



**ORANGE COUNTY
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
Technical Advisory Committee**

Meeting Date / Location

Tuesday, May 5, 2020

9:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.

<https://yorkalinda.zoom.us/j/94096192110?pwd=Y2NoVIRwam5zNUV0VjVLQzU0eCtO UT09>

Meeting ID: 940 9619 2110

Password: 050620

Dial-In Audio option

+16699006833,94096192110#

Agenda Item

Staff

Page

INTRODUCTIONS

(Chair Nate Farnsworth,
City of Yorba Linda)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

(Chair Farnsworth)

The agenda descriptions are intended to give members of the public a general summary of items of business to be transacted or discussed. The posting of the recommended actions does not include what action will be taken. The Technical Advisory Committee may take any action which it deems appropriate on the agenda item and is not limited in any way by the notice of the recommended action.

At this time members of the public may address the TAC regarding any items within the subject matter jurisdiction, which are not separately listed on this agenda. Members of the public will have an opportunity to speak on agendized items at the time the item is called for discussion. NO action may be taken on items not listed on the agenda unless authorized by law. Comments shall be limited to three minutes per person and an overall time limit of twenty minutes for the Public Comments portion of the agenda.

Any person wishing to address the TAC on any matter, whether or not it appears on this agenda, is requested to complete a "Request to Speak" form available at the door. The completed form is to be submitted to the TAC Chair prior to an individual being heard. Whenever possible, lengthy testimony should be presented to the TAC in writing and only pertinent points presented orally. A speaker's comments shall be limited to three minutes.

ADMINISTRATION

1. **OCCOG TAC Meeting Minutes** (Chair Farnsworth) **4**
◆ Draft OCCOG TAC minutes for the April 7, 2020 meeting

Recommended Action: Approve OCCOG TAC minutes for the April 7, 2020 meeting, as presented or amended

Agenda Item	Staff	Page
PRESENTATIONS, DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS, REPORTS		
2	HCD Local Early Assistance Planning (LEAP) Grant Program <i>Recommended Action:</i> Receive report. Discussion.	(Sohab Mehmood, HCD) – 30 minutes 8
3.	Center of Demographic and Research Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Housing Inventory System (HIS) Data Collection & DOF Parallel Housing Survey (PHS) ◆ 2020 Census Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP) Verification Phase Status Report ◆ 2020 Census Data Release Schedule ◆ Orange County Data Acquisition Partnership (OCDAP) <i>Recommended Action:</i> Receive report. Discussion.	(Ms. Deborah Diep, Director, Center for Demographic Research) – 15 minutes 9
4.	Proposed Final Connect SoCal and PEIR <i>Recommended Action:</i> Receive report. Discussion	(Chair Farnsworth) 15 minutes 14
5.	RHNA Update <i>Recommended Action:</i> Receive report. Discussion	(Chair Farnsworth) 15 minutes 19
6.	Accessory Dwelling Units <i>Recommended Action:</i> Receive report. Discussion	(Chair Farnsworth) 15 minutes 26
7.	SB 743 (VMT) <i>Recommended Action:</i> Receive report. Discussion	(Fehr and Peers) 30 Minutes 36
8.	Regional Early Assistance Planning (REAP) Grant <i>Recommended Action:</i> Receive report. Discussion	(Chair Farnsworth) 15 minutes 37

Agenda Item	Staff	Page
<p>9. SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS/Connect SoCal Draft Data/Map Book <i>Recommended Action:</i> Receive report. Discussion</p>	(Ms. Deborah Diep) – 15 minutes	60

REPORT FROM THE OCCOG EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MATTERS FROM OCCOG TAC MEMBERS

ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM NON-MEMBERS

ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

IMPORTANT DATES OR UPCOMING EVENTS

- ◆ May 5-6, 2020 – Go Human: Local Community Engagement and Safety Mini-Grants Q&A Session
- ◆ May 7, 2020 – SCAG Policy Committee Meetings
- ◆ May 7, 2020 – SCAG Regional Council Meeting
- ◆ June 8, 2020 – Comment deadline for the State of California Draft 2020-2024 Federal Consolidated Plan
- ◆ June 11, 2020 - SCAG/USC Demographic Workshop
- ◆ October 9, 2020 – OCCOG 2020 General Assembly

Adjourn to: JUNE 2, 2020
LOCATION: TBD



**ORANGE COUNTY
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
Technical Advisory Committee**

Draft Action Minutes

Meeting of April 7, 2020

The Orange County Council of Governments Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting of April 7, 2020, was called to order by Chair Nate Farnsworth, City of Yorba Linda. The meeting was held through video and telephone conferencing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments at this time.

ADMINISTRATION

1. OCCOG TAC Meeting Minutes

The OCCOG meeting minutes of March 3, 2020 were unanimously approved by the TAC as moved by Vice Chair Justin Equina, City of Irvine, and a second by an OCCOG TAC member.

PRESENTATIONS, DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS, REPORTS

2. Center for Demographic Research - January 1- December 31, 2019 Housing Inventory System (HIS) Data Collection

Ms. Deborah Diep, Executive Director for the Center for Demographic Research, provided the OCCOG TAC with an update on the January 1 – December 31, 2019 Housing Inventory System (HIS) Data Collection

July 1- December 31, 2019 housing construction and demolition data was due to CDR on Friday, January 24, 2020. Missing data for a portion of 2019 include San Juan Capistrano, Seal Beach and Westminster. Verification forms will be sent the week of April 6, 2020. Verification forms are due April 30, 2020.

HIS submission forms were updated in 2020 to include additional sample entries and clarifications in the instructions. An additional optional column was added “Building Permit Date Issued” to assist in compiling HIS, DOF and HCD APR data. Please submit data to CDR using the new 2020 HIS form located at <http://www.fullerton.edu/cdr/HISform.xls> . Revisions to prior years may use either the new or old form. Please verify that the same data reported to CDR is also provided to DOF in their annual Housing Unit Change Survey.

CDR’s Demographic Analyst and HIS contact is Tania Torres. She can be reached at 657-278-3417 or tatorres@fullerton.edu.

3. SCAG/Orange County Data & Aerial Consortium

Ms. Deborah Diep provided the OCCOG TAC with an update on the SCAG/Orange County Data & Aerial Consortium.

OCCOG TAC Minutes
Meeting of May 5, 2020
Page 2

Orange County agencies are partnering with SCAG to pool resources to create purchase online and GIS-accessible aerial imagery for Orange County. This is patterned off of LA County's collaborative GIS effort known as LARIAC (Los Angeles Region Imagery Acquisition Consortium). <https://eqis3.lacounty.gov/dataportal/lariac/>

This joint effort, now called the Orange County Data Acquisition Partnership (OCDAP), will reduce the cost of purchasing aerial imagery and other GIS information that can be used by all departments within an agency without the need for GIS software by including a user-friendly, non-GIS platform; GIS users would have access to GIS data. Cycle 1 will include 3-inch pixel aerial/ortho imagery, infrared, and building footprints. The services would include in-person training, webinars, and additional support. Imagery and reference information is expected to be collected in June 2020, which would provide a critical baseline reference for the 2020 U.S. Decennial Census and the 2024 RTP/SCS. 2020 will also be the base year for CDR's 2022 Orange County Projections (OCP). Some of the goals are to reduce or eliminate duplicate purchases across the region, reduce costs using economies of scale, allow for unlimited and cross-departmental users within an agency. Some sample uses are:

- Reference/point-in-time snapshots
- Sidewalk analyses
- Tree canopy coverage
- Vegetation coverage

The total project cost for Cycle 1 is \$362,803. Currently, 17 agencies have indicated participation and full funding has been reached to proceed with the project. Additional agencies may still participate; those interested in participation should contact Javier Aguilar, SCAG: (213) 236-1845 Cell: (213) 999-1252 aguilar@scag.ca.gov.

The OCCOG Board has authorized OCCOG take the lead in invoicing the participating agencies in Cycle 1 for the OCDAP through its billing for OCCOG dues and CDR fees. OCCOG will collect the payments and send to SCAG.

Action: Received report. Discussion

4. 2020 SCAG RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal) Data / Growth Vision Update

Chair Nate Farnsworth updated the OCCOG TAC members on the 2020 SCAG RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal) Data / Growth Vision Update.

On March 27, 2020 SCAG released the proposed Final Connect SoCal and Program EIR (PEIR) on their website. Included in the PEIR are SCAG's response to stakeholders comments. Both documents were originally scheduled for the April 2, 2020 Regional Council meeting; however, the meeting was cancelled. SCAG is in the process of re-scheduling another meeting. During the re-scheduled meeting, the Regional Council will consider certification of the Proposed Final PEIR and adoption of the Proposed Final Connect SoCal.

5. HCD Presentation

Patrick McDougall and Sohab Mehmood, from the State Housing and Community Development (HCD) presented to the OCCOG TAC members about the role of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) during the 6th RHNA Cycle. HCD indicated that aggressive ADU assumptions may count towards RHNA as long as there is sufficient justification (e.g. affordability data). HCD also indicated they are willing to approve these assumptions in advance so jurisdictions could plan for the use of ADUs in their obligation. An ADU technical assistance booklet is scheduled for release by the end of the month.

Sohab Mehmood led the discussion about the LEAP Planning Grant Program. The program establishes \$119 million in grant funding for cities and counties. Much like the SB 2 Planning Grant Program, eligible activities must accelerate housing production. The application deadline is July 1, 2020.

Action: Received Report. Discussion.

REPORT FROM CHAIR/VICE CHAIR

There was no additional report from the Chair or Vice Chair.

REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Ms. Marnie Primmer, Executive Director of OCCOG, announced the April 23rd OCCOG Board meeting. It was also announced that the OCCOG General Assembly is postponed to possibly Fall 2020.

MATTERS FROM OCCOG TAC MEMBERS

There were no other matters from OCCOG TAC members.

ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM OCCOG TAC NON-MEMBERS

There were no other matters from OCCOG TAC non-members.

ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

IMPORTANT DATES OR UPCOMING EVENTS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Farnsworth until Tuesday, May 5, 2020 via video and teleconferencing.

Submitted by:

Justin Equina, City of Irvine
OCCOG TAC Vice Chair



Item 2: HCD LEAP Grant Technical Assistance
Recommended Action: Discussion.

Reports

HCD LEAP Grant Technical Assistance

In the 2019-20 Budget Act, Governor Gavin Newsom allocated \$250 million for all regions, cities, and counties to prioritize planning activities that accelerate housing production. With this allocation, HCD established the Local Early Action Planning Grant Program (LEAP) with \$119 million for cities and counties. LEAP provides an over-the-counter, one-time grant, to cities and counties to update their planning documents and implement process improvements that accelerate housing production, and help prepare for their 6th cycle RHNA, much like the SB2 Planning Grants Program. The LEAP grant application deadline is July 1, 2020. At the May 5, 2020, OCCOG TAC meeting, HCD will present on LEAP grant frequently asked questions.



Item 3: Center for Demographic Research (CDR) Updates
Recommended Action: Receive reports.

Reports

1. Housing Inventory System (HIS) Data Collection & DOF Parallel Housing Survey (PHS)

Verification forms for the January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019 HIS data were sent the week of April 13, 2020. Verification forms were due April 30, 2020.

HIS submission forms were updated in 2020 to include additional sample entries and clarifications in the instructions. An additional optional column was added “Building Permit Date Issued” to assist in compiling HIS, DOF and HCD APR data. Please submit data to CDR using the new 2020 HIS form located at <http://www.fullerton.edu/cdr/HISform.xls> . Revisions to prior years may use either the new or old form. Please verify that the same data reported to CDR is also provided to DOF in their annual Housing Unit Change Survey.

CDR’s Demographic Analyst and HIS contact is Tania Torres. She can be reached at 657-278-3417 or tatorres@fullerton.edu.

CDR will send requests for the January 1 – June 30, 2020 HIS data on July 1, 2020 with a deadline to submit the data to CDR by Friday, July 24, 2020.

DOF Parallel Housing Survey (PHS)

The Department of Finance is conducting data collection for the April 2020 Parallel Housing Survey (PHS) to coincide with the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2020 Decennial Census. The housing information gathered on the PHS is collected only once each decade and it essential for the State to transition into new population and housing estimates starting from the Decennial Census date of April 1, 2020. The PHS also serves as a closing point for the 2010-2020 estimates period. When the 2020 Decennial Census data is available, the PHS will be used as a comparative tool to make sure the vital housing information you are providing to Finance annually is being captured accurately. The PHS is collecting housing changes from 1/1/2020 – 3/31/2020 only. The 2021 Housing Survey will collect the remaining 9 months of calendar year 2020 in January 2021. The PHS is different than the annual Housing Survey.

