



September 13, 2023

Via U.S. Mail and Requested Electronic Mail to:

Contra Costa Civil Grand Jury
P.O Box 431
Martinez, CA 94533
ctadmin@contracosta.courts.ca.gov

RE: City of Brentwood's response to Grand Jury Report No. 2306

Dear Grand Jury Foreperson:

Thank you for your letter and the accompanying Grand Jury Report No. 2306, Affordable Housing, in which you highlighted several findings that align with the prevailing trends and challenges in our jurisdiction.

As part of our review process, we carefully considered your concerns, and we acknowledge that some findings may lack context. As you highlighted in your letter and report, one significant challenge is the lack of funding for affordable housing initiatives. Additionally, even when funding is available, the competition for these dollars often discourages developers from pursuing projects with a lower probability of receiving funding. Local jurisdictions play a pivotal role in fostering housing development, including affordable housing options; however, development activity will often follow the path of least resistance.

Your letter and report indicate that all findings and recommendations uniformly apply to Contra Costa County and the 19 incorporated towns/cities. We recognize that the challenges, and associated solutions, for each jurisdiction in Contra Costa County are different, based on geography/location, demographics, market conditions, land availability and associated costs, and land use/transportation options. Individual jurisdictions may also face unique constraints, especially environmental constraints, which may compromise a jurisdiction's ability to address housing needs.

Finally, among the key points from our review and your findings, unfunded mandates from the State that add to the administrative burden continue to impact local jurisdictions and their ability to take proactive steps to increasing housing production. On January 1, 2023, additional housing laws went into effect, including changes to the State Density Bonus law and the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) law. On July 1, 2023, two additional laws came into effect, requiring local jurisdiction staff to create handouts and checklists and re-prioritize workloads to process housing applications in commercial corridors. Before January 1, 2024, local building and public works departments need to develop specific submittal requirements for post-entitlement permit applications, and all such applications, such as building and grading permits, will be subject to a "shot clock" to review and approve permits. The expectations and costs to local jurisdictions and their staff are significant and,



without adequate funding and resources, impact local jurisdictions' ability to focus their resources on implementation.

The lack of accessible housing options has particularly impacted vulnerable populations, including low-income households, seniors, disabled, and individuals experiencing homelessness. As local jurisdictions endeavor to tackle this crisis, they are confronted with the daunting challenge of vying for limited resources and funding.

Your letter has shed some light on critical aspects of the housing crisis we face today and affirmed that we are not alone as a jurisdiction in facing these challenges. Despite potential areas of partial disagreement, we acknowledge the factual basis of your findings and recognize the interconnectedness of the underlying conditions that have given rise to the current challenges.

By working collaboratively and understanding the broader context of the housing crisis, we strive to develop more effective strategies and policies to address this pressing issue and create a more inclusive and sustainable housing landscape for all members of our community.

The Brentwood City Council reviewed and approved this response at its public meeting of September 12, 2023.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Tim Ogden", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Tim Ogden
City Manager

cc: Brentwood City Council

Attachment: Brentwood Response to Findings and Recommendations of Grand Jury Report No. 2306, "Affordable Housing: A Plan Without a Home"

CITY OF BRENTWOOD'S RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT NO. 2306

As a preliminary matter, the City of Brentwood notes that it is unable to respond to the following findings and recommendations on behalf of any public agency other than itself. The following responses should not be understood or interpreted to represent the views of any public agency other than the City of Brentwood.

GRAND JURY FINDINGS

F1. Within existing city or County infrastructure, there is no clear owner who is responsible for achieving RHNA permitting targets.

Disagree. Within the City of Brentwood, the Planning Division of the Community Development Department is responsible for updating and administering the City's Housing Element and for monitoring progress toward meeting the City's RHNA targets. Further, the Community Development Department has an Affordable Housing Program that, among other things, provides safe and affordable housing options to the residents of Brentwood, provides data on housing trends and affordability, and seeks funding opportunities and engages community stakeholders in order to make progress towards meeting the City's RHNA targets. The Planning Division and the Affordable Housing Program actively coordinate with developers, community stakeholders, and relevant agencies to ensure the efficient processing of permits and approvals. They are also responsible for implementing policies and measures to streamline the permitting process and address any challenges that may arise. While the process may involve multiple stakeholders, the existence of designated "owners" within the City ensures accountability and a structured approach towards achieving RHNA permitting targets. State Housing Law only requires that jurisdictions plan to address barriers to development, accommodate all types of housing based on the RHNA allocations, and report their progress towards RHNA. The Planning Division is responsible for preparing the Annual Progress Report (APR) as required by State Housing Law. These reports are presented to the City Council annually prior to submission to HCD. Furthermore, each jurisdiction's Housing Element identifies the department responsible for carrying out the Housing Element's Plans and Programs.

