

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*

1:15 p.m., Thursday, April 20, 2017
San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd Floor Auditorium
San Carlos, California

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes). | Porter/Hurley | No materials |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None | Hoang | No materials |
| 3. Approval of the minutes from March 16, 2017 | Hoang | Page 1-2 |
| 4. Local Street and Road Regional Initiatives and Work Plan Outreach (Information) | Romell (MTC) | Page 3-4 |
| 5. Review and recommend approval of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Local Street and Roads Rehabilitation Program and Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) list of projects and augmentation of planning funds for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). (Action) | Higaki | Page 5-11 |
| 6. Review and recommend approval of the updated San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy (Action) | Wong | Page 12-77 |
| 7. Review and comment on the candidate project list for Regional Measure 3 funding (Action) | Wong | Page 78-86 |
| 8. Regional Project and Funding Information (Information) | Lacap | Page 87-93 |
| 9. Executive Director Report | Wong | No materials |
| 10. Member Reports | All | |

¹ For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 260, 295, 390, 391, KX or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

| 2017 TAC Roster and Attendance | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| No. | Member | Agency | Jan | Feb | Mar |
| 1 | Jim Porter (Co-Chair) | San Mateo County Engineering | x | x | x |
| 2 | Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair) | SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain | x | x | x |
| 3 | Afshin Oskoui | Belmont Engineering | x | | x |
| 4 | Randy Breault | Brisbane Engineering | x | x | x |
| 5 | Syed Murtuza | Burlingame Engineering | x | x | x |
| 6 | Bill Meeker | Burlingame Planning | | | |
| 7 | Sandy Wong | C/CAG | x | x | x |
| 8 | Brad Donohue | Colma Engineering | x | x | |
| 9 | John Fuller | Daly City Engineering | x | x | x |
| 10 | Tatum Mothershead | Daly City Planning | x | x | x |
| 11 | Jeff Moneda | Foster City Engineering | x | x | x |
| 12 | Paul Willis | Hillsborough Engineering | x | x | x |
| 13 | Ray Razavi | Half Moon Bay | n/a | x | x |
| 14 | Justin Murphy | Menlo Park Engineering | x | x | x |
| 15 | Ray Chan | Millbrae Engineering | | x | |
| 16 | Van Ocampo | Pacifica Engineering | x | x | x |
| 17 | Jessica Manzi | Redwood City Engineering | | x | x |
| 18 | Jimmy Tan | San Bruno Engineering | | x | x |
| 19 | Jay Walter | San Carlos Engineering | x | x | x |
| 20 | Brad Underwood | San Mateo Engineering | | x | x |
| 21 | Eunejune Kim | South San Francisco Engineering | n/a | n/a | x |
| 22 | Billy Gross | South San Francisco Planning | x | x | x |
| 23 | Sean Rose | Woodside Engineering | x | x | x |
| 24 | vacant | MTC | | | |
| 25 | vacant | Caltrans | | | |

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP) TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

March 16, 2017
MINUTES

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd Floor Auditorium, San Carlos, CA. Vice Chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:19 p.m. on Thursday, March 16, 2017.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Jean Higaki, John Hoang, Eliza Yu (C/CAG); Dave Bishop – Colma, Khee Lim – Millbrae, and other attendees not signed in.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meeting.

As indicated on the Agenda.

3. Approval of the Minutes from February 16, 2017.

Approved.

4. Receive OBAG 2 funding update

Jean Higaki provided information that the C/CAG Board, on March 9th, approved the OBAG 2 TLC (Transportation for Livable Communities) and BPIP (Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program) list of projects. There is approximately \$800,000 of undersubscribed funds that remains to be programmed.

The TAC recommended that staff consider programming the remaining funds to the LS&R program. Staff plans to review options and bring back a recommendation to the TAC at a future meeting.

5. Receive a list of “next steps” items post-adoption of the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (SMCTP 2040)

John Hoang provided an overview of action items to be undertaken by C/CAG staff as follow up activities to the SMCTP 2040 to address recommendations by the C/CAG Board, committees, stakeholders, and interested parties.

