



# CITY OF MARTINEZ

525 Henrietta Street, Martinez, CA 94553-2394

Community and Economic Development

(925) 372-3515 | Fax (925) 372-0257

September 13, 2023

Contra Costa County Grand Jury  
Attn: Cynthia Roberts, Foreperson  
725 Court Street  
P.O. Box 431  
Martinez, CA 94553-0091  
Email: [ctadmin@contracosta.courts.ca.gov](mailto:ctadmin@contracosta.courts.ca.gov)

**RE: Grand Jury Report No. 2306, Affordable Housing: “A Plan Without a Home”**

Dear Foreperson Roberts,

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, the City carefully considered your concerns, and acknowledge 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. However essential it is to emphasize that local jurisdictions play a pivotal role in fostering housing development – including affordable housing options – 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 the challenges, and associated solutions, for 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 add to the administrative burden and continue to impact local jurisdictions’ 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 on 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, will definitely impact local jurisdictions’ ability to focus their resources on implementation.

The City's key points include the following:

- **Lack of Funding:** The shortage of funding poses a significant obstacle to the development of affordable housing projects in our jurisdiction. This scarcity hampers the progress of initiatives aimed at addressing the housing needs of our community.
- **Competition for Funding:** When funding becomes available, developers often face stiff competition. This intense competition can lead developers to focus only on projects that have a higher likelihood of receiving funding, potentially leaving out projects that may cater to specific, underserved demographics.
- **Jurisdictions' Role in Housing Development:** Local jurisdictions do not directly produce housing. However, local jurisdictions play a crucial role in creating an environment that encourages housing development, including affordable housing options. The Housing Element and Housing Plan of each jurisdiction serve as essential frameworks for addressing housing concerns.
- **Tools and Collaborative Efforts:** To proactively address the housing needs of our community, jurisdictions utilize various tools provided by the State and local government, including setting goals, policies, and actions in their Housing Element and Housing Plan. Collaborative efforts involving developers, community organizations, and other stakeholders are crucial to achieving sustainable and inclusive housing solutions.

The housing crisis has become a pressing concern in Martinez and beyond, with far-reaching implications for individuals and communities. Escalating housing costs, coupled with stagnant wages and limited housing supply, have led to an increasing number of individuals and families struggling to secure decent and affordable housing.

The lack of accessible housing options has particularly impacted vulnerable populations, including moderate-, low-, and very low-income households; seniors; disabled persons; 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. The competition among jurisdictions with diverse capacities and needs often accentuates the difficulty of implementing comprehensive and equitable housing solutions.

Your letter has shed some light on critical aspects of the housing crisis we face today and affirmed that the City is not alone as a jurisdiction in facing these challenges. Despite potential areas of partial disagreement, the City acknowledges the factual basis of your findings and recognizes 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, the City strives 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.

## Findings

### *Grand Jury Findings*

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

**Partially Disagree.** The City partially disagrees with Finding F1 because while a single entity is responsible for reporting on RHNA permitting targets, jurisdictions do not develop housing projects. 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 Community and Economic Development Department is responsible for preparing the Annual Progress Report (“APR”) as required by State Housing Law. These reports are presented before the City Council early in the calendar year, prior to submission to HCD. Furthermore, each jurisdiction’s Housing Element identifies the departments and divisions 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.**

**Agree.** The City agrees with finding F2. Without a dedicated funding source from the State of California or other mechanism to obtain additional funding, most local jurisdictions throughout the State will continue to miss their RHNA targets for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. Units affordable to lower income households require significant subsidies since the cost of construction exceeds the return on investment and there is inadequate funding to support the housing need. The City’s Draft 2023- 2031 Housing Element identifies potential solutions to accommodate the RHNA targets and the City is actively exploring and implementing strategies to work towards meeting state-mandated regional housing (RHNA) targets. Despite acknowledging the complexity of the task, the City is committed to finding viable solutions and collaborating with stakeholders to address the housing needs of the region to the best of our ability. However, the City is not a housing developer and does not construct the units.