DOF has extended the deadline to May 30, 2020.

2. 2020 Census Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP) Verification Phase Status Report

In May 2019, the CDR completed its participation in the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2020 Census Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP), which allowed invited participants to review and update selected statistical area boundaries for 2020 Census data tabulation following U.S. Census Bureau guidelines and criteria. Standard statistical geographies updated in this program included:

- Census tracts
- Block groups
- Census designated places (CDPs)
- Census county divisions (CCDs), in selected states

The U.S. Census Bureau finalized the draft 2020 statistical geographic area plans in late 2019 based on submissions received during the delineation phase of the 2020 Census PSAP.

In January 2020, as a designated participant, CDR took the lead in reviewing and verifying the final draft statistical areas for Orange County and coordinated closely with the County of Orange and the Census Bureau throughout the PSAP Verification Phase to ensure that guidelines were followed and as many as possible of the recommended changes would be accepted. CDR has now completed the the PSAP Verification Phase review and submitted the final recommended changes to the 2020 Census geographies.



Note that changes provided through the PSAP to the Census Bureau are recommendations only and the Census Bureau will assess each proposed change, or retention of existing boundaries, and has the final decision-making authority for the geographic boundaries.

As of April 16, 2020, the 2020 Census statistical areas will be available for public use, without data, between November 2020 and February 2021; California is expected to be released nearer to the end of the period.
<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/psap.html>

3. 2020 Census Data Release Schedule

The Census Bureau is posting revisions to the release of the 2020 Census data. Below are some of the revisions and links to further information.

<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/rdo/summary-files.2020.html>

2020 Census P.L. 94-171 Geographic Support Products

Posting December 2020 through January 2021

- Shapefiles
- Maps (.pdf)
- Block Assignment Files/Name Look-up Tables
- 2010 to 2020 tabulation block crosswalk

<https://2020census.gov/en/news-events/operational-adjustments-covid-19.html?#>

2020 Census Operational Adjustments Due to COVID-19 (updated 4/13/2020)

Process Apportionment Counts

After collection activities are complete, Census Bureau experts run and review output from programs to unduplicate responses, determine final housing unit status, populate any missing housing unit data on household size and finalize the universe to be included in the apportionment count file.

Planned Schedule July 31, 2020 – December 31, 2020

*Revised Schedule **October 31, 2020 – April 30, 2021***

Process Redistricting Data

Census Bureau experts run and review programs to populate any missing demographic data for each household, run differential privacy programs to ensure confidentiality and run tabulation programs for each state delivery.

Planned Schedule January 1, 2021 – March 30, 2021

*Revised Schedule **May 1, 2021 – July 31, 2021***

Deliver apportionment counts to the President

By law, the Census Bureau will deliver each state’s population total, which determines its number of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Planned Schedule By December 31

*Revised Schedule **Deliver By April 30, 2021***

President delivers apportionment counts to Congress

Planned Schedule Within 7 days of start of legislative session or, approximately 10-20 days after receipt.

*Revised Schedule **Within 14 days of receipt.***

Deliver redistricting counts to states

By law, the Census Bureau will deliver the local counts each state needs to complete legislative redistricting.



Planned Schedule By April 1, 2021

Revised Schedule Deliver By July 31, 2021

4. Orange County Data Acquisition Partnership (OCDAP)

Orange County agencies are partnering with SCAG to pool resources to create purchase online and GIS-accessible aerial imagery for Orange County. This is patterned off of LA County’s collaborative GIS effort known as LARIAC (Los Angeles Region Imagery Acquisition Consortium). <https://egis3.lacounty.gov/dataportal/lariac/>

This joint effort, now called the Orange County Data Acquisition Partnership (OCDAP), will reduce the cost of purchasing aerial imagery and other GIS information that can be used by all departments within an agency without the need for GIS software by including a user-friendly, non-GIS platform; GIS users would have access to GIS data. Cycle 1 will include 3-inch pixel aerial/ortho imagery, infrared, and building footprints. The services will include in-person training, webinars, and additional support. Imagery and reference information is expected to be collected in June 2020, which would provide a critical baseline reference for the 2020 U.S. Decennial Census and the 2024 RTP/SCS. 2020 is expected to be the base year for CDR’s 2022 Orange County Projections (OCP). Some of the goals are to reduce or eliminate duplicate purchases across the region, reduce costs using economies of scale, allow for unlimited and cross-departmental users within an agency.

The total project cost for Cycle 1 is \$383,603. Currently, 17 agencies have indicated participation and full funding has been reached to proceed with the project. Additional agencies may still participate; those interested in participation should contact Javier Aguilar, SCAG: (213) 236-1845 Cell: (213) 999-1252 aguilar@scag.ca.gov.

The OCCOG Board has authorized OCCOG take the lead in invoicing the participating agencies in Cycle 1 for the OCDAP. OCCOG will collect the funds and send to SCAG. A Participant Agreement will need to be signed by each agency participating in Cycle 1 of OCDAP; the Agreement will also be signed by OCCOG, which will be invoicing and collecting the funds, and SCAG who is handling the procurement of the vendor contract. Copies of the Participant Agreement will be prepared and distributed by SCAG for signature; this is expected to occur by the end of May 2020.

Attachment: SCAG Data Collaborative FAQ 4/28/2020

-
- Contact: Ms. Deborah Diep, Director, Center for Demographic Research
657/278-4596 ddiep@fullerton.edu
 - Employment data: Ms. Ruby Zaman, Assistant Director, CDR
657/278-4709 ruzaman@fullerton.edu
 - For GIS: Mr. Ian Boles, GIS Analyst, CDR
657/278-4670 iboles@fullerton.edu
 - For HIS: Ms. Tania Torres, Demographic Analyst, CDR
657/278-3417 tatorres@fullerton.edu

Jurisdiction	1 Price covers 2 years	Cycle 1 Participation?
Aliso Viejo	\$2,000	
Anaheim	\$5,000	yes
Brea	\$2,000	yes
Buena Park	\$2,000	Interested
Costa Mesa	\$2,000	yes
Cypress	\$2,000	
Dana Point	\$2,000	Cycle 2
Fountain Valley	\$2,000	yes
Fullerton	\$2,000	
Garden Grove	\$2,000	Interested
Huntington Beach	\$5,000	
Irvine	\$5,000	Interested
Laguna Beach	\$2,000	
Laguna Hills	\$2,000	yes
Laguna Niguel	\$2,000	yes
Laguna Woods	\$2,000	
La Habra	\$2,000	Interested
Lake Forest	\$2,000	Interested
La Palma	\$2,000	
Los Alamitos	\$2,000	
Mission Viejo	\$2,000	yes
Newport Beach	\$2,000	yes
Orange	\$2,000	Interested
Placentia	\$2,000	
Rancho Santa Margarita	\$2,000	
San Clemente	\$2,000	yes
San Juan Capistrano	\$2,000	
Santa Ana	\$5,000	yes
Seal Beach	\$2,000	
Stanton	\$2,000	
Tustin	\$2,000	Interested
Villa Park	\$2,000	
Westminster	\$2,000	Interested
Yorba Linda	\$2,000	yes
County of Orange	\$15,000	

Project cost for Cycle 1: \$383,603

Includes:

- 3" aerial/ortho imagery with infrared for all Orange County (tif, ecw...)
- Building Footprints
- Ability to download and retain local copies of above data to use in GIS and/or CAD systems software
- Vendor-hosted online software application for unlimited non-GIS users to view data listed above and perform data analysis
- Training for all participants
- One price for two years' worth of access

Committed Regional Agencies:

- SCAG- \$230,000
- MWDOC- \$50,000
- OCWD- \$50,000
- OCFA- \$62,275
- OCCOG- \$20,000
- Cities- \$28,000

Project funding: Reached

Draft pricing for jurisdictions is based on minimum base fee of \$2,000 that covers the online software/user-interface and aerial images.

CONTACT JAVIER AGUILAR IF INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING BY MAY 31, 2020.

With unlimited user access, all departments within an agency can utilize the information to address their unique needs. This can be done on mobile devices or at their workstation instead of having to go out into the field.

Some example uses are:

- Reference/point-in-time snapshots
- Planning: Measuring height of buildings or setbacks
- Public Works: distance between manhole openings, curb-to-curb
- Fire: Counting number of floors in a building; locating fire hydrants
- Police: assessing access points on a building
- Sidewalk analyses
- Tree canopy coverage
- Vegetation coverage

Project Overview

Through the SCAG GIS Services Program and SCAG Future Communities Initiative, SCAG has worked to build a consortium in Orange County with local jurisdictions and partner agencies to procure and share orthogonal, obliques, building footprints, LiDAR and digital terrain imagery. Cycle 1 will have imagery flights completed to serve as a benchmark for the 2020 Decennial Census and RTP 2024 base year. Envisioned as a 10-year program with five two-year cycles, this data collaborative between Orange County and SCAG is part of a broader, region-wide effort SCAG is undertaking.

As part of the project, SCAG staff is helping to manage the project, assist to secure funds, host a consortium website, and coordinate activities with agency technical staff. Currently, a small group of staff from SCAG, Orange County jurisdictions, water districts, non-profits, and special districts are working to secure funds for the project, establish project parameters, and oversee the project. Meetings have been held around Orange County to discuss the project. Contact Javier Aguilar, SCAG at aguilar@scag.ca.gov to be included on the email distribution list regarding the project and future meetings.

Objectives

1. Obtain high accuracy aerial imagery (and related products) to support local agencies' needs, such as land use and asset monitoring, pre-engineering design, and geospatial analyses.
2. Unify imagery acquisition to improve communication among Orange County agencies and SCAG.
3. Eliminate duplicate imagery acquisitions for many agencies and leverage economies of scale to obtain more and better products.
4. Save taxpayer money and increase efficiency through collaboration.
5. Integrate aerial imagery and related products with the SCAG land use database and other geographic information system (GIS) layers.

What's Included in Cycle 1?

- Aerial imagery flown in late spring/early summer 2020
 - 3" aerial/ortho imagery with infrared for all Orange County (tif, ecw...)
 - Building Footprints
- Ability to download and retain local copies of above data to use in GIS and/or CAD systems software
- Vendor-hosted online software application for unlimited non-GIS users to view data listed above and perform data analysis
- Training for all participants
- One price for two years' worth of access

Timeline

- Ongoing - Outreach to OC agencies for participation
- SCAG RFP & vendor selection in late fall 2019
- Imagery flights in late June 2020
- Training and outreach on product beginning in summer 2020 & ongoing throughout Cycle 1
- Products available in late 2020
- Billing for Cycle 1 in ~July 2020 (FY2020/21)

FAQs

- Cycle 2 expected to include everything in Cycle 1 plus:
 - Obliques/45-degree angle aerial imagery
 - Contours
 - LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging)— a remote sensing method used to examine the surface of the Earth
- An agency can sign up for one cycle at a time; this is not a 10-year commitment.
- If an agency needs to drop out in future cycles, they will still have access to their original cycle's data.
- Even if you only want some of the products, there is a minimum base fee on the pricing that covers the online software/user-interface and aerial images; no city will pay less than the \$2,000 base fee.
- Recognizing agencies may currently be in multi-year contracts, this information can be used for future budgeting and procurement.
- Cycles run for two fiscal years:
 - Cycle 1: July 2020-June 2022
 - Cycle 2: July 2022-June 2024
 - Cycle 3: July 2024-June 2026
 - Cycle 4: July 2026-June 2028
 - Cycle 5: July 2028-June 2030
- Aerials will be flown every two years
- LiDAR- about every 5-6 years (TBD)



Item 4: Final Draft Connect SoCal 2020 RTP/SCS
Recommended Action: Discussion.

Reports

Final Draft Connect SoCal 2020 RTP/SCS

At the April 23, 2020 OCCOG Board meeting, it was announced the Final Draft Connect SoCal 2020 RTP/SCS and PEIR is scheduled for consideration at the May 7th SCAG Regional Council meeting.

The OCCOG board members discussed ongoing concerns with the Connect SoCal plan because of its inconsistency with the 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). Currently, the Plan’s growth forecast does not align with the “existing need” portion of the RHNA. If the Plan does not accurately reflect “existing need”, which accounts for 2/3 of the total RHNA, or more than 800,000 units, it will significantly impact jurisdictions reliance on the RTP/SCS for compliance with CEQA. Furthermore, the OCCOG Board also received a request from the BIA and other private business stakeholders to delay the approval of Connect SoCal.

