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

BOARD MEETING NOTICE

Meeting No. 255

DATE:	Thursday, April 11, 2013
TIME:	6:30 P.M.
PLACE:	San Mateo County Transit District Office 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium San Carlos, CA
PARKING:	Available adjacent to and behind building. Please note the underground parking garage is no longer open.
PUBLIC TRANSIT:	SamTrans Caltrain: San Carlos Station. Trip Planner: http://transit.511.org

1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

2.0 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3.0 PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA Note: Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker.

4.0 PRESENTATIONS/ ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

5.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Consent Agenda items are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Board, staff or public request specific items to be removed for separate action.

5.1 Approval of the minutes of regular business meeting No. 254 dated March 14, 2013. ACTION p. 1 5.2 Review and approval of Resolution 13-11 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an agreement with Iteris, Inc. to provide System Integration Support to C/CAG, Caltrans District 4, and the Smart Corridor Project stakeholders for an amount not to exceed \$580,977.00.

ACTION p. 7

NOTE: All items on the Consent Agenda are approved/accepted by a majority vote. A request must be made at the beginning of the meeting to move any item from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

6.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 6.1 Presentation on the Draft San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy. ACTION p. 15
- 7.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS
- 7.1 Committee Reports (oral reports).
- 7.2 Chairperson's Report
- 7.3 Boardmembers Report
- 8.0 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT
- 9.0 COMMUNICATIONS Information Only

Copies of communications are included for C/CAG Board Members and Alternates only. To request a copy of the communications, contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406 or <u>nblair@co.sanmateo.ca.us</u> or download a copy from C/CAG's website – <u>www.ccag.ca.gov</u>.

9.1 Letter from Honorable Anna G. Eshoo, U.S. House of Representatives, to Mr. Bob Grassilli, C/CAG Chair, dated 3/27/13. RE: Annual appropriations process for Fiscal Year 2014

p. 41.

10.0 ADJOURN

Next scheduled meeting: May 9, 2013 Regular Board Meeting.

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG Board and Committee meetings will be posted at San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular board meeting are available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members of the Board. The Board has designated the City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making those public records available for inspection. The documents are also available on the C/CAG Internet Website, at the link for agendas for upcoming meetings. The website is located at: http://www.ccag.ca.gov.

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.

If you have any questions about the C/CAG Board Agenda, please contact C/CAG Staff:

Executive Director: Sandy Wong 650 599-1409 Administrative Assistant: Nancy Blair 650 599-1406

FUTURE MEETINGS

April 11, 2013	C/CAG Board - SamTrans 2 nd Floor Auditorium - 6:30 p.m.
April 16, 2013	NPDES Technical Advisory Committee – San Mateo Library, San Mateo - 10:00 a.m.
April 17, 2013	Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)
April 18, 2013	CMP Technical Advisory Committee - SamTrans 2 nd Floor Auditorium – 1:15 p.m.
April 22, 2013	Administrators' Advisory Committee - 555 County Center, 5th Fl, Redwood City - Noon
April 29, 2013	CMEQ Committee - San Mateo City Hall - Conference Room C - 3:00 p.m.

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

BOARD MEETING NOTICE

Meeting No. 254 March 14, 2013

1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Grassilli called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll Call was taken.

Jerry Carlson - Atherton Terry O'Connell-Brisbane Terry Nagel -- Burlingame, San Mateo County Transportation Authority Joseph Silva – Colma (6:33) Ruben Abrica - East Palo Alto Art Kiesel – Foster City Rick Kowalczyk - Half Moon Bay Jay Benton - Hillsborough Kirsten Keith - Menlo Park Nadia Holober - Millbrae Len Stone - Pacifica Maryann Moise Derwin - Portola Valley Alicia Aguirre - Redwood City Bob Grassilli - San Carlos Brandt Grotte - San Mateo Karyl Matsumoto - South San Francisco, San Mateo County Transit District Don Horsley - San Mateo County Deborah Gordon - Woodside

Absent, Belmont Daly City San Bruno

Others: Sandy Wong, Executive Director C/CAG Nancy Blair, C/CAG Lee Thompson, C/CAG Legal Counsel Tom Madalena, C/CAG Staff

ITEM 5.1

John Hoang, C/CAG Staff Jean Higaki, C/CAG Staff Matt Fabry, C/CAG Staff Kim Springer, San Mateo County Scott Hart and Jennifer Stuart, PG&E Onnolee Trapp, CMEQ, Committee, League of Women Voters of San Mateo County Jim Bigelow, Redwood City/San Mateo County Chamber, CMEQ Member John Bliss, SCI Consulting Group Rita Haskin, Caltrain Mike Van Lonkhuysen, City of Daly City

5.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Board Member Keith MOVED approval of Items 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6.1, 5.6.2, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, and 5.10. Board Member Aguirre SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 18-0.

