

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

AGENDA

Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

Date: Monday, April 29, 2013 at 3:00 p.m.
Place: San Mateo City Hall
330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, California
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL Sandy Wong (599-1409) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

- | | | | |
|----|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. | Public comment on items not on the agenda | Presentations are limited to 3 mins | |
| 2. | Approval of minutes of March 25, 2013 meeting | Action (Garbarino) | Pages 1 - 2 |
| 3. | Update on Stormwater pollution prevention funding Initiative | Information (Fabry/SCI) | Verbal Presentation |
| 4. | Bi-County Transportation Study | Information (SFCTA) | Presentation |
| 5. | Review and recommend approval of the San Mateo County Green Business Program funding proposal and City Fee Schedule | Action (Springer) | Pages 3 - 7 |
| 6. | Review and recommend approval of the Federal Cycle 2 OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program list of projects | Action (Wong) | Pages 8 - 11 |
| 7. | Review and recommend approval of the San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy | Action (Wong) | Pages 12 - 39 |
| 8. | Executive Director Report | Information (Wong) | |
| 9. | Member comments and announcements. | Information (Garbarino) | |
| 10 | Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date:
May 20, 2013. | Action (Garbarino) | |

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

NOTE: **All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee.
Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.**

NOTE: ***Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and
participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five
working days prior to the meeting date.***

Other enclosures/Correspondence - None

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION
MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CMEQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF March 25, 2013**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Richard Garbarino in Conference Room C at City Hall of San Mateo at 3:03 pm. Attendance sheet is attached.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 28, 2013 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes of the January 28, 2013 meeting, Lloyd/Bigelow. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Presentation and discussion on the Development of the Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy for San Mateo County.

Tom Madalena presented the Draft Priority Development Area Investment & Growth Strategy for San Mateo County. This document is being developed in response to MTC's requirement. Initial draft has been presented to a group of Planning Directors in San Mateo County as well as to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). This investment and growth strategy is meant to help priority development areas to become a reality. Also, it will help inform future transportation funding decisions. Staff plan on bringing back a revised draft next month.

CMEQ members have the following comments:

- Better articulate in the document as to what this document is for.
- In addition to formally approved PDAs, we need to support growth in PDA-like areas that will contribute to housing supply.
- Add the public transit piece to the overall puzzle.
- Need to consider how to address impacts from developments, and seek money to do so.
- Recognize the diversity in the region and in the county. For example, high-density living as well as single-family living are both valued by different people.

4. Executive Director Report.

Sandy Wong announced that the C/CAG Board, at its March 14, 2013 meeting, appointed new CMEQ members including Redwood City Mayor Alicia Aguirre, Atherton Mayor Elizabeth Lewis, and Brisbane Council Member Cliff Lentz, and welcome them to the committee. The C/CAG Board also elected Brandt Grotte of San Mateo as the Chair and Mary Ann Nihart of Pacifica as the Vice Chair. C/CAG Board will have its annual retreat on April 11, 2013. CMEQ members are invited.

5. Member comments and announcements.

None.

6. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for April 29, 2013. Meeting was adjourned at 4:09 pm.

CMEQ 2013 Attendance								
Name	Jan 28	Mar 28						
Arthur Lloyd	Yes	Yes						
Barbara Pierce	Yes	Yes						
Gina Papan	Yes	Yes						
Irene O'Connell		Yes						
Jim Bigelow	Yes	Yes						
Lennie Roberts	Yes							
Nadia Holober								
Naomi Patridge	Yes	Yes						
Onnolee Trapp	Yes	Yes						
Richard Garbarino	Yes	Yes						
Steve Dworetzky								
Zoe Kersteen- Tucker								
Mark Olbert		Yes						
Cliff Lentz	NA	Yes						
Elizabeth Lewis	NA							
Alicia Aguirre	NA	Yes						
Staff/Guests in Attendance for March 25th:								
Sandy Wong								
Jean Higaki								
Tom Madalena								

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 29, 2013
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee
From: Kim Springer, Contracted County Staff to C/CAG
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the San Mateo County Green Business Program and fee schedule for FY 2013/14 and FY 2014/15 for 21 local jurisdictions

(For further information contact Kim Springer at 599-1412)

RECOMMENDATION

Review and recommend approval of the San Mateo County Green Business Program and fee schedule for FY 2013/14 and FY 2014/15 for 21 local jurisdictions

FISCAL IMPACT

Proposed fee schedule for the San Mateo County Green Business Program is as shown in Attachment A. In addition, the C/CAG Board adopted Resolution 09-37 which authorized \$45,000 for the Green Business Program.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In April 2007, the County of San Mateo along with Burlingame, Daly City, Redwood City, San Carlos, Millbrae and San Mateo launched the pilot phase of the Bay Area Green Business Certification Program. The San Mateo County pilot included certification in the following commercial sectors: Restaurant/Cafe, Auto Service Shop, Hotel/Motel, and Office/Retail. After a successful six-month pilot, the program was offered to cities countywide on an opt-in basis and some new cities joined, such as South San Francisco.

Though the program was (and continues to be) well-received by councils, management and staff across the county, the program was suspended in July 2011 due to funding issues. On March 1, 2013 the County re-launched the program for one year, using the aforementioned, previously approved funds from C/CAG and County funds related to Solid Waste. Additional funding from fees charged to the businesses is also part of the current budget.

County staff brought this item to the CMEQ Committee in October 2011. The committee agreed that the SMC Green Business Program was valuable and there was a clear desire to see it continue, suggested that it was an unfortunate time to ask cities for funding, and suggested that C/CAG and the County solicit feedback from the City Managers. Staff provided an update to the CMEQ Committee on November 26, 2012, presenting its recommendation to solicit \$5,000 annually from each city in San Mateo County to provide a sustainable funding mechanism for the program.

The CMEQ committee continued the Green Business November 2012 item, requesting that staff come back with responses that addresses the following items:

- Include a proposal that scales the cost per city by number of businesses with additional feedback from city managers.
- Include the number of Green Businesses that were previously certified and enrolled in the program, by city.
- Describe how other counties fund their Green Business programs.
- Provide a proposed budget for the program's sustained implementation in future years.

Additional feedback from City Managers to scaled cost per city: Staff presented a proposed city fee schedule, based on a different categories of cost per city by number of businesses, at the February 15, 2013 city manager's meeting. Feedback was provided during the meeting and in the days following the meeting. The proposed fee schedule attached to this staff report reflects this feedback.

Number of businesses certified, waiting for re-certification and newly enrolled per city:

A chart showing the number of businesses in these different categories, by city, will be provided at the meeting.

Description of how other counties fund their program:

Data, provided by ABAG, showing the source of funding and amount for the Green Business program in other counties in the ABAG region is provided as an attachment to this staff report.

Proposed budget for the program in future years:

An estimated budget for FY 2013/14 and 2014/15 is provided as an attachment to this staff report.

Staff will present a report back on the items requested and is asking for approval to move the proposed funding structure to the C/CAG Board for approval at the May 9, 2013 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Proposed San Mateo County - City Fee Schedule
- 2) Proposed Budget for FY 2013/14 and FY 2014/15
- 3) ABAG Regional Counties' Funding Sheet

**San Mateo County Green Business Program
Fee Schedule Proposal**

City	Businesses	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Atherton	800	\$1,000	\$2,000
Belmont	2754	\$2,000	\$4,000
Brisbane	406	\$1,000	\$2,000
Burlingame	4071	\$2,500	\$5,000
Colma	1094	\$1,000	\$2,000
Daly City	7100	\$2,500	\$5,000
East Palo Alto	1078	\$1,000	\$2,000
Foster City	3402	\$2,500	\$5,000
Half Moon Bay	1639	\$2,000	\$4,000
Hillsborough	1440	\$1,000	\$2,000
Menlo Park	4691	\$2,500	\$5,000
Millbrae	2699	\$2,000	\$4,000
Pacifica	3539	\$2,500	\$5,000
Portola Valley	1000	\$1,000	\$2,000
Redwood City	8369	\$2,500	\$5,000
San Bruno	3296	\$2,500	\$5,000
San Carlos	4458	\$2,500	\$5,000
San Mateo	11260	\$2,500	\$5,000
South San Francisco	4986	\$2,500	\$5,000
Uninc. County	1783	\$2,000	\$4,000
Woodside	1043	\$1,000	\$2,000
Totals	70908	\$40,000	\$80,000

Based on 2012 US Census and Chamber data

Cities w/	< 1500 businesses
Cities w/	1500 to 3000 businesses
Cities w/	> 3000 businesses

FY 13/14 Estimated Overall Program Budget

(Scaled to ~160 Businesses/Year)

Revenues	\$\$	Fund
Businesses	\$22,400	Certification Fee
SMC Cities	\$40,000	Annual Contribution via C/CAG
C/CAG	\$26,250	C/CAG Funds 7/1/13-1/31/14
County	\$29,550	AB 939 Fees
Total	\$118,200	

