



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

June 18, 2019

The Honorable Nancy Skinner
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5100
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Senate Bill 330 (Skinner) – OPPOSE

Dear Senator Skinner:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) writes to you today in OPPOSITION to your bill, SB 330. C/CAG is made up of all 20 cities in San Mateo County, as well as the County, and we deal with issues ranging from transportation to water quality. What is often overlooked is C/CAG's role in housing and development. C/CAG facilitates the sub-regional RHNA process and is the Airport Land Use Commission which evaluates development projects for consistency with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan around San Mateo County airports, including SFO.

Let me begin by saying that we agree that California is in a housing crisis and in San Mateo County, we see the impact that our thriving job market is having on housing. We see increased homelessness, and lower-wage earners pushed out of the County due to affordability issues, exacerbating commute times, congestion, and transportation & housing costs. Our cities are aggressively zoning and permitting new housing and we have seen thousands of units under construction in recent years, many of them rising around our Caltrain stations thanks to a firm belief that transportation and housing are inextricably linked. We believe that San Mateo County is doing its part to build new housing.

As noted above, our member cities have been building housing to accommodate for the influx of workers and are well on their way to meeting their RHNA targets. For example, San Carlos has approved 61% of its RHNA target (596 units) for the current cycle and is processing additional projects that will result in 84% compliance of this requirement in the coming months. San Carlos is on target to wholly meet the total number of units allocated by the State by the end of the cycle. Hillsborough is 90% of the way towards meeting its target. Foster City has approved over 200% of their RHNA target (896 units), including 58% of their very low- and low income RHNA allocations, and other cities in the County are also making good strides. Please see the attached table that illustrates the housing production that our member cities have been producing.

That being said, we believe SB 330 would greatly inhibit our local agencies' ability to make decisions that address the specific needs of our communities. Addressing our state's housing shortage and affordability issues cannot be done using a "one-size fits all" approach. For

example, we acknowledge that requiring more parking adds costs to a development and/or takes up space that could be used for additional housing units. However, applying a statewide limit on parking, as your bill does, does not account for existing conditions in our cities. The Caltrain system runs adjacent to many single-family neighborhoods. In several of those neighborhoods, multiple families are already occupying single family homes. As more multifamily projects come online, we fear that parking limitations, that conflict with local standards, will exacerbate already crowded streets and congested traffic in our neighborhoods.

SB 330 could also jeopardize a city's ability to seek mitigation from developers for parking impacts to help lessen the burden on existing neighborhoods. Additionally, SB 330 would lock in project fees at existing levels and at the very early stages of a project (before the totality of the project's impacts are known). This aspect of the bill seems unnecessary as cities are already limited in how they can assess impact fees on housing projects.

Many of the changes you, and other members of the Legislature, have enacted in recent years have not had time to play out to determine if there has been a positive impact on housing production in California. Before pursuing SB 330 (or any other major housing legislation impacting local processes), we feel the recent laws need time to progress. Additionally, C/CAG believes the most important thing the State can do is provide funding for local agencies to plan, incentivize, and mitigate for future housing development. Please feel free to contact Sandy Wong, the C/CAG Executive Director, at slwong@smcgov.org with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Irene O'Connell, Legislative Committee Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: Assembly Member Marc Berman
Assembly Member Kevin Mullin
Assembly Member Phil Ting
Senator Jerry Hill

San Mateo County Housing Production/Progress 2014-2018 (REVISED 04/22/19)

Jurisdiction

	Total number of housing units completed (certificate of occupancy issued) in the past five years (Jan. 1, 2014-Dec. 31, 2018)		Total number of housing units currently under construction - if not available, indicate # building permits (but no CoO) issued		Number of housing units permitted in the last five years (Jan. 1, 2014-Dec. 31, 2018) where planning entitlements/permits are still valid but construction has not begun		Number of housing units currently in planning pipeline (application received)	
	Market Rate	BMR	Market Rate	BMR	Market Rate	BMR	Market Rate	BMR
Atherton	146	0	97	0	24	0	7	0
Belmont	45	0	120	0	6	0	237	139
Brisbane	50	9	5	8	48	11	0	0
Burlingame	44	6	276	30	166	147	563	66
Colma	6	0	69	0	0	0	0	0
Daly City	355	63	130	204	776	97	276	595
East Palo Alto	58	41	9	0	0	0	533	241
Foster City	637	147	130	0	0	0	78	14
Half Moon Bay	179	85	15	0	14	0	33	0
Hillsborough	73	0	20	0	1	0	12	
Menlo Park	698	173	224	25	227	20	1788	488
Millbrae	0	0	3	0	680	167	263	46
Pacifica	30	0	31	0	37	4	67	4
Portola Valley	56	0	42	0	14	0	6	0
Redwood City	686	4	595	62	35	242	281	162
San Bruno	10	0	151	11	77	11	424	72
San Carlos	65	0	418	29	9	0	98	39
San Mateo	1403	194	492	44	310	26	1542	278
South San Francisco	443	112	493	102	286	17	1199	125
Woodside	37	24	7	28	1	4	7	5
San Mateo County	373	36	161	67	0	0	0	0
Totals	5394	894	3488	610	2711	746	7414	2274

23531

NOTE: BMR numbers reflect deed restricted units only, though many non deed restricted ADUs may be eligible to be counted as BMRs for Housing Element reporting