S Lake Ave Apt B Pasadena, CA 91101-5000
jessamynmidoriprince@gmail.com

From: alex@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Alex Dobbs](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 9:40:43 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Alex Dobbs
620 S Ferris Ave Los Angeles, CA 90022-2514
alex@faithhousingla.com

From: 16.stares_slump@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Thomas Tai](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 9:48:32 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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.

Beyond the technical issues, I find this attempt to shirk responsibility absolutely risible. Let's be honest with ourselves, the failure to build enough housing is entirely self-inflicted because of politicians' consistent surrender to NIMBYism and refusal to make difficult decisions for the long-term good. You cannot turn success into failure by reclassifying a D to an A. Enough with the games.

Sincerely,
Thomas Tai
335 S Los Robles Ave Pasadena, CA 91101-3267
16.stares_slump@icloud.com

From: auguste@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Auguste Miller](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 10:50:01 PM

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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Auguste Miller
37 Park Ave Venice, CA 90291-9003
auguste@streetsforall.org

From: wfinch6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [William Finch](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Friday, October 23, 2026 11:29:47 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
William Finch
28 Village Pkwy Santa Monica, CA 90405-2852
wfinch6@gmail.com

From: justinj1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Justin Jones](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 3:37:37 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. thanks for your efforts

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

From: thomasboat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Tom Boat](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 7:13:03 AM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear SCAG Public Comment,

We have a serious housing shortage that is causing hardship for the 60% of our population who do not own homes. Conversely, the housing shortage has created a large financial windfall for the people who own homes and has created a very vocal minority of homeowners who oppose new developments.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Tom Boat
2890 Magna Vista St Pasadena, CA 91107-1838
thomasboat@yahoo.com

From: humafz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Humaira Afzal](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 7:15:16 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Humaira Afzal
777 S Marengo Ave Apt 3 Pasadena, CA 91106-4733
humafz@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 (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 7:33:22 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

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

From: stephenmcfarland@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Stephen McFarland](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 8:16:44 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Stephen McFarland
2747 Pacific Ave Apt 5 Long Beach, CA 90806-2656
stephenmcfarland@gmail.com

From: Aaron.mccain@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Aaron McCain](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 8:58:31 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation. Please do right by Southern California residents, present and future, and increase the amount of available housing as much as possible to lower our rents and reduce homelessness.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Aaron McCain
2210 Blossom Ln La Verne, CA 91750-5211
Aaron.mccain@zerozillion.com

From: j_amirkhan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Jonathan Amirkhan](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 10:11:05 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Jonathan Amirkhan
211 S Avenue 57 Los Angeles, CA 90042-4728
j_amirkhan@hotmail.com

From: marcosrm14@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Marcos Rodriguez Maciel](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 11:18:21 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Marcos Rodriguez Maciel
1035 N Harper Ave Apt 9 West Hollywood, CA 90046-5931
marcosrm14@yahoo.com

From: clarkhanstudent@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Clark Han](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 2:46:44 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
Clark Han
22416 Ocean Ave Torrance, CA 90505-2416
clarkhanstudent@gmail.com

From: dynamique@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Brian Trautman](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2026 5:54:17 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Brian Trautman
6355 De Soto Ave Apt B130 Woodland Hills, CA 91367-2634
dynamique@gmail.com

From: stauffermt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Matt Stauffer](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2026 10:07:13 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Matt Stauffer
908 S Hobart Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90006-1273
stauffermt@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 (Item 3)
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2026 12:38:29 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

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

From: alexfineman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Alex Fineman](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2026 8:35:12 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Alex Fineman
1909 Clark Ln Unit B Redondo Beach, CA 90278-4203
alexfineman@yahoo.com

From: allee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Allison Lee](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2026 10:03:22 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Allison Lee
3231 Cheviot Vista Pl Apt 304 Los Angeles, CA 90034-3567
allee@stanfordalumni.org

From: bckohan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Brian Kohan](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Monday, October 26, 2026 9:57:24 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Brian Kohan
2340 Meadowvale Ave Los Angeles, CA 90031-1111
bckohan@gmail.com