Expenses	\$\$	Source
Coordination	\$98,246	Consultant/Contractor
Management	\$8,000	RecycleWorks Coordination
Database	\$7,000	Regional/Statewide Contract
Marketing	\$4,954	Outreach/Misc. Program Exp.
Total	\$118,200	

FY 14/15 Estimated Overall Program Budget

(Scaled to ~185 Businesses/Year)

Revenues	\$\$	Fund
Businesses	\$24,050	Certification Fee
SMC Cities	\$80,000	Annual Contribution via C/CAG
County	\$34,683	AB 939 Fees
Total	\$138,733	

Expenses	\$\$	Source
Coordination	\$113,596	Consultant/Contractor
Management	\$11,000	RecycleWorks Coordination
Database	\$7,000	Regional/Statewide Contract
Marketing	\$7,137	Outreach/Misc. Program Exp.
Total	\$138,733	

ABAG Regional Counties' Funding

County	Funding Source	Staffing	Budget
Alameda	County, Water District, Utilities, StopWaste, Cities	PE -.75 FTE +contract staff @ 5 + hrs/wk	\$120,000 = \$50K county + \$70 K cash contributions from partners
Contra Costa	Haz Waste Generator Fees, Waste, Wastewater, Water district, Cities	1.7 FTE = 0.7 FTE (RBW) + 1 FTE (CP)	\$181,000 = \$138K county + \$43 K partners
Marin	General Fund	1 - 0.33 FTE	\$35,000
Napa	Department of Environmental Management (DEM), Napa County Transportation and Planning (NCTPA)	0.55 FTE from 2 staff	DEM = \$25,000 NCTPA = Overhead Support for D. Sinclair
San Francisco	Generally, SFDOE, SF PUC from Garbage rates/Tipping, SFPUC - Permit fees; PG & E/CPUC/Fed'l stim funds - Energy	1.6 FTEs for Program Admin + .4 FTEs auditors + Contract support for assessments/ audits/ standards development (See below)	\$232,600 (ongoing for salaries, marketing, events and other expenses)
Santa Clara	Water District grants / Tipping Fees	1.3 FTEs	\$150,000
Solano	Existing Landfill Fees	.15 FTE	N/A
Sonoma	Emergency Services	AP-.025 FTE MH-.5 FTE	\$25,000

* updated March 2011

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 29, 2013

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)

From: Tom Madalena

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Federal Cycle 2 OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program list of projects for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460 or Jean Higaki at 599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ review and recommend approval of the Federal Cycle 2 OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program list of projects for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact will be \$10,473,000 in total recommended funding for San Mateo County jurisdictions.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding for the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program comes from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program funding is derived from Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On May 17, 2012 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted Resolution 4035 which governed the process for the implementation of the Federal Cycle 2 funding for both Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding. This Federal funding cycle had a competitive component which was called the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program. In San Mateo County, the C/CAG Board of Directors approved a call for projects with two programs under the OBAG Program. These programs are called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP) and the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program. C/CAG issued the call for projects for the OBAG Program on October 12, 2012 with applications being due on December 14, 2012. C/CAG staff received a total of eighteen applications from twelve jurisdictions as presented in Table 1. There were eight applications for the BPIP and ten applications for TLC Program. There was a limit of \$1,000,000 per jurisdiction that could be awarded to each jurisdiction that was placed on the competitive OBAG Program overall. Some jurisdictions applied for both the

BPIP and TLC Program and the ask for these jurisdictions exceeded the \$1,000,000 maximum that could be awarded. As a result jurisdictions that scored well for both programs were presented with the opportunity to choose which project(s) for which they could receive funding, up to a maximum of \$1,000,000.

This item was presented to the C/CAG Congestion Management Program (CMP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at the April 18, 2013 CMP TAC meeting and the CMP TAC has recommended the attached project list for funding.

BPIP

For the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program, C/CAG utilized the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) as the panel that evaluated the applications. The BPAC members received presentations on the eight proposed projects from project sponsors and were also offered the opportunity to see selected projects in the field. The BPAC then scored the applications and created a project ranking list as presented in Table 1. The BPIP ask was \$4,215,028 and there was \$6,500,000 available. After evaluating the applications the BPAC voted on a final project list recommendation and this recommendation included funding all of the applications with the exception of the City of San Bruno application for College Drive. There was a divide among the BPAC members for the vote but the motion passed with the aforementioned recommendation.

TLC Program

C/CAG staff established a TLC Program Panel to review, score and rank the ten TLC Program applications. The TLC Panel had five members and was composed of staff from Caltrans, SamTrans, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, Metropolitan Transportation Commission and C/CAG. The TLC Panel also met to discuss the project applications as well as to score and rank them. The ranking for the TLC Program is also presented in Table 1. The TLC Program ask was \$8,445,000 and there was \$4,500,000 available. The San Carlos TLC project funding amount was reduced by \$150,000 as a result of a design only component which is ineligible per Federal guidelines for CMAQ funding. The San Bruno Median Improvement Project was conditionally recommended for funding by the TLC Panel and will be conditioned on the city making a commitment to build the features as proposed including those described as "as feasible".

Inter-program fund adjustment

As approved by the C/CAG Board of Directors at the October 11, 2012 Board meeting, if a program is under subscribed, C/CAG Board has the flexibility to make adjustments to the total amount of funds for each of these programs. As a result additional funding that was made available from the BPIP being under subscribed, funding is being recommended to be directed towards the TLC Program to enable additional projects to be funded.

Schedule

The recommended project list for the OneBayArea Grant Program will be presented to the C/CAG Board of Directors at the May 9, 2013 Board meeting. C/CAG staff will submit the adopted project list to MTC prior to the June 30, 2013 due date for OBAG projects. Jurisdictions that receive OBAG funding resulting from the May 9th C/CAG Board action are required to

submit to C/CAG a resolution of local support for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program funds as required by MTC. The example resolution can be found in the call for projects document, on the MTC website and here <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/#2>.

Remaining OBAG Program funds

Upon approval of the recommended BPIP and TLC Program list of projects, there is \$164,000 in funds remaining unprogrammed. Staff recommends this \$164,000 be directed to be combined with the upcoming San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning Program. The PDA Planning Program has recently been approved by the MTC, and San Mateo County's share is approximately \$1.6 million. This grant program will be on a competitive basis that targets assistance to PDAs that are high impact and capable of early implementation. The grant program process is expected to begin this summer.

There was another option that was considered but discarded and this was to distribute the funds to the cities through the Local Streets and Roads (LS&R) Program. Having recognized that the LS&R Program is in dire need of money, staff analyzed this option although it is not being recommended because of the small dollar amount that is available and the fact that those cities that participated in the SLPP swap would not be eligible.

ATTACHMENTS

- Table 1 OBAG Program

Table 1 OBAG Program

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program

Jurisdiction	Project	Original Request	Recommended by TLC Panel	Final Recommendation/Award	Note/Comment
East Palo Alto	Bay Road	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
San Mateo	North Central Pedestrian	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
Daly City	John Daly Blvd.	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
South San Francisco	Grand Boulevard	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
Burlingame	California Drive	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	Exceeded \$1,000,000 limit per jurisdiction
San Carlos	PDA Connectivity Project	\$1,000,000	\$850,000	\$850,000	Design only component deducted
Belmont	Ralston Ave.	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	
San Bruno	Transit Corridor Pedestrian	\$264,500	\$264,500	\$265,000	
Pacifica	Palmetto	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
San Bruno	Median Improvement Project	\$930,500	\$735,000	\$735,000	Exceeded \$1,000,000 limit per jurisdiction / Conditionally approved
Total		\$8,445,000	\$8,099,500	\$7,100,000	

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP)

Jurisdiction	Project	Original Request	Recommended by BPAC	Final Recommendation/Award	Note/Comment
Redwood City	Streetscape Project	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
Daly City	Geneva Ave.	\$318,600	\$318,600	\$0	Exceeded \$1,000,000 limit per jurisdiction
County of San Mateo	Semicircular Road	\$319,658	\$319,658	\$320,000	
Daly City	Westmoor to Guadalupe	\$274,000	\$274,000	\$0	Exceeded \$1,000,000 limit per jurisdiction
Burlingame	Carolan Ave.	\$986,000	\$986,000	\$986,000	
Menlo Park - Atherton	Bike Ped Improvements	\$796,770	\$796,770	\$797,000	
Belmont	Old County Road	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$270,000	
San Bruno	College Drive	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	Not recommended by BPAC
Total		\$4,215,028	\$3,965,028	\$3,373,000	

Total for BPIP and TLC Program	\$12,660,028	\$12,064,528	\$10,473,000
---------------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 29, 2013

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)

From: Tom Madalena

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Draft San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy for submission to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460 or Jean Higaki at 599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ review and recommend approval of the San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy for submission to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact will be the cost associated with staff time.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding for additional staff time to implement the San Mateo County Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy comes from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On May 17, 2012 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted Resolution 4035 which requires the Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies to develop and submit to MTC an Investment and Growth Strategy for the Priority Development Areas (PDAs). The requirement for this investment and growth strategy is spelled out in Appendix A-6 of MTC Resolution 4035. The PDA Investment and Growth Strategy is due to MTC by May 1, 2013. C/CAG staff intends to submit a Draft PDA Investment and Growth Strategy (IGS) to MTC by the May 1st deadline. Staff will bring this PDA IGS to the C/CAG Board for review and approval at the May 9th Board meeting so that the final adopted PDA IGS can be submitted to MTC on May 10, 2013.

