### Approval of the City of El Cerrito’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist

**Summary of Issues**  
The City of El Cerrito has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated allocation of $362,459 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP.

**Recommendations**  
Staff recommends approval of the City of El Cerrito’s GMP Compliance Checklist and payment of $362,459 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-14 Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds to the City of El Cerrito, with a second (off-year) payment of FY 2014-15 funds on the one-year anniversary of the first payment.

**Financial Implications**  
A total of $13,662,000 is estimated to be available for Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds in FY 2013-14, based on actual sales tax receipts to date.

**Options**  
The Authority has the option to disapprove a checklist, request additional information, such as an audit of a specific checklist question, grant conditional approval, or otherwise apply flexibility to individual circumstances.

**Attachments**  
A. Acknowledgement letter from CCTA’s Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Martin Engelmann, to Yvetteh Ortiz, Public Works Director/City Engineer, May 5, 2015

B. City of El Cerrito’s CY 2012 & 2013 GMP Compliance Checklist. (abridged – full version available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net))
Background

The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP), as amended, requires that every two years the Authority review local compliance with the GMP and allocate funds to cities, towns, and the County, subject to submission of a Statement of Compliance by the local jurisdiction and findings made by the Authority.

The *Biennial Compliance Checklist* provides a vehicle for measuring local jurisdictions’ fulfillment of the requirements of the Measure J Growth Management Program. The Measure J Checklist for this reporting period covers CY 2012 & 2013. Jurisdictions found to be in compliance with the GMP will receive FY 2013-14 funds for local street maintenance and improvements. The second-year’s funding also known as the “off year” (in this case, FY 2014-15) will be allocated automatically on the one-year anniversary of the current year’s allocation, without requiring any further checklist submittals from local jurisdictions.

A summary of the completed checklist submitted by the subject jurisdiction is attached. Staff recommends approval of the jurisdiction’s Checklist and allocation of funds.

Citizens Advisory Committee Review

The full Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed the City of El Cerrito’s Checklist on May 27, 2015 and recommended approval.
City of El Cerrito
BIENNIAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST SUMMARY Calendar Years 2012 & 2013
OVERALL FINDING: Complies

According to the jurisdiction’s Checklist, the following findings have been made:

1. **Action Plans: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented the actions and followed procedures as called for in its Action Plan. The jurisdiction has followed procedures outlined in the Authority’s *Implementation Guide* and applicable Action Plan.

2. **Transportation Mitigation Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented a local and is participating in a regional mitigation program.

3. **Housing Options and Job Opportunities: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has submitted the required report demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels.

4. **Traffic Impact Studies: Complies**
   Where applicable, the jurisdiction has, in accordance with the Authority’s *Technical Procedures*, prepared traffic impact studies for projects generating more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips.

5. **Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning: Complies**
   The jurisdiction regularly participated in RTPC meetings; the jurisdiction's representative to the RTPC regularly reported to the council on RTPC activities; and the jurisdiction made land use and traffic data available for the countywide model.

6. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted CIP that meets Measure J requirements: Resolution 2013-33, June 18, 2013.

7. **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted TSM Resolution or Ordinance that conforms with the Authority’s Model TSM Resolution: Ordinance 98-2, May 4, 1998.
8. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE): Complies.**
   The MoE requirement for the City of El Cerrito is $173,871.

9. **Posting of Signs: Complies.**
   Where applicable, the jurisdiction posted signs for all projects exceeding $250,000 that were funded in whole or in part with J funds.

10. **Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element (GME): Complies**
    The jurisdiction has adopted a GME to its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority’s adopted Measure J Model GME. The jurisdiction Measure J GME was adopted by the City of El Cerrito’s Council on February 5, 2013, Resolution 2013-06.

11. **Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL): Complies**
    The jurisdiction has continuously complied with the County’s voter approved Measure J ULL. Adopted October 16, 2006, Resolution No. 2006-87.