- 5.1 Approval of the minutes of regular business meeting No. 253 dated February 14, 2013. APPROVED
- 5.2 Review and approval of a recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: San Francisco International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) consistency review of a referral from the City of Daly City, Re: Daly City General Plan update (*Daly City 2030*). APPROVED
- 5.3 Review and approval of a recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: San Francisco International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) consistency review of a referral from the City of Daly City, Re: Christopher Highlands Project (General Plan amendment and zone change for an 80-unit single-family subdivision). APPROVED
- 5.5 Review and approval of the appointment of Shobuz Ikbal from the City of Redwood City to fill a vacant seat on the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC). APPROVED
- 5.6 Receive copies of contracts approved by the C/CAG Chair and/or Executive Director in accordance with C/CAG Procurement Policy:
 - 5.6.1 Executive Director executed contract with William Klein for staff services for the San Mateo County Energy Watch for an amount not to exceed \$17,000 for calendar year 2013 through 2014. INFORMATION p. 41
 - 5.6.2 Executive Director executed contract with Bay Area Community Resources for an AmeriCorps Member to support the San Mateo County Energy Watch program for an amount not to exceed \$8,750. INFORMATION
- 5.7 Review and approval to add an environmental stakeholder seat to the Resource Management and Climate Protection (RMCP) Committee. APPROVED

5.8 Review and accept the C/CAG quarterly investment report as of December 31, 2012. APPROVED

- 5.9 Review and approval of the appointment of Commissioner Alicia Aguirre (Mayor of Redwood City) to the Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee. APPROVED
- 5.10 Review and approval of Resolution 13-10 authorizing the funding allocation of the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) - Cycle 2 Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program for the C/CAG 5th Cycle Transit Oriented Development (TOD) program commitments. APPROVED

Items 5.4 and 5.11 were removed from the Consent Calendar.

5.4 Review and approval of a waiver of the Request for Proposals process to allow an extension of EOA, Inc.'s funding agreement to ensure uninterrupted compliance support for meeting Municipal Regional Permit requirements. APPROVED

When possible, staff is to coordinate the permit and the contract to have the same time line.

Board Member Grotte MOVED approval of Item 5.4. Board Member Aguirre SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 18-0.

5.11 Review and accept information regarding C/CAG financial practices INFORMATION

Staff answered questions about C/CAG's Finance Department's policies and methods for safe guarding of C/CAG's funds.

The contract for professional services with the City of San Carlos is renewed every fiscal year. For future contract renewals with the City of San Carlos, it was suggested background checks on key finance personnel be part of the contractual obligation.

Board Member Horsley will send the County's latest investment policy to C/CAG's Executive Director for distribution to the Board Members, to be reviewed at a future C/CAG Board meeting.

The Executive Director was directed to work with the San Carlos Finance Department to do the following:

- 1. What liability insurance does the City of San Carlos provide to C/CAG for their professional services?
- 2. Find out if there are any management comments made about Internal Controls that C/CAG should be made aware of?
- 3. Look in obtaining fraud prevention training from the County.

6.0 REGULAR AGENDA

6.1 Presentation and discussion on the Caltrain Go Pass Program.

ACTION

Rita Haskin, Caltrain's Executive Officer of Customer Service and Marketing, gave a presentation and answered questions about Caltrain's Go Pass Program.

No action was taken.

6.2 Review and approval of C/CAG Legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified.)

There was no Legislative Committee meeting for March.

At the 2/14/13 C/CAG Board meeting, the Board adopted the legislative Policies for 2013, with some language changes. Staff provided the report to the Board, with the requested changes to the language.

No action was taken.

6.3 Receive an update on Countywide Funding Initiative for municipal stormwater compliance activities. INFORMATION

C/CAG's Stormwater Pollution Program Manager, and John Bliss, SCI Consulting Group, provided an update on the early stages of the Countywide Funding Initiative and what is to be expected for the next 18 to 24 months.

6.4 Election of a C/CAG Chairperson and C/CAG Vice Chairperson. APPROVED

Board Member Horsley MOVED approval to elect Brand Grotte as C/CAG Chair. Board Member Benton SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 18-0.

Board Member Grotte MOVED approval to elect Mary Ann Nihart as C/CAG Vice Chair. Board Member Matsumoto SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 18-0.

7.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

7.1 Committee Reports (oral reports).

Volunteers are needed to work on the C/CAG By-Laws Task Force. Board Members Aguirre, Keith, Benton, and Rick Kowalczyk volunteered.

Three volunteers are needed to fill the vacant three seats on the Finance Committee. Those who volunteered are Board Members Kiesel, Benton, and Bob Grassilli.

7.2 Chairperson's Report

Chair Grassilli expressed his appreciation to the Board for being the C/CAG Chair for the last two years, and thanked them for their support.

7.3 Board Members Report

Board Member Grottee announced on April 11 C/CAG will be having their annual retreat. It will be a two phase meeting. The first phase will be for C/CAG Board members. The second phase will be the actual retreat.

The guest speaker will be Matthew Franklin, President of Mid - Peninsula Housing.

MTC and ABAG are giving a second presentation to the C/CAG Board on the Draft Plan Bay Area. This is their time to provide the presentation for all the elected officials in San Mateo County. The Board is encouraged to go back to their City Councils, and let them know this is an opportunity to hear about the Draft Plan Bay Area, and to provide input back to MTC and ABAG on this plan.

Staff will be sending an invitation asking for an RSVP.

San Mateo County Plan Bay Area Open House/Public Hearing will be held on April 29, 2013. Time is 6:00 p.m., the location is Crowne Plaza Hotel, Foster City.

March 25, 11:00 a.m., is a ribbon cutting for the opening of Devil Slide's tunnel.

8.0 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

9.0 COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only

Copies of communications are included for C/CAG Board Members and Alternates only. To request a copy of the communications, contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406 or nblair@co.sanmateo.ca.us or download a copy from C/CAG's website – www.ccag.ca.gov.

10.0 ADJOURN

The Board meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

-6-

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 11, 2013

To: City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

Subject: Review and approval of Resolution 13-11 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an agreement with Iteris, Inc. to provide System Integration Support to C/CAG, Caltrans District 4, and the Smart Corridor Project stakeholders for an amount not to exceed \$580,977.00.