6. Review and recommend approval of partnership with Scoop for rideshare services in San Mateo County

John Hoang presented a proposal to enter into agreement with Scoop to provide carpool services in San Mateo County.

The TAC recommended that C/CAG go through a Request for Proposal process.

7. Regional Project and Funding Information

Eliza Yu presented on the status of inactive project and project delivery; information on HPMS requirements, TDA Art. 3 timeline and PMP certification status.

8. Executive Director Report

None

9. Member Reports

Member announced that Redwood City is hosting a talk on March 30th about transitions in CEQA from auto LOS to VMT for identifying transportation related impacts. Details will be e-mailed to the TAC. Staff requested that members notify staff if they do not wish to receive a hard copy of the meeting packet.

Meeting adjourned.



Memorandum

TO: Public Works Staff

DATE: April 12, 2017

FR: Theresa Romell, Sui Tan

RE: Local Streets and Roads Regional Initiatives and Work Plan Outreach

MTC's Regional Streets and Roads Program (RSRP) staff are conducting outreach to local agency public works staff in each of the region's nine counties, in an attempt to solicit input on desired regional initiatives and/or focus areas for future efforts related to local street and roads.

Background

MTC's RSRP has been working over the last several decades to assist local agencies in improving the state of repair of local streets and roads through the ongoing develop and support of pavement management tools like StreetSaver and the Pavement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP), as well as funding advocacy and policy development at the local, regional and state levels.

MTC's RSRP also facilitates meetings of the Local Streets and Roads Working Group (LSRWG), a technical advisory body of the Bay Area Partnership, comprised of public works staff from around the region. The LSRWG typically meets monthly to discuss issues relevant to local streets and roads.

The LSRWG mission is *"to advocate on behalf of the local agencies within MTC's nine-county region for levels of regional, State and federal funding for maintenance and rehabilitation of local streets and roads sufficient to achieve a state of good repair, while recognizing similar funding needs for other modes of travel. The LSRWG promotes the most efficient use of funds through collaboration and coordination among agencies, the use of highly effective products, materials and application methods, and the use of systematic inventories and condition evaluations"*.

A sampling of the benefits that the LSRWG has achieved for local cities and counties include:

- Better representation of cities and counties on the regional policy advisory board – The LSRWG lobbied for and was granted four seats for public works directors on the Bay Area Partnership Board
- Parity with other regional transportation plan (RTP) investments – LSRWG participants were part of a regional task force convened to ensure that regional investments in local streets and roads were on par with investments in transit capital and expansion projects

- Improved needs assessments – The LSRWG worked with MTC staff to improve the accuracy and detail of maintenance needs assessments for local streets and roads and used the results to demonstrate the need for better funding
- Improved allocation policies – The LSRWG:
 - Worked with MTC staff to shift from a shortfall-based allocation of regional funding to one that incorporates other factors such as population, mileage, and performance
 - Successfully lobbied to eliminate the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS)—a limited, designated subset of “regionally significant” roadways—that was the sole roadway system eligible for federal funding
- PTAP preservation – the LSRWG lobbied to maintain this regional program and increase funding for it
- Overall increased regional investment in local streets and roads – Total RTP investments grew from \$143 million over the 2001 RTP period, to \$10 *billion* in the 2013 RTP (Plan Bay Area)

Future Focus Needed

Participation at the working group meetings has waned over the last several years, making it difficult for MTC staff to gauge the needs of local jurisdictions as they relate to local streets and roads. In response, RSRP staff is conducting outreach to local agency public works staff in each of the region’s nine counties in an attempt to solicit input on desired regional initiatives and/or focus areas. Common themes that develop through this effort will form the basis of the LSRWG work plan. Initiatives sought are regional in nature and should be geared towards improving the overall functionality and state of repair of the region’s local street and road network. Specific project delivery issues or concerns are not the focus of this effort. While important, these concerns are best raised with MTC staff that specialize in federally funded programs.

Items in the Work Plan should ideally come from local agencies, and should support the goals described in the LSRWG’s mission statement.