As a result, the board members voted to include the following recommendations in the OCCOG comment letter to SCAG for the Final Draft Connect SoCal 2020 RTP/SCS and PEIR:

1. 90-day delay. OCCOG is recommending a 90-day delay to allow more time in reviewing the RTP/SCS and appropriating corrections for entitled projects and local input in the document. A delay would pose little risk as the Environmental Protection Agency issued a 90-day grace period from the date of conformity expiration, which is June 1, 2020; or
2. Uncoupling the RTP and SCS. Separating both documents allow jurisdictions more time to review the SCS to ensure projects, which comply with the existing RTP/SCS, are accurately reflected in the Plan, while not jeopardizing transportation funding from the RTP.

Attachment: OCCOG Comments for Final Draft Connect SoCal 2020 RTP/SCS and PEIR



April 27, 2020

Mr. Kome Ajise
Executive Director
Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire, Suite 1700
Los Angeles, California 90017

*Subject: Orange County Council of Governments Comments for Final Draft Connect SoCal
2020 RTP/SCS and PEIR*

Transmitted via email

Dear Mr. Ajise:

On behalf of the Orange County Council of Governments, I want to thank you and your team for the tremendous effort that has gone into the creation of the Connect SoCal Plan and PEIR. This is a gargantuan task every four years, and this cycle in particular has seen significant challenges to the development of the planning documents.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the draft Connect SoCal and PEIR documents. We also appreciate all of the changes SCAG has made to the documents based on our comments in our formal response to the draft document and our informal comments offered in countless meetings over the past four years. Unfortunately, OCCOG continues to have significant concerns, as we have been expressing over the past six months, with the consistency between the RHNA and the Connect SoCal Plan as required per state housing law. We appreciate that SCAG took the time to provide a detailed response to this concern on pages i-iv of the Connect SoCal Appendix 2. Nevertheless, the response falls short in explaining how these two documents are consistent. We provide the following additional comments for your consideration:

- 1) Paragraph 1 of the section entitled, "Existing Need Portion of the 6th Cycle RHNA" from Master Response 1 (see page iii) states, "In accordance with Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(iii), as discussed above, Connect SoCal's SCS identifies areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the RHNA need, **meaning the "projected need" portion (504,970 units) of the 6th Cycle (2021- 2029) RHNA.**" This response really does not



address the intent of the law, which is that the RHNA should be consistent with the SCS. The law does not distinguish between “existing need” and “projected need” RHNA being consistent with the SCS, but states that the RHNA must be consistent with the development pattern of the SCS. Furthermore, projected household growth comes from a variety of different factors, including existing population living in overcrowded conditions that form new households as more housing units are constructed. Since existing households are simply occupied existing housing units, as the market becomes flooded with more housing units as a result of the RHNA, there will likely be an increase in household growth into those additional housing units. The SCS should take into account the approved RHNA development pattern.

- 2) Paragraph 3 of the section entitled, “Existing Need Portion of the 6th Cycle RHNA” from Master Response 1 (see page iv) states, “The 6th Cycle RHNA allocation at the jurisdiction level will not be finalized until October 2020 following an appeals process which may result in changes to the RHNA at the jurisdictional level...Until this planning work is done at the local level, it would be speculative for Connect SoCal to make assumptions about potential development levels and patterns that includes the 6th Cycle ‘existing need.’”
 - a. Aren’t both “projected need” and “existing need” housing units appealable through the RHNA process? Why is it that Connect SoCal can make assumptions about the potential development levels and patterns for “projected need” but not “existing need”? Jurisdictions are not going to distinguish the construction of their housing units between “projected need” vs. “existing need.” They are simply going to permit the housing units.
 - b. Historically most appeals have not been granted by SCAG. In fact, it has actually been pretty rare for an appeal to be granted. Based on historic trends, it seems like SCAG would be able to make assumptions about how the final RHNA may turn out following the appeals.
 - c. While RHNA and Connect SoCal may be more consistent in much of the SCAG region under the current RHNA methodology, Orange County and much of Los Angeles County are going to be extremely inconsistent between the forecasts in Connect SoCal and the RHNA allocation.
- 3) Jurisdictions are going to be relying on the data assumptions in the RTP/SCS and the RHNA. For example, many jurisdictions are going to rely on the RTP/SCS for compliance with SB 743 in screening projects for VMT impacts. However, if the RTP/SCS doesn’t accurately account



for 2/3 of total RHNA, more than 800,000 units. This will significantly impact jurisdictions' reliance on the RTP/SCS for compliance with CEQA.

In addition to the concerns expressed herein, OCCOG believes that the request from several business groups to delay a vote on final approval of the Connect SoCal Plan by the SCAG Regional Council for 90 days is a reasonable request.

At the OCCOG Board meeting of April 23, 2020, representatives of the Building Industry Association expressed significant concern over the accuracy of the entitlement data incorporated in the proposed Connect SoCal Sustainable Communities Strategy. As you well know, Orange County raised this same concern more than a year ago, and we greatly appreciated the additional review opportunity that SCAG extended to all the jurisdictions on October 31, 2019, to review and make corrections to the entitlement database for their respective jurisdiction at the small, traffic analysis zone geography. With the leadership of the Center for Demographic Research (CDR) at CSU Fullerton, every Orange County jurisdiction participated in the entitlement database review opportunity and provided corrections back to SCAG to ensure all entitlements in Orange County were accurately incorporated into the RTP/SCS growth forecast. At the same time, we also recognize that the time afforded for the additional review opportunity was very compressed, and that some jurisdictions and subregions may not have had the same coordinated effort as Orange County to conduct a quality control check on the entitlement database under the expedited timeline.

OCCOG recognizes the importance of having an error-free SCS document that does not put housing and nonresidential projects in jeopardy of challenge from CEQA lawsuits that could impact the creation of needed jobs and housing units in the region due to an inadvertent inconsistency between entitled projects and the land use pattern of the region's SCS.

Further, given the status of the negotiations on the SAFE Act between the State of California Air Resources Board (CARB) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the memo that EPA has issued stating that regulatory penalties will be stayed for a 90-day window from the date of the expiration of conformity, OCCOG believes there is little risk to our region in providing additional time for stakeholders to review the document. This additional time will allow the building community and affected jurisdictions to carefully review the RTP/SCS and related documents, and consistent with the two prior RTP/SCS processes, allow for appropriate corrections for entitled projects and local input.

Should SCAG believe that the arguments put forth for a delay by the business community are still unwarranted, OCCOG would support decoupling the approval of the RTP from the SCS



portion of the Connect SoCal plan for the 90-day period of review to give stakeholders more time to ensure entitlements and development agreements, and pending housing projects that comply with General Plans and the existing RTP/SCS, are accurately included in the Plan while not jeopardizing transportation funding that is an essential element of economic recovery for Southern California with jobs, housing and transportation solutions that work for the region and meet all applicable legal mandates including air quality. We believe this will avoid inadvertently inviting legal hurdles to building housing projects that have already been approved and planned for by a jurisdiction, while still keeping our region in conformity. The 90-day time period being requested is well below the one-year threshold for delay of the SCS that would require legislation to pursue.

We appreciate your consideration of our additional comments provided in this letter and the ongoing collaboration SCAG and OCCOG have built. It is a shared goal to have an RTP/SCS adopted that is credible and defensible on all levels.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Marnie Primmer, OCCOG Executive Director at (949) 698-2856 or marnie@occog.com.

Sincerely


Stacy Berry, Chair of the Board

Stacy Berry
Chair
Orange County Council of Governments

Cc: OCCOG Member Agencies
OCCOG Board of Directors
OCTA Board of Directors
TCA Board of Directors



Item 5: Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
Recommended Action: Discussion.

Reports

On March 5, 2020, SCAG’s Regional Council approved the final RHNA methodology, which had been previously reviewed and supported by HCD. On May 7, 2020, the Regional Council will approve the final RHNA allocations and will approve the RHNA appeals procedures. Details on the RHNA methodology and proposed RHNA appeals are available on SCAG’s website.

On April 23, 2020, the OCCOG Board authorized two letters to be sent related to RHNA. The first letter is to HCD and encourages the state reconsider the regional determination of 1.34 million housing units for the 6th Cycle RHNA by following state housing law. The second letter is to SCAG’s President and expresses its frustration and disappointment with the RHNA methodology process. The OCCOG Board is recommending that Orange County jurisdictions consider sending similar letters to HCD and SCAG.

Attachments:

- 1) OCCOG Letter to HCD dated April 27, 2020
- 2) OCCOG Letter to SCAG dated April 27, 2020



April 27, 2020

Mr. Doug McCauley
Acting Director
California Department of Housing and Community Development
2020 West El Camino Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95833

Subject: 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Dear Mr. McCauley:

During this time of worldwide crisis, the Orange County Council of Governments is focused on planning activities that will help our communities recover and will give all of our residents housing options in the years to come. We would be remiss if we did not point out that the regional determination that has been assigned to our region by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) will have severe and lasting consequences for our region, and despite our collective best efforts is unlikely to be achievable, especially with the recent sharp economic downturn. We strongly urge you to reconsider the regional determination that was made in light of both statutory irregularities in reaching the determination and current economic circumstances that will add significant impediments to our region's ability to meet the RHNA.

On August 22, 2019, HCD provided SCAG with its determination of the Regional Housing Need of 1,344,740 housing units. SCAG rightly objected to this regional determination in a letter dated September 18, 2019. On October 15, 2019, HCD rejected every point of objection by SCAG.

Respectfully, OCCOG disputes HCD's interpretation of statute which resulted in rejecting SCAG's objection. Further, we object to the process used to determine the regional housing need and urge HCD to reevaluate the outcome based on adherence to state housing law. Our goal is to establish a regional determination that is credible, attainable, and legally defensible in order to support the local jurisdictions responsible for implementing the regional housing plan.

We support SCAG's concerns from their September 18, 2019 objection letter that HCD did not base its regional determination on SCAG's RTP/SCS Growth Forecast, which is inconsistent with Government Code 65584.01(c)(2)(A). Also, HCD's regional determination for the SCAG region was not a reasonable application of the methodology and assumptions as required in Government Code 65584.01(c)(2)(B).

Since the regional determination was made, Governor Newsom has stated that his commitment to building 3.5 million homes by 2025 was in fact a "stretch goal" and that the state would soon be releasing a more pragmatic estimate of the housing needs by region. Therefore, the SCAG regional



determination of 1.34 million housing units should be revised. This inflated number combined with an inequitable RHNA methodology is setting up local jurisdictions for failure to comply with state housing law which will lead to delays in getting housing built across our region.

The remainder of this letter further outlines our specific concerns with the regional determination and its consistency with state housing law.

Regional Determination

Growth Forecast

Government Code Section 65584.01(a) states: *“If the total regional population forecast for the projection year, developed by the council of governments and used for the preparation of the regional transportation plan, is within a range of 1.5 percent of the total regional population forecast for the projection year by the Department of Finance, then the population forecast developed by the council of governments shall be the basis from which the department determines the existing and projected need for housing in the region....”*

As outlined in SCAG’s September 2019 objection letter, SCAG’s regional population forecast for its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) differs from the Department of Finance (DOF) projection by 1.32%, which falls within the range of 1.5% outlined in state law. Therefore, by statute, the regional determination should be based on SCAG’s population projections. However, HCD’s October 2019 response letter cites two reasons for not using SCAG’s total regional population forecast:

- 1) The total household projection from SCAG is 1.96% lower than DOF’s household projection.
- 2) The age cohort of under 15-year old persons from SCAG’s population projections differ from DOF’s projections by 15.8%.

HCD’s rejection of SCAG’s population growth projections is not consistent with the state housing law, which clearly states that the 1.5% range is based on the total regional population forecast, not household projections or age-cohort projections. We urge HCD to update the regional determination based on SCAG’s population growth projections.

Comparable Regions

Government Code 65584.01(b)(1) allows for SCAG to determine an overcrowded rate and rate of housing cost burden for a healthy housing market based on averages of comparable regions throughout the nation. SCAG had proposed a robust analysis to provide a more refined rate of overcrowding and cost-burdenedness; however, HCD stated that it “did not find the proposed comparable regions an effective benchmark to compare SCAG’s overcrowding and cost burden metrics to.” Therefore, HCD used the national average as the comparison benchmark. However,



when the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) made a similar request for use of comparable regions, HCD applied an adjustment based on the amount of that region's overcrowding and cost-burdenedness. Why is HCD allowing the use of comparable regions in Sacramento, but not in other regions in the state?