(For further information or questions contact Parviz Mokhtari at (408) 425-2433)

RECOMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board review and approve Resolution 13-11 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an agreement with Iteris, Inc. to provide System Integration Support to C/CAG, Caltrans District 4, and the Smart Corridor Project stakeholders for an amount not to exceed \$580,977.00

FISCAL IMPACT

This project will be funded from \$1.2M State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC)

BACKGROUND

The attached status report was presented to the C/CAG Board at the regular meeting of September 13, 2012. The following is an update to that report;

- The \$1,200,000 of STIP finds has been approved and allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC)
- Project 2 is under construction and most of required conduits have been installed in Town of Atherton and cities of Menlo Park, Redwood City, San Carlos, Belmont and San Mateo and estimated completion is December 2013.
- Project 3 is under construction and estimated completion is December 2013.
- The contract for project 5 has been awarded by Caltrans and the construction will begin mid-April and will be completed in early 2014.
- The contract for first phase of project 4, Signal System, has been awarded by C/CAG Board and the consultant is working with Caltrans and staff to complete that phase of the project. The second phase of project 4 is the System Integration.

In preparation for the selection of a consultant to assist in the Smart Corridor System Integration, a request for proposal (RFP) was prepared by C/CAG and Caltrans staff with assistance from a consultant not eligible to bid on this service. Following the release of the RFP on November 6, 2012, the following firms submitted proposals;

Iteris, Inc. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. TransCore, Inc. Aegis, ITS

All four proposals were reviewed and evaluated by the Selection Panel consisted of staff from C/CAG, Caltrans Headquarter, Caltrans District 4, City of Redwood City and City of San Mateo, with support from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) staff. Following initial evaluation, the proposal submitted by Aegis, ITS was rejected by the Panel. The other three consultants were invited to oral interviews conducted by the Panel.

All consultants were required to present their proposals to the interview panel and answer questions. Following evaluation and scoring by the panel, the proposal submitted by Iteris was rated the best and received highest scores.

Following completion of the evaluation process, staff negotiated the fees submitted by Iteris, Inc. and the amount of \$580,977.00 has been agreed upon by both parties.

ATTACHMENT

- 1. Staff report dated September 13, 2012.
- 2. Resolution 13-11
- 3. Agreement with Iteris, Inc. (available only at www.ccag.ca.gov)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date:	September 13, 2012
То:	City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors
From:	Richard Napier, Executive Director
Subject:	Update on the implementation of the San Mateo County Smart Corridor project
	(For further information or questions contact Parviz Mokhtari at (408) 425-2433)

RECOMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board approves this status update on the implementation of the San Mateo County Smart Corridor project.

FISCAL IMPACT

The entire Smart Corridor project limits are from Highway 380 on the north to the Santa Clara County line on the south.

The following are the funds programed/allocated to the entire Smart Corridor Project (consisting of 5 separate projects)

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	\$11,000,000
Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP)	\$10,000,000
San Mateo County Transportation Authority	\$ 3,000,000
C/CAG (Vehicle License Fee)	\$ 1,600,000
Federal funds for project 1 in City of San Mateo	\$ 1,000,000
Additional TLSP	\$ 7,500,000_Approved January 24, 2012
Additional STIP	<u>\$ 1,200,000</u> Pending CTC approval
Total	\$35,300,000

The 5 Smart Corridor separate projects are;

Project 1. This is the demonstration project in City of San Mateo

Project 2. This project consists of all the local roads from San Bruno Avenue to the Santa Clara County line and installation of some equipment on El Camino Real

Project 3. This project includes all Smart Corridor elements on El Camino Real and other State right of way from Highway 380 to Whipple Avenue in Redwood City

Project 4. System Integration and all required hardware and software for the traffic signals operation are included in this project.

Project 5. This project includes all Smart Corridor elements on El Camino Real and other State right of way from Whipple Avenue to the Santa Clara County line

STATUS UPDATE

The following are the status of each of the five projects:

- Project number 1 consists of El Camino Real and other major streets in the City of San Mateo from Hillsdale Boulevard to Highway 92 (**The pilot project**). This project has been completed.
- Project number 2 includes all local arterials from San Bruno Avenue on the north to Santa Clara County line. At the regular meeting of C/CAG Board of March 8, 2012, staff report indicated the construction cost estimate for the project, including 10% contingency to be \$7,452,363. The low bid submitted by W. Bradley Electric on July 31, 2012 was 7,820,470; adding 10% contingency brings the total construction estimate to \$8,602,517. To include design and construction support will bring the total estimated project cost to \$10,700,000. The County Board of Supervisors at the regular meeting of August 28, 2012, awarded the construction contract to W. Bradley Electric. The construction will begin in early October and will be completed in late 2013.
- Project number 3 includes El Camino Real and all other locations within the State rightof-way (State portion). The State has awarded the construction contract and the contractor has started construction and it will be completed by late 2013.
- Project 4 includes the Signal System and System Integration. The Signal System contract is presented to the C/CAG Board for approval. A request for proposal (RFP) for the System Integration has been prepared and it will be released shortly to select the consultant.
- Project 5 has been designed by Caltrans and it is estimated that the State will award the construction contract in late 2012 and the construction will begin in early 2013 and be completed by late 2013.

