

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



Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)

November 1, 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. Project Overview

SACOG was able to utilize the generous REAP 1 grant from the State in a variety of ways to accelerate the development of housing. Housing development in the six-county SACOG region has struggled to keep up with demand. This region has not built nearly enough multifamily housing products, and in particular multi-family in infill areas. These products, which include everything from small scale “missing middle” housing like fourplexes to larger apartment buildings, tend to be more affordable because they have smaller unit sizes and use less land per unit.

The vast majority of the funds were distributed to the 22 cities and 6 counties that comprise SACOG membership in the form of sub-recipient grants. About 92% of the \$6,762,880 grant was distributed in early 80 grants to SACOG's member city and county agencies. Each of the 28 members received at least two grants each: one to assist with the development of their Cycle 6 Housing Element, and one to use their choice related to promoting the production of housing. All non-competitive grants were based on a formula determined by each jurisdiction's RHNA. In addition, competitive grants were awarded to jurisdictions based on their proposed ability to immediately promote housing production. Grants were also awarded to jurisdictions that participated in SACOG's Civic Lab program, which was an educational effort to promote residential development in commercial corridors. Finally, for the funds that were not distributed directly as grants to local agencies, SACOG utilized the funds to provide SACOG-led or consultant-led technical assistance directly to agencies that requested assistance in some housing-related matters. Funds were also used to pay for SACOG grant administrative time.

2. Start Date/End Date:

SACOG and its member agencies utilized the REAP 1 grants starting in October 2020. The subrecipient member agencies had staggered their starting times to utilize their grants. All grants were contractually required to stop incurring grant related expenses on October 1, 2024. All deliverables by grant recipients have been submitted to

SACOG.

3. Project goals and relevance to REAP goals

The primary goal of the SACOG grant was to utilize the grant funds to assist local agencies promote the development of housing. All sub-recipient grants had to demonstrate how they were able to do that in a written proposal. After review by SACOG and modifications, SACOG and the sub-recipient agreed upon a scope of work for the grant in a demonstration how it would promote housing. Related goals that the SACOG grant strived to meet:

- promote production of affordable housing. A number of jurisdictions utilized their funds to promote either more affordable housing in specific neighborhoods or corridors, or in their overall jurisdictions;

- promote housing in high opportunity areas. Using Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing as guidance, SACOG members agencies used some of the grant funds toward promoting multi-family and affordable housing in areas of their jurisdiction that had high performing educational facilities, job opportunities, transit, etc.

- removing barriers to housing production. SACOG members also utilized grants to update housing development codes and to streamline the development review process.

4. Proposed uses and Actions taken in support of proposed uses

In the aforementioned goals, all grants had the main goal of promoting more housing development. Every jurisdiction received a grant to help develop their Cycle 6 housing element, which all had programs and policies to implement promoting housing elements. For the individual grants that focused on affordable housing, most used them for specific geographic areas, such as developing Specific Plans, or for jurisdiction-wide policies such as Inclusionary Zoning. For high opportunities areas, some jurisdictions used their grants towards Specific Plans that had many multi-family residential infill opportunities. And to remove barriers to housing production, some jurisdictions received grants to update their development codes, zoning codes, and rezone land.

The list of projects by jurisdiction is provided later in this report.

5. Actions that had the greatest impact on housing production

The activities that will have the most immediate impact on housing production are those grants that went to projects that went towards specific geographic areas. The jurisdictions had plans for these areas and were working with the development community, and a specific activity was needed to help move past a particular obstacle. In some cases, it was rezoning land, other case it may be needed an environmental

study or an infrastructure capacity issue. In addition, a number of smaller jurisdictions used grant funds to set up and/or update their Accessory Dwelling Units programs. For the activities that will have the biggest impact in terms of the number of units, it is the grants with the long-range planning horizons: the code changes updates, the specific, community and master plans, zoning amendments, Climate Action Plans, Safety elements, and Missing Middle programs.

6. Overall outcomes including quantified outcomes

The overall outcomes of the grant program are that each of the 28 cities and counties in the SACOG region have completed housing elements plus at least one significant step closer to a more efficient and effective system towards housing production.

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?

