

Regional Early Action Planning Grants of 2019 (REAP) Close Out Report Form



Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)

(9/30/2024)

REAP Close Out Report Form Instructions

This form is for Regional Early Action Planning Grants of 2019 (REAP) grant holders to satisfy the reporting requirements of California Health and Safety Code section 50515.04. The report must be submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) via email to reap@hcd.ca.gov no later than December 31, 2025.

Additional information about the REAP program is found at the program's webpage at: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-and-funding/programs-active/regional-early-action-planning-grants-of-2019>

Please proceed to the REAP Close Out Report Form on the next page and complete Parts I–X.

REAP Close Out Report Form

Part I – Summary

Briefly describe the grantee's REAP project(s), including but not limited to the following information:

1. Overview of the project
 2. Project start date, duration and completion
 3. Project goals and relevance to REAP goals
 4. Proposed uses and actions taken in support of proposed uses
 5. Actions that had the greatest impact on housing production
 6. Overall outcomes including quantified outcomes
-
1. The vast majority of AMBAG's REAP grant program was suballocated to our regional cities and counties in the Central Coast megaregion including jurisdictions in the Counties of San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara. 5% was used for program administration and remaining funds were suballocated to cities and counties throughout the project area. Eligible activities for suballocation grantees were the same as designated in REAP program guidance.
 2. Start Date: June 30, 2020. End Date: September 30, 2024.
 3. Project goals were the same as the goals detailed in the REAP program guidance. The core of the program suballocated funds to jurisdictions in the Central Coast megaregion to support planning to accelerate housing production in ways with align with state housing priorities and consistent with REAP guidelines.
 4. The core use of REAP funding was suballocation grants to cities and counties throughout the Central Coast megaregion. Those suballocation projects largely involved funding the completion of 6th Cycle Housing Elements and meeting associated RHNA goals, updating ADU policies to streamline permitting, and updating key plans to accelerate affordable housing.
 5. Actions which had the greatest impact on affordable housing production were the large number of 6th Cycle Housing Elements which were finalized using REAP funding.
 6. Overall outcomes include completed 6th Cycle RHNA housing elements for cities and counties throughout the megaregion, updated ADU policies, and updates to other plans to accelerate affordable housing, resulting in a region wide improvement to the affordable housing framework in the Central Coast megaregion.

Part II – Lead Agency and Partnerships

List lead agency and partnerships, including names, position titles, organizations, and the roles and responsibilities of each. What did those collaborative relationships and processes look like?

AMBAG was the lead fiscal agent for disbursing REAP funds to jurisdictions throughout the Central Coast mega region. AMBAG worked with our partner Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) and San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) to implement the program and disburse funds. Each MPO created their own locally appropriate suballocation approach to assure funds were distributed to each city and county in the project area. AMBAG as the lead fiscal agent then worked with each city and county in the megaregion to disburse, monitor, oversee, and provide technical assistance to suballocation grantees in implementing their projects to accelerate affordable housing.

Part III – Drivers

Answer the following questions:

1. Did any local, state, or federal legislation or mandates drive the project(s)? (SB 35, AB 1397, etc.)
 2. Was it a community-driven effort?
 3. Were there additional funding opportunities present?
-
1. The key mandate that drove the project was the need to implement the more intensive 6th Cycle RHNA.
 2. Community input was taken for suballocation projects including intensive community outreach as part of each city and county's housing element process. Outreach helped identify and develop funding suballocation projects.
 3. In some cases, suballocation recipients also had LEAP program funding which supported REAP projects by funding similar projects to accelerate affordable housing.

Part IV – Engagement Process

Answer the following questions:

1. Who were your stakeholders?
 2. What did the engagement process look like?
 3. What role did stakeholders play in the process? (Keep in mind: training, education, council formation, technical assistance, etc.)
 4. What were the outcomes of the engagement process?
-
1. Stakeholders were MPOs, elected officials on the boards of AMBAG, SBCAG, and SLOCOG, and members of the public.
 2. Engagement was primarily undertaken through MPO board meetings which included elected officials representing their constituents in the public to assure project goals were meeting the needs of the public. Engagement was also intensive for suballocation recipients who used funding to complete their housing elements which required significant engagement of the public and affordable housing partners.
 3. Stakeholder roles including guiding suballocation grant program designed to assure funds were meeting local needs.
 4. Outcomes of the engagement process resulted in more locally appropriate plans and projects to accelerate affordable housing.