Project	Design& Construction	Construction Support	Total
Project 1	\$ 2,750,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 3,100,000
Project 2	\$ 9,600,000	\$1,100,000	\$10,700,000
Project 3	\$ 7,400,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 8,300,000
Project 5	\$ 7,600,000	\$1,000,000	\$ 8,600,000
Sub-Total	\$27,350,000	\$3,350,000	\$30,700,000

Construction Cost Estimate

Project 4:

Signal System	\$1,500,000
System Integration, Operation Plan, Flush Plan and all other traffic analysi	s \$1,500,000
Installation of fiber in City Halls and BART buildings	\$ 300,000
Project Management (Feb. 2009-Present)	<u>\$ 435,000</u>
Sub-Total	\$3,735,000

Grand Total

\$34,435,000

While the above Fiscal Impact indicates that the available revenue exceeds the above estimated cost, due to unforeseen circumstances the actual construction and implementation cost may exceed the above estimates and additional local funds may become necessary to complete the project.

Staff is working with Caltrans to schedule a ground breaking ceremony for early October.

ATTACHMENT

None

-12-

RESOLUTION 13-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG) AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH ITERIS,INC.TO PROVIDE SUSTEM INTEGRATION SUPPORT TO C/CAG, CALTRANS DISTRICT 4, AND ALL SMART CORRIDOR PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$580,977.00

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), that

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Smart Corridor Project ("Project") is a cooperative effort of C/CAG, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority ("Authority"), the California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") and select cities in San Mateo County to promote safe and effective transportation management and operation on local arterials and highways 101 and 82 within San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, the project includes development of an Intelligent Transportation System ("ITS") to improve operational efficiency of the existing system and to manage traffic congestion on local streets and SR-82 (El Camino Real) resulting from traffic diversion from US-101 during an incident.

WHEREAS, the project requires system integration; and

WHEREAS, a request for proposal (RFP) was prepared and released to solicit consultant services to provide system integration support; and

WHEREAS, four proposals were received and evaluated by a selection panel consisted of staff from C/CAG, the California Department of Transportation, the cities of San Mateo and Redwood City; and

WHEREAS, based on evaluation of the proposals and oral interviews and program demonstration, the proposal submitted by Iteris, Inc. was rated as being in the best interests of C/CAG and the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Chair is hereby authorized to execute an agreement with Iteris, Inc. to provide System Integration Support for the entire Smart Corridor, for an amount not to exceed \$580,977.00

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 11TH DAY OF APRIL, 2013.

Brandt Grotte, Chair

-14-

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date:April 11, 2013To:C/CAG Board of DirectorsFrom:Sandy Wong, Executive DirectorSubject:Presentation on the Draft San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA)
Investment and Growth Strategy
(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460 or Jean
Higaki at 599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board receive a presentation on the Draft San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy.

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 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 back to the 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 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. 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 reward and support housing development, specifically affordable housing.

C/CAG staff has now prepared the Draft Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy (attached) for San Mateo County. This 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 ascertain the progress towards PDA growth. As a new policy direction from MTC, this PDA Investment and Growth Strategy will be updated and submitted to MTC annually.

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.

This Draft PDA IGS has been presented four times so far in San Mateo County. C/CAG staff presented an initial outline of the San Mateo County PDA IGS to the Planning Directors/staff at the 21 Elements meeting on March 7th, and at a special Planning Directors/staff meeting on March 28th. It was also presented to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on March 21st. It was then presented to the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) on March 25th so that each of these committees would have an opportunity to review and comment on the initial draft. The document will also be presented to the TAC and CMEQ one more time during the month of April before it comes back to the Board for review and approval on May 9th. C/CAG staff welcomes input as to how this PDA Investment and Growth Strategy can be a valuable and realistic guidance tool.

ATTACHMENTS

- Draft 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

Draft 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 cycles 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 it's 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 employments 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 it's 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.

Priority Development Area	Place Type	2010-2040 HU Growth
(CoC)= Community of Concern		Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy
Downtown Redwood City	City Center	5,243
Downtown San Mateo (CoC)	City Center	1,070
	Total City Center:	6,313
Brisbane, San Fancisco/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 (CoC)	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 (CoC)	Transit Town Center	3,116
	Total Transit	10,911

San Mateo County Priority Development Areas

Studies and the second states of the second states and	Town Center:	10-2-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-14-
	Transit	
San Mateo Rail Corridor	Neighborhood	5,028
	Total Transit Neighborhood:	5,028
Redwood City - Broadway/Veterans Blvd.		General Contraction
Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,529
San Bruno Transit Corridors (CoC)	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,328
Villages of Belmont	Mixed-Use Corridor	907
Daly City - Mission Blvd. (CoC)	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,048
San Mateo - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,204
Millibrea Transit Station Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,424
El Camino Real Countywide Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,630
	Total Mixed Use Corridor:	14,070

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 will also be 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 multiyear, 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 highvalue programs contained in their adopted housing elements, for example zoning ordinance amendments to comply with new State law enabling ministerial approval for comforming 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 landuse/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 metropolitan areas develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy to 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 is 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. Committed revenues are restricted based on their sources such as those Federal and State funds specified for transit maintenance, or those voter approved funds dedicated to specific projects. Ninety percent of the committed funds are being directed towards the region's existing transit and road system. 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. Please see the table below.

Projected Revenues and Investment Strategy Outlined by Plan Bay Area

Committed Revenues	Discretionary Revenues
\$232 Billion (80%)	\$57 Billion (20%)
60% Transit: Maintain Existing System (\$139	43% Road and Bridge: Maintain Existing
Billion)	System (\$25 Billion)
30% Road and Bridge: Maintain Existing	36%Transit: Maintain Existing System (\$20
System (\$69 Billion)	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 on the funding, such as through MTC Resolution 4035 for Cycle 2., which governs OBAG.

