

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



County of Shasta with Sub-Recipients:
The City of Redding and The City of Shasta Lake

September 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

The REAP grant funds were utilized as pass-through funds for unique projects that were carried out by the City of Redding and the City of Shasta Lake. 5% of the total grant amount was also allocated to the County of Shasta and the City of Shasta Lake for the grant administration costs. The City of Redding utilized their portion to fully staff a planner that would be tasked with completing a General Plan Update (Project 1) that would include an increase residential capacity throughout the City. The City of Shasta Lake utilized their portion of the project to cover consultant costs to prepare a Summit City Wastewater Feasibility Study and Preliminary Engineering (Project 2) for sewer service system that would serve existing areas and increase development capacity in the Summit City area of the City. The consultant costs also cover assistance .

Project 1 – City of Redding General Plan Update: \$398,245.80

Project Start Date: April 2021

Duration: 36 Months

Project Completion Date: Adopted by City Council in March 2024

Project Goals: To complete a General Plan Update that would increase residential capacity in the range of 15%-20%. The staff planner assigned to this task would be fully funded by the grant.

Proposed Uses: The General Plan Update proposed no land use designation changes. Instead, the City evaluated an increase in development intensity within existing land use designations. The General Plan Update EIR further identified that increasing intensity within existing land use patterns would have a greater impact on Hazardous Materials, Land Use, Noise, Utilities and Wildfire. While the increased intensity alternative was environmentally superior to other aspects of the General Plan Update proposal, the community expressed concerns over whether there is a market for this type of development intensity and whether there was general acceptance. The General Plan Update maintained that existing policies were adequate to deal with the projected population growth and Regional Housing Needs Allocation through the encouragement of residential infill and development of suitable lands already identified under their existing land use designations/vacant land supply.

Actions that had the greatest impact on housing production: The action that would have

the greatest impact on housing production included amended General Plan policies so that future development would increase the potential for multiple-family housing, mixed-use housing, form-based codes, small lot standards and new affordable housing types. Such policies being established in the General Plan require implementation through future zoning efforts and will ultimately make residential development more viable in existing infill areas.

Overall outcomes including quantified outcomes: A majority of the City is subject to Senate Bill 9 which has significantly increased residential capacity. The increase in capacity is considerable and is one that the General Plan Update sought to address with policies related to design standards that would ensure development matches existing neighborhood design and thereby making development of SB9 units more viable. With the proposed General Plan policies discussed above and with SB9 implementation in the City, development capacity is increased by 100% in just the vacant single-family residential districts alone. This does not even account for existing single-family zone districts which have effectively had their development capacity doubled. In the vacant single-family residential district estimations, the total number of dwelling units which could be built is expected to go from 26,000 to 52,000 if SB9 were utilized.

Project 2 – City of Shasta Lake Summit City Wastewater Feasibility Study: \$250,000.00

Project Start Date: June 2022

Duration: 24 Months

Project Completion Date: June 2024

Project Goals: To complete preliminary engineering and identify funding sources and design alternatives that would lead to the ultimate construction of wastewater infrastructure to serve existing and future residential development.

Proposed Uses and Actions: The feasibility study proposed design alternatives and identified funding sources to ultimately extend wastewater services to an unserved western area of the City. The Study was adopted by City Council in 2023 and an overall project timeline to fund, design and construct the project is in place.

Actions that had the greatest impact on housing production: While the actions to complete the study and to understand what is needed to finance and construct the wastewater facilities is very impactful, the submittal of a Clean Water State Revolving Fund Planning Application and the ultimate awarding of that grant would have the greatest impact on housing production. This aspect of the project is key towards implementation of the feasibility study and the City of Shasta Lake is hopeful for its success.

Overall outcomes including quantified outcomes: Ultimate buildout of the Summit City Wastewater extension would provide sewer facilities for over 100 existing residential units, accommodate a 160-unit subdivision, create capacity for ADUs on existing lots where it is not currently feasible and increase residential capacity and opportunity for numerous lots within the area.

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?

Project 1 – City of Redding 2045 General Plan Update

Lead Agency: City of Redding

Jeremy Pagan, Director of Development Services

Once taking over as Director Jeremy oversaw several public hearings, certification of the Final EIR and the ultimate adoption of the 2045 General Plan Update by City Council.

Kent Manuel, Senior Planner

Assisted in completing the certification of the Final EIR, presenting the Draft 2045 General Plan Update at public hearings through the completion of its final draft being adopted by City Council.