C/CAG is required to develop a strategy that will help inform how future transportation investments are made in San Mateo County. The objective of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments is to make sure that CMAs keep apprised of on-going transportation and land-use planning efforts and to encourage local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes. This work also includes encouraging and supporting local jurisdictions in meeting their housing objectives established through their adopted

housing elements and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). These objectives and resulting strategies are aimed at developing and encouraging policies for transportation investments which incentivize and support housing development, specifically affordable housing.

The San Mateo County Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy includes a narrative report describing the setting in San Mateo County and that spells out the process that C/CAG will undertake over the next 4 years in order to track progress towards PDA growth. As a new policy direction from MTC, this PDA Investment and Growth Strategy is just beginning and may be refined over time.

C/CAG plans to monitor the progress of local jurisdictions in implementing their housing element objectives and to identify current local housing policies that encourage affordable housing production and/or community stabilization. The current production for the 2007-2014 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) cycle and current housing policies in place are presented in the attached Appendix A. Appendix A data was originally compiled by Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) staff and ABAG staff gave cities an opportunity to comment on the table. Appendix B provides a summary of the PDA activities jurisdictions have undertaken in San Mateo County. These two spreadsheets will be updated annually around April of each year. C/CAG staff intends to utilize already completed data tracking efforts such as the Housing and Community Development (HCD) report that cities turn into HCD each April. C/CAG staff intends to minimize the amount of data reporting and staff time for cities as much as possible while still meeting the requirements placed on Congestion Management Agencies by MTC.

During the development of this PDA IGS, staff presented an initial outline to the Planning Directors/staff at the 21 Elements meeting on March 7th, and presented a draft at a special Planning Directors/staff meeting on March 28th. The Draft PDA IGS was also presented to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on March 21st and on April 18th. It was then presented to the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) on March 25th. The document will be presented to the Board for approval on May 9th.

At the April 18, 2013 CMP TAC meeting, the TAC recommended approval of the San Mateo County PDA Investment and Growth Strategy with the following requests/comments:

1. Staff was directed to correct the housing numbers as necessary in Appendix A.
2. Continue to raise concerns with MTC regarding the adverse funding impacts to local streets and roads maintenance as a result of this PDA IGS strategy.
3. The ability to achieve the housing growth projections (2010-2040 Growth) for each of the PDAs as shown in the "Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy" as provided by ABAG are questionable.

Note: The "San Mateo County Priority Development Area" table has been moved to Appendix C as a reference only.

ATTACHMENTS

- San Mateo County Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy
- Appendix A – San Mateo County Housing Policies and Production
- Appendix B - Summary of Priority Development Area (PDA) Activities for San Mateo County
- MTC Resolution 4035 Appendix A-6

San Mateo County

Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy

- I. Objectives
- II. Background
 - a. Setting
 - b. Challenges
- III. San Mateo County Priority Development Areas (PDA)
 - a. Existing PDA Information from ABAG
 - b. Confirming PDA Information with Cities and the County
 - c. Future PDA Progress Updates
- IV. Housing
 - a. Housing Production Progress
- V. On-going Countywide Efforts towards PDA Growth
 - a. Grand Boulevard Initiative
 - b. Grand Boulevard Multimodal Transportation Corridor Plan
 - c. C/CAG TOD Incentive Program
 - d. San Mateo County Sub-RHNA process
 - e. Other Efforts
- VI. Transportation Investments
 - a. Plan Bay Area
 - b. OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program
 - c. Identifying On-going and Future Transportation Projects within PDAs
 - d. Linking Transportation Investments to PDAs
- VII. Project Partners
 - a. San Mateo County Planning Directors/Staff
 - b. C/CAG Standing Committees (CMP TAC, CMEQ)
 - c. San Mateo County Department of Housing

I. Objectives

The San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy (IGS) is being developed in accordance with requirements specified in MTC's Resolution 4035, Appendix A-6. Resolution 4035 requires each County Congestion Management Agency to develop a PDA Investment and Growth Strategy to inform future transportation investments. This strategy aims to inform the distribution of federal transportation funds in San Mateo County. MTC requires that an investment and growth strategy be designed to encourage and support the growth of the Priority Development Areas. This PDA Investment and Growth Strategy is intended to maximize federal transportation funding to support and encourage development in the San Mateo County PDAs. MTC requires that this PDA Investment and Growth strategy focuses on housing production and future transportation investments are intended to support PDA growth.

Under MTC's Resolution 4035 CMAs must develop a Growth Strategy for the County. The objective is to keep CMAs apprised of ongoing transportation and land-use planning efforts and to encourage local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes. The objective also includes encouraging and supporting local jurisdictions in meeting their housing objectives established through their adopted housing elements and Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). These objectives and resulting strategies are aimed at developing and encouraging policies for transportation investments which reward and support housing development, specifically affordable housing.

San Mateo County as with the entire Bay Area is expected to experience significant population and job growth and as a result more planning is needed in order to effectively accommodate this growth in manner that protects the environment, people and resources while maximizing transportation investments at the local level. There has been recent legislation (SB375) which now requires that metropolitan transportation agencies (MPOs) develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) – a new element of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – to strive to reach the greenhouse gas (GHG) target established for each region by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

The goal of this PDA Investment and Growth Strategy is to funnel and focus transportation investments into communities that are planning for and accommodating growth. This will be a long term process in which C/CAG will monitor the success of jurisdictions in approving housing projects and adopting supportive housing policies that achieve the production of more housing and the production and preservation of affordable housing. The goal is to reward jurisdictions that have adopted supportive housing policies and that produce housing through the next two RHNA cycle; with discretionary transportation dollars that flow into San Mateo County from MTC. The goal is to encourage jurisdictions to plan for and enable housing to be produced, especially affordable housing. This transportation–land use connection is further cemented through the adoption of Resolution 4035 by MTC.

II. Background

a. Setting

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Created by the state Legislature in 1970 (California Government Code § 66500 et seq.), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. Over the years, the agency's scope has grown, and it is now three agencies in one, functioning as MTC as well as the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) and the Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE).

MTC functions as both the regional transportation planning agency (a state designation) and, for federal purposes, as the region's metropolitan planning organization (MPO). As such, it is responsible for regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan, a comprehensive blueprint for the development of mass transit, highway, airport, seaport, railroad, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Commission also screens requests from local agencies for state and federal grants for transportation projects to determine their compatibility with the plan. Adopted in April 2009, the most recent edition of this long-range plan, known as Transportation 2035, charts a new course for the agency, particularly with regard to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. MTC is now collaborating with ABAG on Plan Bay Area, an integrated long-range transportation and land-use/housing plan covering the time period through 2040. Set for adoption in 2013, the plan will address the requirements of a landmark bill passed by the California Legislature in 2008 (Senate Bill 365), which calls on regions to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy as a way of combating climate change.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)

ABAG is part regional planning agency and part local government service provider. Within each of these two categories, ABAG performs a broad range of activities for its members. One of ABAG's main roles includes the allocation of the regional housing needs as directed down from the State of California's Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

ABAG prepared a short report in September of 2012 that provides a preliminary overview of San Mateo County jurisdictions' Priority Development Areas (PDAs), housing production, and affordable housing creation and preservation. This report provides an initial assessment of the state of the San Mateo County PDA's and is partially incorporated into the Priority Development Area section in this IGS.

City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County

C/CAG, an Association of Governments formed through a Joint Powers Agreement, is the Congestion Management Agency for San Mateo County. The C/CAG Board is made up of representatives from every city, the County, and County transportation agencies in San Mateo County. C/CAG also serves San Mateo County as the official Airport Land Use Commission,

Solid Waste Local Task Force and functions as a countywide forum for common issues. C/CAG prepares, reviews, adopts, monitors and facilitates implementation by member agencies a number of state-mandated countywide plans. These plans include the Congestion Management Plan, Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan, Airport Land Use Plan, Stormwater Management Plan and Hazardous Waste Management Plan. C/CAG is also responsible for programming state and federal transportation funds allocated to San Mateo County.

C/CAG is a Congestion Management Agency and performs and functions as the transportation planning and funding agency for San Mateo County. As the Congestion Management Agency, C/CAG has limited influence on the actual development and build out of the Investment and Growth Strategy. In its role, C/CAG distributes funds at the local level in a competitive environment. Generally speaking most of the funding that C/CAG administers is distributed based upon regulations and guidelines established by the source of the funds.