List of lead agency partnerships:

		Proj Scope	Contact	email
1	Auburn	Housing Choices and Zoning Options	Jonathan Wright	jwright@auburn.ca.gov
2a	Citrus Heights	Planning counter/display hardware	Casey Kempenaar	ckempenaar@citrusheights.net
2b	C Heights - competitive	Retail to Rooftops	Alison Bermudez	abermudez@citrusheights.net
3	Colfax	Zoning Code / Develop Process review	Kathy Pease	planning@colfax-ca.gov
4a	Davis - non-competitive	Affordable Housing ordinance	Sherri Metzker	smetzker@cityofdavis.org
4b	Davis - competitive	Historic resources analysis	Eric Lee	elee@cityofdavis.org
5	El Dorado County	Aff Housing Ord/Land Dev Manual	Rob Peters	robert.peters@edcgov.us
6	Elk Grove	Evaluation of two city-owned affordable	Sarah Bontrager	sbontrager@elkgrovecity.org
7a	Folsom - non-competitive	East Bidwell MFR/MU Design Market Feas	Desmond Parrington	dparrington@folsom.ca.us
7b	Folsom - competitive	East Bidwell Green Zones Transit Priority	Stephanie Henry	shenry@folsom.ca.us
7c	Folsom - Civic Lab	East Bidwell drainage study	Ryan Neves	rneves@folsom.ca.us
8	Galt	rezone for Housing element	Kristyn Bitz	ktibz@cityofgalt.org
9	Isleton	Rental Inspection program	Gary Price	gary@plannerprice.com
10	Lincoln	Downtown Development Analysis	Rommel Palabrin	rommel.pabalinas@lincolncal.gov
12	Loomis	Zoning Amendments for HE;	Christy Consolini	cconsolini@loomis.ca.gov
13a	Marysville	Green Zone Specific Plan (city staff)	Kathy Pease	kpease@masfirm.com
13b	Marysville - competitive	Green Zone Specific Plan (consultant)	Kathy Pease	kpease@masfirm.com
14a	Placer County	Auburn Bowman - Comm Planning	Angel Green	agreen@placer.ca.gov
14b	Placer Co - competitive	Auburn Bowman - Master Plan	Angel Green	agreen@placer.ca.gov
15a	Placerville	Safety element	Pierre Rivas	privas@cityofplacerville.org
15b	Placerville - Civic Lab	Broadway Corridor Housing Feasibility	Cleve Morris	cmorris@cityofplacerville.org
16a	Rancho Cordova	Climate Action Plan/CEQA compliant	Stefan Heisler	sheisler@cityofranhocordova.org
16b	Rancho Cordova - Civic Lab	Folsom Corridor- specific sites	Stefan Heisler	sheisler@cityofranhocordova.org
17	Rocklin	Missing Middle/MFR presentation	David Mohlenbrok	david.mohlenbrok@rocklin.ca.us
18a	Rosville - Civic Lab+REAP2	Harding Corridor and Housing Analysis	Lauren Hocker	lauren.hocker@roseville.ca.us
19	Sacramento	Missing Middle Development Standards	Nguyen Nguyen	nnnguyen@cityofsacramento.org
20	Sacramento County	Stockton Blvd	Joelle Inman	inmanj@saccounty.gov
21	Sutter County	ADU pre-approved yard	Arwen Wacht	awacht@co.sutter.ca.us
22	West Sacramento	Grand Gateway Master Plan	Elijah Ortega	elijah@cityofsacramento.org
23	Wheatland	MFR planning analysis	Kevin Valente	kvalente@raneymanagement.com
24	Winters	ADU plans	(vacant)	(vacant)
25a	Woodland	Comprehensive Zoning Update	Brent Meyer	brent.meyer@cityofwoodland.org
25b	Woodland - competitive	Redevelopment area	Brent Meyer	brent.meyer@cityofwoodland.org
26	Yolo County	Dunnigan	JD Trebec	jd.trebec@yolocounty.org
27a	Yuba City	ADU package + fee cost estimator	Ashley Potocnik	apotocnik@yubacity.net
27b	Yuba City - Civic Lab only	Zoning code analysis	Ashley Potocnik	apotocnik@yubacity.net
28	Yuba County	ADU Handbook	Kevin Perkins	kperkins@co.yuba.ca.us

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. **Did any local, state, or federal legislation or mandates drive the project(s)? (SB 35, AB 1397, etc.)**

The state laws that have had the most influence on SACOG grant recipients are:

SB 330 – Housing Accountability Act: the cities of Folsom, Citrus Heights, and Lincoln all prepared Objective Design Standards. The intention of these grant projects was to make development standards can be objectively met or failed for approval. The standards all provided more graphic representations and more clear and objective standards by which a development proposal can clearly met or not.

