



City Clerk Council and Public Services &lt;clerk.cps@lacity.org&gt;

---

**Fwd: Save the Coastal Plan**

1 message

---

**Izabella Hovhanisian** <izabella.hovhanisian@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 8:43 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Steven Guerry** <[steven.guerry@everyactionadvocacy.com](mailto:steven.guerry@everyactionadvocacy.com)>  
Date: Wed, May 20, 2020 at 8:43 AM  
Subject: Save the Coastal Plan  
To: <[cityclerk@lacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@lacity.org)>

Dear City Clerk Holly L. Wolcott,

I am writing to express my concerns about the focus of Connect SoCal on exurban development, and the potential delay of the Connect SoCal adoption, which has the potential to cause SCAG to fail to meet its October RHNA deadline to move forward with the Coastal Plan. Since Connect SoCal provides guidance on the region's transportation investments over the next 25 years, these projections effectively perpetuate unsustainable sprawl. The severe consequences to the region of this type of plan will include rising traffic, greenhouse gas emissions, and housing costs. This threat multiplier would accelerate climate change and put more people at risk of heat and air pollution-related illnesses.

In addition to this problem, SCAG is considering delaying the adoption of Connect SoCal by 120 days without a clear objective to accomplish during that time. The issue with delaying adoption is that it could put our region at risk of not moving forward with the Coastal Plan as required by the RHNA process, since the Coastal Plan is linked with the growth forecasts of Connect SoCal. Noncompliance with RHNA cannot be an option for our region. A delay that improves the growth forecasts, but does not delay the adoption of the Coastal Plan, would be an acceptable alternative.

We believe that the Coastal Plan RHNA methodology aligns with the goals of the SCS to reduce VMT and GHG emissions. We stand by the Coastal Plan RHNA methodology for determining jurisdictions' housing allocations, and urge the Regional Council to certify the Coastal Plan RHNA methodology without delay.

Therefore, I respectfully ask that the Regional Council improve the SCS growth forecasts to reduce exurban sprawl, and prevent delay of the Coastal Plan finalization by the October deadline.

Personally sent by Steven Guerry using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. AHLA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,  
Steven Guerry  
5120 1/2 Fountain Ave Los Angeles, CA 90029-1308  
[steven.guerry@gmail.com](mailto:steven.guerry@gmail.com)



Isabel Onate &lt;isabel.onate@lacity.org&gt;

---

## Fwd: Reopening Los Angeles City

2 messages

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 3:20 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Anna Janzen** <annajanzen24@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, May 20, 2020 at 10:37 AM

Subject: Reopening Los Angeles City

To: &lt;rita.moreno@lacity.org&gt;

Dear President and Members,

I am emailing to implore you to reconsider the restrictions on and the reopening of Los Angeles City.

First, blanket restrictions on such a diverse population is unwise, short-sighted, and not in the best interest of those you swore to serve. Does not Los Angeles pride itself on diversity? Then as diverse as the ethnicities of all Angelinos, so is the diversity of their individual health. Population is not as dense in unincorporated areas, or even in the San Fernando Valley, as it is in downtown LA. Let the immunocompromised continue to protect themselves, whether working from home or having accessible testing. But, please, allow those not compromised to integrate more normally again. If you celebrate Los Angeles's diversity, then you would do well to implement varied and community-by-community based reopening strategies.

Second, you have been elected as a public servant and have sworn to uphold our great Constitution of the United States of America, which protects personal and religious liberties. May I respectfully remind you of your role as a public servant, not as a public health dictator? Many of us feel the restrictions do not serve us well, but instead are an undue burden on our jobs, families, schools, and religious communities. The government's role may be to protect its citizens, but that does not include trading a false sense of "health protection" for personal responsibility.

Remember your political future will be judged, not only by the containment of COVID-19 in your community, but also by how well you served the local economy, small businesses, families, and the large religious communities. My community and I will certainly not support you with our vote if you do not allow us to have personal responsibility for our own health. My family, and many others, feel so exasperated with the undue current restrictions, that we are not only considering moving out of Los Angeles City, but also moving out of California all together. If these restrictions remain, you will effectively drive out businesses, families, taxes, and votes.

Lastly, the City's treatment of religious establishments is deplorable. Churches in general are NOT non-essential! The community is the backbone of society, and religious establishments are ESSENTIAL for the health of the community. They provide practical community support like food banks, homeless shelters, and often child care, not to mention the essential mental and spiritual support. Surely you do not wish these to decline in your city? As we know, California families are already suffering from feelings of isolation at the

very least, and domestic abuse and higher rates of suicide at the very worst. Whether you are religious or not, it is undeniable that church involvement and the religious community positively supports the family. Do you wish to increase your rates of suicide and domestic abuse for the sake of keeping your rates of (supposed) positive flu results down? We have all made sacrifices to flatten the curve and comply with new health precautions, such as wearing face masks and social distancing. Health precautions are one thing; the City's forced restrictions on businesses and churches are quite different. Allow them to decide what is best for their patrons/members. They will do what's in the best interest of those they serve, or suffer the consequences of loss of business and/or support!

I respectfully beg you not to strip us of our freedom of personal responsibility. This country was founded on men and women who passionately fought to protect personal rights, responsibility, and religion. Since our country's birth, Americans have believed that battling and dying for freedom is more important than even their very life. What has changed? Would you scorn the spilled blood of the soldiers who died for the freedoms you swore to uphold?

Please understand, we care about the immunocompromised and do not wish to expose them to any disease that compromises their life. However, let each individual person and family decide how best to protect himself and their loved ones. Please do not be short-sided in the reopening of Los Angeles. Please untie the hands of businesses, churches, and families, and give back Angelinos the right to their personal health responsibility! The results will pleasantly surprise you.

Sincerely and Respectfully,

Anna Janzen