C/CAG deals with issues that affect the quality of life in general; transportation, air quality, storm water runoff, hazardous waste, solid waste and recycling, land use near airports, and abandoned vehicle abatement.

San Mateo County Transportation Agencies

San Mateo County is served by bus, rail and ferry transit service. SamTrans operates the bus service along with a robust shuttle program. There are two providers of fixed rail service, Caltrain and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART). Additionally, new ferry service is being offered through the Water Emergency Transit Authority. The ferry service in San Mateo County is currently offered in South San Francisco with connections to both Alameda and Oakland.

SamTrans' most productive bus service lines are along the El Camino Real corridor.

BART serves the northern part of the County and was extended down into Millbrae at the Millbrae Intermodal Station where connections to Caltrain are available. BART also serves San Francisco International Airport (SFO).

Caltrain service runs for the most part parallel to the El Camino Real corridor and has seen increased ridership after the roll out of the Baby Bullet service. Caltrain continues to be a productive service and C/CAG has funded shuttles for over 10 years that provide connections from Caltrain to employment sites to enable and increase Caltrain ridership.

All of these transit providers will need to be at the table so that they can be informed and kept apprised as to outcomes that are expected to be achieved through this IGS. Focusing transportation investments into the PDAs will, over time, hopefully allow for increased housing and therefore the need for these transportation services. As a result these transportation agencies will need to be informed of these changes, even when they occur incrementally over time, so that they will be able to plan for and accommodate the need for increased transit service. Essentially these transit providers will need to be advised as to where the development is going in the County so that they can be prepared for the increased need. For SamTrans this will be an

important factor as the El Camino Real corridor is already where SamTrans experiences their highest ridership.

b. Challenges

As the county with the largest number of local jurisdictions in the nine County Bay Area region, San Mateo County has its own set of unique challenges and opportunities when it comes to working in a regional and collaborative manner. The framework that C/CAG has established and built over the last two decades has enabled C/CAG to provide a proactive process for the cities to work together on countywide issues and projects that benefit the region as a whole.

In San Mateo County housing needs and job growth are expected to be accommodated mostly through infill. Jurisdictions in San Mateo County, particularly those on the bayside, have championed a vision to develop the El Camino Real corridor, through the Grand Boulevard Initiative.

In order to achieve the priorities established by the region, discretionary Federal transportation funds will be directed to focus on communities that establish focused growth around transit stations, downtowns and transit corridors in order for the land uses and transportation investments to complement one another.

Even with communities that are development ready, San Mateo County may still experience the challenges of achieving infill and higher densities. Professional planning staff from jurisdictions have reported that due to the high land value, small parcel size and fragmentation of ownership, the ability for development to occur is challenging. Many San Mateo County communities actually experience small gains when it comes to housing production. Additionally the existing local residents are in some communities opposed to infill and increased densities. Along El Camino Real, the Grand Boulevard corridor, developers have faced opposition to projects due to congestion associated with higher densities or building heights that are considered to be too high.

For this PDA Investment and Growth strategy to be successful the development and investment community must be ready, willing and able. Without the private market the projected housing need and job growth will not be able to be achieved.

The harsh reality of affordability of housing stock or lack thereof is well known in San Mateo County. According the “Out of Reach 2013” report by the National Low Income Housing Coalition, San Mateo County is tied at third (along with County of San Francisco and County of Marin) as the least affordable county in the United States when it comes to renting at Fair Market Value (FMV). This leaves San Mateo County, tied for first, as the least affordable county in California.

Land use is controlled at the local level and C/CAG recognizes and respects this local environment. The cities and counties are themselves, as land use agencies, limited in their control of the development market as has been evident during the last down real estate cycle which started in 2007.

C/CAG's funding sources are transportation related. Land use decisions rest with local jurisdictions. Housing production itself is market driven. Cities in San Mateo County have embraced (please see attachment A) inclusionary zoning yet the recent Palmer Case in Los Angeles County has indicated that inclusionary ordinances are in jeopardy of being unenforceable, which may have a chilling effect upon such strategies to promote and create affordable housing. While many jurisdictions have made attempts to increase affordable housing production, it continues to be a challenging issue. With the loss of redevelopment agencies these challenges are even more evident today.

Funding Sources

C/CAG administers a number of Federal, state and local funding sources. These funding sources have specific limitations or restriction placed on them which limit the types of improvements or infrastructure treatments that can be achieved.

III. San Mateo County Priority Development Areas

Priority Development Areas are self-designated by local land use jurisdictions that are near transit service and are planned for development and housing. Cities/County have applied to ABAG for PDA approval and San Mateo County has seventeen approved PDA's throughout the County. Fourteen of San Mateo County's twenty-one jurisdictions have PDAs. The geographic land mass this represents however is a small portion of the overall geography of the county. In effect this is what is promoted through "focused growth" which is what the original Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) FOCUS Program, which eventually became the current Priority Development Area (PDA) Program, were designed to achieve. The OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program, governed by Resolution 4035, reinforces this concept by requiring that 70% of the locally available competitive funding from MTC must be spent in or in proximate access to a PDA.

San Mateo County is suburban in nature and the place types for the PDAs in the County range from Transit Town Center to City Center. This wide variety in geographies and place types make San Mateo County the desirable place that it is. The environment of San Mateo County is also characterized as one in which development is difficult to realize. The bayside is considered fairly built out and most of the available vacant parcels are considered to be difficult parcels to develop by planners and the development community alike.

In 2013, C/CAG will administer the San Mateo County PDA Planning Program through which planning grant funds will be made available to help PDAs become more development ready and hopefully help streamline the entitlement process. C/CAG will administer the program based on the PDA Program guidelines developed by MTC. These planning grants will be awarded to provide assistance to PDAs that are high impact and capable of early implementation. The goal is to encourage and assist the cities with PDA's to develop and adopt planning documents that facilitate focused growth in PDAs.

a. Existing PDA Information from ABAG

In San Mateo County the Bayside downtown areas and transit-served neighborhoods will continue to be the primary focus for incremental growth in San Mateo County. Led by the Grand Boulevard Initiative, the redevelopment of El Camino Real is the clear growth vision for the County. The Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy projects 55,700 additional housing units in San Mateo County through 2040, or 8% of the total regional housing unit growth, with nearly 70% of that new housing in PDAs along El Camino Real. Additionally, significant development potential exists off the corridor in the East Palo Alto and Downtown South San Francisco PDAs.

Development along El Camino Real will take different shapes. San Mateo and Redwood City, the County's two largest City Centers, are expected to see the largest growth in jobs and housing in the County. Redwood City allows the highest densities for new development, while San Mateo has more acreage in PDAs. While the Mixed Use Corridor place type is generally lower density than other place types, the overall potential for growth in Mixed Use Corridors, combined, is higher than any other place type in San Mateo County due to the number and scale of the PDAs.

For reference, please see Appendix C – San Mateo County Priority Development Areas.

Transportation policies and investments are key to the success of housing development in many PDAs. Parking reductions in many areas, including corridors, will be critical to supporting smaller scale infill development. The redesign of Caltrain stations and station areas in Transit Neighborhoods and Transit Town Centers like San Bruno and South San Francisco are strongly tied to the potential for new transit-oriented development in those areas.

The northeastern corner of the County (Brisbane and Daly City Bayshore neighborhoods) is not currently planned for high levels of growth, but may play a significant role in future strategies. While the Town of Brisbane has chosen the Suburban Center place type, the potential for housing in this area is dependent on the outcome of the Brisbane Baylands planning process. For this reason the current SCS does not include housing in this location.

b. Confirming PDA Information with Cities and County

C/CAG will continue to update and monitor the success of the growth in the seventeen PDAs in San Mateo County. Appendix A and Appendix B to this document will be used to track the number of jobs, housing units, affordable housing units and affordable policies that are produced in the PDAs as well as the entire jurisdiction. This information in these tables was obtained from work completed by ABAG staff. C/CAG has presented these tables to planning staff in San Mateo County through the 21 Elements Technical Advisory Committee, to check for accuracy and completeness. These tables have also been vetted by the C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) before submittal to MTC in May of 2013.

c. Future PDA Progress Updates

This PDA assessment will need to occur over many years in order to obtain valuable data to measure results. The anticipated growth of PDAs in San Mateo County is expected to occur over many decades. As a result, tracking the success of this incremental growth in the short term may be difficult to quantify or to have data that shows a pattern of success. C/CAG, through Appendix A, will monitor and track affordable housing supportive policies and the number of affordable housing units that are produced in each jurisdiction in April of each year. C/CAG is required to submit updates on the changes to housing policy and housing production to MTC annually by May 1st. C/CAG Staff will make every effort to obtain this housing information from existing sources in an effort to minimize the work required by city staff to provide updates. This data collection effort will be accomplished through a number of actions, programs and sources.