Some broad focus areas may include, but are not limited to:

- Ways to capitalize on increased funding from the Road Rehabilitation and Accountability Act of 2017;
 - Improved efficiencies through technology and/or materials procurement
 - Regional incentive programs
- Examination of funding policies;
- Asset management data enhancement and coordination;
- Funding advocacy

MTC staff are looking forward to your ideas on how the RSRP in partnership with local agencies can best work towards the benefit of local streets and roads in the region.

If you would like to provide input outside of the meeting, please email me us at tromell@mtc.ca.gov or stan@mtc.ca.gov.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 20, 2017

To: C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC)

From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Local Street and Roads Rehabilitation Program and Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) list of projects and augmentation of planning funds for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

(For further information or questions, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMP TAC review recommend approval of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Local Street and Roads Rehabilitation Program and Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) list of projects and augmentation of planning funds for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

FISCAL IMPACT

No Direct fiscal impact to C/CAG other than staff time. Upon C/CAG and MTC approval, OBAG funds will be allocated to project sponsors directly.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal funds are allocated by MTC via OBAG 2 include Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds.

BACKGROUND

On November 18, 2015, MTC and ABAG adopted Resolution 4202 outlining and approving the OBAG 2 Grant Program. OBAG 2 is composed of two fund sources, Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and covers (five years) FY 2017/18 through FY 2021/22. On May 12, 2016 the C/CAG Board adopted the funding Framework for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) in San Mateo County.

Subsequent to the C/CAG Board's adoption of the framework MTC revised Resolution 4202, in the summer of 2016, to add funds from the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and to add anti-displacement requirements. The C/CAG Board adopted a revised framework on August 11, 2016 which revised the allocation of LSR funds as shown in Attachment 1. The C/CAG Board also directed \$892,000 to the County Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) per state statute. California statute provides minimum levels to counties for the maintenance of rural county roads under the FAS program.

On March 9, 2017 the C/CAG Board approved the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP) list of projects for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Approximately \$807,000 remains after funding all eligible TLC and BPIP projects.

At the February 16, 2017 CMP TAC meeting, the CMP TAC expressed a desire to have an opportunity to provide further input if the resulting total left over funding from both the TLC and BPIP is greater than \$1,000,000. At the February 27, 2017 CMEQ meeting, the CMEQ also recommended that the Board direct undersubscribed funds towards the Local Streets and Roads Rehabilitation Preservation (LS&R) Program. At the March 16, 2017 CMP TAC meeting the CMP TAC requested that staff consider using the unsubscribed funds to augment the Local Streets and Roads program. At this time staff is proposing to direct \$557,000 in remaining funds to augment the LS&R program. The proposed revised allocation is shown in Attachment 1.

Congestion Management Agency (CMA) planning and outreach program provides staff support at the county level for programming, monitoring and outreach activities delegated by MTC to the CMAs. These include but are not limited to additional follow up activities for the Countywide Transportation Plan, countywide development of the Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Community Strategy (RTP/ SCS), development of Priority Development Area (PDA) Growth strategies, Congestion Management Plan (CMP) updates, Countywide Transportation Planning, administration of the MTC Lifeline Program, updating the Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs), developing calls for projects, assistance with the programming and delivery of federal aid projects. Due to the increase in proposed planning activities after the August 11, 2016 adoption of the funding framework, staff is proposing to direct \$250,000 in the remaining funds to augment planning and outreach activities for five fiscal years 2017/2018 through 2021/2022.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed revision to the Local Streets and Roads allocation.
2. Rehabilitation Program list of LSR projects and FAS projects for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