The same bill also focuses on the Permit Streamlining Act. Some jurisdictions, including the cities of Sacramento, Woodland, Yuba City, Marysville, Lincoln, and Folsom focused on code updates and streamlining the development review process to be more efficient in the spirit of the Permit Streamlining Act.

SB 9, and to a less degree SB 10, influenced some smaller, rural communities to utilize their grant funds toward developing and implement their Accessory Dwelling Unit programs and development codes. The jurisdictions of Winters, Yuba City, Yuba County, and Sutter County all developed or enhanced their ADU programs with outreach, educational materials, or planning guidance on development ADUs for prospective developers.

2. Was it a community-driven effort?

Many of the 50-plus grant awards for housing related planning projects were community-driven. Several projects were community or corridor-based and were driven by community leaders. Examples include the city of Sacramento's Missing Middle Ordinance, which city and community leaders wanted more options for non-single family residential housing options in existing neighborhoods that were not just large multi-family complexes. The city of Marysville focused its efforts on its Downtown Specific Plan to be leveraged with the city's General Plan update; both efforts are driven by the downtown businesses and property owners who see a lot of potential for re-birth based on housing into the Downtown Marysville area. The city of West Sacramento has been working with the residents in its core area neighborhoods on the Grand Gateway Master

Plan. Other communities had a strong outreach component based on community-driven demand.

3. Were there additional funding opportunities present?

Other funding resources were utilized to match or leverage these REAP 1 subrecipient grants. First and foremost, the local agencies used general funds to supplement housing planning efforts. All of them had to provide most of the funds to pay for the development of their housing elements. For their other REAP 1 projects, several matched local funds. Others leveraged funds from the REAP 2/SACOG Green Means Go program. Jurisdictions also leveraged the LEAP grant projects to compliment their REAP 1 grants.

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?

5. Who were your stakeholders?

The stakeholders for the sub-recipient included:

- The broader communities that these local agencies service. Some of these projects affected the entirety of the jurisdictions. In other cases, some projects focused on one targeted geographic area.
- Specific groups, either business or property owners, or directly affected area residents. With several area-specific plans, these stakeholders had a direct impact from the plans
- Residents and future residents: all of these grants focused on promoting more housing production.

6. What did the engagement process look like?

Engagement activities varied by project. Jurisdictions used a variety of ways to educate and engage the public including public workshops, project websites, interactive planning simulations, neighborhoods meetings, and Planning Commission and City Council presentations.

7. What role did stakeholders play in the process? (Keep in mind: training, education, council formation, technical assistance, etc.)

Depending on the grant project, some stakeholders directly played a role in providing input and information on projects to serving on project advisory committees and focus groups. Property owners and developers provided input into the development review process and input on how to make the permit process more streamlined.

8. What were the outcomes of the engagement process?

Results varied by project. In most cases, the projects moved ahead with changes to codes, adopted plans or implemented actions based on the input from the engagement process.

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. What challenges were encountered?

The biggest issues to most projects were finding solutions that worked for all the interested parties. Streamlining housing development review processes sometimes can come at the cost of shortcutting the environmental review process or compromising long range planning efforts such as reducing vehicle miles travels and greenhouse case emissions.

2. What solutions were encountered or created?

As with most planning efforts, each grant project must develop its best solution based on the particulars of that situation. For that to occur, it takes quality information and data, a clear understanding of multiple objectives and a possibility for creative problem solving.

3. Are there areas for improvement of policy alignment at the state or federal level to help achieve this project more easily?

The biggest area where state policy can help is not to have conflict statewide policies. There are many instances where housing policies conflict with statewide transportation, land use or environmental policies. And state housing policies are only getting more and more stringent, with less and less flexibility.

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. What are the current or projected outcomes? What are the benefits?

All grant deliverables have been submitted to SACOG by the grant recipients.