These efforts will include:

- 1) Participation on the Grand Boulevard Initiative (Task Force and Working Group)
- 2) Priority Development Area Planning Program for San Mateo County
- 3) Obtaining information in April of each year from the already completed State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) reports that planning staff at the cities submit to HCD.
- 4) Requesting City/County staff to confirm/provide comments on the C/CAG tracking tables each year before submission to MTC in May.

In the future C/CAG staff will update the information tables in Appendix A and Appendix B annually. These tables will include a summary of PDA job growth, PDA housing growth, housing production, affordable housing production and affordable housing preservation policies. Zoning changes within San Mateo County jurisdictions that may achieve housing strategies will also be monitored and tracked. All of this data will be tracked and presented in a format as shown in the attached Appendix A and Appendix B.

IV. Housing

For many years C/CAG has actively promoted the planning and production of high-quality housing in service-rich areas near transit in San Mateo County. In 1999 C/CAG launched the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program, which continues into the present. In 2005 C/CAG worked with ABAG and local State legislators to pass legislation giving delegated authority for jurisdictions within a county to self-administer distribution of quotas for Regional Housing Needs Allocation. In July 2007, to formally document the large and growing gap between housing need and supply, C/CAG published a Housing Needs Study developed under contract by Economic & Planning Systems. That same year C/CAG sponsored, and the County of San Mateo Department of Housing produced and distributed, an attractive summary of the study. This partnership produced series of five policy primers on housing need, infill

development, housing implications of aging population, environmental effects of housing policy and a Countywide Housing Production Strategy.

a. Housing Production Progress

21 Elements Project

Building on the success of these projects, C/CAG and Department of Housing collaborated on a series of activities that came to be known as the 21 Elements Project. 21 Elements is a multi-year, multi-phase collaboration of all twenty-one San Mateo County jurisdictions, along with partner agencies and stakeholder organizations, to adopt and implement local housing policies and programs codified in the State-mandated Housing Element of each jurisdiction's General Plan. It is a forum for sharing resources, successful strategies and best practices. Spring 2013 marks the beginning of Phase 5 of the project.

- Phase 1 (2006-2008) – Housing Needs Allocation Subregion

Jurisdictions formed a sub-region and negotiated the redistribution of the countywide total share of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). This was the first-ever established RHNA subregion in California. The give-and-take process enabled an allocation that fit local plans and priorities more closely than a regional formula could. The most notable example of this local customization, Town of Woodside and Redwood City actually moved their shared municipal boundary to facilitate permitting and construction of permanently affordable housing for staff at Canada Community College—and adjusted their respective allocations accordingly

- Phase 2 (2008-2009) – Housing Element Updates

21 Elements organized a peer learning group of municipal planning staff involved in the preparation of housing elements, developed a website, and prepared a Housing Element Update Kit containing materials to assist each jurisdiction in the preparation of their housing elements. Among many resources available on the website is a complete searchable database of all of the Housing Action Programs of all of the jurisdictions and a collection of policy statements and links to resource materials from advocacy organizations representing diverse interests including labor, health, environment, social justice, transportation among others.

- Phase 3 (2009-2013) – Housing Element Implementation & Preparation for Next Cycle

Phase 3 continued the multi-jurisdiction collaboration process as staff implement high-value programs contained in their adopted housing elements, for example zoning ordinance amendments to comply with new State law enabling ministerial approval for conforming emergency shelter and supportive housing uses. In addition, the 21

Elements project staff negotiated with California State Housing & Community Development Department to enable and allow streamlined processing of certified Housing Elements conforming to certain standards, which would substantially simplify production and reduce costs for the next housing element update.

- Phase 4 (2012-2013) – Housing Needs Allocation Subregion (new cycle) & Sustainable Community Strategy

The jurisdictions again elected to form a subregion and successfully self-allocated their collective mandate to zone sites for enough housing to meet regional planning quotas. The complexity of the task increased as the RHNA process was merged into the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) process regionally to foster climate change mitigation through a tighter coupling of planning for land use, housing and transportation infrastructure.

- Phase 5 (2013-2014) – Housing Element Updates (New Cycle)

Phase 5 reprises Phase 2, jurisdictions cooperating as they meet State deadlines to update local Housing Elements. The preparatory work to streamline production, along with similar changes now implemented by State HCD statewide, will pay off as 21 Elements staff can carry a substantial portion of the requisite workload at a relatively nominal shared cost.

V. On-going Countywide Efforts towards PDA Growth

Jurisdictions in San Mateo County have been active in a host of activities that are in support of focused growth which supports transportation investments. Below is a list of projects that the San Mateo County partners have been involved with that have been in support of housing, affordable housing and jobs.

a. Grand Boulevard Initiative

The Grand Boulevard Initiative is a historic inter-jurisdictional collaborative planning effort to achieve a shared vision that links transportation and land use. Nineteen cities, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties, two transit agencies and two Congestion Management Agencies, and a number of other agencies and groups have united to improve the performance, safety, and aesthetics of the El Camino Real corridor between San Francisco and San Jose, California. The Vision of the Initiative is that “El Camino Real will achieve its full potential as a place for residents to work, live, shop and play, creating links between communities that promote walking and transit and an improved quality of life.” This State Highway “will become a grand boulevard of meaningful destinations shaped by all the cities along its length and with each community realizing its full potential to become a destination full of valued places.”

C/CAG has supported and been a member of both the GBI Task Force and Working Committee. C/CAG has also partnered with SamTrans, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and cities on numerous projects and planning grants that aim to enable the revitalization and growth of the El Camino Real corridor.

b. Grand Boulevard Multimodal Transportation Corridor Plan (Corridor Plan)

C/CAG partnered with SamTrans and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority on a Caltrans planning grant for El Camino Real. The resulting planning document is the Grand Boulevard Multimodal Transportation Corridor Plan. The goal of the Corridor Plan is to facilitate development of a better match for land use and transportation on the El Camino Real Corridor from Daly City to San Jose's Diridon Station in support of smart growth. The plan included the "Street Design Guidelines" to provide a framework for the cities and agencies along El Camino Real and Caltrans to implement roadway, frontage, and transit improvements. Also included are "Street Design Prototypes" that depict improvements consistent with basic Caltrans design standards, as well as modifications that may be considered for a "design exception" from Caltrans.

c. C/CAG Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program (TOD Program)

C/CAG has a strong history in the Bay Area of promoting regional cooperation as it relates to growth in a collaborative manner. The C/CAG Board originally adopted the nationally recognized Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program in 1999. This program was awarded an United States Environmental Protection Agency award for Smart Growth under Policies and Regulations. This incentive program rewards jurisdictions for approving high-density housing (greater than 40 units per acre) with transportation funding. The program provides up to \$2,000 per bedroom as a reward for jurisdictions that approve high-density housing. Additionally this program supports affordable housing by providing an addition bonus for projects that provide affordable units. For developments with a minimum of 10% of the units set aside for low or moderate-income households, an additional incentive of up to \$250 per affordable bedroom will be provided to encourage low or moderate-income housing.

d. San Mateo County Sub-RHNA Process

Jurisdictions in San Mateo County formed a local Sub-Regional Housing Needs Allocation process for the last two RHNA Cycles. As a result the local agencies have come together in San Mateo County in a meeting forum which has enabled additional collaboration at the County level for Planning and Community Development Directors.

San Mateo County was the first in the State of California to establish a sub-Regional Housing Need Allocation at the county level. This process enabled the twenty-one jurisdictions of San

Mateo County to work together to establish a countywide housing needs allocation methodology that was acceptable to the local jurisdiction staff and elected officials.

e. Other Efforts

Tiger II

C/CAG partnered with the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) which was awarded a U.S. Department of Transportation TIGER II Planning Grant in the amount of \$1,097,240 to fund the GBI: Removing Barriers to Sustainable Communities project. The TIGER II grant will support the development of concrete strategies for removing barriers to implementation of the GBI vision. The TIGER II grant is funding three distinct, but interrelated, projects that will effectively address key challenges facing the corridor.