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 is designed to 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 jurisdictions 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 utilizing project selection criteria to incentivize PDA growth and affordable housing production.

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 and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee to review and vet projects and programs. The PDA Investment and Growth Strategy was presented to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on March 21, 2013. It was then presented to the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) on March 25, 2013 so that each of these committees would have an opportunity to review and comment on the initial draft. The document will also be presented to the TAC and CMEQ one more time during the month of April before it comes back to the Board for review and approval on May 9th.

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.

Appendix A - San Mateo County Housing Policies and Production

	Housing Production - Current RHNA Cycle (2007-2014)								Hou	sing Polic	les			LASS STREET	
urisdiction and PDA Name	Units Permitted (Year)	Very Low	Low Mo	Above derate Moderate	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	Developmen Readiness
			A	section and an and	The Marshard	tore states	The states	Real Provide Street				RICE	THE REAL	1.5.1	
therton	2007	1 0	0	0 1	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	2007			0 0	1	1.3.7.8	i func	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		1					
	2008			0 -4	-11		1		1						
	2008			0 -4	-4										
	2010			0 -2	3	1	1								1
	2012			0 0	7										
	2012	1			Definition of the later	Contractory of	Contract of	Carl Street and Street			STATISTICS.	1. 2. 4	100	1982910	1853 L
Belmont	2007		0	0 2		Yes - 15%	Yes	No	No	No	1	No	No		
Villages of Belmont	2008	-	0	1 5		739653 (0386577)	1000	2007		.0					
	2008		0	2 4											1
	200			2 3		1									1
	2011			0 1		1									1
	201			0 0							1				
	2012	4 1			100 C 100 C 100 C	a second and	and the second	Charles and with the	and the second	A. DRE	Status and	1.0.00000112	105-20-10		Billson (Heth
Brisbane San Fancisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	Contraction of the			3 11	1 in 2012	Yes, BMC	Yes.	n/a	In/a	n/a	Ordinances to	Yes, BMC	Yes.	Brisbane	
San Fancisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	2007		0		Lit Bildberg Aber	Chapter 17.3		1000			protect	Chapter 17.30.	Through develop ment agreem ent.	has	
	. 2008		0	0 2	4	C. 1000000000000000000000000000000000000					tenants in			p ordinances allowing for: n density bonuses; transferable	
	200		0		1	1	1				apartment to condominium conversions				1
	2010	_	0 0			1									
	201	-	0 0	0 1	-						and mobile				
	201	2 0	0 0	0	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	No. or Contractor		August Services		0.10217-0	1000	Color ANS		100.00	W TRAIL
Burlingame					70	4+ units, 10-	In/a	n/a	In/a	n/a	in/a	n/a	n/a	Density	
Burlingame El Camino Real	200		0 0	1 6	70	25%, very low, low, moderate				Transco.	, 121 m 1		in the second	bonus, flexible design standards,	
	200	-	0 0	1 4											
	200		0 0	0 6								1			
	201	_	0 0	6 49	-							1	1	reduced	
	201		0 0	0 0	-			4						parking	6
	201	2	0 0	0 3	the state of the state	Contraction of the local division of the loc	de .	Constant and a	Sec. 15-100	0.000		they want to be	10 200		100
Colma	11				12101.20082	5+ units, 20%	In/a	n/a	In/a	In/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Clustering	
	200		0 0	0 2	4	very low, low				1.0Ve5.7	1000			of IH units	1
	200	-	0 0	0 0	-	moderate				1				1	
	200	_	0 0	0 0	-					1					
	201		0 0		4			1				1			
	201	_	0 0		1										
	201	z	0 0	0 0	2	L				_					