The most universal project outcome of all grants are that the local government agencies are further able to implement their housing elements and planning efforts. Each grant project focused on the one or two activities that local agencies believed would best help them to promote housing development. The development of housing will be the ultimate outcome.

2. Did actual outcomes meet expectations?

Although the ultimate goal out of the program is to develop housing, the actual and realistic outcomes of these grants was to get the local agencies closer to developing housing. Whether through area plans, code updates, streamlined processes, these grants will lead to long-range housing production.

3. Have new opportunities arisen as a result of this project?

The realistic outcome of the longer-range planning grant projects were that they identify housing opportunities. Some of the bigger projects areas such as the Auburn Bowman area in Placer County, the Downtown Marysville and the North Watt Avenue area in Sacramento County all identified housing opportunities that weren't known or available before these grant projects.

4. What are the next steps?

For the bigger planning efforts, the next steps are oftentimes resolving the needed infrastructure to serve the area. Frequently, the outdated infrastructure needs to be updated and increased capacity. SACOG's Green Means Go program is specifically designed to address these needs.

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. What aspects of the project could be replicated in other communities?

The most replicable aspects of these projects are to follow the planning process to develop these planning efforts. Although each project was unique to its circumstances, the processes remain the same in all of them: engage stakeholders on the values and objectives of the project, gather and assess existing conditions, identify a number of options, identify criteria to evaluate the options, evaluate and select a preferred pathway.

2. What useful resources and tools were implemented? Were there specific tools used for specific regions or sectors?

Some of the implemented tools from this program include:

-updated code work. Some jurisdictions had to update their development codes to fall more in line with current standard housing practices, particularly for the purposes of streamlining

-Objective Design Standards: jurisdictions are all heading towards more objective design standards that meet state mandates but also to provide clear and objective standards.

-Specific Plans: jurisdictions have long held that the specific plan is the right level of information to plan a community or neighborhood. Grant recipients used a number of grants to develop specific plans.

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. What are the most prominent project highlights and why?

The most prominent highlight of the project is the breadth of projects types and the many ways to address the housing crisis. Every jurisdiction has their own unique circumstance, but they all had the option to use any number of solutions, depending on their needs: specific or area plans, code updates, ADU packets, master and community planning, rezoning, rezoning plans, affordable housing and inclusionary programs, infrastructure analysis, and housing feasibility analysis.

2. What are some of the best practices that could be used by other agencies at a local, regional, state or federal level?

Based on SACOG's grant program, some of the best practices found in this program are

-focusing on specific areas instead of jurisdiction-wide planning. Each community within a jurisdiction is unique and city-wide policies do not always address what the specific community is looking for.

-sharing examples. Jurisdictions find different density levels and missing middle housing products or ADU examples, but these are universal across all jurisdictions.

-shared data: SACOG was able to share all of its GIS-based mapping information with a number of jurisdictions so that they would better analyze their own communities.

3. What are some long-term achievements that could result from the overall project?

The ultimate long-term goal achievement in the overall project is that more housing is produced across the SACOG region.

Part IX – Additional Resources

Provide web links to:

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

1. Provide web links to: the project itself, and

Marysville Downtown Specific Plan: [General Plan Update](#) and [Marysville Specific Plan](#) and [City Council Meeting 031725](#)

City of Sacramento Missing Middle Program: [Missing Middle Housing | City of Sacramento](#)

Placer County Auburn Bowman Community Plan: [Auburn Bowman Community Plan Update | Placer County, CA](#) and [PlacerCoBOS_agenda041525.pdf](#)

Yuba City Accessory Dwelling Units program: [Yuba City, CA](#)

Roseville Corridor Planning and Infill Opportunities: [Commercial Corridors project - City of Roseville](#)

Rancho Cordova Climate Action and Adaptation Plan: [Climate Action and Adaptation Plan | City of Rancho Cordova](#)

2. Provide web links to: resources used throughout the project, and any other relevant resources.

SACOG website:

Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy: [Transportation | SACOG](#)

SACOG's Green Means Go/REAP 2 program for infill infrastructure: [Green Means Go | SACOG](#)

Regional Progress Report providing regional data pertinent to all local agencies in the region: [2021 Regional Progress Report | SACOG](#)

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.

SACOG's project manager for the REAP 1 grant program is Greg Chew, Senior Planner. He can be reached at 916-340-6227 or gchew@sacog.org.