- **Designing El Camino Real as a Complete Street (Complete Streets Project)** – The Complete Streets Project facilitates the design of demonstration projects on El Camino Real to integrate the roadway with sustainable development and pedestrian/transit activity to provide safe and efficient travel for all users (motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders). Preliminary designs (up to 40%) for Complete Streets segments on El Camino Real will be developed for four case studies in Daly City, South San Francisco, San Bruno, and San Carlos; these will serve as model projects for the corridor. The case studies will apply the GBI Street Design Guidelines (from the Grand Boulevard Multimodal Transportation Corridor Plan, October 2010) and demonstrate how to address challenges common to transforming auto-dominated state highways into balanced multimodal corridors.
- **Economic & Housing Opportunities Assessment (ECHO) Phase II** – ECHO Phase I, completed in December 2010, examined market trends and demonstrated the corridor’s capacity to accommodate job/housing increases and estimated the economic benefits of infill development. ECHO Phase II will address development scenarios and potential barriers, assess urban design strategies to achieve revitalization and redevelopment, and analyze multimodal access and circulation. ECHO Phase II encompasses four case studies to create a common understanding of the effects of development patterns and streetscape enhancements and to develop guidance that addresses the “how to” of implementation.
- **Infrastructure Needs Assessment and Financing Strategy** - This project evaluates the level of readiness of infrastructure to accommodate transit-supportive development along El Camino Real and investigates strategies for providing and financing infrastructure to accommodate the desired density and intensification. A cost estimate for all corridor infrastructure improvements, including identification of funding sources for unfunded improvements, will be prepared. The financing strategy will also identify and prioritize necessary improvements to leverage other local investment programs. This project will position communities and service providers along the corridor to move forward with planning, engineering, and financing activities to achieve the GBI vision. This project is currently underway and will serve as a resource and guide in future years to help jurisdictions plan for and accommodate growth through the financing and construction of

infrastructure improvements that enable infill development along the El Camino Real corridor (PDA) to occur.

VI. Transportation Investments

The regional agencies have goals to facilitate development growth in the PDAs through transportation investments into the PDAs. Specifically the emphasis is on housing.

In anticipation of future funding cycles we expect to be required to utilize findings from activities in the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy to inform investment decisions. The PDA Planning Program work (discussed below) along with the data collection effort will help inform where and how investments will be made.

a. Plan Bay Area

Plan Bay Area, a responsibility of MTC, is an integrated long-range transportation and land-use/housing plan for the San Francisco Bay Area. This plan is a guiding document for transportation investments made by the region with a 2040 horizon date. Plan Bay Area grew out of The California Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (California Senate Bill 375, Steinberg), which requires each of the state's 18 metropolitan areas – including the Bay Area – to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks. SB 375 requires that the Sustainable Communities Strategy promote compact, mixed-use commercial and residential development. To meet the goals of SB 375 more of the future development is planned to be walkable and bikable and close to public transit, jobs, schools, shopping, parks, recreation and other amenities. Plan Bay Area was intended to be designed to create more housing choices for residents in livable communities, support a growing economy and reduce transportation-related pollution.

The current draft of Plan Bay Area released by MTC on March 22, 2013 outlines the investment strategies for the \$289 billion anticipated over the 28 year life of the plan. As a plan that guides transportation investments throughout the Bay Area, Plan Bay Area directs \$57 Billion of the \$289 Billion as "Discretionary" funding while the remaining \$232 Billion as "Committed" funding over the 28-year period. Hence, the amount of funding available to the nine CMAs, such as C/CAG, that can be used to directly affect the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy is relatively small. Committed revenues are restricted based on their sources such as Federal and State funds specified for transit maintenance. Ninety percent of the committed funds are being directed towards the region's existing transit and road system. Please see the table below.

Projected Revenues and Investment Strategy Outlined by Plan Bay Area

Committed Revenues \$232 Billion (80%)	Discretionary Revenues \$57 Billion (20%)
60% Transit: Maintain Existing System (\$139 Billion)	43% Road and Bridge: Maintain Existing System (\$25 Billion)
30% Road and Bridge: Maintain Existing System (\$69 Billion)	36% Transit: Maintain Existing System (\$20 billion)
5% Transit: Expansion (\$13 Billion)	14% Transit: Expansion (\$8 Billion)
5% Road and Bridge: Expansion (\$11 Billion)	7% Road and Bridge: Expansion (\$4 Billion)

For FY 12/13 through FY 15/16, the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program funding that C/CAG administers on behalf of MTC and distributes to local jurisdictions is approximately \$26 million. This \$26 million in funding is limited in how it can be spent by both Federal guidelines and further restrictions that MTC places locally on the funding, such as through MTC Resolution 4035 for Cycle 2.

b. OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program

The OBAG Program is a new funding approach that better integrates the region’s federal transportation program with California’s climate law (Senate Bill 375) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). Under this approach the funding distribution to the counties will encourage land-use and housing policies that support the production of housing with supportive transportation investments. This is accomplished through the following policies:

- Using transportation dollars to reward counties that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process and produce housing.
- Supporting the Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Bay Area by promoting transportation investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and by initiating a pilot program in the North Bay counties that will support open space preservation in Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs).
- Providing a higher proportion of funding to local agencies and additional investment flexibility by eliminating required program targets. A significant amount of funding that was used for regional programs in Cycle 1 is shifted to local programs (the OneBayArea Grant Program). The OBAG Program allows investments in transportation categories such as Transportation for Livable Communities, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and roads preservation, and planning and outreach activities, while also providing targeted funding opportunities for Safe Routes to School (SR2S) and Priority Conservation Areas.

The OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program governed by Resolution 4035 reinforces the Priority Development Area (PDA) concept by requiring that 70% of the locally available competitive funding from MTC must be spent in or in proximate access to a PDA. C/CAG implemented the

San Mateo County OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Call for Projects process, and supported PDA growth strategies by setting the project selection criteria to incentivize local jurisdictions to have air quality mitigation and affordable housing production policies in place.

c. Identifying On-going and Future Transportation Projects within PDAs

C/CAG will continue to support jurisdictions achieve the on-going and future transportation projects in San Mateo County throughout the life of this PDA IGS. C/CAG has supported and administered the development of five separate Community Based Transportation Plans in San Mateo County. These plans have identified community transportation needs and projects and programs to support these needs. C/CAG will continue to be involved in the support of these findings and will also assist the jurisdictions through the development of the PDA Planning Program as mentioned in the section below.

d. Linking Transportation Investments to PDAs

Priority Development Area Planning Program

MTC recently approved providing approximately \$20 million in Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding to the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) for the implementation, at the county level, of the Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning Grant Program. San Mateo County can expect have approximately \$1.5 million available for this program during the FY 12/13 through FY 15/16 time frame. This program is intended to help local jurisdictions plan for growth in the PDAs. This funding is specifically expected to provide jurisdictions with financial support to develop Specific Plans and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) to plan for, enable and support the growth in the San Mateo County PDAs. CMAs are required to distribute these funds on a non-formula basis that targets assistance to PDAs that are high impact and capable of early implementation. These funds will be made available through a competitive grant funding program administered by C/CAG. C/CAG expects to have this program in place by the end of summer 2013.

VII. Project Partners

a. San Mateo County Planning Directors/Staff

Planning Directors and staff from all 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County will be a body that will be utilized on an as needed basis to distribute information, consult, and solicit feedback from as this PDA Investment and Growth Strategy moves forward and becomes more refined. In March of 2013 C/CAG staff brought forward an outline of this PDA Investment and Growth Strategy to the 21 Elements Technical Advisory Committee to solicit comments and feedback. On March 28, 2013 C/CAG staff held a special workshop with the Planning Directors/staff to present the Draft PDA Investment and Growth Strategy and have discussion on the intent and process.

b. C/CAG Standing Committees (CMP TAC, CMEQ)

C/CAG utilizes a Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) to review and vet projects and programs. This PDA Investment and Growth Strategy has been presented to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on March 21, 2013 and April 18, 2013. It was presented to the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) on March 25, 2013 and April 29, 2013 so that each of these committees would have an opportunity to review and comment on the draft.

C/CAG staff will utilize these committees as forums to review future updates to the San Mateo County PDA Investment and Growth Strategy and to engage our member agencies on the development and progress of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy over time.

c. San Mateo County Department of Housing

C/CAG will collaborate with the San Mateo County Department of Housing throughout the life of this document on housing strategies, policies, and implementation countywide.

d. Transportation agencies

C/CAG will continue to coordinate with transportation agencies in the county and in the region including but not limited to the SamTrans, Caltrain, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, in transportation planning to support the Growth and Investment Strategy.