4/8 0 333 15 lbw, 15 wey 145 ⁺ tenths, low, 10 ⁺ 10 ⁻	Valy uny								I	ĺ				
70000 0 0 1 Monodentin, monodentin, 2011 1 Monodentin, 2011 1 1 Monodentin, 2011 1 Monodentin, 2011 1 1 Monodentin, 2011	Bayshore			0	335: 1	8 low, 18 very lo	5+ units, low, n/a	Yes	n/a	va n/a	n/a	e/u	Parking	
2010 1 2 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Mission Blvd. (CoC)			0	11		moderate,						for low	
2010 19 10 41 100 41 2011 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <		2009	2	0	6		above-						income	
2011 5 6 2013 0 7 0 2014 1 2 1 2014 0 7 0 7 0 2010 0 0 7 0 0 7 0 2010 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				10	4		uponel ate			-			family and	
2011 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				5	9							_	senior	
2001 0 7 Ves		2012		2	-					-	-	-	housing	
2001 0 7 0 7 Ves Ves <	East Palo Alto	Set The Later and	11 1000	122	U.Namilab	CONTRACTOR OF	Note Street William	V VOTATION OF AN		North Control				Distant of
2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Ravenswood (CoC)			2	0		Yes	Yes		res	Yes	Yes	Density Bonie/Seco	
2006 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				-	2								nd Unit	
2010 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				0	0								Ordinance/	
2011 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				0	0								Emergency	
2012 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				0	0								Shelter	
3007 0 0 0 000 mpont Collay La Policy La				0	0			_		-		-	Ordinance/	
2007 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Easter Ottu	A No HOM PERSON	1000	The state of	1000	The State of the				College Street	States of the second	J.F. Contraction	M. C. S.	
2010 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Losier City			c	c		20% required	Homeowner	Г	policy to			Density	
2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1			0			on specified	rehabilitation	-	work			bonuses in	
Corritor 6 Corr				5			pousing	foan program,	_	with non-		-	accordance	
2010 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				0			projects	BMR resale	organizatio	profit			with State	
2011 15 240 through intendiation intendit				0	0		(negotiated	controls, home	ns for	organiza			law, design	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				20	240		through	sharing	rental	tions for			flexibility.	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				0	0		Development			rental	-		bermit	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Half Moon Bay													
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				0	21	21	10+units/lots,							
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				0	18	18	ZU-Z5%, Very							
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		2009					moderate							
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		2010												
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		2011												
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		11		0	9	83	-	_		-	-	-		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Hillshoronah			and a set	Survey by	の日本になるの		2 2 41C6 - 1 1 1 1 1	Number of States	CUPAPING ST	II Roll II		ALCOUNT OF	
2008 8 3 1 2010 10 4 12 2011 9 5 10 2012 0 0 12 2013 0 12 2014 9 5 10 2012 0 18 98 2014 0 18 98 2015 0 16 10-15%, very low, low, low, low, low, low, low, low,					15			n/a				n/a	Density	
2010 14 8 6 2011 9 5 10 2012 10 4 12 2012 0 18 98 2012 0 18 98 2013 0 16 1 2014 1 10 1 2012 1 10 1 2013 0 0 18 88 lots visue visue visue 10.15%, very low, low, low, low, low, low, low, low,					-								emergency	
2010 10 4 12 2011 9 5 10 2012 1 5 10 2012 0 18 98 2013 0 18 98 2014 0 18 98 2017 0 0 18 98 2018 0 0 10 10 2019 1 10 10 10 2011 1 14 142 Mone tate 2012 1 1 142 None post City holds None post 2013 0 0 0 147 142 None post Infa Infa 2003 0 0 0 142 None post City holds None post Infa Infa 2003 0 0 0 0 142 None post Infa Infa	L				9								shelter	
2011 9 5 10 2012 0 18 98 2012 0 0 18 98 2007 0 0 18 98 2007 0 0 5+ units/1+ Iois, 10-15%, very low, low, low, low, low, low, low, low,					12								zoning,	
2012 0 18 98 2007 0 0 18 98 2007 0 0 5+ units/1+ 2008 0 0 5 2009 0 5 73 2010 1 1 2011 1 1 2012 1 1 2013 1 1 2014 1 1 2015 1 1 2014 1 1 2015 1 1 2014 1 1 2015 1 1 2016 1 1 2017 1 1 2018 0 0 1 1 2008 0 0 1 1					10								contribution	
2007 0 18 98 5+ units/1+ 2008 0 5 73 lots, 10-15%, very 1		2012					_			-		-	s to nousing	1000 1 1 1 1 1
2007 0 18 88 5+ units/1+ 2008 0 5 73 lots, 10-15%, lots, 10	Menio Park	日に「愛知」ころ		State and		N. S. CAL	Salary Salary		DU VII - S			-	Doneito	
2008 0 5 73 vois, 10-13-%, very low, low, 2010 very low, low, 2011 very low, low, 2012 very low, low, 142 very low, low, moderate very low, moderate very low, low, moderate very low, low, moderate very low, low, moderate very low, moderate very low, moderate very low, moderate very low, moderate very low, moderate very low, low, low, low, moderate very low, low, low, low, low, moderate very low, low, low, low, low, low, low, low, low,	El Camino Real Corridor & Downtown			18	88		5+ units/1+						bonus,	
2009 1 moderate 2010 0 0 0 2011 1 0 0 2012 1 142 None post 1/1 2013 0 0 147 142 None post 1/1 2009 0 0 0 1/2 Redevelopme 1/1 1/1 2009 0 0 0 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2				2	73		iots, 10-15%,					_	flexible	
2010 1 1 2011 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0<	1	2009					moderate						design	
2011 1 2013 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 </td <td></td> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>standards</td> <td></td>		2010											standards	
2012 1 147 142 None post In/a In/a In/a 2007 0 0 0 147 142 None post In/a In/a 2008 0 0 0 12 Redevelopme Redevelopment		2011												
2007 0 0 147 142 None post City holds None post In/a		2012										1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	and the second	A Second Second
2007 0 0 147 142 None post City holds None post Nua	Milibrae	Constant and	Contraction of the	and they are	C ADD	10 B/2 CIL:		CC CUTUP CON	in the second second		2010	e/u	Density	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
2008 0 0 0 4 Redevelopme purchase Redevelopment	Transit Station Area			0	147	142		holds None post	<i>u/a</i>			2	bonus.	
			Ľ.	0	4		Dadavelopme purc	hase Redevelopmen					Housing	
		2009 0	1	0	12		A hu		-	-0	-		Eund	