San Mateo C/CAG
OBAG 2 Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program

| CITY / COUNTY | Board Approved Distribution on 8/11/16 (Rounded to 1,000) | Proposed Distribution 5/11/17 (Rounded to 1,000) |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Atherton** | \$240,000 | \$251,000 |
| Belmont | \$446,000 | \$467,000 |
| Brisbane | \$131,000 | \$137,000 |
| Burlingame | \$546,000 | \$571,000 |
| Colma* | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| Daly City | \$1,252,000 | \$1,310,000 |
| East Palo Alto | \$398,000 | \$416,000 |
| Foster City | \$421,000 | \$441,000 |
| Half Moon Bay* | \$193,000 | \$202,000 |
| Hillsborough | \$390,000 | \$408,000 |
| Menlo Park | \$619,000 | \$647,000 |
| Millbrae | \$370,000 | \$387,000 |
| Pacifica | \$641,000 | \$671,000 |
| Portola Valley | \$192,000 | \$201,000 |
| Redwood City | \$1,209,000 | \$1,266,000 |
| San Bruno | \$643,000 | \$673,000 |
| San Carlos | \$550,000 | \$575,000 |
| San Mateo | \$1,522,000 | \$1,593,000 |
| South San Francisco | \$982,000 | \$1,027,000 |
| Woodside | \$231,000 | \$242,000 |
| SM County (Urban) | \$1,024,000 | \$1,072,000 |
| Total | \$12,100,000 | \$12,657,000 |

Increased to minimum allowed grant size of \$100,000.

* Jurisdiction will apply this funding to their BPIP or TLC project

** Jurisdictions under \$250,000 allowed to use funds on TLC or BPIP type projects.

San Mateo C/CAG

OBAG 2 Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program

| CITY / COUNTY | Proposed Distribution 5/11/17 (Rounded to 1,000) | Project Name | Project Location | Description of Work |
|---------------|--|---|---|--|
| Atherton | \$251,000 | 2017/2018 Middlefield Road Class II Bike Lanes | Middlefield Rd from San Mateo County to City of Menlo Park | The Project involves implementation of a number of safety related improvements for bicyclists and vehicles along Middlefield Road between San Mateo County and City of Menlo Park. The anticipated project includes widen bike lane by improving shoulder conditions; re-strip with high-visibility green markings at conflict zones and increased signage/wayfinding. |
| Belmont | \$467,000 | Belmont Pavement Project | Chula Vista (Alameda de las Pulgas-Ralston Avenue); 6th Avenue (Ralston Avenue to Hill Street); Cypress Avenue (Laurel to Middle Road); Daleview (Hiller to Old County Road); Elmer(Ralston to O'Neill); Notre Dame Avenue (Arbor to Miller); Davey Glen Road (El Camino Real to Middle Road); Laurel (Hill to Cypress); Harbor Blvd (Molitar to El Camino Real); Molitar (Harbor Blvd. to San Carlos City Limit) | Project consists of pavement repair and rehabilitation, crack sealing, slurry sealing, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, new access ramps, sidewalk installation and repair, curb and gutter installation and repair, drainage improvements, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |
| Brisbane | \$137,000 | Tunnel Avenue Rehabilitation | from northern city limits (N/O Beatty Ave.) to 1500 ft. south | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, new sharrows, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |
| Burlingame | \$571,000 | 2018 Street Resurfacing Project OBAG LSR | Broadway, Cadillac Way, California Drive, and Trousdale Drive | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, new access ramps, curb and gutter repair, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |
| Colma* | \$100,000 | Mission Road Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements | Mission Road (El Camino Real to the North - Lawndale Boulevard to the South) | The Project involves implementation of a number of safety related improvements for the pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles along Mission Road between El Camino Real and Lawndale Boulevard. The anticipated improvements include relocation and reconstruction of the existing curb, gutter, sidewalk and non-ADA compliant ramps and driveway approaches, addition of new sidewalk to provide continuous safe and accessible pedestrian route, extension of Class II bicycle lanes on northbound direction, construction of bulbouts and high visibility crosswalks with rectangular rapid flashing beacons, installation of energy efficient street lights, and construction of landscape planters for drainage and stormwater treatment purposes. |
| Daly City | \$1,310,000 | 2018/2019 Daly City Pavement Street Resurfacing and Slurry Seal Project | Eastgate Ave. (John Daly Blvd. - Glenwood Dr.); Westmoor Ave. (Baldwin Ave. - Southgate Ave.); Southgate Ave. (St. Francis Blvd. - El Dorado Dr.); South Hill Blvd. (Bellevue Ave. - Alta Vista Way); Junipero Serra Blvd. (John Daly Blvd. - Citrus Ave.); Geneva Ave. (Castillo St. - Schwerin St.) | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, slurry seal, asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, new access ramps, curb and gutter repair, grading, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |

San Mateo C/CAG

OBAG 2 Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program

| CITY / COUNTY | Proposed Distribution 5/11/17 (Rounded to 1,000) | Project Name | Project Location | Description of Work |
|----------------|--|---|--|---|
| East Palo Alto | \$416,000 | Citywide Annual Street Resurfacing Project | West Bayshore Road From 1838 West Bayshore Road To Woodland Avenue Scofield Street From Woodland Avenue To Cooley Avenue Runnymede Street From Cooley Avenue To 433 Ft E/O Cooley Avenue Donohoe Street From Clarke Avenue To Cooley Avenue Runnymede Street From University Avenue To Cooley Avenue Pulgas Avenue From O'connor Street To Gaillardia Way O'connor Street From Euclid Street To Manhattan Avenue Pulgas Avenue From Gaillardia Way To East Bayshore Road University Avenue From Donohoe Street To Freeway 101 Newbridge Street From Ralmar Avenue To Saratoga Avenue Cooley Avenue From University Avenue To Runnymede Street O'connor Street From Tate Street To Pulgas Avenue Woodland Avenue From University Avenue To Cooley Avenue Woodland Avenue From Cooley Avenue To Newell Road | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings. |
| Foster City | \$441,000 | FY2019/20 City of Foster City Pavement Rehabilitation Project | Edgewater Blvd. - NB (Beach Park Blvd. - E. Hillsdale Blvd.); Edgewater Blvd. - SB (E. Hillsdale Blvd. - Regulus St.); E. Hillsdale Blvd. - EB (Marina Bridge - Altair Ave.); E. Hillsdale Blvd - EB & WB (Rainbow Bridge - Gull Ave.) | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, new access ramps, curb and gutter repair, grading, drainage improvements, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |
| Half Moon Bay* | \$202,000 | Poplar Street Complete Streets Project | Poplar Street is an east-west bearing street in central Half Moon Bay. Project begins at Main Street and terminates at Railroad Avenue near California Coastal Trail and designated Poplar Beach Public Access. Poplar Street intersects with 4th Avenue, Highway 1, the Naomi Patridge Bicycle Trail, 3rd Avenue, 2nd Avenue and 1st Avenue. Poplar Street improvements are located within a 60-foot wide Right-of-Way. There is one intersection in Caltrans right-of-way. | This is a new design and construct project for approximately 3,000 lineal feet of Poplar Street in Half Moon Bay. The design will be a "Complete Street" design based on Metropolitan Transportation Commission guidelines. "Complete Street" improvements will include full depth pavement reconstruction, curb and gutter, crosswalk enhancements, sidewalks and bicycle lanes. |
| Hillsborough | \$408,000 | Street Resurfacing Project | Hayne Rd. (Sandra Rd - Black Mountain Rd); Chateau Dr. (Skyline Blvd - Ralston Ave); Ralston Ave. (Chateau Dr - Town Limits) | Project consists of resurfacing and preventative maintenance of various roadways throughout the Town of Hillsborough. Treatment types include localized digout repairs, 2.5" Mill, 2.5" Asphalt Overlay, Microsurfacing, and Crack Sealing. In addition, utility irons will be raised and new striping will be installed on the newly treated roadways. |
| Menlo Park | \$647,000 | 2018-19 Santa Cruz and Middle Avenues Rehabilitation Project | Santa Cruz Avenue between Olive Street and Orange Avenue and Middle Avenue between Olive Street and San Mateo Drive | The project consists of performing base repairs, 2-3 inch deep area grind, 3-inch asphalt overlay, construction of ADA compliant curb ramps, intermittent curb, gutter and sidewalk work, adjusting utility covers to grade, installation of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon on Santa Cruz Avenue at Lemon Street installation of markings and striping and other ancillary road work including upgrade of drainage inlets. |
| Millbrae | \$387,000 | City of Millbrae 2019 Street Rehabilitation | Larkspur Drive (Skyline Boulevard to Helen Drive) Bayview Avenue (Lomita Avenue to Santa Barbara Avenue) Lomita Avenue (Bayview Avenue to Linden Avenue) & Magnolia Avenue (Anita to Park Place) | Pavement Rehabilitation at Various Streets in the City of Millbrae (project is within one mile radius of a PDA boundary, El Camino Real corridor) |
| Pacifica | \$671,000 | FY 2017-18 Pavement Rehabilitation Project | Oceana Boulevard from Milagra Drive to Monterey Road and Linda Mar Boulevard from Adobe Drive to Alicante Drive, Pacifica, CA | The FY 2017-18 Pavement Rehabilitation Project will rehabilitate the pavement along Oceana Boulevard from Milagra Drive to Monterey Road and Linda Mar Boulevard from Adobe Drive to Alicante Drive by placing 2 inches of asphalt overlay. This project will also include pavement grinding for base repair as well as installation of thermoplastic traffic striping, markings, and pavement markers. |