Appendix A - San Mateo County Housing Policies and Production

Housing Production - Current RHNA Cycle (2007-2014)

Housing Policies

Jurisdiction and PDA Name	Units Permitted (Year)	Above				Total Permits Within City	Inclusionary Housing	Land Banking	Rehabilitation Program	Just Cause Evictions	Rent Control	Other Preservation Strategies	Condo Conversion	Impact Fees	Other Affordable Housing Policies	Development Readiness
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate											
Atherton																
	2007	0	0	0	1	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	2008	1	0	0	0	1										
	2009	-7	0	0	-4	-11										
	2010	0	0	0	-4	-4										
	2011	5	0	0	-2	3										
	2012	7	0	0	0	7										
Belmont																
<i>Villages of Belmont</i>																
	2007	0	0	0	2	2	Yes - 15%	Yes	No	No	No	No	No			
	2008	0	0	1	5	6										
	2009	0	0	2	4	6										
	2010	0	0	2	3	5										
	2011	0	0	0	1	1										
	2012	0	0	0	0	0										
Brisbane																
<i>San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area</i>																
	2007	0	0	3	11	14	Yes. BMC Chapter 17.31	Yes.	n/a	n/a	n/a	Ordinances to protect tenants in apartment to condominium conversions and mobile	Yes. BMC Chapter 17.30.	Yes. Through development agreement.	Brisbane has ordinances allowing for density bonuses; transferable	
	2008	0	0	0	2	2										
	2009	0	0	1	3	4										
	2010	0	0	0	3	3										
	2011	0	0	0	1	1										
	2012	0	0	0	1	1										
Burlingame																
<i>Burlingame El Camino Real</i>																
	2007	0	0	1	6	7	4+ units, 10-25%, very low, low, moderate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Density bonus, flexible design standards, reduced parking	
	2008	0	0	1	4	5										
	2009	0	0	0	6	6										
	2010	0	0	6	49	55										
	2011	0	0	0	0	0										
	2012	0	0	0	3	3										
Colma																
	2007	0	0	0	2	2	5+ units, 20%, very low, low, moderate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Clustering of IH units	
	2008	0	0	0	0	0										
	2009	0	0	0	0	0										
	2010	0	0	0	0	0										
	2011	0	0	0	0	0										
	2012	0	0	0	0	0										
Daly City																
<i>Bayshore Mission Blvd. (CoC)</i>																
	2007	48	0	0	33		5+ units, low, moderate, above-moderate	n/a	Yes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Parking reductions for low-income family and senior housing	
	2008	0	0	0	11											
	2009		2	0	9											
	2010	18	18	10	4											
	2011			5	6											
	2012			2	1											

Appendix A - San Mateo County Housing Policies and Production

Housing Production - Current RHNA Cycle (2007-2014)

Housing Policies

Jurisdiction and PDA Name	Units Permitted (Year)	Production				Total Permits Within City	Inclusionary Housing	Land Banking	Rehabilitation Program	Just Cause Evictions	Rent Control	Other Preservation Strategies	Condo Conversion	Impact Fees	Other Affordable Housing Policies	Development Readiness
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate											
East Palo Alto																
Ravenswood (CoC)	2007	0	0	7	0		Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Density Bonus/Second Unit Ordinance/Emergency Shelter Ordinance/		
	2008	0	0	1	2											
	2009	0	0	0	0											
	2010	0	0	0	0											
	2011	0	0	0	0											
2012	0	0	0	0												
Foster City																
	2007	0	0	0	0		20% required on specified housing projects (negotiated through Development)		Homeowner rehabilitation loan program, BMR resale controls, home sharing	Policy to work with non-profit organizations for rental mediation	Policy to work with non-profit organizations for rental			Density bonuses in accordance with State law, design flexibility, permit		
	2008	0	0	0	0											
	2009	0	0	0	1											
	2010	0	0	0	0											
	2011	15	40	5	240											
2012	0	0	0	0												
Half Moon Bay																
	2007	0	0	0	0	20	10+units/lots, 20-25%, very low, low, moderate									
	2008	0	0	0	0	17										
	2009	0	0	0	0	6										
	2010	0	0	0	0	7										
	2011	0	0	0	0	9										
2012	51	32	0	10	85											
Hillsborough																
	2007	6	3		15		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Density Bonuses, emergency shelter zoning, contributions to housing		
	2008	8	3		1											
	2009	14	8		6											
	2010	10	4		12											
	2011	9	5		10											
2012																
Menlo Park																
El Camino Real Corridor & Downtown	2007	0	0	18	98		5+ units/1+ lots, 10-15%, very low, low, moderate							Density bonus, flexible design standards		
	2008	0	0	5	73											
	2009															
	2010															
	2011															
2012																
Millbrae																
Transit Station Area	2007	0	0	0	147		None post dissolution of Redevelopment	City holds site purchased by former RDA designate	None post dissolution of Redevelopment	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Density bonus, Housing Fund	
	2008	0	0	0	4											
	2009	0	0	0	12											
	2010	0	0	0	18											
	2011	0	0	0	7											
2012	0	0	0	1												

Appendix A - San Mateo County Housing Policies and Production

Housing Production - Current RHNA Cycle (2007-2014)

Housing Policies

Jurisdiction and PDA Name	Units Permitted (Year)	Above				Total Permits Within City	Inclusionary Housing	Land Banking	Rehabilitation Program	Just Cause Evictions	Rent Control	Other Preservation Strategies	Condo Conversion	Impact Fees	Other Affordable Housing Policies	Development Readiness	
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate												
San Mateo County																	
<i>El Camino Real - North Fair Oaks (CoC)</i>	2007	0	2	6	82		Yes	No	Yes	No	No		Yes	No	Density bonus program; various housing funding including		
<i>El Camino Real - Uninc. Colma</i>	2008	0	1	3	60												
	2009	0	5	2	46												
	2010	0	4	1	68												
	2011	0	7	4	46												
	2012	0	0	2	34												
South San Francisco																	
<i>Down town (CoC)</i>	2007	5	11	4	91		4+ units, 20%, low, moderate		Per Federal CDBG Program				only allows conversion when multifamily housing in City has vacancy rate		Density bonus, subsidies, second units		
	2008	0	0	0	5												
	2009	0	0	0	0												
	2010	108	0	0	1												
	2011	0	0	0	0												
	2012	0	0	0	0												
Woodside																	
	2007	0	0	0	11												
	2008	1	1	1	5												
	2009																
	2010																
	2011																
	2012																

Appendix B - Summary of Priority Development Area (PDA) Activities for San Mateo County

City	PDA Name	Place Type	Community of Concern	Planning status	ABAG Net Acres ¹	PDA FOCUS Jobs ⁴	2010 Jobs ³	2013 Jobs ³	2040 SCS Jobs ²	Job Growth	PDA FOCUS Housing Units ⁴	2010 Housing Units	2013 Housing Units ³	2040 SCS Housing Units ²	Housing Unit Growth	Efforts to date (Includes planning, design, and/or construction ³)
Atherton																
Belmont	Villages of Belmont	Mixed-Use Corridor		Potential	54		1,260		2,510	1,260		920		1,830	910	
Belmont	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	274											
Brisbane	San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	Suburban Center		Planned	574	7,326	550		1,100	540	1,574	0		0	0	Visitation Valley / Schlage Lock Master Plan Executive Park Subarea Plan Brisbane Baylands Plan
Burlingame	Burlingame El Camino Real (includes C/CAG ECR)	Transit Town Center		Planned	768		12,480		18,460	5,980		7,610		10,870	3,260	
Colma	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	290		2,130		2,410	280		560		810	240	
Daly City	Bayshore	Transit Town Center		Potential	320	1,870	1,110		3,260	2,160	973	1,590		3,580	1,990	Cow Palace/Carter Martin Area Master Plan, 2004 Geneva Avenue Urban Design Plan, 2001 Geneva Avenue Streetscape Masterplan, 2002
Daly City	Mission Blvd	Mixed-Use Corridor	Bayshore (CoC)	Potential	142	N/A	3,790		5,240	1,450	N/A	2,270		3,310	1,050	Colma BART Station Specific Plan Mission Street-Junipero Serra Boulevard Redevelopment Area Vision Comprehensive Station Plan, Daly City (BART, May 2006)
Daly City	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	398		3,860		5,260	1,400		5,960		7,230	1,260	
East Palo Alto	Ravenswood	Transit Town Center	East Palo Alto/ North Fair Oaks (CoC)	Potential	275	0	810		1,230	430	0	1,030		1,880	860	East Palo Alto Bay Access Master Plan (2007) East Palo Alto Redevelopment Agency 5 Year Implementation Plan (2007) Draft Engineering Plan for Ravenswood Business District (2008) Adopted as basis of design for Bay Road Phase II (2009) Market Demand Analysis for the Ravenswood Business District (2009)
Foster City																
Hai Moon Bay																
Hillsborough																
Mano Park	El Camino Real Corridor & Downtown	Transit Town Center		Planned	118	5,350	5,630		7,680	2,050	294	1,130		2,050	910	El Camino Real/Downtown Visioning and Planning Process
Menlo Park	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Potential	321		5,540		7,540	2,000		2,850		3,850	1,000	
Millbrae	Transit Station Area	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	83	4,000	1,350		3,400	2,060	105	280		2,710	2,420	Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan, 1998 Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan EIR
Millbrae	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	349		4,610		6,360	1,750		2,910		5,100	2,180	
Pacifica																
Portola Valley																
Redwood City	Downtown	City Center		Planned	144	10,000	10,470		14,110	3,640	1,047	1,060		6,300	5,240	Downtown Redwood City Precise Plan Downtown Redwood City Precise Plan EIR
Redwood City	Broadway/Veterans Blvd. Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	330		8,540		11,980	3,440		770		2,300	1,530	
Redwood City	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	470		7,390		9,710	2,320		4,820		7,020	2,210	

34

Appendix B - Summary of Priority Development Area (PDA) Activities for San Mateo County