Vacancy Rates

Government Code 65584.01(b)(1)(E) states that vacancy rates for a healthy rental housing market shall be considered no less than 5 percent. However, the law does not establish a healthy market vacancy rate for owner occupied housing. Furthermore, it is important to point out that the American Communities Survey (ACS), which was used to determine vacancy rates, include multiple categories for vacant units beyond just vacant rental units and vacant for-sale units. Other categories include units rented but not occupied, units sold but not occupied, units vacant for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use (i.e., vacation homes, short-term rentals), vacant units for migrant workers, and other vacant units. These additional vacant units amount to an additional 353,517 vacant units in the SCAG region (ACS 2013-2017 5-year estimates), increasing the total vacancy rate to 7.72%. These additional vacant units should be included when calculating the regional determination.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we sincerely appreciate the hard work and dedication of HCD staff. OCCOG is requesting that HCD update the regional determination through the method prescribed in Government Code 65584. This should result in a regional determination in the SCAG region in the approximate range of 820,000 to 920,000. We anticipate that this would significantly increase the number of jurisdictions who will be able to certify their housing elements during the 6th Cycle RHNA, and put us well on the path towards our ultimate shared goal: providing housing for all Californians.

Sincerely,

Trevor O'Neil
Chair, Orange County Council of Governments

cc: Zach Olmstead, Deputy Director
Gustavo Velasquez, Incoming Director
OCCOG Board of Directors
Orange County City Managers



April 27, 2020

Mr. Bill Jahn
President, Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Subject: OCCOG concerns regarding process used for development of SCAG 6th Cycle RHNA methodology

Dear President Jahn,

SCAG has been tasked with representing the local governments and agencies within its jurisdiction during the RHNA process. As you know, SCAG's jurisdiction is vast, consisting of six counties and 191 cities in an area covering more than 38,000 square miles. Through SCAG's representation, millions of Californians are given only one voice to HCD during the RHNA process. SCAG has an obligation to ensure that these Californians are equally represented within SCAG during the RHNA process, and that SCAG's part in the RHNA process produces a result that benefits all of SCAG's constituents equally. In conducting the RHNA process, the Orange County Council of Governments strongly believes that SCAG has fallen short in both of these obligations.

Key among SCAG's responsibilities during the RHNA process is to develop the RHNA methodology, allocating SCAG's regional determination to the 197 jurisdictions within the SCAG region. Throughout the RHNA methodology process, SCAG staff strove to encourage public involvement in the decision-making process. SCAG staff organized countless meetings with various groups, local agencies, and other constituents within SCAG's jurisdiction. The development of the RHNA methodology is supposed to be a transparent process, and SCAG staff went as far as providing multiple versions of a calculator tool, which allowed individual member jurisdictions to determine an approximation of their draft allocation under the proposed methodology options. Public input was key to developing the proposed methodology, and SCAG staff took great pains to incorporate the feedback received from the public. However, when the time came to take action on this allegedly transparent process, SCAG chose to ignore the product of this inclusive and collaborative process.



At the November 7th, 2019 meeting of the Regional Council, SCAG failed to allow its members to have an equal voice in deciding SCAG's RHNA methodology, and subverted the previously transparent and collaborative process to ensure that only a portion of SCAG's jurisdiction benefited from the results of the ultimately-selected RHNA methodology. At the November 7th meeting, a substitute methodology was introduced. In contrast to the methodology created by staff, this alternate methodology had not been submitted to the public nor been thoroughly researched and vetted. When the details of the substitute methodology become clear after the November 7th meeting, it became evident that the substitute methodology shifted the majority of the burden of SCAG's RHNA allocation to a minority of jurisdictions in the SCAG region. Orange County's RHNA allocation has increased from 107,978 to 182,194 under the adopted, alternative methodology, almost doubling in size. This increase in Orange County's RHNA allocation directly benefited the counties of Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura and Imperial, each of which saw its RHNA allocation go down. By allowing this methodology to be chosen, SCAG supported a portion of its members at the expense of others.

The alternative methodology not only favors a particular portion of SCAG's member jurisdictions, it was chosen by SCAG in a manner that denied its members a full opportunity to be heard. As stated above, SCAG's staff prepared a proposed RHNA methodology that had been provided to all of SCAG's constituents for an opportunity to review, scrutinize, and comment. In contrast, the full details of the alternative methodology were not revealed until after the November 7th meeting. Further, in making the substitute motion to vote upon the alternative methodology, four people spoke and attempted to define the actual contents of the substitute motion. The final speaker was not even the original maker of the substitute motion. This left the members of the Regional Council unclear on what was being voted upon. When members of the Regional Council attempted to clarify the details of the alternative methodology through discussion, the discussion was wrongfully and prematurely cut off through a "call the question" motion, leaving the members without the ability to discuss the complex issue before them. The November 7th meeting was the last meeting at which such a discussion could occur before the methodology was sent to HCD. No further opportunity for discussion was offered to any member of the Regional Council. SCAG failed to properly explain the alternative methodology to the Regional Council and allow reasonable discussion of its methods. Through this, SCAG failed to give each of its member jurisdictions an equal voice in the RHNA process.

OCCOG has also been extremely disappointed with SCAG's performance in its role as the negotiator between its member jurisdictions and HCD. SCAG, given its size and the jurisdictions it represents, is in a position of authority to act as the representative and advocate to HCD for its member jurisdictions. This was especially key as it came to the RHNA determination set for the SCAG region.



On September 18, 2019, SCAG sent a letter to HCD asserting certain objections to the RHNA determination calculated by HCD for the SCAG region. This letter outlined several objections to the determination based upon incorrect applications of State statutes. Although HCD failed to provide any legitimate reason or explanation for these errors, SCAG failed to re-assert its objections. OCCOG and other members within SCAG's jurisdiction feel HCD's casual disregard for a transparent and legally adequate determination affects them directly. As such, it is SCAG's responsibility to act as their representative, but SCAG has failed to do so.

Given its size, both geographically and in population, SCAG has the responsibility to ensure that all of its members are equally represented. SCAG, through the RHNA process, has chosen to only represent the interests of a portion of its members. We are now left with a scenario that leaves our member agencies with an immense challenge in certifying their housing elements during the 6th Cycle RHNA to comport to the numbers that were unjustly allocated to our region. We find this unacceptable and wish to know how SCAG intends to address this injustice.

Sincerely,

Trevor O'Neil
Chair, Orange County Council of Governments

Cc: Kome Ajise, SCAG Executive Director
OCCOG Board of Directors
Orange County City Managers



Item 6: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)
Recommended Action: Discussion.

Reports

At the April 7, 2020 OCCOG TAC meeting, HCD provided a presentation on how the state would likely allow jurisdictions to count accessory dwelling units (ADUs) into their housing sites inventory during the 6th Cycle RHNA, especially considering the dramatic changes in state housing law regulating ADUs. Paul McDougal, Housing Policy Manager at HCD, explained that HCD would be flexible in counting ADUs towards 6th Cycle RHNA. HCD stated that they were willing to consider aggressive assumptions for the amount of projected ADUs (and their affordability levels) as long as sufficient analysis was provided to justify the assumptions. HCD also indicated that they would be willing to approve these assumptions in advance so that jurisdictions would know how to plan for the use of ADUs in their RHNA obligations. Moreover, HCD stated that they would consider regional assumptions for local jurisdictional use. For example, Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG) had a study on ADU affordability accepted by HCD. A similar approach in Orange County may provide great opportunity to pool collective resources together for a solution that would benefit all jurisdictions in meeting their RHNA.

Attachments:

- 1) SACOG Regional Accessory Dwelling Units Affordability Analysis

SACOG REGIONAL ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT AFFORDABILITY ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Government Code section 65583.1 details how local governments can consider alternate means of accommodating the RHNA beyond vacant and underutilized sites. The potential for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) within the planning period is one of these available alternative means. Since the location and rents of projected ADUs are unknown, local governments must make assumptions about which RHNA income categories they should be counted towards. The purpose of this advisory is to provide local governments in the SACOG region with an assumption for ADU affordability that can be used to assign ADUs to RHNA income categories in Cycle 6 (2021-2029) Housing Elements.

The results of this analysis have been reviewed by the State Department for Housing and Community Development (HCD) and have been found to be satisfactory. There are a number of ways to conduct this analysis. This guidance relies on a survey of existing ADU rents throughout the region in January and February 2020. However, there are other ways to conduct this analysis. For example, local governments could consider square footage, number of bedrooms, amenities, age of the structure, general location. Another method could examine current market rents for reasonably comparable rental properties to determine an average price per square foot in the community. Given the variety of potential approaches, jurisdictions are free to provide their own analysis and assumptions should they choose.

The table below provides the results of the analysis, which can be used to make assumptions about ADU affordability in the SACOG region. The analysis provides separate assumptions for three areas within the region. The affordability differences reflect the relative difference in household income, according to 2019 State income limits. The following pages include a detailed, step-by-step walkthrough of how the assumptions below were derived.

ADU Affordability by County			
Category	Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado Counties	Yuba and Sutter Counties	Yolo County
Extremely Low	15%	15%	15%
Very Low	6%	1%	10%
Low	35%	14%	44%
Moderate	43%	49%	30%
Above Moderate	1%	21%	1%

STEP-BY-STEP SUMMARY

1. Affordability Breakdown of Rented ADUs in Sacramento Region
 - a. Calculate maximum rent limits for RHNA income categories for both one-person and two-person households in each county
 - b. Conduct survey of rents for ADUs in the Sacramento region
 - c. Use above survey to determine proportion of ADUs within each income category for both one-person and two-person households
 - d. Make assumption for what percentage of ADUs will be occupied by one-person households and two-person households
 - e. Use (d) to combine proportions from (c) into single breakdown of rented ADUs by income category by county
2. Affordability Breakdown of non-rented ADUs in Sacramento Region
 - a. Make assumption for what % of ADUs are rented for free based on existing literature and allocate those towards ELI
3. Combine rented and free ADUs into single affordability breakdown by county

1. AFFORDABILITY BREAKDOWN OF RENTED ADUS

A) Calculate maximum rent limits for RHNA income categories for both one-person and two-person households by county

Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado Counties Maximum Rent by RHNA Income Category					
Category	Income Range	One Person Household		Two Person Household	
		Income ¹	Max Rent ²	Income ¹	Max Rent ²
Extremely Low	Below 30% of area median income	\$17,600	\$440	\$20,100	\$503
Very Low	30%-50% of area median income	\$29,300	\$733	\$33,450	\$836
Low	50%-80% of area median income	\$46,850	\$1,171	\$53,550	\$1,339
Moderate	80%-120% of area median income	\$70,200	\$1,755	\$80,250	\$2,006
Above Moderate	Over 120% of area median income	No max	No max	No max	No max

1) Maximum of income range multiplied by household median income average based on 2019 State income limits (<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/income-limits/state-and-federal-income-limits/docs/Income-Limits-2019.pdf>)

2) Income maximum multiplied by 30% divided by 12 to yield monthly maximum affordable rent

Yuba and Sutter Counties Maximum Rent by RHNA Income Category					
Category	Income Range	One Person Household		Two Person Household	
		Income ¹	Max Rent ²	Income ¹	Max Rent ²
Extremely Low	Below 30% of area median income	\$13,650	\$341	\$16,910	\$423
Very Low	30%-50% of area median income	\$22,700	\$568	\$25,950	\$649
Low	50%-80% of area median income	\$36,300	\$908	\$41,500	\$1,038
Moderate	80%-120% of area median income	\$54,450	\$1,361	\$62,200	\$1,555
Above Moderate	Over 120% of area median income	No max	No max	No max	No max

1) Maximum of income range multiplied by household median income average based on 2019 State income limits (<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/income-limits/state-and-federal-income-limits/docs/Income-Limits-2019.pdf>)

2) Income maximum multiplied by 30% divided by 12 to yield monthly maximum affordable rent

Yolo County Maximum Rent by RHNA Income Category					
Category	Income Range	One Person Household		Two Person Household	
		Income ¹	Max Rent ²	Income ¹	Max Rent ²
Extremely Low	Below 30% of area median income	\$18,450	\$461	\$21,100	\$528
Very Low	30%-50% of area median income	\$30,800	\$770	\$35,200	\$880
Low	50%-80% of area median income	\$49,250	\$1,231	\$56,250	\$1,406
Moderate	80%-120% of area median income	\$73,850	\$1,846	\$84,400	\$2,110
Above Moderate	Over 120% of area median income	No max	No max	No max	No max

1) Maximum of income range multiplied by household median income average based on 2019 State income limits (<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/income-limits/state-and-federal-income-limits/docs/Income-Limits-2019.pdf>)

2) Income maximum multiplied by 30% divided by 12 to yield monthly maximum affordable rent

B) Conduct survey of rents for ADUs in the Sacramento region

The survey, included as appendix A, includes location, rent, sqft (if available), and a link for 49 accessory dwelling units across the Sacramento region. SACOG used key word searches (ADU, backyard cottage, in-law, granny flat, carriage unit, etc) across a variety of rental housing search engines. ADUs were found across 14 of the region’s jurisdictions. Prices ranged from \$600 to \$2,000 per month and from 250 to 1,500 square feet. The median ADU was approximately 600 sqft and rented for just over \$1,200.