Vishnu Krishnan, Senior Planner

Completed initial data compilation, public outreach, and preparation of draft versions of the 2045 General Plan Update. Also presented the draft update at public hearings and addressed comments and edited drafts.

Partnership: Placeworks

Mark Teague, AICP – Principal

A team assembled at Placeworks, under the leadership of Mark Teague, assisted in prepare the Final EIR for the City of Redding 2045 General Plan Update. The process involved a contract between the City and Placeworks for consulting services which covered all aspects of the preparation and completion of the EIR.

Project 2 – City of Shasta Lake Summit City Wastewater Feasibility Study

Lead Agency: City of Shasta Lake

Shelby Millingar, Associate Engineer

Worked with the project consultant on project coordination, analyzing alternatives, conducting public outreach, grant writing and preparing and presenting final reports to City Council.

Partnership: PACE Engineering

Curtis R. Paget, Senior Engineer

Worked with the City of Shasta Lake to ultimately deliver a sewer feasibility study and grant application through project coordination, analyzing alternatives, conducting public outreach, assisting with grant writing, and preparing and presenting final reports to City Council.

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?

Project 1 – City of Redding 2045 General Plan Update

State laws governing the need for jurisdictions to have up-to-date General Plans and the sunset date of the City's 2000-2020 General Plan is what drove the project. The City responded to the need to update the General Plan and the community was heavily involved in the process. An additional \$300,000 of LEAP Grant funds were utilized to complete the project.

Project 2 – City of Shasta Lake Summit City Wastewater Feasibility Study

This project wasn't necessarily driven by local, State or federal legislation or mandates. However, the existing circumstances involving the Summit City area where sewage disposal systems were concentrated in a high-density area and were leading to high levels of bacteria in nearby water ways was cause for the community to pursue permanent wastewater infrastructure. Such a conversion from septic systems to sewer is consistent with local and State policies which seek to convert highly concentrated areas served by septic systems to sewer service in order to avoid public health issues. While the City is pursuing additional funding for the completion and construction of the project, no additional funding opportunities were present for the feasibility study.

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?

Project 1 – City of Redding 2045 General Plan Update

The stakeholders for Project 1 were numerous and range from all residents of the City of Redding to stakeholder groups and agencies that are impacted by future planning decisions. The engagement process involved numerous general public meetings and workshops along with meetings with stakeholder groups. Public input was received in various mediums from both the general public as well as the stakeholder groups and agencies. Service providers and other agencies which operate within or in the sphere of influence received letters or were contacted for the opportunity to comment on the General Plan update. Community members were able to attend workshops, or review public drafts and provide comments either, in-person, or via email, standard mail and online comment solicitation. The outcome of the engagement process is that the General Plan Update is well-informed by public opinion.

Project 2 – City of Shasta Lake Wastewater Feasibility Study

The stakeholders for the project is the citizens of Shasta Lake City and those who would be served by sewer extension in the western part of the City by the project. The engagement process involved multiple public meetings and workshops which sought to gather public input as well as stakeholder insight into challenges that the project might face. The stakeholders would not only provide public support of the project, but their knowledge of existing conditions and infrastructure was vital in preparing design alternatives. The outcome is that the best alternative for the community was selected and will be constructed if environmental review is completed and funding can be secured.

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?

Project 1 – City of Redding 2045 General Plan Update

One of the biggest challenges was navigating the desire of residents to adopt policies in the General Plan that were absolute and enforceable and balancing that with the direction provided by the City's legal staff to craft policies that allow flexibility; as circumstances change over the 20-year lifespan of the General Plan.

To address this challenge, policies were tightened where legislation, City Council policies or existing practices supported a firmer policy. In addition to this, a section of the Introduction chapter was added to describe the nature of the policies and how they are intended to be used and implemented.

The City of Redding feels as though California requirements for what must be addressed and how things must be addressed in General Plans are voluminous and often impractical for smaller cities. Legislation that is large-city-centric does not account for the circumstances and capabilities of mid-size and smaller cities and towns and more work should be done to make legislation applicable in differing settings across the State.

Project 2 – City of Shasta Lake Wastewater Feasibility Study

Challenges that were encountered on this project include capturing feedback of the desired demographic. To address this challenge the City of Shasta Lake hosted meetings close in proximity to the neighborhoods impacted by the project, canvassing those neighborhoods and offering several meeting options.

Areas for improvement of policy alignment at the state or federal level to help achieve the project more easily is to offer more funding for projects like this and technical assistance in smaller communities which have limited resources.

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?