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

**Disagree.** While there are no legal or financial penalties if the City does not achieve their RHNA targets (nor should there be as the actual construction of these units is dependent in large part upon the private sector and the availability of funding) there are punitive consequences. For jurisdictions that do not meet their RHNA targets, developers may choose to use a ministerial, streamlined process for housing projects pursuant to Senate Bill 35. This outcome removes local control regarding these important land use decisions.

**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.** It is true that many cities and the County as a whole missed their RHNA targets for very low- and low-income housing, and that RHNA Allocation for very low- and low-income housing has continued to increase. However, the increase in RHNA allocation is not to the extent mentioned in this report. RHNA numbers from the past three cycles indicate that the current (6th) cycle has had the largest increase of 2.5x from the previous cycle in very low- and low-income housing requirements.

Cycle	Very Low	% permitted	Low	% permitted	Source
1999 - 2006	6,481	44%	3,741	48%	<a href="#">link</a>
2007 - 2014	6,512	21%	4,325	24%	<a href="#">link</a>
2015 - 2020	5,264	16%	3,086	55%	<a href="#">link</a>
2023 - 2031	13,346	n/a	7,685	n/a	<a href="#">link</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.** While it is true that items a, b, c, d, and f can hinder the development of affordable housing, the City has taken significant steps to promote the development and preservation of affordable housing. However, the City has taken recent actions primarily addressing item b. For example, in the past year, the City has approved a comprehensive update to its General Plan, updated and streamlined its ADU regulations, and updated the regulations for various residential and residential-support uses.

The City is also taking further actions in connection with the 2023-2031 Housing Element Update to streamline and incentivize residential development projects with very low- and low-income housing.

**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.

**Partially Disagree.** AB 1397 set forth strict criteria for adequate sites. These criteria are somewhat arbitrary (e.g., not smaller than 0.5 acre and not larger than 10 acres). The requirement to demonstrate substantial evidence that existing uses do not impede redevelopment also tends to steer sites selection to neighborhoods with declining uses and lower and moderate resource areas.

Most jurisdictions consider amending/changing the zoning while reviewing their Housing Element and/or updating the General Plan, not just when a project is proposed for development.

1. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65583.2(b), Housing Element sites must include information on the number of dwelling units that a site can realistically accommodate, the RHNA income category 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. When selecting sites to accommodate the lower income RHNA, HCD provides jurisdictions with best practices to consider factors such as:
  - (1) Proximity to transit
  - (2) Access to high performing schools and jobs
  - (3) Access to amenities, such as parks and services
  - (4) Access to health care facilities and grocery stores
  - (5) Locational scoring criteria for Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (TCAC) Program funding
  - (6) Proximity to available infrastructure and utilities
  - (7) Sites that do not require environmental mitigation
  - (8) Presence of development streamlining processes, environmental exemptions, and other development incentives.

However, sites that meet these locational criteria do not always meet the other existing use criteria needed to demonstrate substantial evidence for existing uses to discontinue within the planning period. These include high vacancies, deteriorating conditions, marginally operating businesses, underutilization of sites, etc. These conditions are often directly contrary to access to high performing schools and jobs, amenities, adequate infrastructure, and clear of environmental hazards.

In addition to the above requirements and pursuant to AB 686 (Government Code Section 65583(c)(10)), Housing Elements due on or after January 1, 2021, sites must be identified throughout the community in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing (“AFFH”). AFFH 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.

Very often the approach to site selection is to target declining areas for redevelopment. Without tax increment financing as a reinvestment tool, jurisdictions must rely on private investments as catalyst to induce redevelopment in declining neighborhoods. Housing is the best catalyst. For jurisdictions that take a neighborhood revitalization approach to accommodating the RHNA, place-based strategies that focus on public improvements, economic development, prioritization of funding, and targeted outreach are used to complement the site inventory strategies.

As such, Housing Element plans provide an inventory of land that addresses the unique conditions of each jurisdiction.