From: alicia.m.andre@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Alicia Andre](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Monday, October 26, 2026 10:17:26 AM

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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Alicia Andre
1716 S 2nd St Alhambra, CA 91801-5465
alicia.m.andre@gmail.com

From: chris.rhie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Christopher Rhie](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Monday, October 26, 2026 10:34:21 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
Christopher Rhie
4519 Ayla Ln Los Angeles, CA 90041-3497
chris.rhie@gmail.com

From: [Alicia Velasco](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Cc: [Ma'Ayn Johnson](#); [Kome Ajise](#); [Maggie Aguilar](#); [Shannon DeLong](#)
Subject: City of Cypress RHNA Subcommittee Pubic Comment and Letter of Support
Date: Monday, October 26, 2026 12:32:58 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Cypress SCAG RHNA Support Letter.pdf](#)

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Members of the Regional Housing Needs Subcommittee,

Attached is a letter on behalf of the City of Cypress supporting staff's recommendation to appeal HCD's 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination.

Best,



Alicia Velasco

Director of Community Development
City of Cypress
5275 Orange Ave., Cypress CA 90630
714.229.6720

avelasco@cypressca.org



CITY of CYPRESS

5275 Orange Avenue, Cypress, California 90630 • 714-229-6700 • cypressca.org

October 26, 2026

Southern California Association of Governments
Attn: Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee
Sent via Email: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov

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

Dear Members of the Subcommittee:

The City of Cypress supports SCAG staff's recommendation to appeal HCD's 7th cycle Regional Housing Need Determination (RHND) of 1,359,750 housing units.

Housing affordability is a significant regional concern. However, HCD has not clearly explained its methodology or how the cost-burden adjustment relates to regional housing need. As SCAG's staff report notes, HCD has not shown why the resulting increase is a reasonable response to cost burden.

SCAG cities have already zoned capacity for approximately 1.3 million housing units. Many of those units have not been built due to market conditions, rather than a lack of zoning capacity. This underscores the importance of ensuring that the RHND is grounded in a transparent, supportable methodology and that the resulting targets are realistically connected to the region's housing conditions.

The City prefers the recommendation of removing the cost-burden adjustment altogether. If it is retained, we support limiting it to lower-income households. We encourage SCAG to pursue these alternatives and advance the appeal to the Regional Council.

Thank you for considering the City's comments. We urge the Subcommittee to support the staff recommendation and advance the appeal to the Regional Council.

Sincerely,

Shannon DeLong
City Manager

C: 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

Leo Medrano, Mayor

Kyle Chang, Mayor Pro Tem - David Burke, Council Member - Bonnie Peat, Council Member - Rachel Strong Carnahan, Council Member

From: dkitani@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [David Kitani](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Subject: OPPOSE: Effort to Reject HCD's Final Housing Allocation (Item 3)
Date: Monday, October 26, 2026 1:12:35 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 the Subcommittee to NOT recommend an objection to the 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Southern California has a severe housing crisis. The proposed objection on Monday's agenda fails to establish that HCD's approach is unreasonable. It would also substantially understate the region's housing needs. I urge you to oppose the item.

Millions of southern California residents are housing-cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The thrust of staff's recommendation is to tell the state that this metric should not factor into California's RHND allocation. This is troubling, especially because California state housing law specifically 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 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 one portion of the staff recommendation suggests—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.

Additionally, an objection requires demonstrating that HCD's determination is “not a reasonable application” of the statutory methodology and assumptions—not simply that another method is possible. 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, rather than excluding it.

Lastly, the final allocation is only 18,000 units higher than the one issued for the 6th

Cycle. The new number would be higher, were it not for the region's declining population. However, 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. With that in mind, we are concerned that SCAG staff lobbied HCD to reduce population growth estimates by using figures from the Department of Finance, instead of those in the SCAG's own Regional Transportation Plan. Although HCD accommodated the request in its Final Determination, there was no basis for this change in the statute, given that the numbers were within 0.5% of each other—well below the 1.5% threshold that triggers reevaluation.