	2010	0	o	ol	18		P ^m	u uy	1 0		í i	1	ř.	1	1 MIN	
	2010	0	0	ol	7			former RDA								
	2012	0	0	0	- 1			designate								
ha - 10	2012	-	-		Co. Caller I. Co.		ALC: NO.	uesignate	A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER	1	-	Charles and the		COLUMN T	ava.cets.	
acifica			_	1312083 440	100 C 100	1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.	8+ units, 15%,	In/a	n/a	In/a	In/a	Mobile Home	Condo	In/a	Density	10 0000
	1 1	- 1					very low, low,	10.4	i u ci	140	i wa	Parks	Conversion		Bonus,	
	1 1						moderate					Ordinance -	Ordinance:		second	
												restrictions on			units,	
	2007	0	0	6	95							converting			parking	
	2008	0	1	4	13		1					mobile home				
	2009	0	0	0	20		1					parks to other uses				
	2010	0	0	0	7							uses				
	2011	0	0	0	3											
	2012	0	0	0	7											
Portola Valley	1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1	1234	kas i es	1111 1112				1.310	「目的」、対応の	医加里尔				945 2 E [Barris .	131611
	2007	0	0	0	7		1+ lots, 15%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Density	
	2008	2	0	0	8										bonus, second	
	2009 1	n/a i	n/a n/	a n/a	3						1				units,	
	2010	4	1	1	2						1				housing at	
	2011	2	0	1	2						1			1	institutions	
	2012										-					
Redwood City	10 DAY SALES	122	0.000	S. 32 8 10		1		10 To 312 -	NAL BOATSCOTT	S 8 2 10 7	158 8			and a second second	Server Trees	
Downtown	2007	60	0	3	3	66	n/a	Yes &	Yes. City Used	Yes. City	n/a	City has strict	Yes. City has	Afford.		Downtown Precis
Broadway/Veterans Blvd. Corridor	2008	0	0	9	19	28		City has	Home Imp.	provides		Condo Conver, standards, Mobile Home	strict Condo Conver-sion Ord.	Hsg- Exempt from Park	obtained Affordable	Plan & seven (7) Mixed Use
	2009	8	1	5	9	23		taken on RDA	Loan Pgrm, CDBG, RDA-set	funding to Legal Aid	1				Hsg thru: Density	Corridor (MUC)
	2010	0	0	14	107	121		Housing	aside & Home	to support						rezonings have
	2011	0	55	5	97	157		Function	funds	program		Ord., Hsg		fees.	Bonuses,	made Redwood
	2012	14	26	35	709	784		071025-5395				Rehab		City	Precise	City develop-me
San Bruno	TOTSC.W	100		Seattle Dr	2000 C 11 C	C Case Dies of	3.500 50 50.00	성상 태도	SIVA ST	e Manife	THE P	4.2 5.00	and sur star		1997 - La	1925
Transit Corridors (CoC)	2007	0	0	0	50	350	10+ units,	City	Redevelopment		City's	HE Program.	HE Program.		Density	
El Camino Real	2008	3	145	127	86		15%, low,	would	Housing	about this.	BMR	Permit fee	Ensure	a Parks Facilitie		
	2009	0	0	0	24		moderate	consider if suitable	Redevelopment Program ended		related	al rehabilitation	affordable ownership choices provided in condominium	s impac fee, No other	ct reduce parking requirement	
	2010	0	0	0	-38			opportuni		discuss	to rental projects					
	2011	0	154	154	15			ty arises	of RDA. City	with City						
	2012	_			16			And Alexandria	relies on County	Attorney.	in doubt					
San Carlos	STATES THE	1524	1211	of applying the				8			16	10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ा ् अत् व	27301	1. S.	
Railroad Corridor	2007	2	6	13	94	90	7+ units, res		-				yes, requires	Afforda	Density	
	2008	2	0	0	9		ownership:						compliance	ble	bonus,	
	2009	1	0	0	1		15% to low &			1			with inclusionary	Impact	modified developmen	
	2010	4	0	0	2		Mod; res ownership						housing ORD		t standards;	
	2011	1	1	0	3		allowed to			1			0.000	res	flexible	
	2012	1	0	0	1		request in lieu	r						rental	parking &	
San Mateo City		175	1000	TO THE R	10.575	Service Service	1 - 1	NAT SHARE	and the second second		1999 L 19		1		A Carlo	CRASH STATES
Downtown (CoC)	2007	0	19	11	13		11+ units/lots,		CDBG funded				Yes		Density	
El Camino Real	2008	16	1	7	13		Rental projects:		free minor home repair, acessibility						bonus, flexible	
Rail Corridor	2009	53	14	2	24		10% very low o 15% low.		improvements,						design	
															standards,	

F	2011		0	3	24		units 10% low or 15%		program for very low income	1	I I	1	1	public funding for
San Mateo County	2012		_				moderate,		households.					extremely
		1		C					n ouveringe of the		Sales States			
EL Camino Real - North Fair Oaks (CoC)	2007	0	2	6	82	3	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Density
El Carnino Real - Uninc. Colma	2008	0	1	3	60								1	bonus
	2009	0	5	2	46								1	program;
	2010	0	4	1	68								1	various
Γ	2011	0	7	4	46									housing
	2012		0	2	34								1	funding including
South San Francisco		1000		The second		CA DEDRICT STOP	17.428.00 K	Realiz	Contraction of the second	A.0.22		And the second s	<u> </u>	Including
Downtown(CoC)	2007	5	11	4	91	13 Very Low, 1 non-r	4+ units, 20%	e.	Per Federal CDBG Program	n		only allows	T	Density
	2008	0	0	0	5		low, moderate					conversion		bonus,
	2009	_	0	0	0							when	1	subsidies,
	2010		0	0								multifamily housing in City has	1	second
F	2011		0	0	-								1	units
				0									1	
110-3-110	2012		.0	U	0					L		vacancy rate	1	
Woodside		-	1	20131		12 12 1 - A -	1000	1.00				TEL BENCH 200	STA	
	2007	0	0	0	11									
	2008	1	1	1	5									1 1
	2009													1 1
	2010													
	2011							1						
	2012												1	