2. According to State Density Bonus Law (“SDBL”), local agencies are 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 the jurisdiction’s regulatory or development standards that 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 ask for increased height above that allowed by the zoning regulations without the need to request a variance, exception, or conditional use permit. As such, height and density do not represent a restriction to development. Furthermore, many sites are located in transit-oriented neighborhoods where recent State laws have preempted restrictions on height and density.
3. 15 jurisdictions in Contra Costa County have implemented inclusionary housing ordinances, but the City of Martinez is not one of them. However, the City does have Program 11.J in the 2023-2031 Housing Element where the City will consider adopting an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, housing impact fee, and any alternatives to inclusionary housing as a means to provide some below market rate units in market-rate developments and to integrate/disperse affordable housing throughout the community. This Program is scheduled to be completed by December 2025.

**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.**

**Agree.** The City agrees there are penalties that are directly related to not meeting statutory deadline of the Housing Element. 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. In addition, depending on specific programs, eligibility for some state funds requires a certified Housing Element (such as PLHA and State HOME funds). 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.

Link to information on HCD’s accountability efforts and enforcement authority:

<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/accountability-and-enforcement>

**F8. Builder's Remedy and SB35 projects do not address ingrained local obstacles identified in this report that prevent the completion of approved AH projects.**

**Partially Disagree.** While Builder's Remedy and SB35 projects are valuable tools that can expedite affordable housing development, they may not comprehensively address all the ingrained local obstacles identified in this report that hinder the completion of approved AH projects. The effectiveness of these streamlined processes can vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and while they

can help overcome certain barriers like restrictive zoning policies and prolonged approval timelines, other challenges mentioned in the report, such as limited available funding, community support, and NIMBY opposition, may continue to persist in diverse degrees in different locations. To achieve the successful completion of approved AH projects and effectively address these obstacles, a multifaceted and jurisdiction-specific approach is required, taking into account the unique circumstances and complexities faced by each locality.

**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.**

**Partially Disagree.** While the County and cities did not create or find new sources of funds for affordable housing after the State discontinued 452 RDAs, 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.

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*. 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 agrees with this finding.

**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.**

**Agree.** Measure X is allocating \$12 million per year for affordable housing development. This funding level is woefully inadequate when compared to the amount of funding required to facilitate construction of low- and very low-income housing development throughout the County. Affordable housing developers typically require multiple sources of financing such as federal and state grants, tax credits, private investments, and partnerships with nonprofit organizations. While local funding like Measure X can enhance a project's financial feasibility and facilitate its development, this local funding is only one piece of a complex tapestry of funding necessary for a project to move forward in today's economy.

**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.** While the factors listed above help attract developers, there are many other factors that can prevent a project from moving forward despite a city's best efforts. Other factors include high

land costs and limited availability of developable sites, increasing labor and materials costs, expenses associated with compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act {CEQA} and associated project opposition, a lack of adequate infrastructure, transit and other amenities, environmental constraints, supply chain and material/labor costs, and unwilling landowners. Even where a project is approved by a city and set to move forward, circumstances can change that result in the development not moving forward.

**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 Allocation for very low- and low-income housing has continued to increase. However, the increase in RHNA allocation is not to the extent mentioned in this report. RHNA numbers from the past 3 cycles indicate that the current (6th) cycle has had the largest increase of 2.5x from the previous cycle in very low- and low-income housing requirements. Please see the response to Finding F4 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.** The Planning Manager has been assigned to ensure those elements of meeting the allocated RHNA targets that are within the City's control (the programs and objectives of the Housing Element) are implemented. The goals of these programs and objectives are to reduce barriers and constraints for housing development to facilitate achieving the RHNA targets, but the City is not ultimately responsible for achieving RHNA goals (i.e., constructing housing units); this is done by the private market. The Planning Manager's role is to ensure those assigned to completing the program or objective do so within the timeframe identified within the 2023-2031 Housing Element.

**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 (§65400) requires each jurisdiction (city council or board of supervisors) to prepare an annual progress report ("APR") on the jurisdiction's status and progress in implementing its housing element using forms and definitions adopted by the HCD.