C) Use regional survey to determine proportion of ADUs within each income category for both one-person and two-person households

Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado Counties Surveyed ADU Income Categories				
Category	One Person Household		Two Person Household	
	Number of Surveyed ADUs within Range ¹	Percent of Surveyed within Range ²	Number of Surveyed ADUs within Range ¹	Percent of Surveyed within Range ²
Extremely Low	0	0%	0	0%
Very Low	2	4%	5	10%
Low	14	29%	26	53%
Moderate	32	65%	18	37%
Above Moderate	1	2%	0	0%

- 1) Number of all surveyed ADUs in step B that fall within the max rent in each RHNA income category
 2) Percent of all surveyed ADUs

Yuba and Sutter Counties Surveyed ADU Income Categories				
Category	One Person Household		Two Person Household	
	Number of Surveyed ADUs within Range ¹	Percent of Surveyed within Range ²	Number of Surveyed ADUs within Range ¹	Percent of Surveyed within Range ²
Extremely Low	0	0%	0	0%
Very Low	0	0%	1	2%
Low	6	12%	10	20%
Moderate	25	51%	32	65%
Above Moderate	18	37%	6	12%

- 1) Number of all surveyed ADUs in step B that fall within the max rent in each RHNA income category
 2) Percent of all surveyed ADUs

Yolo County Surveyed ADU Income Categories				
Category	One Person Household		Two Person Household	
	Number of Surveyed ADUs within Range ¹	Percent of Surveyed within Range ²	Number of Surveyed ADUs within Range ¹	Percent of Surveyed within Range ²
Extremely Low	0	0%	0	0%
Very Low	5	10%	6	12%
Low	22	45%	29	59%
Moderate	21	43%	14	29%
Above Moderate	1	2%	0	0%

- 1) Number of all surveyed ADUs in step B that fall within the max rent in each RHNA income category
 2) Percent of all surveyed ADUs

D) Make assumption for what percentage of ADUs will be occupied by one-person households and two-person households

Based on the survey results below from Portland, we will assume that ADU residents are split 50% as one-person households and 50% as two-person households. Assuming household sizes greater than two would increase the assumed affordability of ADUs because these households have higher median incomes. Using only one- and two-person households yields a more conservative estimation of ADU affordability.

Number of Adults	Number of Households	Percent of Total
1	72	51%
2	61	43%
More than 2	8	6%
Total	141	
*Based on survey done of Portland ADU residents in 2018		

E) Use (D) to combine proportions from (C) into single breakdown of rented ADUs by income category

Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado Counties Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs			
Category	Affordability Assumption 1-Person Households	Affordability Assumption 2-Person Households	Combined Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs ¹
Extremely Low	0%	0%	0%
Very Low	4%	10%	7%
Low	29%	53%	41%
Moderate	65%	37%	51%
Above Moderate	2%	0%	1%

1) Based on assumption that ADUs will be occupied by 50% one-person households and 50% two person households, as outlined in (D)

Yuba and Sutter Counties Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs			
Category	Affordability Assumption 1-Person Households	Affordability Assumption 2-Person Households	Combined Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs ¹
Extremely Low	0%	0%	0%
Very Low	0%	2%	1%
Low	12%	20%	16%
Moderate	51%	65%	58%
Above Moderate	37%	12%	24%

1) Based on assumption that ADUs will be occupied by 50% one-person households and 50% two person households, as outlined in (D)

Yolo County Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs			
Category	Affordability Assumption 1-Person Households	Affordability Assumption 2-Person Households	Combined Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs ¹
Extremely Low	0%	0%	0%
Very Low	10%	12%	11%
Low	45%	59%	52%
Moderate	43%	29%	36%
Above Moderate	2%	0%	1%

1) Based on assumption that ADUs will be occupied by 50% one-person households and 50% two person households, as outlined in (D)

2. AFFORDABILITY BREAKDOWN OF NON-RENTED ADUS

Accessory Dwelling Units are sometimes rented for free, usually to family members. It is difficult to estimate exactly how many ADUs will be rented for free, but there have been surveys that attempt to estimate the proportion:

- A 2012 UC Berkeley publication entitled “Scaling up Secondary Unit Production in the East Bay” indicates that approximately half of all secondary dwelling units are unpaid.¹
- A 2018 report entitled “Jumpstarting the market for ADUs” surveyed ADUs in Portland, Seattle, and Vancouver and found that approximately 17% of ADUs were occupied by a friend or family member for free.²
- A 2014 analysis entitled “Accessory dwelling units in Portland, Oregon: evaluation and interpretation of a survey of ADU owners” found that “18% of Portland ADUs are occupied for free or extremely low cost.”³

Based on these surveys, this analysis will conservatively assume that 15% of ADUs will be available at rents affordable to Extremely Low Income households.

¹

https://communityinnovation.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/scaling_up_secondary_unit_production_in_the_east_bay.pdf?width=1200&height=800&iframe=true

² http://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/uploads/ADU_report_4.18.pdf

³ <https://accessorydwellings.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/adusurveyinterpret.pdf>

3. COMBINE RENTED AND NON-RENTED ADUS INTO CONSOLIDATED AFFORDABILITY BREAKDOWN

Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado Counties Affordability Assumption for All ADUs			
Category	Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs ¹ 85% of Total	Affordability Assumption for Non-Rented ADUs ² 15% of Total	Affordability Assumption for all ADUs ³ 100% of Total
Extremely Low	0%	100%	15%
Very Low	7%	0%	6%
Low	41%	0%	35%
Moderate	51%	0%	43%
Above Moderate	1%	0%	1%

1) See Step 1.E

2) See Step 2

3) Combined by multiplying rented ADUs by 85% and non-rented ADUs by 15%

Yuba and Sutter Counties Affordability Assumption for All ADUs			
Category	Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs ¹ 85% of Total	Affordability Assumption for Non-Rented ADUs ² 15% of Total	Affordability Assumption for all ADUs ³ 100% of Total
Extremely Low	0%	100%	15%
Very Low	1%	0%	1%
Low	16%	0%	14%
Moderate	58%	0%	49%
Above Moderate	24%	0%	21%

1) See Step 1.E

2) See Step 2

3) Combined by multiplying rented ADUs by 85% and non-rented ADUs by 15%

Yolo County Affordability Assumption for All ADUs			
Category	Affordability Assumption for Rented ADUs ¹ 85% of Total	Affordability Assumption for Non-Rented ADUs ² 15% of Total	Affordability Assumption for all ADUs ³ 100% of Total
Extremely Low	0%	100%	15%
Very Low	11%	0%	10%
Low	52%	0%	44%
Moderate	36%	0%	30%
Above Moderate	1%	0%	1%

1) See Step 1.E

2) See Step 2

3) Combined by multiplying rented ADUs by 85% and non-rented ADUs by 15%

APPENDIX A: SACRAMENTO REGION ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT SURVEY

County	Jurisdiction	Address	General Location	Price	Sq Ft	Price/Sqft	Date Found
Sacramento	Sacramento		Land Park	\$ 1,000	250	\$4.00	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		South Sacramento	\$700	270	\$2.59	1/29/2020
Yolo	West Sacramento	1520 Virginia Ave		\$ 1,000	400	\$2.50	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		Colonial Heights	\$750	450	\$1.67	1/29/2020
Placer	Lincoln		Saint Tropez Ln,	\$ 1,200	450	\$2.67	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		Land Park	\$ 1,150	500	\$2.30	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento County	2143 Bircher Way	Carmichael	\$ 1,197	500	\$2.39	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	2848 Marshall Way	Curtis Park	\$ 1,200	550	\$2.18	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	1314 Q St APT 2	Midtown	\$ 1,195	571	\$2.09	1/29/2020
Yolo	Woodland	1255 East Oak #C		\$975	600	\$1.63	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento County		Fair Oaks	\$ 1,100	600	\$1.83	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Elk Grove		Near Sheldon	\$ 1,200	600		1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		Alhambra Triangle	\$ 1,395	650	\$2.15	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	4157 6th Ave	Oak Park	\$ 1,250	700	\$1.79	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	4311 21st St	Land Park	\$ 1,650	700	\$2.36	1/29/2020
Placer	Placer County		Newcastle	\$ 1,150	725	\$1.59	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		South Natomas	\$ 1,250	800	\$1.56	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		Oak Park	\$ 1,500	820	\$1.83	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento County		Arden-Arcade	\$ 1,400	900	\$1.56	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Folsom		Historic Folsom	\$ 1,975	1000	\$1.98	1/29/2020
Placer	Loomis		King Road near Penryn	\$ 1,500	1100	\$1.36	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Folsom		Historic Folsom	\$ 1,275	1500	\$0.85	1/29/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	4201 53rd St	Colonial Heights	\$ 1,075	1br		1/29/2020
Placer	Placer County		Granite Bay	\$ 1,395			1/29/2020
El Dorado	El Dorado County		El Dorado Hills	\$ 1,500			1/29/2020
Placer	Lincoln			\$ 1,200	450	\$2.67	2/3/2020
Yolo	Davis	1044 Strawberry Ter	Cannery	\$ 1,500	455	\$3.30	2/3/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	3556 Folsom Blvd	East Sacramento	\$ 1,300	550	\$2.36	2/3/2020
Placer	Roseville		West Roseville	\$ 1,595	550	\$2.90	2/3/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		Midtown	\$950	700	\$1.36	2/3/2020
Placer	Lincoln		Lyles near 193	\$ 1,200	1br		2/3/2020
Sacramento	Folsom		American River Canyon	\$ 1,700	550	\$3.09	2/7/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento County	7619 Blue Bell Cir	Vineyard	\$ 1,200	600	\$2.00	2/7/2020
El Dorado	El Dorado County		West of Placerville	\$ 1,500	600	\$2.50	2/7/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		Natomas	\$ 1,200	650	\$1.85	2/7/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento County		North Highlands	\$750	1br		2/7/2020

County	Jurisdiction	Address	General Location	Price	Sq Ft	Price/Sqft	Date Found
Sacramento	Sacramento	1740 39th Street	East Sacramento	\$871	1br		2/7/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	5351 B Street	East Sacramento	\$ 1,211	1br		2/7/2020
Yolo	West Sacramento		Southport	\$ 1,550			2/7/2020
Sacramento	Galt	134 Oak Avenue	Central Galt	\$750	1br		2/13/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	2418 28th St	Midtown	\$ 1,500	1br		2/13/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento			\$600			2/13/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		Elmhurst	\$950			2/13/2020
Yolo	Woodland		Central Woodland	\$ 1,200	300	\$4.00	2/28/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	1310 P St	Downtown	\$ 1,395	500	\$2.79	2/28/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento County		Fair Oaks	\$ 1,580	600	\$2.63	2/28/2020
El Dorado	Placerville		Placerville	\$ 1,600	700	\$2.29	2/28/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento		Natomas	\$ 1,100	720	\$1.53	2/28/2020
Sacramento	Sacramento	2418 28th St	Midtown	\$ 1,500	1br		2/28/2020



Item 2: **SB 743**
Recommended Action: Discussion.

Reports

SB 743 changes the focus of transportation impact analysis in CEQA from measuring impacts to drivers, to measuring the impact of driving. The change is being made by replacing LOS with vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and providing streamlined review of land use and transportation projects that will help reduce future VMT growth. This shift in transportation impact focus is expected to better align transportation impact analysis and mitigation outcomes with the State’s goals to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, encourage infill development, and improve public health through more active transportation.

In January 2019, the Natural Resources Agency finalized [updates to the CEQA Guidelines](#) including the incorporation of SB 743 modifications. The Guidelines changes were approved by the Office of Administrative Law and are now in effect. Specific to SB 743, Section 15064.3(c) states, “A lead agency may elect to be governed by the provisions of this section immediately. Beginning on July 1, 2020, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide.”