12. **Other Considerations: N/A**

    **Certified By:** Mark Friedman, Mayor  
    **Date:** April 21, 2015  

    **Date Received by CCTA:** May 1, 2015
May 5, 2015

Yvetteh Ortiz
Public Works Director/City Engineer
City of El Cerrito
10890 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Subject: CY 2012 & 2013 GMP Compliance Checklist

Dear Ms. Ortiz,

Thank you for submitting the City of El Cerrito’s Calendar Years (CYs) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Compliance Checklist, received May 1, 2015.

According to our preliminary review, the Checklist is complete. The expected schedule for review and approval of your checklist is as follows:

**May 27, 2015:** The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviews the checklist. The CAC generally requests a representative from your agency to be present at this meeting to discuss the checklist and respond to questions.

**June 3, 2015:** The Authority’s Planning Committee (PC) will discuss the checklist at its regularly scheduled meeting. Your attendance is advised should any questions come up.

**June 17, 2015:** The Authority reviews the checklist and, if approved, authorizes allocation of FY 2013-14 funds in the amount of $362,459.

After the Authority approves payment, a check for FY 2013-14 funding will be transmitted under separate cover; the allocation of FY 2014-15 funds (amount to be determined) will be transmitted at the same time the following year.
Please feel free to call me at 925-256-4729 should you have any questions regarding the review procedure.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Martin R. Engelmann, P.E.
Deputy Executive Director, Planning

cc: Scott Hanin, City of El Cerrito
Lisa Malek-Zadeh, City of El Cerrito

File: 2.06.02
April 24, 2015

Martin R. Engelmann  
Deputy Executive Director, Planning  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek CA 94597

RE: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist

Dear Mr. Engelmann:

The City of El Cerrito’s certified Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist and approving Council Resolution No. 2015-24 are enclosed for your review. Please contact me at (510) 215-4382 or yortiz@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Yvette Ortiz  
Public Works Director/City Engineer

Enclosures: Compliance Checklist and City Council Resolution
RESOLUTION 2015–24

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO
APPROVING THE CALENDAR YEARS 2012 AND 2013 GROWTH
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (GMP) COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST FOR
ALLOCATION OF FISCAL YEARS 2013-14 AND 2014-15 MEASURE J, LOCAL
STREET MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT FUNDS BY THE CONTRA
COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (CCTA)

WHEREAS, in 1988 Contra Costa County voters approved Measure C imposing a
half-cent sales tax to generate revenue for transportation improvement projects over 20
years and approved Measure J extending the sales tax for another 25 years; and

WHEREAS, to receive 18 Percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement
(LSM) program funds and to be eligible for funds from the Transportation for Livable
Communities (CC-TLC) program, Measure J requires each jurisdiction in Contra Costa to
comply with all the components of its Growth Management Program (GMP); and

WHEREAS, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority requires that local
jurisdictions complete a biennial Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist
("Compliance Checklist") to demonstrate compliance with Measure J; and

WHEREAS, the City has satisfied all requirements necessary to be in
compliance with Measure J including those involving implementation of 2009 West
County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance, continued development
mitigation programs; housing options; traffic impact studies; multi-jurisdictional
planning; minimum five-year Capital Improvement Program; Transportation Systems
Management (TSM) Ordinance; Growth Management Element for General Plan; and
Urban Limit Line.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of El
Cerrito finds the actions of the City to be in conformance with the provisions of Measure
J and hereby approves the Calendar Years 2012 and 2013 GMP Compliance Checklist,
attached and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit A, for allocation of Fiscal Years

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall become effective
immediately upon passage and adoption.

I CERTIFY that at a regular meeting on April 7, 2015 the City Council of the City
of El Cerrito passed this Resolution by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Abelson, Bridges, Lyman and
Mayor Friedman

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Councilmember Quinto
IN WITNESS of this action, I sign this document and affix the corporate seal of the City of El Cerrito on April 8, 2015.