F2. City and County officials see no direct path to meet state-mandated regional housing (RHNA) targets.

Partially Disagree. We partially disagree with Finding 2 because there are paths to meeting the state-mandated RHNA targets. First, at a policy level, the City must identify adequate sites to meet the RHNA targets through our Housing Element. The State will not certify a Housing Element that does not accommodate RHNA targets. Second, the Housing Element must include strategies and programs to remove constraints and to encourage housing development by others in accordance with State Law.

However, despite identifying adequate sites and removing constraints, cities are not responsible for producing affordable housing. While the City can and must zone sites adequate to meet RHNA

targets, achieving those targets is also highly dependent on factors outside of the City’s control. These include real estate prices, construction costs, material costs, labor costs, interest rates, and lack of available funding for affordable housing development.

F3. There are currently no measurable penalties if a city or a County does not achieve RHNA targets in an approved housing element plan.

Partially Disagree. We partially disagree with Finding 3 because while there may be no legal or financial penalties if the City does not achieve its RHNA targets, there are penalties for not accommodating RHNA in a Housing Element and the consequences for not issuing adequate permits can be considered punitive.

In addition, the City is subject to penalties if it does not adopt a Housing Element that is certified by the State. For example, the City may be subject to litigation from individuals, housing rights’ organizations, developers, and/or HCD. Depending on court decisions, local control may further diminish, beyond that prescribed in State law, including, for example, suspending the City’s authority to issue building permits or approve certain land use permits. The City may also be subject to court-issued fines, court receivership, and streamlined approval processes that remove local discretion.

Regardless of the reasons for lack of building permit activity, if the City does not meet its RHNA targets, developers may choose to use a ministerial process for housing projects that meet specified criteria (SB 35).

F4. Data published by ABAG shows that Contra Costa County and most of its cities have missed their current RHNA targets for very low- and low-income housing allocations. The allocation requirements continue to increase (16x for very low-income and 4x for low-income residents).

Partially Disagree. The City cannot comment on other jurisdictions’ progress towards meeting their RHNA targets. It is true that the City missed its RHNA targets for very low- and low-income housing in the 5th Housing Element cycle, and that the RHNA for very low- and low-income housing increased. However, the increase in the City’s RHNA allocation is not as great as suggested in this report. The City’s RHNA numbers from the past three cycles indicate that the allocation for very low- and low-income housing current (6th) cycle did not increase from the 4th cycle allocation and increased 1.7 times over the 5th cycle.

Cycle	Very Low	# Permitted	Low	# Permitted
2007 - 2014	359	152	435	54
2015 - 2020	234	3	124	14
2023 - 2031	402	n/a	232	n/a

F5. Many obstacles hinder the development of AH at the local level, specifically for very low and low-income housing, including:

- a. Limited availability of land;*
- b. Restrictive zoning policies specific to AH development;*
- c. Limited developer interest to bring projects forward;*
- d. Limited available funding;*
- e. Lack of community support;*
- f. NIMBY opposition & city council response to NIMBY opposition.*

Partially Disagree. Though the above list of obstacles can hinder the development of affordable housing, the City has addressed each item in its Housing Element programs, policies, and actions to the extent feasible. (See [Section 4: Housing Plan](#) of the 6th Cycle Housing Element.) The City rejects the use of the term “NIMBY” to broadly characterize opposition to housing development, as it is often used as a pejorative term. There are both proponents and opponents of housing development in the City of Brentwood, and the City Council is obligated to consider all public comments in the decision making process, regardless of their nature.

F6. Zoning changes are generally addressed only when a project is presented for development.