OCCOG TAC has invited Fehr & Peers to provide a general overview of SB 743 implementation and will be available to address questions from the TAC.



Item 7: **Regional Early Assistance Planning (REAP) Grant Program**
Recommended Action: Discussion.

Reports

Increasing the availability of affordable homes statewide is critical to bettering the quality of life of all Californians and to ending homelessness. In the 2019-20 Budget Act, Governor Gavin Newsom allocated \$250 million for all regions, cities, and counties to do their part by prioritizing planning activities that accelerate housing production to meet identified needs of every community. With this allocation, HCD established the Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program (REAP) with \$125 million to regions. REAP provides one-time grant funding to regional governments and regional entities for planning activities that will accelerate housing production and facilitate compliance in implementing the sixth cycle of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

The 2019-20 Budget Act provides a spectrum of support, incentives, resources, and accountability to meet California’s housing goals. Some specific elements include:

- Local and regional planning grants (LEAP and REAP)
- Prohousing preference points on competitive funding applications
- Additional funding resources
- Accountability (penalties for noncompliant housing plans)
- Reform (collaborative processes to reform regional housing needs)

Attachments:

- 1) Notice of Funding Availability – REAP Grant Program

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500, 95833
P. O. Box 952054
Sacramento, CA 94252-2054
(916) 263-2771 / FAX (916) 263-2763
www.hcd.ca.gov



February 27, 2020

MEMORANDUM FOR: All Potential Applicants

FROM: Zachary Olmstead, Deputy Director
Division of Housing Policy Development

SUBJECT: **2020 Notice of Funding Availability -
Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program (REAP)**

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (Department) is pleased to release this Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for approximately \$118,750,000 for the Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program (REAP). This NOFA is made available as a portion of the Local Government Planning Support Grants Program pursuant to Chapter 3.1 of Health and Safety Code (Sections 50515 to 50515.05) (Chapter 159, Statutes of 2019). The principal goal of this program is to make funding available to councils of governments and other regional entities for the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans and processes that accelerate housing production and facilitate compliance in implementing the sixth cycle of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA).

In order to be eligible for grant funding, an applicant must submit both a complete, signed original application and an electronic copy on CD or USB flash drive. In addition, the applicant may submit a copy by email to EarlyActionPlanning@hcd.ca.gov to expedite the review process. Applications will be accepted on an Over-the-Counter (OTC) basis as of the date of this NOFA through January 31, 2021. The Department encourages early applications and will accept applications postmarked by the January 31, 2021 deadline. Applicants may utilize various carrier services, such as the U.S. Postal Service, UPS, FedEx, or other carrier services. All applications must be submitted to the Department at the following address:

**California Department of Housing and Community Development
Division of Housing Policy Development
2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833**

Program applications, forms, and instructions are available on the Department's website on the [REAP webpage](#). If you have questions regarding this NOFA, please email the Department at EarlyActionPlanning@hcd.ca.gov.

Attachment

**Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program (REAP)
2020 Notice of Funding Availability**



**Gavin Newsom, Governor
State of California**

**Alexis Podesta, Secretary
Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency**

**Douglas R. McCauley, Acting Director
California Department of Housing and Community Development**

**Zachary Olmstead, Deputy Director
California Department of Housing and Community Development
Division of Housing Policy Development**

2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95833
(916) 263-2771

[REAP Webpage](#)

REAP Email: EarlyActionPlanning@hcd.ca.gov

February 27, 2020

Table of Contents

A.	Introduction	3
B.	Authority and Scope.....	3
C.	Program Summary	4
D.	Program Timeline	4
E.	Eligible Applicants	5
F.	Award Amounts.....	6
G.	Multiagency Working Groups	6
H.	Requests for an Advance of Up to 25 Percent.....	7
I.	Eligible Activities.....	8
J.	Ineligible Activities	10
K.	Eligible Uses	10
L.	Application Requirements	11
M.	Application Submission Process	11
N.	Application Review Process	12
O.	Award Letter and Standard Agreement.....	12
P.	Appeals	12
Q.	Performance, Monitoring and Enforcement	13
R.	Right to Modify or Suspend NOFA and Final Decision-making	16
S.	Definitions.....	16
	Attachment 1: Award Amounts by Eligible Applicant	21

A. Introduction

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (Department) is pleased to announce the release of this Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for \$118,750,000 for the Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program (REAP). REAP provides grants to councils of governments (COGs) and other regional entities for technical assistance, preparation, and adoption of planning documents and process improvements to accelerate housing production and facilitate compliance in implementing the sixth cycle of the RHNA.

B. Authority and Scope

This NOFA is authorized pursuant to Chapter 3.1 of Health and Safety Code sections 50515 to 50515.05 and implements, interprets, and makes statute specific for purposes of implementing REAP. This NOFA establishes terms, conditions, forms, procedures and other mechanisms as the Department deems necessary to exercise the powers and perform the duties conferred by Chapter 3.1.

The matters set forth herein are regulatory mandates, and are adopted in accordance with the authorities set forth below:

Quasi-legislative regulations ... have the dignity of statutes ... [and]...
delegation of legislative authority includes the power to elaborate the meaning
of key statutory terms...

Ramirez v. Yosemite Water Co., 20 Cal. 4th 785, 800 (1999).

Further, the Department may implement REAP through the issuance of forms, guidelines, and one or more NOFAs, as the Department deems necessary, to exercise the powers and perform the duties conferred on it by this Chapter 3.1 of Health and Safety Code. Any forms, guidelines, and NOFAs adopted pursuant to this section 50515.04 are specifically exempted from the rulemaking provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Gov. Code). (Health and Safety Code section 50515.04(f).)

The Department reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to suspend or amend the provisions of this NOFA, including, but not limited to, grant award amounts.

C. Program Summary

REAP is part of the broader Local Government Planning Support Grants Program, which was established as part of the 2019-20 Budget Act. In response to the state’s housing crisis, the overarching goals of the program are to (1) accelerate housing production and (2) facilitate compliance in implementing the sixth cycle of the RHNA. The 2019-20 Budget Act provides a spectrum of support, incentives, resources, and accountability to meet California’s housing goals. Some specific elements include:

- Local and regional planning grants (LEAP and REAP)
- Prohousing preference on funding applications
- Additional funding resources
- Accountability (penalties for noncompliant housing plans)
- Reform (collaborative processes to reform regional housing needs)

D. Program Timeline

Grants will be available to eligible applicants on a noncompetitive, Over-the-Counter (OTC) basis. Applications will be accepted from the date of the release of this NOFA and up until January 31, 2021. See below for the anticipated timeline for awards for the OTC period.

NOFA Release	February 26, 2020
NOFA Webinar	March 2020
NOFA Application Workshops	March 2020
Final Due Date for OTC Applications	January 31, 2021
Technical Assistance	February 2020 through December 31, 2023
Deadline for Submission of Final Invoices	August 31, 2023
HCD Expenditure Deadline	December 31, 2023

The Department will:

1. Begin review of applications on a rolling basis within 30 days of receipt;
2. Preliminarily approve applications within 2-4 weeks of initial compliance determination;
3. Make award determinations on applications within 2-4 weeks of approval; and
4. Provide a Standard Agreement within 60 days of award.

The Department will hold workshops and a webinar to review the REAP NOFA and application and will provide technical assistance to aid applicants throughout the OTC application period and implementation of the grant. For a list of dates, times, and locations for the workshops, as well as information on technical assistance, please visit the [Department's website](#).

E. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants for the REAP are councils of governments and other regional entities, as follows:

1. Councils of Governments:

- The Association of Bay Area Governments, representing the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma, and the City and County of San Francisco.
- The Sacramento Area Council of Governments, representing the Counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba.
- The San Diego Association of Governments, representing the County of San Diego.
- The Southern California Association of Governments, representing the Counties of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura.
- Councils of governments for the Counties of Butte, Humboldt, Lake, and Mendocino. The councils of governments described in this paragraph may apply directly to the Department for funds pursuant to the program.

2. Multiagency Working Groups:

- A central coast multiagency working group consisting of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, the Council of San Benito County Governments, and the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, representing the Counties of Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz.
- A San Joaquin Valley multiagency working group consisting of the Fresno Council of Governments, the Kern Council of Governments, the Kings County Association of Governments, the Madera County Transportation Commission, the Merced County Association of Governments, the San Joaquin Council of Governments, the Stanislaus Council of Governments, and the Tulare County Association of Governments, representing the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare.

3. The Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Inyo, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Tuolumne, and Trinity. The counties described in this paragraph may apply directly to the Department for funds pursuant to the program. The Department may approve a fiscal agent to receive funds on behalf of a county or consortium of counties listed in this paragraph.

F. Award Amounts

1. The REAP Program makes available \$118,750,000 to applicants. Maximum award amounts are based on population estimates posted on the Department of Finance website as of January 1, 2019 and are aggregated by council of government, county, or regional entity according to maximum amounts by jurisdiction size consistent with subdivision (a) of Health and Safety Code section 50515.02.¹
2. In recognition of the unique challenges in developing a process through a multiagency working group, the Department shall allocate \$8 million (\$8,000,000) to the multiagency working groups referred to in section E.2 above as follows:
 - 25 percent (\$2 million) of the amount shall be allocated to the central coast multiagency working group.
 - 75 percent of the amount (\$6 million) shall be allocated to the San Joaquin Valley multiagency working group.
3. See Attachment 1 for available award amounts based on the noted calculations above for each eligible applicant.

G. Multiagency Working Groups

1. Multiagency working groups shall have been formed before November 30, 2019.
2. Each working group shall consist of the following members:
 - One representative from each county.
 - Two city representatives from each county, one representing a larger city within the county and one representing a smaller city within the county.
3. Of the three representatives from each county serving on the multiagency working group, at least one of the representatives shall also be a member of the governing body of the applicable council of governments representing the county.
4. City representatives shall be appointed by a city selection committee for that county. Either the working group or each county through its council of government representative may define “larger” or “smaller” city based on population to maximize representation for the county. However, a smaller city shall not be larger than 100,000 in population.
5. A representative may be an elected or appointed official, past elected official, city staff (e.g., city manager, planning director) or other person that represents the interests of the jurisdiction and is enabled to act in a decision-making capacity.

¹ Population estimates are based on the Department of Finance E-1 report posted to their website on January 1, 2019.

6. The multiagency working group shall select a council of governments to serve as the fiscal agent of the multiagency working group and identify staff to assist the work of the group. If the multiagency working group fails to agree to the selection of a council of governments to serve as fiscal agent within a reasonable time period, the Department shall select a fiscal agent based on factors such as capacity and experience in administering grant programs.
7. The multiagency working groups shall establish by-laws, a charter, or other decision-making structure, and may determine reasonable parameters of decision-making.
8. For resolutions, the representatives in working groups should approve a resolution by voting on it as a group, but the fiscal agent will be the authorized signer. The attesting officer must be a different person than the fiscal agent. See the sample resolution in the application materials for more information.
9. Upon its formation, the multiagency working group shall notify each city and county that is a member of a council of governments of its purpose.
10. If utilizing funds pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 50515.02(c)(2), multiagency working groups shall develop and carry out a collaborative process-- memorialized in a formal document that reflects the unique challenges of each county, cities, and broader region within the working group. The collaborative process must develop cohesive goals, priorities and activities, including intra-regional programs or efforts. If the working group creates a Suballocation program, that program must be consistent with group goals and priorities. The multiagency working group must consult with the Department throughout the preparation and implementation of the collaborative process and may determine format in consultation with the Department.

H. Requests for an Advance of Up to 25 Percent

1. On or after October 1, 2019, a council of governments or a fiscal agent of a multiagency working group may request up to 25 percent of funding available to it in advance of their full application. Individual counties are not eligible to request funding in advance of their full application.
2. A funding request may include, but is not limited to, education and outreach strategies related to the sixth cycle RHNA and may include other eligible activities, as defined below, to facilitate housing planning and accelerate housing production.
3. The Department shall award requested funds within 30 days of receiving that request.
4. To receive this advance, applicants must submit an application, resolution, and invoice. See early application forms for the application and a template of the required resolution.
5. Applicants may submit a request for an advance under this section at any time during the application period ending January 31, 2021, prior to a full application. However, a full application must be received by January 31, 2021.
6. Applicants who received an advance must demonstrate progress in carrying out advance activities according to an agreed upon timetable prior to submitting a full

application. While this progress is required to be demonstrated prior to application for the balance of fund, the advanced funds do not need to be completely expended prior to applying for and being award the remainder of the REAP funds.

