

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION MANAGEMENT
AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF JUNE 30, 2003**

At 3:07 p.m. Vice-Chair Sue Lempert called the meeting to order in Conference Room C of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: Duane Bay, Jim Bigelow, Tom Davids, Mary Janney, Linda Larson, Sue Lempert, Karyl Matsumoto, and Onnolee Trapp.

Staff/Guests Attending: Walter Martone, Sandy Wong, and Geoff Kline(C/CAG Staff - County Public Works), Christine Maley-Grubl (Alliance), Sylvia Gregory and Jim Kelly (Bay Rail Alliance), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Garrett Dunwoody and Mark Duino (C/CAG Staff – County Planning), Joseph Hurley (San Mateo County Transportation Authority).

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

Jim Kelly made the following comments:

- The Committee should occasionally restate its mission. It appears that a number of the recent agenda items are unrelated to congestion and/or air quality.
- The Committee should look into the fact that BART has become an important source of added traffic and air pollution.
- The Committee should look into the Bay Meadows development and the traffic being generated there.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of April 28, 2003 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes as presented. Bay/Matsumoto, unanimous.

3. Update on legislation.

After discussion about the benefits of considering the safety of road workers in establishing speed limits, the Committee agreed to go on record in support of AB 872.

Motion: To recommend that the C/CAG Board take a “support” position on AB 872. Bigelow/Janney, unanimous.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Measure A status report.

Joseph Hurley provided a power point presentation on the status of the reauthorization effort. A

copy of the presentation is on file at the C/CAG Offices. The presentation primarily addressed the results from the focus groups. A summary of the major points include:

- In 1988 when the Measure A program was first approved only 47% of the registered voters went to the polls. Of that number 25% did not vote on the Measure.
- There were six focus groups with 67 participants and also a phone survey of frequent voters.
- The Transportation Authority and the Measure A program is generally not well known.
- The source of funding for transportation projects is not well known.
- Voters felt left out of the process in the selection of projects for funding.
- The voters like the ability of Measure A to leverage other funding and to provide stability for transportation funding. They liked having assurance that the funds would only be used for transportation projects.
- Individuals wanted projects that provided benefits that touched them personally and benefited their community.
- Once the voters were educated about the Measure A program, they supported the efforts of the Transportation Authority.
- Individuals loved the grade separation projects.
- They wanted specifics on how the local share (20%) funds were spent.
- They supported CalTrain and wanted more spent to improve service further.
- They supported the highway projects that have been completed.
- They wanted more money spent on paratransit.
- They were not familiar with the purpose of Transportation System Management programs.
- They generally don't trust elected officials.
- They generally trust experts.
- If they had to choose between trusting the experts or their own city council, they trust the council.
- They support situations where the experts and the elected officials are in agreement.

4. Housing program opportunities.

Mark Duino reported on a new proposal to define the role of C/CAG in a countywide housing opportunity program. This new program will hopefully qualify C/CAG to receive outside funding. The description of the program and the comments by the CMAQ members are as follows:

1. Gaining local control over ABAG's regional housing needs allocation process.
 - a. Under this proposal ABAG would provide C/CAG with a countywide total and C/CAG would develop the city and county suballocations.
 - b. How does this program tie in with the Housing Endowment Fund?
 - c. Why are we advocating the building of more housing for upper income individuals (who already have housing) and not more for the lower income (who need housing)?
 - d. The total required number of housing units for San Mateo County would remain the same. C/CAG would have the ability to make adjustments between jurisdictions.
 - e. Concern was expressed about one city paying another city to build housing and

thereby being excluded from the housing requirement. This could make the jobs/housing imbalance worse.

- f. Will there be winners and losers? There will be more local control to reflect the numbers that make sense for each jurisdiction.
 - g. This proposal will build housing in the poorer communities and let the richer communities off the hook from having to build affordable housing.
 - h. It seems optimistic to try to adopt this program by 2006.
 - i. Getting the city and county planners together to work on housing issues is a positive outcome of this project.
 - j. Individuals would be in favor of C/CAG playing a role in facilitating the building of projects where the jurisdictions are in agreement.
 - k. There is merit in having C/CAG as a vehicle to bring a reality check to the ABAG numbers process.
 - l. C/CAG should do a trend analysis to see where the County as a whole has been going with meeting the housing numbers.
 - m. Cost is a major factor that needs to be considered.
2. Coordinated housing element development.
 - a. There needs to be some standardization in procedures and reporting so that we can save time and money.
 - b. The census data shows who is living here now. It does not project the expected influx of individuals over the next few years.
 - c. There should be an incentive program to get landlords to rent at below market rate to people commuting long distances to low wage jobs.
 - d. Some of this work may be a duplication of what some cities are already doing.
 - e. Moving to the proposed plan will create new costs for C/CAG. The five largest entitlement cities are already doing this. They would now be asked to pay C/CAG to do it.
3. Housing impact fee.
 - a. It is hard to compete for business when we charge more fees and other communities are offering incentives for businesses.
 - b. This is already being done in a number of communities.
 - c. Other groups (such as childcare, open space, the arts, etc.) are also asking for development fees.
 - d. If fees are going to be collected, the money should be used in the city where it was generated.
 - e. By making this a countywide fee, it would take the city off the hook from having to respond to individual fees.
 - f. In Menlo Park the imposition of fees has not deterred development.
 - g. Countywide developers get frustrated with having to deal with different rules for each city.
 - h. Proposals to collect money for low-income housing is not the hard part – getting the low-income housing is much more difficult.
 - i. Consider support for a countywide approach and a nexus study. This would only make sense to have C/CAG involvement if there is a tie to the Transit Oriented Development program. This proposal is more appropriate to be done by the new Housing Trust Fund.
 - j. The Transportation Authority has money for corridor improvements. Consider

- working with them to develop a pilot project along a transportation corridor.
- k. Is C/CAG losing its focus? What does this proposal have to do with congestion management? Should C/CAG redefine its mission?
 - l. Some cities are already doing everything that has been asked of them – and now we want them to give up money to a countywide effort, when that money could be used for local programs.
 - m. This program may be too broad. It takes in all housing and does not focus on transit oriented development, low-income housing, worker housing, etc.
4. Inclusionary housing ordinances.
 - a. The list provided in the handout does not reflect city policy or practice. It only shows where a city has adopted a specific ordinance. It was suggested that staff research more thoroughly what is happening in other cities.
 5. Public comments.
 - a. It was suggested that the cities and the county get together on the requirements for builders. They should try to reduce the requirements and the cost so that it will be more affordable to build affordable housing. For example they may want to consider reducing the parking requirements. Limits should be put on accommodations for the automobile in favor of making better use of the land. There also needs to be greater support for public transit so that individuals have better travel options.
 6. Next steps.
 - a. There will be more meetings with the city planners and dialogue with other interested parties. This item will then come back to CMAQ for further review in the fall before it is considered by C/CAG.

6. Adjournment.

At 5:00 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.