Cheryl Morse, City Clerk

APPROVED:

Mark Friedman, Mayor

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF AN OFFICIAL DOCUMENT OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO, COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

Cheryl Morse
CITY CLERK OF CITY OF EL CERRITO
**Measure J Growth Management Program**

**Compliance Checklist**

Reporting Jurisdiction: City of El Cerrito  
For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15  
Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Action Plans</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Is the jurisdiction implementing the actions called for in the applicable Action Plan for all designated Routes of Regional Significance within the jurisdiction?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Has the jurisdiction implemented the following procedures as outlined in the Implementation Guide and the applicable Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Circulation of environmental documents,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Analysis of the impacts of proposed General Plan amendments and recommendation of changes to Action Plans, and</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Conditioning the approval of projects consistent with Action Plan policies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Has the jurisdiction followed the procedures for Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) review of General Plan Amendments as called for in the Implementation Guide?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Transportation Mitigation Program</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Has the jurisdiction adopted and implemented a local development mitigation program to ensure that new development pays its fair share of the impact mitigation costs associated with that development?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Transportation Mitigation Program

b. Has the jurisdiction adopted and implemented the regional transportation mitigation program, developed and adopted by the applicable Regional Transportation Planning Committee, including any regional traffic mitigation fees, assessments, or other mitigation as appropriate?

3. Housing Options and Job Opportunities

a. Has the jurisdiction prepared and submitted a report to the Authority demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels under its Housing Element? The report can demonstrate progress by:

   (1) comparing the number of housing units approved, constructed or occupied within the jurisdiction over the preceding five years with the number of units needed on average each year to meet the housing objectives established in its Housing Element; or

   (2) illustrating how the jurisdiction has adequately planned to meet the existing and projected housing needs through the adoption of land use plans and regulatory systems which provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development; or

   (3) illustrating how its General Plan and zoning regulations facilitate improvement or development of sufficient housing to meet the Element’s objectives.

b. Does the jurisdiction’s General Plan—or other adopted policy document or report—consider the impacts that its land use and development policies have on the local, regional and countywide transportation system, including the level of transportation capacity that can reasonably be provided?

c. Has the jurisdiction incorporated policies and standards into its development approval process that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments?
### 4. Traffic Impact Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Using the Authority's *Technical Procedures*, have traffic impact studies been conducted as part of development review for all projects estimated to generate more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips? (Note: Lower traffic generation thresholds established through the RTPC's Action Plan may apply).

b. If the answer to 4.a. above is "yes", did the local jurisdiction notify affected parties and circulate the traffic impact study during the environmental review process?

### 5. Participation in Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. During the reporting period, has the jurisdiction’s Council/Board representative regularly participated in meetings of the appropriate RTPC, and have the jurisdiction’s local representatives to the RTPC regularly reported on the activities of the Regional Committee to the jurisdiction’s council or board? (Note: Each RTPC should have a policy that defines what constitutes regular attendance of Council/Board members at RTPC meetings.)

b. Has the local jurisdiction worked with the RTPC to develop and implement the Action Plans, including identification of Routes of Regional Significance, establishing Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) for those routes, and defining actions for achieving the MTSOs?

c. Has the local jurisdiction applied the Authority’s travel demand model and *Technical Procedures* to the analysis of General Plan Amendments (GPAs) and developments exceeding specified thresholds for their effect on the regional transportation system, including on Action Plan MTSOs?
5. **Participation in Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d.** As needed, has the jurisdiction made available, as input into the countywide transportation computer model, data on proposed improvements to the jurisdiction's transportation system, including roadways, pedestrian circulation, bikeways and trails; planned and improved development within the jurisdiction; and traffic patterns?

6. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the jurisdiction have an adopted five-year capital improvement program (CIP) that includes approved projects and an analysis of project costs as well as a financial plan for providing the improvements? (The transportation component of the plan must be forwarded to the Authority for incorporation into the Authority's database of transportation projects)

7. **Transportation Systems Management Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has the jurisdiction adopted a transportation systems management ordinance or resolution that incorporates required policies consistent with the updated model ordinance prepared by the Authority for use by local agencies or qualified for adoption of alternative mitigation measures because it has a small employment base?

8. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has the jurisdiction met the MoE requirements of Measure J as stated in Section 6 of the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Ordinance (as amended)? (See the Checklist Instructions for a listing of MoE requirements by local jurisdiction.)
9. **Posting of Signs**

Has the jurisdiction posted signs meeting Authority specifications for all projects exceeding $250,000 that are funded, in whole or in part, with Measure C or Measure J funds?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO
- [ ] N/A

10. **Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element**

Has the local jurisdiction adopted a final GME for its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority’s adopted Measure J Model GME?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO
- [ ] N/A

11. **Adoption of a Voter-Approved Urban Limit Line**

a. Has the local jurisdiction adopted and continually complied with an applicable voter-approved Urban Limit Line as outlined in the Authority’s annual ULL Policy Advisory Letter?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO
- [ ] N/A

b. If the jurisdiction has modified its voter-approved ULL or approved a major subdivision or General Plan Amendment outside the ULL, has the jurisdiction made a finding of consistency with the Measure J provisions on ULLs and criteria in the ULL Policy Advisory Letter after holding a noticed public hearing and making the proposed finding publically available?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO
- [ ] N/A

12. **Other Considerations**

If the jurisdiction believes that the requirements of Measure J have been satisfied in a way not indicated on this checklist, has an explanation been attached below?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO
- [ ] N/A
13. Review and Approval of Checklist

This checklist was prepared by:

[Signature]

Yvetteh Ortiz, Public Works Director
Name & Title (print)

(510) 215-4382
Phone

yortiz@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us
Email

3/31/15
Date

The council/board of the City of El Cerrito has reviewed the completed checklist and found that the policies and programs of the jurisdiction as reported herein conform to the requirements for compliance with the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program.

[Signature]
Certified Signature (Mayor or Chair)

Mark Friedman
Name & Title (print)

4/21/15
Date

[Signature]
Attest Signature (City/Town/County Clerk)

Cheryl Bose
Name (print)

4/22/2015
Date
Supplementary Information (Required)

1. Action Plans
   a. Please summarize steps taken during the reporting period to implement the actions, programs, and measures called for in the applicable Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance.

   The City of El Cerrito has taken various actions to implement the 2009 West County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance. Refer to Attachment 1.

   b. Attach, list and briefly describe any General Plan Amendments that were approved during the reporting period. Please specify which amendments affected ability to meet the standards in the Growth Management Element and/or affected ability to implement Action Plan policies or meet Traffic Service Objectives. Indicate if amendments were forwarded to the jurisdiction’s RTPC for review, and describe the results of that review relative to Action Plan implementation.

   No General Plan Amendments were approved during this reporting period.

   Provide a summary list of projects approved during the reporting period and the conditions required for consistency with the Action Plan.

   No projects were approved that required action under the West County Action Plan.

2. Transportation Mitigation Program
   a. Describe progress on implementation of the regional transportation mitigation program.

   The City adopted a revised Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program ordinance
in 2006 and the corresponding fees are part of the City’s adopted Master Fee Schedule.

3. **Housing Options and Job Opportunities**
   
a. Please attach a report demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels.

   Refer to Attachment 2.

   c. Please attach the jurisdiction’s adopted policies and standards that ensure consideration of and support for walking, bicycling, and transit access during the review of proposed development.

4. **Traffic Impact Studies**

   Please list all traffic impact studies that have been conducted as part of the development review of any project that generated more than 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips. (Note: Lower traffic generation thresholds established through the RTPC’s Action Plan may apply). Note whether the study was consistent with the Authority’s Technical Procedures and whether notification and circulation was undertaken during the environmental review process.

   No projects were approved that required action under the West County Action Plan.

5. **Participation in Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning**

   No attachments necessary.
6. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program**

Please attach the transportation component of the most recent CIP version, if the Authority does not already have it. Otherwise, list the resolution number and date of adoption of the most recent five-year CIP.

Refer to Attachment 3. The latest CIP adopted by El Cerrito City Council during the CY 2012 and 2013 period was under Resolution 2013-33, dated June 18, 2013.

7. **Transportation Systems Management Program**

Please attach a copy of the jurisdiction's TSM ordinance, or list the date of ordinance or resolution adoption and its number.

Refer to Attachment 4 for City of El Cerrito Ordinance 98-2 dated May 4, 1998.

8. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE)**

Please indicate the jurisdiction's MoE requirement and MoE expenditures for the past two fiscal years (FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13). See the Instructions to identify the MoE requirements.

The MoE Requirement for the City of El Cerrito, which is based on average annual amount of transportation expenditures during the base period of Fiscal Year 1987–88 through Fiscal Year 1989–90, is $173,871.

El Cerrito's MoE expenditures for the reporting period are as follows:
- $453,310 in FY11-12
- $288,494 in FY12-13
9. Posting of Signs

Provide a list of all projects exceeding $250,000 within the jurisdiction, noting which ones are or were signed according to Authority specifications.

In 2012 and 2013, the City had the following projects under construction that were partially funded with Measure J funds:

Potrero Ave – 55th to 56th Streets Safety Improvements, C3045:
Total Project Budget - $649,900
Measure C/J Return to Source Funding - $31,600
Construction Began - February 2013
$649,900.

Central Avenue & Liberty Street Streetscape Improvements, C3063:
Total Project Budget - $1,280,000
Measure J TLC Funding - $180,000
Construction Began - September 2013

Both projects were signed according to the Authority’s specifications.

10. Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element

Please attach the adopted Final Measure J Growth Management Element to the local jurisdiction’s General Plan. There have been no updates to the previously submitted Element.

11. Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line

The local jurisdiction’s adopted ULL is on file at the Authority offices. Please specify any actions that were taken during the reporting period with regard to changes or modifications to the voter-approved ULL, which should include a resolution making a finding of consistency with Measure J and a copy of the related public hearing notice.

No actions were taken during this reporting period with regard to the voter-approved
12. Other Considerations

Please specify any alternative methods of achieving compliance for any components for the Measure J Growth Management Program.

None.
Table A
Annual Building Activity Report Summary - New Construction
Very Low-, Low-, and Mixed-Income Multifamily Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development Information</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Identifier (may be ANNU project name or address)</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Affordability by Household Income</td>
<td>Total Units per Project</td>
<td>Housing with Financial Assistance and/or Dead Restrictions</td>
<td>Housing without Financial Assistance or Dead Restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>Ex &amp; HUD Units*</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Total of Moderate and Above Moderate from Table A3  0 10
(10) Total by Income Table A/3  10
(11) Total Extremely Low-income Units*  0

* Note: These fields are voluntary
ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT
Housing Element Implementation
(CCR Title 25 §6202)

Table A2
Annual Building Activity Report Summary - Units Rehabilitated, Preserved and Acquired pursuant
to GC Section 65583.1(c)(1)

Please note: Units may only be credited in the table below when a jurisdiction has included a program in its housing element to rehabilitate, preserve or acquire units to accommodate a portion of its RHNA which meets the specific criteria as outlined in GC Section 65583.1(c)(1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Affordability by Household Incomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Rehabilitation Activity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Preservation of Units At Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Acquisition of Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Total Units by Income</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: This field is voluntary

Table A3
Annual building Activity Report Summary for Above Moderate-Income Units
(not including those units reported on Table A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units Permitted for Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units Permitted for Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: This field is voluntary
ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT
Housing Element Implementation
(CCR Title 25 §6202)

Jurisdiction
City of El Cerrito

Reporting Period
2007-2014

Table B
Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress
Permitted Units Issued by Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enter Calendar Year starting with the first year of the RHNA allocation period. See Example.</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total Units to Date (all years)</th>
<th>Total Remaining RHNA by Income Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Level</td>
<td>RHNA Allocation by Income Level</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RHNA by COG: Enter allocation number:</td>
<td>431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Need for RHNA Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Annual Element Progress Report