Zoning obstacles include:

- a. Housing element plans that offer poor land choices for AH development;*
- b. Restrictive height and high-density zoning policies;*
- c. Lack of inclusionary housing ordinance(s) in many cities.*

Disagree. AB 1397 set forth strict criteria for the identification of adequate sites. These criteria are somewhat arbitrary (e.g., not smaller than 0.5 acre and not larger than 10 acres) but pursuant to Government Code Section 65583.2(b), the City must demonstrate that sites identified in the Housing Element can realistically accommodate the RHNA income category that the parcel is anticipated to accommodate, whether the parcel has available or planned and accessible infrastructure, and the existing use of the site, amongst other details. Brentwood’s 6th Cycle Housing Element identifies vacant sites in high resource areas with accessible infrastructure that have no environmental or zoning constraints.

The City has updated its zoning ordinance many times in ways that facilitate residential development and to implement the Housing Elements over time (e.g. ADU ordinances, Objective Design Standards, by-right zoning of multi-family development). The City does not only consider zoning changes when a project is proposed for development.

The City’s height requirements and high-density zoning designations can accommodate development at the highest density allowed in each designation. Furthermore, according to State Density Bonus Law (SDBL), the City is required to allow increased density, reduced standards, and development incentives based on the number and type of affordable housing units proposed in a project. The SDBL applies to housing projects, including mixed-use developments, new subdivisions, or common-interest development. Developers may request incentives and concessions from City development standards that would result in actual and identifiable cost reductions to provide for affordable housing costs or rents. The number of required incentives is based on the percentage of affordable units provided in the qualifying project. For example,

developers may request increased height above that allowed by the zoning regulations and the City cannot deny this request for eligible projects, provided the request actually resulted in identifiable and actual cost reductions. As such, height and density do not represent a restriction to development.

The City has an inclusionary housing ordinance that was originally adopted in December 14, 2004, and updated several times since (see [BMC Chapter 17.725 Affordable Housing](#)). The ordinance has created 100 affordable rental and ownership units that are deed restricted for at least 45 years and has provided in-lieu fees to fund other affordable housing projects and programs.

F7. Penalties directed at cities and the County (financial, loss of control over local planning) are tied to not meeting state deadlines for Housing Element plan approval.

Partially Disagree. We agree that there are penalties that are directly related to not meeting the statutory deadline for certification of the Housing Element. The Builder's Remedy, where individuals may apply for a building permit on land that is not designated for housing, is one such penalty that is directly linked to meeting state deadlines for Housing Elements.

We partially disagree with Finding 7 because there are other penalties that are not directly tied to the statutory deadline. There are penalties associated with lawsuits, which are rarely brought forward for simply missing the statutory deadline, but more due to a perception of continued inactions. As stated in the response to Finding 3, the City may be subject to litigation from individuals, housing rights' organizations, developers, and/or HCD. Depending on court decisions, the City may lose additional local control, such as suspension of authority to issue building permits or approve certain land use permits; and/or the City may be subject to court-issued fines, court receivership, and streamlined approval processes that remove local discretion.

Penalties also include losing eligibility for funding. Depending on specific programs, eligibility for some state funds, such as PLHA and State HOME funds, requires a certified Housing Element. Finally, loss of local control is not limited to jurisdictions that do not meet specified timeframes for a certified housing element. For example, SB 35, the Housing Accountability Act, the No Net Loss Act, Density Bonus Law, and AB 2011/SB 6 specify what types of projects local jurisdictions must approve and where such projects must be approved, regardless of whether jurisdictions meet state deadlines for Housing Elements.

F8. Builder's Remedy and SB 35 projects do not address ingrained local obstacles identified in this report that prevent the completion of approved AH projects.

Disagree. The Builder's Remedy and SB 35 are not intended to address local obstacles. Instead, they are intended to provide a streamlined development process for jurisdictions that have fallen out of compliance with State Housing Law (the Builder's Remedy) or where housing production does not meet the RHNA targets (SB 35). The Housing Element and its associated programs are intended to address potential local constraints to housing development. A variety of factors, such as market conditions, capital costs, financing, supply chain disruptions, and labor market conditions, may affect the construction and completion of approved affordable housing projects. These factors are rarely associated with local obstacles and are beyond the City's purview.

F9. When local Redevelopment Agencies (RDA's) were discontinued by the state in 2012, the County and cities, did not address the loss of funding for affordable housing or find alternative funding to support affordable housing projects until voters passed Measure X in November 2020. Projects that target very low- and low-income residents were particularly impacted.

