



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 Scott Wiener
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5100
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Senate Bill 50 (Wiener) – Comments and Concerns

Dear Senator Wiener:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) writes to you today to convey several concerns with your bill, SB 50, that have been discussed by our Board in recent weeks. As you are aware, 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. We very much appreciate the time you and your staff have spent with us discussing SB 50.

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 and transportation. 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. With that we offer the following comments on SB 50:

- **Acknowledge Existing Plans:** Several cities in San Mateo County, specifically in the areas your bill targets, have transit-oriented development plans in place that address development around our rail stations and transit hubs, under various names (Transit Corridor Plans, Station Area Plans, and Specific Plans). These plans were carefully crafted with local input and in some cases (City of San Bruno), have been approved by local voters. Additional cities (Burlingame, Brisbane, Millbrae) also have recently adopted these plans. SB 50 could have a significant impact on these plans and we believe *exemptions should be given in the bill to locally approved plans that incorporate a reasonable amount of housing.*
- **No Credit for Current Work:** 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. *SB 50 should not apply to cities that are on target to meet the state-approved RHNA target.*

- **Parking is a Local Issue:** We acknowledge that requiring more parking than may be necessary adds costs to a development and/or takes up space that could be used for housing units. However, applying a statewide limit on parking does not account for existing conditions in our cities. The Caltrain system runs adjacent to many single-family neighborhoods. As multifamily projects come online, we fear that parking limitations that conflict with local standards will crowd our streets and worsen traffic in our neighborhoods. SB 50 could also jeopardize a city's ability to seek mitigation from developers for parking impacts to help lessen the burden on existing neighborhoods. *We believe SB 50 should provide discretion to local agencies in determining parking requirements, while still acknowledging the bill's intent.*
- **Local Zoning Should Still Apply:** Our understanding of SB 50 is that if a parcel is zoned for housing, regardless of whether it is zoned as a single-family parcel or multi-family parcel, a developer may seek to build 55- or 45-foot projects on those parcels. This is concerning given the existing conditions in some of our cities along the Caltrain corridor. *We would like to see flexibility in SB 50 to allow local zoning standards to remain in place to accommodate unique physical characteristics and limitations of cities.*
- **Equal application of requirements:** San Mateo County has a population that is approximately 750,000. We have a population above the proposed threshold in part because our members have been promoting housing production. Tailoring requirements for counties below a population threshold appears to favor low growth areas and is counter to the intent of SB 50. *We would like to see this population threshold removed.*

The above concerns highlight common themes we have heard from our members that we feel should be addressed as SB 50 continues to move through the process. However, we would argue that many of the changes you, and other members of the Legislature, 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 50 (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