City	PDA Name	Place Type	Community of Concern	Planning status	ABAG Net	PDA FOCUS	2010 Jobs	2013 Jobs	2040 SCS	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
therton										100 010000		• mile	ering.	Units	aroman	
					-	10.363		1				1			-	
Selmont Selmont	Villages of Belmont C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor Mixed-Use Corridor		Potential	54 274		1,260		2,510	1,260		920	-	1,830	910	
semen	CAG - El Camilio Real	Mixed-Ose Corridor	and the second second	Planned	2/4				-				-		1.	
Brisbane	San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	Suburban Center		Planned	574	7,326	550		1,100	540	1,574	0		a	0	Visitacion Valley / Schlage Lock Master Plan Executive Park Subarea Plan Brisbane Baylands Plan
Burlingame	Burningame El Camino Real (includes C/CAG ECR)	Transit Town Center		Planned	768		12,480		18,460	5,980		7,610		10,870	3,260	
		Margaret M. Margaret							1		1.2.1.2.1		_		5	The second second second
Colma	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	290		2,130		2,410	280		560	2 20	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, 200 Geneva Aveue Urban Design Plan, 2001 Geneva Avenue Streetscape Masterplan, 2002
only only	ouyande	Tranait Town Center		Fotenadi	325	1,070	1,110	-	3,000	6,400				4,000	-	Colma BART Station Specific Plan
Daly City	Mission Blvd.	Mixed-Use Corridar	Bayshore (CoC)	Potential	142	N/A	3,790		5,240	1,450	N/A	2.270		3,310	1,050	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	delanore (dela	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	D	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 Ba Road Phase II (2009) Market Demand Analysis for the Ravenswood Business District (2009)
Foster City																
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						ize in s				2.1	100.000					
Half Moon Bay	ज													I	-	
Hillsborough	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR A CONTR					-	-	-			1.0	101	-		-	
Hillsborougn		Commenter de la comme	and the second sec	NULL GYC		10110			1.1.			1		-	10000	
Menio 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 Planni Process
Menio Park	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Carridor		Potential	321	L	5,540		7,540	2,000		2,850		3,850	1,000	and the second second second
	A Contract of the second s	a second s			-			_	STT.					1		Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan, 1998
Milibrae	Transit Station Area	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	83	4,000	1,350		3,400	2,050	105	280		2,710	2,420	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	the second se
Pacifica	A CONTRACTOR OF	STREET, STREET			10.00	-					-	11. m. m. 1. M.		-	1	
Pacifica		In the second of	15 W-15		1.1.1	1.5.1			in the second		1000	12.0.13				2 2 2 1 1 2 2
Portola Velley																
Redwood City	Dewntown	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	
Neuwoou ony		Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	470		7,390		9,710	2.320		4,820		7,020	2.210	

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

7 Appendix B - Summary of 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	2013 Jobs 3	2040 SCS Jobs ²	Job Growth	PDA FOCUS Housing Units ⁴	2010 Housing Units	2013 Housing Units ⁸	2040 SCS Housing Units ²	Housing Unit Growth	Efforts to date (includes planning , design, and/ or construction ³
			South San Francisco/ San Bruno	Detected		10 000	6,750		10.710	3,960	4.00	4.330		7,660		Transit Corridors Planning process San Bruno Redevelopment Plan (1999) Cathrain Station Area Design General Plan Update Nawy Site Specific Plan (2001) Nawy Site Specific Plan (2001) EIR
Sen Bruno	Transit Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	1000	Potential	495	10,000	7,320		and the second s		4,460	4,330			3,330	Wavy Site Specific Plan (2001) Elk
San Bruno	G/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	498		7,320		10,480	3,160		4,350		6,930	2,580	and the second sec
	Railroad Corridor C/CAG - El Camino Real	Transit Town Center Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	4 <u>5</u> 516	N/A	10,260		12,650	2,390	N/A	3,570		4,730		Eastside Specific Plan EIR for Eastside Specific Plan Westalde Specific Plan Grand Boulevard Initiative General Plan update 2009
		manue ore common						100		1000			1			
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 Gity	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. ER 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 th area
San Mateo City	C/CAG - El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	1,003	1	17,220		29,300	12,080		13,180		20,360	7,180	
								1000				1		200		a second s
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 - Uninc. Colma	Mixed-Use Corridor		Planned	41	<u> </u>	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	O	2,670		6,920	4,250	D	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	
				and the second second			100	1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.							-	

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

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

1.1

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.bayareavision.org/pda/san-mateo-county/)

-39-



Congress of the United States House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Anna G. Eshoo Fourteenth District California

March 27, 2013

Mr. Bob Grassilli, Chair City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County 555 County Center Fifth Floor Redwood City, California 94063

Dear Mr. Grassilli,

Last week Congress passed a Continuing Resolution to fund the government through September 30, 2013. Beginning in April, Congress will commence its annual appropriations process for Fiscal Year 2014.

In previous years, as part of the appropriations process, I've invited public entities and community nonprofits to submit worthy projects in our Congressional District for my review. However, there continues to be a ban on Member-requested projects, commonly called "earmarks."

l care a great deal about ensuring that worthy projects in my District receive the federal support and attention they deserve. While current budget constraints necessitate difficult budget choices, l remain committed to assisting you in every way l can. If you apply for a grant or need help with a federal agency, my staff will work with you to identify the best possible way to position your project for funding, or help you look for alternative funding options. You can also find more information on my website.

Should you have any questions or comments, you can contact Karen Chapman in my Palo Alto office at (650) 323-2984 or Geoffrey Browning in my D.C. office at (202) 225-8104.

All my best,

Member of Congress

ITEM 9.1