## Housing Element Implementation

(CCR Title 25 §6202)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description (By Housing Element Program Names)</th>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Deadline in HE</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program 1.1 - Continue to implement the Residential Rental Inspection Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>New cycle started in 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 1.2 - Continue to investigate complaints and take action about rental housing code violations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 1.3 - Continue to encourage the rehabilitation of existing housing units by providing program information</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Information available to the public at the front counter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 1.4 - Continue to permit new housing units &amp; rehabilitation in mixed use &amp; commercial zoning districts</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Allowed for by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 1.5 - Continue to regulate condominium conversions</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Mandated by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 1.6 - Continue to regularly monitor assisted housing units to help preserve existing stock of affordable housing</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Annual monitoring completed in 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 1.7 - Continue to enforce notification requirements on BMR and Section 8 units</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Mandated by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 1.8 - Annual review of the City Capital Improvements Program (CIP)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>The Planning Commission reviewed and certified the CIP in 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2.1 - Retain existing residential zoning and discourage non-residential uses</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Mandated by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3.1 - Consider enacting additional incentive programs to encourage retrofit of seismically unsafe buildings</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3.2 - Explore possible funding sources to minimize financial impact of retrofits on low-income residents</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3.3 - Conduct an annual evaluation of the City's inventory of available sites</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>To be completed by end of 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 5.1 - Maintain General Plan designations for mixed use and high density housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 5.2 - Continue to fast track processing for second units meeting established City standards</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Allowed for by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 5.3 - Consider the establishment of a &quot;pre-approved&quot; second unit program</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Evaluating Santa Cruz second unit program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 7.1 - Continue to implement City regulations that allow manufactured and prefab housing in residential districts</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Allowed for by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 8.1 - Continue to identify underutilized properties where transit oriented development can occur</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 9.1 - Use existing zoning regulations to allow innovative approaches to increasing alternative housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Allowed for by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 10.1 - Rezone the Zoning Ordinance to include housing size diversity standards</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>To be analyzed with annual ZO update in 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 11.1 - Continue to enforce the Zoning Ordinance which provides incentives for affordable housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Mandated by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 11.2 - Continue to inform developers about and allow density bonuses</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By Housing Element Program Names)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Deadline in HE</td>
<td>Status of Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 12.1 - During the annual Master Fee Schedule revision, evaluate development fees.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Fees were updated with Master Fee Schedule as part of 2013 Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 13.1 - Streamline the application process by continuing to offer Interdepartmental team meetings for applicants</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 14.1 - Continue to enforce the Zoning Ordinance and encourage Transit Oriented development</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 15.1 - Assist developers in obtaining state and federal funding available to develop affordable housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 15.2 - Continue to enforce Federal and State Accessibility and Adoptability standards</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Required by Building Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 15.3 - Continue to fast track inspection processes for large family and special needs housing.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 15.4 - Continue to encourage and support development of senior housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 15.5 - Facilitate the provision of housing that supports “aging in place” for the City’s senior population</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The Planning Commission approved 56 units of “aging in place” senior housing in December 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 15.6 - Update the Zoning Ordinance to include a definition of transitional and support housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>To be completed with annual ZD update in 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 16.1 - Assist in the development of extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate income housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 16.2 - Study the feasibility of an inclusionary housing ordinance</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 16.3 - Encourage developers to leverage limited Housing Funds with other assistance</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 17.1 - Continue to allow emergency and transitional housing as a permitted use within the CC zone</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Mandated by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 17.2 - Consult with other agencies to maintain 2007-2014 demand estimate for emergency housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 17.3 - Coordinate with the County and cities to develop the annual 5-year consolidated plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 18.1 - Look for opportunities with non-profits and other cities to expand the City’s supply of affordable housing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>56 units of affordable housing were approved in 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 19.1 - Continue to provide non-discrimination clauses in rental agreements and deed restrictions</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 19.2 - Reasonable Accommodations program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Required by Building Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 19.3 - Continue the City’s participation in the Contra Costa Urban County CDBG Consortium</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 19.4 - Continue to allow emergency, transitional and supportive housing as a permitted use within the CC zone</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Mandated by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 20.1 - Develop an energy conservation strategy</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The City adopted a Climate Action Plan in 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 21.1 - Continue to enforce the State Energy Conservation Standards</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Mandated by Building Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 22.1 - Develop policies consistent with AB32 and SB375 to establish common thresholds for green buildings</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The City adopted a Climate Action Plan in 2013 with goals for such projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 23.1 - Continue to provide for increased density, reduced parking and design and development standards</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Allowed for by Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>