Disagree. State law limits local jurisdictions' ability to create new funding sources. Voters need to approve virtually all new funding or financing mechanisms to generate the revenues or funds needed to preserve existing affordable housing and construct or finance new affordable housing. The City Council cannot, for example, float bonds any longer without voter approval. The City adopted an Inclusionary Housing ordinance as a way to generate affordable housing and in-lieu fees for affordable housing without a Redevelopment Agency.

Measure X, the countywide 20-year ½ cent sales tax was approved in November 2020, is projected to provide up to \$12 million annually for "housing and related services" for the entire County (emphasis added). Measure X Affordable Housing funds will be distributed through a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process, a competitive process.

F10. Measure X housing funds are not fully dedicated to building AH for very low- and low-income residents.

Agree. The City of Brentwood agrees with this response.

F11. Local funding provided by bonds like Measure X Housing Fund is a critical component of a developer's overall ability to raise funds for an AH development.

Disagree. While local funding provided by bonds like the Measure X Housing Fund in Contra Costa County can be a beneficial component, it is not a critical factor in a developer's overall ability to raise funds for an affordable housing (AH) development. Developers often require multiple sources of funding, or "stacking" strategies available to them, including federal and state grants, tax credits, private investments, and partnerships with nonprofit organizations. While local funding can certainly enhance a project's financial viability and facilitate its development, affordable housing projects cannot move forward successfully without a combination of various funding sources and partnerships that fill the funding gap between market rate and affordable housing feasibility. The critical aspect lies in the ability of developers to strategically leverage and combine these funding options to meet the financial requirements of the project and ensure its feasibility.

F12. Cities that proactively engage citizens, address zoning obstacles, make reasonable zoning concessions, work collaboratively with developers, provide local funding support, and are united in addressing NIMBY opposition, have been successful in attracting AH projects.

Partially Disagree. The City agrees that proactive strategies can help attract affordable housing developers and mitigate the barriers to housing production; however, proactive strategies alone do not result in affordable housing projects being constructed. For example, while the City engages in all of the above, many other obstacles towards affordable housing development exist beyond a local jurisdiction's control. This includes the gap in financing between constructing market-rate versus



affordable housing, land costs, construction and labor costs, infrastructure costs (on- and off-site), fees for public utilities (particularly for non-municipal utilities), etc.

F13. The latest RHNA targets for cities and unincorporated Contra Costa County show a significant increase in the number of units that are expected to be permitted for very low and low-income housing.

Partially Disagree. It is true that RHNA for very low- and low-income housing has continued to increase. However, the increase in the City's RHNA allocation is not as great as the assumptions included in the Grand Jury's report. The City's RHNA numbers from the past three cycles indicate that the allocation for very low- and low-income housing current (6th) cycle did not increase from the 4th cycle allocation and increased 1.7 times over the 5th cycle. Please see the response to Finding 4 for detailed RHNA numbers from previous Housing Element cycles.

GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

R1. Each city and the County should consider assigning a staff position with clear leadership, ownership and accountability to achieve allocated RHNA targets. The individual in this position would be responsible for establishing and promoting an operational plan to achieve the RHNA goals set forth in the housing element plan.

The recommendation has been implemented. California's Housing Element Law acknowledges that, in order for the private market to adequately address the housing needs and demands of Californians, local governments must adopt plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for (and do not unduly constrain) housing development. The City is not responsible for the development and construction of housing to achieve the allocated RHNA targets. Instead, the City is responsible for the effective implementation of its housing element and associated programs to address any existing constraints to housing and for tracking and reporting the City's progress toward achieving its RHNA. The Community Development Department's Planning Division is assigned with the responsibility of implementing the Housing Element and monitoring the City's progress towards meeting its RHNA targets. Further, the Community Development Department has an Affordable Housing Program that, among other things, provides safe and affordable housing options to the residents of Brentwood, provides data on housing trends and affordability, and seeks funding opportunities and engages community stakeholders. Together, these two divisions implement the Housing Element's programs and the City's affordable housing programs

R2. Each city and the County should report AH progress and lack of progress using data across all four measured income groups. Special attention should be paid to tracking the housing needs of residents categorized as very low- and low-income. Cities and the County should communicate their progress biannually, against RHNA targets at council and supervisor Meetings.