The HE APR allows HCD to track the progress of the implementation of a jurisdiction's Housing Element and requires its submission as a threshold requirement for several State housing funding programs ([source](#)).

Through the forms and tables provided by HCD ([link](#)), jurisdictions 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 planning agency to provide this report to the legislative body (i.e., local Council or Board), HCD, and OPR by April 1 of each year (covering the previous calendar year). APRs must be presented to the local legislative body for its review and acceptance, usually as a consent or discussion on a regular meeting agenda.

The statute does not specify in which order they be provided, and HCD does not require the report to be submitted to the legislative body prior to submitting it to HCD. However, HCD recommends that planning departments provide the report to the local legislative body prior to sending it to HCD and OPR ([source](#)). Biannual reporting would divert staff time from other housing programs.

**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.**

The City appreciates 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 Mechanisms: Our city and County already have established planning mechanisms and committees responsible for addressing affordable housing issues. These existing structures 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 is already allocating resources to

multiple initiatives aimed at addressing affordable housing needs. Adding another commission might spread resources too thin and hinder the efficiency of current efforts.

**Efficient Decision-Making:** By involving a diverse range of citizens and experts in existing planning and housing committees, we maintain a balanced and inclusive approach. This integration ensures streamlined decision-making processes and comprehensive representation of community interests without creating an additional layer of bureaucracy.

**Previous Outreach:** Furthermore, jurisdictions conduct community outreach and engagement when preparing the Housing Element to identify and address obstacles that may hinder the development of affordable housing projects in their communities.

While the City does not intend to pursue the recommended dedicated AH Commission, we value the underlying principle of community engagement and recognize the importance of community input in the decision-making process. The City will continue to explore alternative strategies that promote transparency, inclusivity, and community-driven solutions for affordable housing development in our city and County.

We remain 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 has reviewed existing processes and identified programs to address any potential constraints to development through the 2023-2031 Housing Element Update process.

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

**The recommendation has been implemented.** Each jurisdiction (city council or board of supervisors) must prepare an annual progress report (APR) on the jurisdiction's status and progress in implementing its housing element using forms and definitions adopted by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). (Government Code Section 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 (covering the previous calendar year (CY)). HCD compiles and showcases all APRs through their interactive digital data dashboard with downloadable data sets. ([link](#)) The APR is available for public review through the City's and HCD's websites.

**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 City's regional housing needs by income level.

**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, jurisdictions have reviewed their zoning policies and identified potential affordable housing development constraints unique to their jurisdiction. The Housing Element Program Section outlines forthcoming changes to their 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 not yet been implemented.**

The City has included Program 11.J in the 2023-2031 Housing Element where the City will consider adopting an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, housing impact fee, and any alternatives to inclusionary housing as a means to provide some below market rate units in market-rate developments and to integrate/disperse affordable housing throughout the community. This Program is scheduled to be completed by December 2025.

**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 not been implemented.**

Through the City's 2023-2031 Housing Element Update process, the City reviewed its zoning policies and identified potential affordable housing development constraints and developed programs to address those constraints. More information is available at <https://www.cityofmartinez.org/departments/planning/housing-element>.

To further promote affordable housing production, the following programs and actions are included in our Housing Element:

- Streamlined review process
- Reduced or waived fees
- Engage faith-based organizations and housing developers on affordable housing development
- Technical assistance

Further, the preservation and promotion of naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH), is also part of our affordable housing strategy. While developing housing that is affordable to lower income

households is important and a key strategy, preservation of affordable units is equally important and requires additional resources. It may, in some cases, be more cost effective to preserve existing units. Additionally, the promotion of Accessory Dwelling Units, as NOAH, is a key strategy identified in our Housing Plan.

**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), 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>

If you have any further questions, please direct them to Michael P. Cass, Planning Manager, at [mcass@cityofmartinez.org](mailto:mcass@cityofmartinez.org).

Sincerely,



Michael Chandler  
City Manager, City of Martinez

- C: City Council
- Jill Bergman, Community and Economic Development Director
- Michael P. Cass, Planning Manager