Project 1 – City of Redding 2045 General Plan Update

The benefits of the projected outcomes is that the General Plan policies facilitates the development of a broader variety of housing types and incentivizes infill development. By incentivizing residential infill, environmentally sensitive areas would be further protected from development and the projected outcomes remain the same. While expected outcomes were anticipated to rely upon higher densities in the residential land use designations, through State legislation the expected outcomes were exceeded. The General Plan Policies that were adopted will further encourage new opportunities for multiple-family residential uses as well as mixed-use developments. The next steps involve implementation of General Plan policies and reporting on the progress of the General Plan.

Project 2 – City of Shasta Lake Summit City Wastewater Feasibility Study

The current projected outcomes from a fully constructed project would provide sewer facilities for over 100 existing residential units, accommodate a 160-unit subdivision, create capacity for ADUs on existing lots where it is not currently feasible and increase residential capacity and opportunity for numerous lots within the area. This would also benefit the general health of the public by ensuring that the residences are no longer using septic systems in a highly concentrated and densely developed area with poor soil quality for leach fields – which can cause high levels of human-derived bacteria in water sources. New opportunities would allow for ADU developments and additional development potential in areas previously not eligible for additional development. The next steps is to secure funding and complete the environmental review of the construction project.

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?

Project 1 – City of Redding 2045 General Plan Update

Because the funds were allocated to fully-staffing a Planner to prepare and compete a General Plan Update, all aspects of this project could be replicated. The Planner who was hired was only brought in to achieve this goal which made the funds useful and effective towards completing the grant task. There are no region-specific tools or resources that couldn't be broadly replicated throughout the State in the same way due to the fact that all jurisdictions must have an up-to-date General Plan.

Project 2 – City of Shasta Lake Summit City Wastewater Feasibility Study

Most aspects of this project could be replicated in other communities that are facing similar circumstances as the City of Shasta Lake. The methods of public engagement which offered food and drinks, canvassing to talk with neighbors, and postcards to encourage attendance to public workshops proved useful and are believed to have helped increase attendance. This is something that can easily be replicated in other communities to ensure more of the public are able to participate in the process. In addition, the City of Shasta Lake provided several options in the feasibility study, which allowed for community and Council buy-in to a future project. These are things that would be good to replicate if another jurisdiction executed a similar project.

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?

Project 1 – City of Redding 2045 General Plan Update

The most prominent project highlights relate to changes in General Plan policies CDD10C, CDD10D, CDD11A, CDD11C, CDD11D, CDD11E, & CDD11K (among others) which further authorize a variety of housing types, encourage infill development further, seek to further protect environmentally sensitive areas, and authorizes more mixed use development in existing neighborhoods. These are best practices in the Planning profession as they address the Statewide housing crisis by making it easier to build infill and provides more paths towards residential construction that satisfies the City's RHNA. Other agencies in the area as well as at the State and Federal level can use these policies to achieve outcomes that impact housing costs. The long-term achievements that could be realized from Project 1 is that more homes are able to be built in infill areas and that housing costs would become more affordable to all income levels.

Project 2 – City of Shasta Lake Summit City Wastewater Feasibility Study

The highlight of this project is that a viable alternative was selected by the City and that funding to conduct environmental review and design for construction of the project has been applied for. The best practices that could be used by other agencies is the extensive public outreach for the project which allowed the City to make a well-informed decision about which alternative to select. The long-term achievement that could result from the overall project is that public health and safety would be improved by discontinuing the use of septic systems in a concentrated area and increasing the development potential for the area overall.

Part IX – Additional Resources

Provide web links to:

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

Link to the City of Redding's 2045 General Plan Update:

https://www.cityofredding.gov/government/departments/development_services/planning/general_plan.php#:~:text=A%20city%E2%80%99s%20general%20plan%20is%20a%20comprehensive%20legal

Link to the City of Shasta Lake's Summit City Wastewater Feasibility Project:

<https://cityofshastalake.org/1247/Summit-City-Septic-to-Sewer>

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 information on the City of Redding General Plan Update please contact:

Jeremy Pagan, Director of Development Services – City of Redding
(530) 225-4030
jpagan@cityofredding.org

For information on the City of Shasta Lakes Summit City Sewer Feasibility Project please contact:

Shelby Millingar, Associate Engineer – City of Shasta Lake
(530) 440-6751
smillingar@cityofshastalake.org

For information on the administration of the Grant from start to finish please contact:

David Schlegel, Senior Planner – County of Shasta County
(530) 245-6473
dschlegel@shastacounty.gov