7. Multiagency group applicants must identify planned activities on a county-by-county basis.
8. Recipients will enter into a state Standard Agreement for their 25 percent advance, if applicable, and for their total allocation amount. The state Standard Agreement may be amended.

I. Eligible Activities

1. Each council of government or other regional entity may, in consultation with the Department and consistent with statutory requirements, determine the appropriate use of funds or Suballocations within its boundaries to appropriately address its unique housing planning priorities.
2. Funds must be used for housing planning activities.
3. A council of governments, other regional entity, or county that receives an allocation of funds shall establish priorities for the use of funds, as noted above and consistent with the categories of activities set out below and use those moneys consistent with priorities.
4. Activities must demonstrate a nexus to increasing housing and accelerating housing production.
5. In consultation with the Department, applicants may select one or more of the following categories of activities to fund:
 - a. Developing an improved methodology for the distribution of the sixth cycle RHNA to further the objectives described in subdivision (d) of section 65584 of the Government Code (RHNA Objectives – See Definitions).
 - I. Activities under this category must demonstrate a nexus to an improved methodology that furthers the RHNA Objectives.
 - II. Activities under this category may include implementation measures associated with an improved methodology that furthers RHNA Objectives. See Best Practices document.
 - b. Suballocation of moneys directly and equitably to jurisdictions or other subregional entities in the form of grants for planning that will accommodate the development of housing and infrastructure that will accelerate housing production in a way that aligns with state planning priorities, housing, transportation, equity, and climate goals.
 - I. In consultation with the Department, applicants may use a variety of measures to directly and equitably suballocate funds such as geographic distribution criteria, jurisdiction size set-a-sides, degree of housing needs, magnitude of benefit on state planning priorities (e.g., reduction in

- vehicle miles traveled), or comprehensive marketing and technical assistance.
- II. Suballocation programs may use different methods such as OTC, competitive or modification of existing programs and strategies, as long as they are related to housing planning and accelerating housing production.
 - III. Eligible activities under Suballocations may include sustainable communities strategies implementation related to housing planning and accelerating housing production.
 - IV. Eligible activities under Suballocations may be coordinated or combined with LEAP pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 50515.03
 - V. Eligible activities under Suballocations may be used to establish Prohousing Policies pursuant to Government Code section 65589.9. See Definitions.
 - VI. Suballocation for housing-related planning activities shall include but are not limited to:
 - Technical assistance in improving housing permitting processes, tracking systems, and planning tools,
 - Establishing regional or countywide housing trust funds for affordable housing (e.g. planning activities and processes, guidelines, charters),
 - Performing infrastructure planning, including sewers, water systems, transit, roads, or other public facilities necessary to support new housing and new residents,
 - Performing feasibility studies to determine the most efficient locations to site housing consistent with Government Code sections 65040.1 (State Planning Priorities) and 65080 (regional transportation plans), and
 - Covering the costs of temporary staffing or consultant needs associated with eligible activities.
- c. Providing jurisdictions and other local agencies with technical assistance, planning, temporary staffing, or consultant needs associated with updating local planning and zoning documents, expediting application processing, and other actions to accelerate additional housing production.
 - d. Covering the costs of administering any programs described in Health and Safety Code section 50515.02.
 - I. Recipients shall use no more than 5 percent of the allocation(s) for costs related to the administration of the activity(ies) for which the allocation(s) were made. Staff and overhead costs directly related to carrying out the eligible activities are “activity costs” and not “administrative costs.” See Best Practices document for examples.
 - e. Outreach, education, priority setting, and other related activities in consultation with the Department to carry out the overall program consistent with statutory objectives.

J. Ineligible Activities

1. Activities unrelated to accelerating housing production;
2. Activities unrelated to preparation and adoption of planning documents, and process improvements to accelerate housing production (The Department may consider proposals that include activities under (1) and (2) if a significant housing component is also present and the net effect on accelerating housing production is positive. For example, an applicant may propose combining an open-space designation, downzoning, preservation or anti-displacement measures with by-right upzoning that has a significant net gain in housing capacity);
3. Activities that obstruct or hinder housing production, e.g., moratoriums, downzoning, planning documents with conditional use permits that significantly impact approval certainty and timing, planned development, or other similarly constraining processes;
4. Capital financing, operation or funding related to programs of individual housing development projects; and
5. Administrative costs of persons employed by the grantee for activities not directly related to the preparation and adoption of the proposed Activity or Activities;

K. Eligible Uses

1. Grant funds may be used to cover the costs of temporary staffing or consultant needs associated with eligible activities.
2. Grant funds shall be used for the costs of preparing and adopting the proposed Eligible Activity or Activities.
3. A jurisdiction that receives funds under REAP may use a subcontractor. The subcontract shall provide for compliance with all the requirements of the program. The subcontract shall not relieve the jurisdiction of its responsibilities under the program.
4. Eligible expenditures may be incurred and expended for the Activity or Activities subject to the terms and conditions of the Standard Agreement.
5. Except as provided in this paragraph, costs incurred prior to the NOFA date are ineligible. Approved and eligible costs incurred for work after October 1, 2019 pursuant to the Health and Safety Code section 50515.02(d)(3), continued past the date of the Standard Agreement, and completed during the grant term, will be reimbursable.
6. For applicants matching federal or state transportation planning funds administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) through the Overall Work Program (OWP) with REAP:
 - a. Confirm activities are eligible in both programs; and
 - b. Clearly identify source of funds on those projects in the application.
 - c. If matching funds are not used, these funds and activities are not required as part of the OWP.

L. Application Requirements

1. Until January 31, 2021, an applicant may request an allocation of funds by submitting an application, in the form and manner prescribed by the Department, that includes the following information:
 - a. An allocation budget, including timelines, deliverables (implementation), sub-steps, and completion dates.
 - b. The amounts retained by the council of governments, regional entity, or county, and any Suballocations to jurisdictions.
 - c. An explanation of how proposed uses will increase housing planning and accelerate housing production.
 - d. Identification of current best practices at the regional and statewide level that promote a sufficient supply of decent housing to meet the needs of all Californians, and a strategy for increasing adoption of these practices at the regional level, where viable.
 - e. An education and outreach strategy to inform local agencies of the need and benefits of taking early action related to the sixth cycle RHNA.
2. Applicants must propose and document plans or processes that increase housing planning and facilitate accelerating local housing production. The application must demonstrate a significant positive effect on accelerating housing production through forms provided by the Department. An application must include an explanation and documentation of the nexus plans or processes impact on accelerating housing production based on a reasonable and verifiable methodology and must utilize the Department's form (see the Department's application).

M. Application Submission Process

In order to be eligible for grant funding, an applicant must submit a complete, signed original application and an electronic copy on CD or USB flash drive. In addition, an applicant may submit a copy by email to EarlyActionPlanning@hcd.ca.gov to expedite the review process. Applications will be accepted on an Over-the-Counter (OTC) basis as of the date of this NOFA through January 31, 2021. The Department encourages early applications and will accept applications postmarked by the January 31, 2021 deadline. Applicants may utilize various carrier services, such as the U.S. Postal Service, UPS, FedEx, or other carrier services. All applications must be submitted to the Department at the following address:

**California Department of Housing and Community Development
Regional Early Action Grant Program/REAP
Division of Housing Policy Development
2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833**

Applications must be on Department forms and cannot be altered or modified by the applicant. Program applications and forms are available on the [Department's website](#).

N. Application Review Process

1. The program will not utilize a competitive process to award funds.
2. Funds will be available to eligible applicants on a rolling OTC basis that begins as of the date of this NOFA and ends January 31, 2021.
3. An application form will be available upon release of the NOFA and will include forms to demonstrate eligibility requirements are met such as, among other forms, a resolution, a proposed budget and timeline table and self-certified attachments demonstrating a nexus to housing production;
4. Applications will first be reviewed for, among other things, completeness, eligibility requirements, and accuracy;
5. In order to be considered complete, an application must contain requested information and supporting documentation where appropriate;
6. All applications must meet the eligibility requirements as specified in this NOFA;
7. If the application is ineligible, it will not be considered for funding, but may be amended and resubmitted;
8. The Department may request additional information to complete and approve the application for funding;
9. Applications recommended for funding are subject to conditions specified by the Department;
10. Applications will be reviewed within 30 days from the date the Department receives the application; and
11. All applicants not meeting the eligibility requirements will be informed within 30 days from the date the Department receives the application.

O. Award Letter and Standard Agreement

Successful applicants will receive an Award Letter from the Department and will be awarded funds. Applicants will enter into a state Standard Agreement (Standard Agreement) for distribution of funds. The Standard Agreement process will specify, among other things, the amount of funds granted, timeline for expenditure of funds, and the approved use of funds. Expenditure report dates and other requirements will also be identified in the Standard Agreement.

P. Appeals

1. Basis of Appeals:
 - a. Upon receipt of the Department's notice deeming an application incomplete or ineligible, applicants under this NOFA may appeal such decision(s) to the Department Director.
 - b. No applicant shall have the right to appeal a decision of the Department relating to another applicant's eligibility, award, denial of award, or any other related matter.

2. Appeals Process and Deadlines:

- a. Process. In order to lodge an appeal, applicants must submit to the Director by the deadline set forth in subsection (b) below, a written appeal which states all relevant facts, arguments, and evidence upon which the appeal is based. No new or additional information will be accepted. Once the written appeal is submitted to the Director, no further information or materials is required to be accepted or considered thereafter. Appeals are to be submitted to the Director at the following address:

California Department of Housing and Community Development
Division of Housing Policy Development
2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, California 95833
EarlyActionPlanning@hcd.ca.gov

The Director will accept appeals delivered through a carrier service such as the U.S. Postal Service, UPS, Fed Ex, or other carrier services that provide date stamp verification of delivery. Deliveries must be received during the Department's weekday (non-state holiday) business hours of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time. Additionally, emails to the email address listed above will be accepted if the email time stamp is prior to the appeal deadline.

- b. Filing Deadline. Appeals must be received by the Director no later than ten (10) business days from the date of the Department's determination.
3. Decision: Any request to amend the Department's decision shall be reviewed for compliance with this NOFA and its application. The Director shall render his/her decision in writing within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of the applicant's written appeal. The decision of the Director shall be the Department's final decision and shall not be appealable to any court or tribunal.

Q. Performance, Monitoring and Enforcement

1. Grant Execution and Term
 - a. The Department will notify the grantee if they have been selected for a grant award;
 - b. After the Standard Agreement has been sent electronically, the grantee will be provided instructions for signing all required documents. The grantee must submit all supporting materials and a signed Standard Agreement within the timeline provided in the instructions or risk forfeiting the grant award;
 - c. The grant term begins on the day the Department and the grantee have fully executed the Standard Agreement. The Department will notify the grantee and partners when work may proceed under the agreement. However, eligible activities that are approved by the Department may be retroactively reimbursed to October 1, 2019; and

- d. Each recipient of funds under REAP shall expend those funds no later than December 31, 2023, as described on Health and Safety Code 50515.04 (c)(1). Deadline for tasks and submission of reimbursements is August 31, 2023).
2. Invoicing and Accounting of Grant Funds
 - a. Grant funds cannot be disbursed until the Standard Agreement has been fully executed;
 - b. The grantee will be responsible for compiling and submitting all invoices and reporting documents.
 - c. The grantee must bill the state based on clear deliverables outlined in the Standard Agreement or budget timeline. Only approved and eligible costs incurred for work after October 1, 2019 and completed during the grant term will be reimbursable. Approved and eligible costs incurred prior to October 1, 2019 are ineligible;
 - d. Applicants with 25 percent advance
 - i. Applicants who received advance funds shall expend all such funds or show substantial progress prior to a full application by submitting an updated project timeline and budget for their eligible projects from the application and any supporting documentation.
 - e. Project invoices may be submitted to the Department by the grantee on a quarterly basis or upon completion of a deliverable, subject to the Department's approval;
 - f. The Department may consider advance payments or alternative arrangements to reimbursement and payment methods based on demonstrated need. The Department may consider factors such as available funds for eligible activities, Suballocations to jurisdictions, need to request funds in increments, schedule for advance payments, and reporting progress in implementing activities according to a timetable;
 - g. Supporting documentation may include, but is not limited to, purchase orders, receipts, progress payments, subcontractor invoices, timecards, reports or any other documentation as deemed necessary by the Department to support the reimbursement to the grantee for expenditures incurred.
 - h. Invoices must be accompanied by supporting documentation where appropriate. Invoices without supporting documentation will not be paid. The Department may withhold 10 percent of the grant until grant terms have been fulfilled.
3. Accounting Records and Audits
 - a. The grantee must establish a separate ledger account for receipts and expenditures of grant funds and maintain expenditure details in accordance with the budget and timeline. Separate bank accounts are not required;
 - b. The grantee shall maintain documentation of its normal procurement policy and competitive bid process (including the use of sole source purchasing), and financial records of expenditures incurred during the course of the project in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles;

- c. The grantee agrees that the state or designated representative shall have the right to review and to copy any records and supporting documentation pertaining to the performance of the Standard Agreement;
- d. The grantee agrees to maintain such records for possible audit for a minimum of three (3) years after final payment, unless a longer period of records retention is stipulated;
- e. Subcontractors employed by the grantee and paid with moneys under the terms of this Standard Agreement shall be responsible for maintaining accounting records as specified above;
- f. At any time during the term of the Standard Agreement, the Department may perform or cause to be performed a financial audit of any and all phases of the award. At the Department's request, the awardee shall provide, at its own expense, a financial audit prepared by a certified public accountant. The State of California has the right to review project documents and conduct audits during project implementation and over the project life;
- g. The Department may request additional information, as needed, to meet other applicable audit requirements;
- h. The Department may monitor expenditures and activities of an applicant, as the Department deems necessary, to ensure compliance with REAP requirements; and
- i. Applicants using federal or state transportation planning funds administered through the OWP shall clearly identify the source of funds.