The recommendation has been implemented. State law (Government Code § 65400) requires the City to prepare an annual progress report (APR) on the jurisdiction's status and progress in implementing its housing element (HE) using forms and definitions adopted by the California

Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The APR allows HCD to track the progress of the implementation of the City's Housing Element and requires its submission as a threshold requirement for several State housing funding programs (see [APR Guidance](#)).

Through the forms and tables provided by HCD ([link](#)), the City must report annual data on housing in the APR, including the following:

- Housing development applications received (including proposed number of units, types of tenancy, and affordability levels)
- Building/construction activity
- Progress towards the RHNA
- Sites identified or rezoned to accommodate a shortfall in housing need
- Program implementation status
- Local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the development of housing
- Projects with a commercial development bonus
- Units rehabilitated or preserved
- Locally owned lands included in the sites inventory that have been sold
- Locally owned surplus sites

Government Code § 65400 requires the City to provide this report to its legislative body (the City Council), HCD, and OPR by April 1 of each year (covering the previous calendar year). APRs must be presented to the City Council for its review and acceptance, usually as a consent or discussion item on a regular meeting agenda. The City of Brentwood provides the APR to the City Council annually prior to submitting it to HCD and OPR. Biannual reporting would divert staff time from other housing programs and would not provide data that is significantly different than the required APR.

R3. Each city and the County should consider creating a dedicated AH commission comprised of a multi-disciplinary team of diverse citizens and led by a current, nonelected, city expert in planning. Each commission would be charged with providing a community voice in the process and helping to identify and address obstacles that hinder the development of affordable housing projects in their community.

The recommendation will not be implemented. We appreciate the thoughtful recommendation to create a dedicated Affordable Housing (AH) commission comprised of a multi-disciplinary team of diverse citizens, led by a current, non-elected, city expert in planning. While we acknowledge the potential benefits of such a commission, after careful consideration, we have decided not to pursue its implementation due to the following reasons:

- Existing Planning Processes: Brentwood already has established planning processes, committees and commissions responsible for addressing affordable housing issues which are made up of elected and appointed residents and staffed by city planners and consultants that are subject matter experts. These include the Planning Commission, the Land Use and Development subcommittee of the City Council, and the City Council. These existing groups provide platforms for community engagement and collaboration, making the formation of a separate commission redundant and potentially duplicative of efforts.

- **Resource Constraints:** Establishing and maintaining a dedicated AH commission would require additional financial and administrative resources. At present, the City already allocates resources to multiple initiatives aimed at addressing affordable housing needs, including the administration of the City’s inclusionary housing ordinance and the management of the Affordable Housing program. Adding another commission would spread already limited resources too thin and hinder the efficiency of current efforts.
- **Community Involvement:** Instead of forming a separate AH commission, we are committed to continuing our practice of involving community members and experts in our existing planning and housing committees. Robust public outreach in multiple languages and via multiple formats, conducting regular workshops and study sessions, and encouraging community feedback will remain focal points in our efforts to address obstacles hindering affordable housing development.

While the City does not intend to pursue the recommended dedicated AH commission, the City values the underlying principle of community engagement and recognize the importance of community input in the decision-making process. The City will continue to explore strategies that promote transparency, inclusivity, and community-driven solutions for affordable housing development in Brentwood. The City remains committed to finding the most effective and sustainable approaches to address affordable housing challenges, working in collaboration with stakeholders and community members to achieve our shared goals.

R4. Each city and the County should consider reviewing existing processes and identifying changes that would address or resolve the specific obstacles identified in this report that hinder achieving RHNA allocation targets for very low- and low-income housing in their Community.

The recommendation has been implemented. As required by State law, the City reviews existing processes and identifies programs to address any potential constraints to housing development through the Housing Element’s constraints analysis section. (See [Section 3: Housing Constraints, Resources and Fair Housing](#) of the City’s 6th Cycle Housing Element adopted by the City Council on March 14, 2023.)

As part of the 6th Cycle Housing Element update, Brentwood has conducted a thorough review of a number of potential factors that may affect the provision of adequate housing or access to opportunities for current and future residents in the City of Brentwood. These factors include governmental and nongovernmental constraints. The analysis identified a number of nongovernmental constraints that impact the provision of housing in the city, including factors such as the cost of land, the cost of construction and the availability of financing. Where governmental constraints were identified, [Section 4: Housing Plan](#) of the Housing Element identifies policies and actions to minimize or eliminate constraints. These include: adopting objective residential design standards; providing development incentives for affordable housing; and, pursuing affordable housing assistance funds. As a result of these actions, tangible progress can be made towards meeting RHNA allocation targets for very low- and low-income housing in Brentwood.