For these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee not to recommend an objection to HCD's 7th Cycle 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,
[sender's info]

Sincerely,
David Kitani
2724 Cincinnati St Los Angeles, CA 90033-3116
dkitani@gmail.com

From: [Bravo, Isaac](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Cc: [Clifton, Justin](#); [Crane, Kristen](#); [Agajanian, Scott](#); [Chantarangsu, David](#)
Subject: City of Murrieta - Comment Letter on HCD Cycle 7 RHND
Date: Monday, October 26, 2026 2:37:13 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[City of Murrieta: Comment Letter RE - HCD Cycle 7 RHND.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 comment letter on behalf of the City of Murrieta.

Sincerely,



Isaac Bravo

MANAGEMENT ANALYST
CITY OF MURRIETA

(951) 461-6449

IBravo@murrietaca.gov

1 Town Square | Murrieta, CA 92562

www.MurrietaCA.gov |     

CITY HALL HOURS: MONDAY TO FRIDAY, 8 AM – 5 PM

MY SCHEDULE: MONDAY-THURSDAY, 8:00 AM – 6:00 PM, FRIDAY 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM, EVERY OTHER FRIDAY OFF



CITY OF MURRIETA

October 26, 2026

Southern California Association of Governments
Attn: Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee
Sent via Email: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov

Re: Support for Appeals of HCD's 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination

Dear Members of the Subcommittee:

On behalf of the City of Murrieta (City), I write to express the City's support for appealing the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) 7th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) of 1,359,750 housing units for the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region.

The City recognizes the critical need to address housing availability and affordability throughout Southern California and supports efforts to facilitate responsible housing production. However, we have significant concerns regarding the methodology used by HCD to establish the proposed regional housing determination, particularly whether the resulting allocation accurately reflects existing market conditions and realistic housing production capacity.

During the 6th Cycle, jurisdictions throughout the SCAG region planned for substantial housing production to accommodate their assigned allocations. However, despite this planned capacity, actual housing production has been constrained by economic conditions, development costs, financing challenges, and other market factors beyond the direct control of local governments. These challenges underscore the importance of establishing a RHND that is based on a transparent, defensible, and supportable methodology that appropriately accounts for regional housing conditions and the practical limitations affecting housing production.

The City supports the recommendation to eliminate the cost-burden adjustment from HCD's methodology altogether. Should the adjustment be retained, we support limiting its application to lower-income households to better align the calculation with the populations most directly affected by housing affordability challenges. The City encourages SCAG to pursue these alternatives and advance a formal appeal of HCD's 7th Cycle RHND. We believe this approach would promote a more equitable, transparent, and realistic determination while maintaining our shared commitment to addressing the region's housing needs.

Sincerely,

David Chantarangsu
Director of Development Services

From: [Nate Farnsworth](#)
To: [ePublic Comment Group](#)
Cc: [Maggie Aguilar](#)
Subject: Public Comment—October 26 RHNA Subcommittee, Item 3
Date: Monday, October 26, 2026 2:54:47 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

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 Chair and Members of the RHNA Subcommittee,

Yorba Linda City staff support SCAG pursuing an objection to HCD's seventh-cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination, focused on the cost-burden adjustment.

We recognize the significant housing affordability challenges throughout the region. Our concern is whether HCD has adequately supported the magnitude of the additional housing need attributed to cost burden. We support advancing SCAG's narrower alternative and documenting why it represents a more reasonable application of the statutory methodology.

We also request that SCAG make the supporting calculations available to member jurisdictions and clearly identify the proposed alternative regional total and its distribution by income category.

Please include this comment in the record for Agenda Item 3. Thank you for your consideration.

NATE FARNSWORTH

Community Development Director
4845 Casa Loma Avenue | Yorba Linda, CA 92886
P: 714-961-7131 **W:** yorbalindaca.gov

CITY of YORBA LINDA