4. Remedies of Nonperformance

- a. In the event that it is determined, at the sole discretion of the state, that the grantee is not meeting the terms and conditions of the Standard Agreement, immediately upon receiving a written notice from the Department to stop work, the grantee shall cease all work under the Standard Agreement. The Department has the sole discretion to determine that the grantee meets the terms and conditions after a stop work order, and to deliver a written notice to the grantee to resume work under the Standard Agreement;
- b. Both the grantee and the Department have the right to terminate the Standard Agreement at any time upon 30 days written notice. The notice shall specify the reason for early termination and may permit the grantee or the Department to rectify any deficiency(ies) prior to the early termination date. The grantee will submit any requested documents to the Department within 30 days of the early termination notice;
- c. There must be a strong implementation component for the funded activity through REAP, including, where appropriate, agreement by the Locality to formally adopt the completed planning document. Localities that do not formally adopt the funded activity could be subject to repayment of the grant; and
- d. The Department may, as it deems appropriate or necessary, request the repayment of funds from an applicant, or pursue any other remedies available to it by law for failure to comply with program requirements.

5. Reporting

- a. At any time during the term of the Standard Agreement, the Department may request a performance report that demonstrates satisfaction of all requirements identified in the Standard Agreement with emphasis on eligible activities, eligible uses, ineligible uses and expenditures according to timelines and budgets referenced in the Standard Agreement;
- b. Awardees shall submit a report, in the form and manner prescribed by the Department, to be made publicly available on its internet website, by April 1 of the year following the receipt of those funds, and annually thereafter until those funds are expended, that contains the following information:
 - The status of the proposed uses listed in the entity’s application for funding and the corresponding impact on housing within the region or jurisdiction categorized by eligible uses specified in the application; and
 - A summary of building permits, certificates of occupancy, or other completed entitlements issued by entities within the region or by the jurisdiction, as applicable.
- c. The Department may request additional information, as needed, to meet other applicable reporting requirements;
- d. Upon completion of all deliverables within the Standard Agreement, the awardee shall submit a close out report. See Close Out Report Form.
 - Applicant may include a line item for advance payment or reimbursement, as part of its administrative costs, for its final report that is due by December 31, 2024. Funding requests for final reports must be submitted no later than August 31, 2023.

R. Right to Modify or Suspend NOFA and Final Decision-making

The Department reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to suspend, amend, or modify the provisions of this NOFA at any time, including, without limitation, the amount of funds available hereunder. If such an action occurs, the Department will notify all interested parties and will post the revisions to the Department’s website. You may subscribe to the [Department’s email](#).

The Department’s decision to approve or deny an application or request for funding pursuant to the program, and its determination of the amount of funding to be provided, shall be final.

S. Definitions

All terms not defined below shall, unless their context suggests otherwise, be interpreted in accordance with the meanings of terms described in Health and Safety Code section 50470.

1. “Accelerating housing production” means improving the timing, cost, feasibility, approval and amount of development through various mechanisms such as zoning incentives (e.g., increased density and heights, reduced parking requirements), upzoning, zoning amendments to permit residential in

non-residential nonhazardous zones, corridor planning, development standards modifications, nondiscretionary review, financing strategies, sliding scale fee modifications, facilitating adequate infrastructure to support development, approval streamlining that addresses quickness and ease of entitlements, and other mechanisms that promote production or remove or mitigate regulatory barriers. This may also include anti-displacement policies when coupled with activities that have a significant net increase in housing production.

2. Pursuant to Government Code section 65584(e), “affirmatively furthering fair housing” means taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws.
3. “Affordability” means a housing unit that satisfies at least one of the following criteria:
 - a. It is available at an “affordable rent,” as that term is used and defined in section 50053 of the Health and Safety Code;
 - b. It is offered at an “affordable housing cost,” as that term is used and defined in section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code; or
 - c. It is available at an “affordable rent” or an “affordable housing cost,” according to the alternative percentages of income for agency-assisted rental and cooperative housing developments pursuant to Department regulations adopted under Health and Safety Code section 50462(f).
4. “Annual Progress Report” (APR) means the Housing Element annual report required to be submitted to the Department pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of section 65400 of the Government Code.
5. “Completed entitlement” means a housing development project that has received all the required land use approvals or entitlements necessary for the issuance of a building permit and for which no additional action, including environmental review or appeals, is required to be eligible to apply for and obtain a building permit.
6. “Council of Governments” or “COG” means a single or multicounty council created by a joint powers agreement pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government Code that is responsible for allocating regional housing needs pursuant to sections 65584, 65584.04, and 65584.05 of the Government Code.
7. “Department” means the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

8. "Housing" means any development that satisfies both of the following criteria:
- a. At least two-thirds of the square footage of the development must be designated for residential use; and
 - b. Includes a house, an apartment, a mobile home, manufactured home, or trailer, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied as separate living quarters, or, if vacant, is intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and which have a direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall.

Note: accessory dwelling units (ADU) and junior accessory dwelling units (JADU) pursuant to Government Code sections 65852.2 and 65852.22 meet the definition above.

9. "Housing Element" or "element" means the Housing Element of a community's General Plan, as required pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 65302 of the Government Code and prepared in accordance with Article 10.6 (commencing with section 65580) of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code.
10. "Jurisdiction" means any city, including a charter city, county, including a charter county, or city and county, including a charter city and county.
11. "Local government" or "Locality" means any city, including a charter city, county, including a charter county, or city and county, including a charter city and county.
12. "Low- and Moderate-income households" means household income not exceeding 120 percent of area median income (AMI), adjusted for household size and other factors. Included are households at the following income levels:
- a. Extremely low income: 0-30 percent of AMI
 - b. Very low income: 30-50 percent of AMI
 - c. Lower income: 50-80 percent of AMI; or 0-80 percent of AMI
 - d. Moderate income: 80-120 percent of AMI
13. "Objective zoning standard", "objective subdivision standard", and "objective design review standard" means standards that involve no personal or subjective judgment by a public official and are uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant or proponent and the public official prior to submittal. "Objective design review standards" means only objective design standards published and adopted by ordinance or resolution by a local jurisdiction before submission of a development application, which are broadly applicable to development within the jurisdiction.
14. "Other Planning Priorities" means planning, policies, programs or investments

to promote housing choices and affordability to lower and moderate income households, the encouragement of conservation of the existing affordable housing stock, and efforts to take into account current and future impacts of climate change, including hazard mitigation.

15. Pursuant to Government Code section 65589.9(f)(2), “Prohousing Policies” ... mean policies that facilitate the planning, approval, or construction of housing. These policies may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Planning for local financial incentives for housing, including, but not limited to, establishing a local housing trust fund;
- b. Reducing parking requirements for sites that are zoned for residential development;
- c. Adoption of zoning allowing for use by right for residential and mixed-use development;
- d. Zoning more sites for residential development or zoning sites at higher densities than is required to accommodate the minimum existing RHNA for the current Housing Element cycle;
- e. Adoption of accessory dwelling unit ordinances or other mechanisms that reduce barriers for property owners to create accessory dwelling units beyond the requirements outlined in Government Code section 65852.2, as determined by the Department;
- f. Process improvements that reduce permit processing time;
- g. Creation of objective development standards;
- h. Studies and implementing actions that reduce development impact fees; and
- i. Establishing a Workforce Housing Opportunity Zone, as defined in Government Code section 65620, or a housing sustainability district, as defined in Government Code section 66200.

16. “Regional housing needs allocation” means the existing and projected need for housing for each region, as determined by the Department pursuant to section 65584.01 of the Government Code.

17. “RHNA Objectives” means

- a. Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low-income households.
- b. Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, the encouragement of efficient development patterns, and the achievement of the region’s greenhouse gas reductions targets provided by the California Air Resources Board pursuant to Government Code section 65080.
- c. Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing, including an improved balance between the number of low-wage jobs and the number of housing units affordable to low-wage workers in each jurisdiction.

- d. Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent American Community Survey.
- e. Affirmatively furthering fair housing as defined by Government Code section 66854(e).

18. “State Planning Priorities” means priorities that are intended to promote equity, strengthen the economy, protect the environment, and promote public health and safety in the state, including in urban, suburban, and rural communities pursuant to Government Code section 65041.1.

19. “Streamlined Housing Production” means improving the entitlement process through actions such as removing, mitigating, or minimizing local regulatory requirements, reforming the local approval process to reduce processing times, reducing the number of local discretionary approvals and permits needed for projects, improving approval certainty, establishing non-discretionary processes, modifying development standards such as reducing parking requirements, and increasing height limits or other efforts such as taking the fullest advantage of existing streamlining mechanisms provided in state law.

Attachment 1: Award Amounts by Eligible Applicant

The REAP Program makes available \$118,750,000 to applicants. Maximum award amounts are based on population estimates posted on the Department of Finance website as of January 1, 2019, and are aggregated by council of government, county, or regional entity according to maximum amounts by jurisdiction size consistent with subdivision (a) of Health and Safety Code section 50515.02.

Eligible Applicants	Maximum Award Amount
Councils of Governments	
Association of Bay Area Governments	\$23,966,861
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	\$6,762,880
San Diego Association of Governments	\$6,851,680
Southern California Association of Governments	\$47,471,023
Butte County COG	\$883,334
Humboldt County Association of Governments	\$785,186
Lake County COG	\$261,729
Mendocino County Association of Governments	\$383,245
Multi-agency Working Groups	
Central Coast Multiagency Working Group, consisting of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the San Luis Obispo COG, the Council of San Benito County Governments, and the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments	\$7,931,311
San Joaquin Valley Multiagency Working Group, consisting of Fresno COG, Kern COG, Kings County Association of Governments, Madera County Transportation Commission, Merced County Association of Governments, San Joaquin COG, Stanislaus COG, and Tulare County Association of Governments	\$18,975,323
Counties	
Alpine	\$60,758
Amador	\$444,004
Calaveras	\$200,970
Colusa	\$182,275
Del Norte	\$200,970
Glenn	\$182,275
Inyo	\$121,517
Lassen	\$121,517
Mariposa	\$60,758
Modoc	\$121,517
Mono	\$121,517
Nevada	\$462,699
Plumas	\$121,517
Shasta	\$682,364
Sierra	\$121,517
Siskiyou	\$687,038
Tehama	\$322,487
Trinity	\$60,758
Tuolumne	\$200,970



Item 9: SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS/Connect SoCal Draft Data/Map Book
Recommended Action: Discussion.

Report

SCAG recently updated its Draft Data/Map Book Page with a description of how SCAG incorporated entitlements in Connect SoCal. Included on the page are the updated Data/Map Books for each jurisdiction (still in draft format for local review and sans growth forecast), the Regional Entitlements Database, as well as the Connect SoCal Growth Vision Methodology: <https://www.connectsocial.org/Pages/Local-Input-Process.aspx> SCAG anticipates seeking feedback from jurisdictions in summer 2020 to finalize any draft data elements.

The Data/Map Books are expected to be approved by the SCAG Regional Council on May 7th as part of the overall approval of the 2020 RTP/SCS/Connect SoCal.