R5. Each city and the County should consider developing a public dashboard to report progress against RHNA targets.

The recommendation has been implemented. As stated above, Brentwood must prepare an APR on the City's status and progress in implementing its Housing Element using forms and definitions adopted by HCD. (Government Code § 65400.) Each jurisdiction's APR must be submitted to HCD and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) by April 1 of each year. HCD compiles and showcases all APRs through their interactive digital data dashboard with downloadable data sets. ([link](#))

R6. Each city and the County should consider, in their individual Housing Element plans, putting forth land zoned "suitable for residential use," without development obstacles, and located strategically close to existing services, for AH purposes.

The recommendation has been implemented. As required by State law, jurisdictions are required to prepare a site inventory identifying land suitable and available for residential development to meet the locality's regional housing needs by income level. Please see the response to Finding 6 for details. Further, in addressing HCD's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements, there is a thorough review of the site selection via the Tax Credit Allocation's Committee (TCAC) Resource Map that designates areas of low-, moderate-, high-, and highest-resource within a jurisdiction and requires specific justification for placing affordable housing projects within low-resources areas. All of the sites identified as suitable for residential development in Brentwood's Housing Element are located in high resource areas of the city.

R7. Each city and the County should consider reviewing their zoning policies to identify restrictive zoning policies unique to their jurisdiction that impede AH projects and consider making zoning changes in light of that review that will support AH in their community.

The recommendation has been implemented. Through the Housing Element process, Brentwood has reviewed its zoning policies and identified potential affordable housing development constraints. Housing Element Section 4: Housing Plan outlines forthcoming changes to zoning policies with specified timeframes to address the identified constraints.

R8. Cities should consider adopting an inclusionary housing ordinance as part of their standard development policy by the end of 2023 (if not already in place).

The recommendation has been implemented. The City has an adopted inclusionary housing ordinance that requires developers of eligible projects to provide a minimum of 13% of the total units affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. See Brentwood Municipal Code [Chapter 17.725 AFFORDABLE HOUSING](#). Since its implementation, the inclusionary housing ordinance has created 100 deed-restricted affordable housing units and generated in-lieu fees to fund affordable housing and affordable housing programs. Overall, the successful implementation of the inclusionary housing ordinance has been a significant step towards promoting inclusive and affordable housing development in our city.

R9. Each city and the County should consider how to prioritize the implementation of housing projects that promote development of very low- and low-income housing.

The recommendation has been implemented. The City must process all residential development applications in accordance with the timelines established by State law. These timelines include provisions for streamlined, ministerial review for qualifying affordable housing projects, which encourages developers to prioritize the creation of affordable housing. The City's density bonus ordinance also encourages developers to prioritize affordable housing by providing increases in density and waivers and concessions from certain development standards to increase the feasibility of affordable projects. Additionally, the promotion of Accessory Dwelling Units is a key strategy identified in our 6th Cycle Housing Element.

R10. Each city and the County should consider prioritizing Measure X funding requests that support projects that address RHNA targets for very low- and low-income residents. Each city and County should consider reporting regularly to their residents on the use of Measure X funds for such purposes.

The recommendation will not be implemented. Measure X is a countywide 20-year, ½ cent sales tax approved by Contra Costa County voters on November 3, 2020 “to keep Contra Costa’s regional hospital open and staffed; fund community health centers, emergency response; support crucial safety-net services; invest in early childhood services; protect vulnerable populations; and for other essential county services.” Under the Measure X Program Allocation Summary, only \$10 million dollars (about 13% of FY 2022-23 funding and about 4.5% of total funding) were allocated to a Local Housing Trust Fund; for FY 2023-24, \$12 million dollars were allocated. The Measure X Housing Funds are to be dispersed by the Department of Conservation and Development (DCD) and the Health Services’ Health, Housing and Homeless (HSD-H3) Services and the Housing Authority of the County of Contra Costa. The use of Measure X funds for housing are reported by the County here: <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/8530/Measure-X>

The City has not received Measure X funds but has identified local funding sources for each of the Program Actions in our 6th Cycle Housing Element to support affordable housing projects that address RHNA targets for very low- and low-income residents.