Part V – Challenges

Answer the following questions:

1. What challenges were encountered?
 2. What solutions were encountered or created?
 3. Are there areas for improvement of policy alignment at the state or federal level to help achieve this project more easily?
-
1. The primary challenge was administrative burden for grant management and oversight among smaller suballocation grantee jurisdictions. These jurisdictions have limited staffing to invoice, track, and report on suballocation grant progress. AMBAG provided technical assistance to jurisdictions as needed to help with the administrative burden.
 2. AMBAG provided intensive technical assistance to all suballocation grantees to assist them with all grant invoicing, reporting, and oversight issues. This included frequent reminders of regular invoicing tasks, budget tracking, and on-on-one meetings with suballocation grantees to provide assistance.
 3. Many smaller suballocation grantees have had a hard time spending down both LEAP and REAP grants concurrently. This was not due to lack of need, but due to limited staff and administrative capacity at smaller cities and counties, and the administrative requirements to invoice, oversee, and spend down two funds on a similar timeline.

Part VI – Outcomes

Answer the following questions:

1. What are the current or projected outcomes? What are the benefits?
 2. Did actual outcomes meet expectations?
 3. Have new opportunities arisen as a result of this project?
 4. What are the next steps?
-
1. Key outcomes and benefits include regional housing elements completed, including new ADU policies to allow more production of that type of housing, improved inclusionary housing policies, and other ordinances and zoning changes to accelerate affordable housing production.
 2. Outcomes met expectations.
 3. The housing elements which were funded have included new policies and programs to accelerate affordable housing.
 4. Next steps primarily revolved around cities and counties building off of their REAP funded housing elements to move on to implement those housing elements. Much of this “next steps” implementation work is being funded by REAP 2.0 grants.

Part VII – Replicability

Answer the following questions:

1. What aspects of the project could be replicated in other communities?
 2. What useful resources and tools were implemented? Were there specific tools used for specific regions or sectors?
-
1. Any part of REAP funded projects could be replicated in other communities including housing element work, new ADU policies, and associated projects and programs.
 2. Housing elements and ADU policies and other programs were implemented. No specific tools were used.

Part VIII – Project Highlights, Best Practices and Anticipated Achievements

Answer the following questions:

1. What are the most prominent project highlights and why?
 2. What are some of the best practices that could be used by other agencies at a local, regional, state or federal level?
 3. What are some long-term achievements that could result from the overall project?
-
1. The City of Santa Cruz had a prominent project where the City successfully completed a Downtown Plan Expansion. The Downtown Plan Expansion added around 25 acres of land into the boundary of the Downtown Plan and will increase the amount of high density affordable housing that can potentially be built in the core downtown area. The Plan also creates opportunities for significant community public space to be created by reconfiguring the roadway network to be more multimodal, supporting high density affordable housing, and transit oriented development.
 2. Any part of AMBAG's REAP funded projects could be replicated in other communities, including Housing Element work, new ADU policies, and other funded projects and programs.
 3. Since REAP funding overwhelmingly funded the completion of 6th Cycle Housing Elements in the AMBAG region, the funding will result in significant long-term achievements as cities and counties implement their housing elements over the 8-year 6th Cycle RHNA horizon. This will significantly accelerate affordable housing.

Part IX – Additional Resources

Provide web links to:

1. the project itself, and
2. resources used throughout the project, and any other relevant resources.

AMBAG's REAP information can be found at the following link:

<https://ambag.org/plans/regional-early-action-planning-grants-program>

Part X – Further Information

Provide information on who can be reached for HCD to obtain more information about the project. Include names, phone numbers, and email addresses for one or more individuals.

For more information, please contact:

Paul Hierling, Principal Planner

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

phierling@ambag.org

831-264-5092