City	PDA Name	Place Type	Community of Concern	Planning Status	ABAG Net Acres ¹	PDA FOCUS Jobs ⁴	2010 Jobs ³	2040 SCS Jobs ²	Job Growth	PDA FOCUS Housing Units ⁴	2010 Housing Units	2013 Housing Units ³	2040 SCS Housing Units ²	Housing Unit Growth	Efforts to date (Includes planning, design, and/or construction) ⁴
San Bruno	Transit Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	South San Francisco/ San Bruno (CoC)	Potential	495	10,000	6,750	10,710	3,960	4,460	4,330				Transit Corridors Planning process San Bruno Redevelopment Plan (1999) Caltrain Station Area Design General Plan Update Navy Site Specific Plan (2001) Navy Site Specific Plan (2001) EIR
San Bruno	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	498		7,320	10,480	3,160		4,350		6,930	2,580	
San Carlos	Railroad Corridor	Transit Town Center		Planned	46	N/A	10,260	12,650	2,390	N/A	3,570				Eastside Specific Plan EIR for Eastside Specific Plan Westside Specific Plan Grand Boulevard Initiative General Plan update 2009
San Carlos	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	516									1,160	
San Mateo City	Downtown	City Center	North Central San Mateo (CoC)	Planned	82	4,995	4,440	7,050	2,610	516	540		1,610	1,070	Downtown Area Plan (2010) Current Downtown San Mateo Plan Update
San Mateo City	El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	93	N/A	2,270	5,680	3,410	25	880		2,080	1,200	El Camino Real Master Plan Rail Corridor Transit Oriented Development Plan (Corridor Plan), 2005.
San Mateo City	Rail Corridor	Transit Neighborhood		Planned	378	800	8,840	18,700	9,870	25	520		5,540	5,030	Rail Corridor Transit Oriented Development Plan (Corridor Plan), 2005. EIR for Rail Corridor Transit Oriented Development Plan (Corridor Plan), 2005. Land Use/Transportation Corridor Study (1998) Concept Plan El Camino Real Master Plan affects ECR within the area
San Mateo City	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	1,003		17,220	29,300	12,080		13,180		20,360	7,180	
San Mateo County	El Camino Real - North Fair Oaks	Mixed-Use Corridor	East Palo Alto/ North Fair Oaks (CoC)	Planned	625		3,680	5,750	2,080		2,540		6,180	3,630	
San Mateo County	El Camino Real - Union Colma	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	41		300	410	120		250		270	30	
San Mateo County	C/CAG - El Camino Real				49		610	680	70		50		80	30	
South San Francisco	Downtown	Transit Town Center	South San Francisco/ San Bruno (CoC)	Potential	121	0	2,670	6,920	4,250	0	1,590		4,700	3,120	South San Francisco General Plan South San Francisco Downtown Strategy
South San Francisco	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	687		4,940	6,340	1,400		5,670		9,200	3,530	
Woodside															

1 - ABAG Net acres is the physical PDA area minus roads, water, and protected open space.

2 - ABAG Methodology for both the employment and housing distributions are described in detail in the Appendix of the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy. They also distributed spreadsheets that show the specific steps in the calculations by jurisdiction and PDA. These files are available on the OneBayArea website: <http://www.onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/plan-elements/Housing-and-Jobs.html>, under "Related Material" on the right hand side of the web page.

3 - This is to be filled out with help from jurisdictions to track progress of PDA development.

4 - Data from FOCUS Priority Development Area Showcase based on PDA application data (<http://www.bayareaaction.org/pda/san-mateo-county/>)

Appendix C

San Mateo County Priority Development Areas

(Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG))

San Mateo County Priority Development Areas

(Source: Association of Bay Area Governments)

Priority Development Area	Place Type	2010-2040 HU Growth
		Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy
<i>(CoC) = Community of Concern</i>		
Downtown Redwood City	City Center	5,243
Downtown San Mateo <i>(CoC)</i>	City Center	1,070
Total City Center:		6,313
Brisbane, San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	Suburban Center	0 (in Brisbane Portion)
Total Suburban Center:		0
Burlingame El Camino Real	Transit Town Center	3,258
Daly City - Bayshore	Transit Town Center	1,992
East Palo Alto - Ravenswood <i>(CoC)</i>	Transit Town Center	856
Menlo Park- El Camino Real Corridor & Downtown	Transit Town Center	915
San Carlos Railroad Corridor	Transit Town Center	774
Downtown South San Francisco <i>(CoC)</i>	Transit Town Center	3,116
Total Transit Town Center:		10,911
San Mateo Rail Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	5,028
Total Transit Neighborhood:		5,028
Redwood City - Broadway/Veterans Blvd. Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,529
San Bruno Transit Corridors <i>(CoC)</i>	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,328
Villages of Belmont	Mixed-Use Corridor	907
Daly City - Mission Blvd. <i>(CoC)</i>	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,048
San Mateo - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,204
Millbrae Transit Station Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,424
El Camino Real Countywide Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,630
Total Mixed Use Corridor:		14,070

Appendix A-6: PDA Investment & Growth Strategy

The purpose of a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy is to ensure that CMAs have a transportation project priority-setting process for OBAG funding that supports and encourages development in the region's PDAs, recognizing that the diversity of PDAs will require different strategies. Some of the planning activities noted below may be appropriate for CMAs to consider for jurisdictions or areas not currently designated as PDAs if those areas are still considering future housing and job growth. Regional agencies will provide support, as needed, for the PDA Investment & Growth Strategies. From time to time, MTC shall consult with the CMAs to evaluate progress on the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy. This consultation may result in specific work elements shifting among MTC, ABAG and the CMAs. Significant modifications to the scope of activities may be formalized through future revisions to this resolution. The following are activities CMAs need to undertake in order to develop a project priority-setting process:

(1) Engaging Regional/Local Agencies

- Develop or continue a process to regularly engage local planners and public works staff. Encourage community participation throughout the planning process and in determining project priorities
- Participate as a TAC member in local jurisdiction planning processes funded through the regional PDA Planning Program or as requested by jurisdictions. Partner with MTC and ABAG staff to ensure that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans.

(2) Planning Objectives – to Inform Project Priorities

- Keep apprised of ongoing transportation and land-use planning efforts throughout the county
- Encourage local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes
- Encourage and support local jurisdictions in meeting their housing objectives established through their adopted Housing Elements and RHNA.
 - *Short-term:* By May 1, 2013, receive and review information submitted to the CMA by ABAG on the progress of local jurisdictions in implementing their housing element objectives and identify current local housing policies that encourage affordable housing production and/or community stabilization.
 - *Long-term:* Starting in May 2014 and in all subsequent updates, PDA Investment & Growth Strategies will assess local jurisdiction efforts in approving sufficient housing for all income levels through the RHNA process and, where appropriate, assist local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals¹. The locally crafted policies should be targeted to the specific circumstances of each PDA. For example, if the PDA currently does not provide for a mix of income-levels, any recommend policy changes should be aimed at promoting affordable housing. If the PDA currently is mostly low-income housing, any needed policy changes should be aimed at community stabilization. This analysis will be coordinated with related work conducted through the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant awarded to the region in fall 2011.

(3) Establishing Local Funding Priorities - Develop funding guidelines for evaluating OBAG projects that support multi-modal transportation priorities based on connections to housing, jobs and commercial activity. Emphasis should be placed on the following factors when developing project evaluation criteria:

- **Projects located in high impact project areas.** Key factors defining high impact areas include:
 - a. Housing – PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units and percentage change), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production

¹ Such as inclusionary housing requirements, city-sponsored land-banking for affordable housing production, “just cause eviction” policies, policies or investments that preserve existing deed-restricted or “naturally” affordable housing, condo conversion ordinances that support stability and preserve affordable housing, etc.

- b. Jobs in proximity to housing and transit (both current levels and those included in the SCS),
- c. Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)
- d. Consistency with regional TLC design guidelines or design that encourages multi-modal access: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tlc/2009_TLC_Design_Guidelines.pdf
- e. Project areas with parking management and pricing policies
- **Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC)** – favorably consider projects located in a COC as defined by MTC (see: <http://geocommons.com/maps/110983>) or as defined by CMAs according to local priorities
- **PDAs with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies** – favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies or policies
- **PDAs that overlap or are colocated with: 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District’s Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program and/or 2) freight transport infrastructure** –Favorably consider projects in these areas where local jurisdictions employ best management practices to mitigate PM and toxic air contaminants exposure.

Process/Timeline

CMA's develop PDA Investment & Growth Strategy	June 2012 -- May 2013
PDA Investment & Growth Strategy Presentations by CMAs to Joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committee	Summer/Fall 2013
CMAs amend PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to incorporate follow-up to local housing production and policies	May 2014
CMAs submit annual progress reports related to PDA Growth Strategies, including status of jurisdiction progress on development/adoption of housing elements and complete streets ordinances.	May 2014, Ongoing

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\RESOLUTIONS\MTC Resolutions\RES-4035_Attach-A.doc