San Mateo C/CAG

OBAG 2 Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program

| CITY / COUNTY | Proposed Distribution 5/11/17 (Rounded to 1,000) | Project Name | Project Location | Description of Work |
|---------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Portola Valley | \$201,000 | 2017/2018 Street resurfacing project | 1. Alpine Road From Arastradero to Town Limits at Ladera 2. Portola Road from Wayside to Westridge Drive 3. Portola Road from Willowbrook to Portola Green Circle 4. Golden Oak Drive from Alpine to Alpine | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, slurry seal, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, and other misc work related to road resurfacing |
| Redwood City | \$1,266,000 | 2017/18 Overlay Project | TWIN DOLPHIN PARKWAY (MARINE PARKWAY- REDWOOD SHORES PARKWAY) | Preventative rehabilitation and pavement maintenance |
| San Bruno | \$673,000 | San Bruno Street Rehabilitation Program | Preventative Maintenance: Huntington Ave. (Florida - Caltrain) Street Rehab: Huntington Ave. (Florida - San Felipe) San Antonio Ave. (San Felipe - Santa Inez) | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, updating curb ramps, and may include: curb and gutter repair, grading, drainage improvements, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work. Project also includes preventative maintenance on a segment of Huntington Avenue. |
| San Carlos | \$575,000 | Cedar and Brittan Ave. Pavement Rehabilitation Project | Cedar Street between San Carlos Ave. and Belmont/ Brittan Ave. between Elm Street and El Camino Real | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, new access ramps, curb and gutter repair, grading, drainage improvements, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |
| San Mateo | \$1,593,000 | 2020 Street Rehabilitation Project | Palm Ave. (16th Ave. - 20th Ave.); Bermuda Dr. (Sullivan St. - Fiesta Dr.); Pacific Blvd (S. Delaware St. - Sterling View Ave.) | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, thin asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, new access ramps, curb and gutter repair, grading, drainage improvements, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |
| South San Francisco | \$1,027,000 | 2018/2019 South San Francisco Pavement Rehabilitation Project | 1. Spruce Avenue (from El Camino Real to Terrace Drive/Huntington Avenue) 2. Alida Way (from Northwood Drive to Country Club Drive) 3. Hickey Boulevard (from El Camino Real to Camaritas Avenue) 4. Camaritas Avenue (from Westborough Boulevard to Arroyo Drive) 5. San Felipe Avenue (from Del Monte Avenue to Serra Drive) | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, asphalt overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, new access ramps, curb and gutter repair, grading, drainage improvements, adjusting utilities to grade, and other miscellaneous work. |
| Woodside | \$242,000 | 2017-18 Woodside Road Rehabilitation Project | Mountain Home Road from Woodside Road to Winding Way | Project consists of pavement grinding, base repair, thin overlay, thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings, raising of monuments, and other misc work related to road resurfacing |
| SM County (Urban) | \$1,072,000 | San Mateo Countywide Pavement Maintenance Project | Spring St (Willow St->Douglas Ave) Ringwood Ave (Bay Rd-> Middlefield Rd) Fifth Ave (El Camino Real->Spring St) 87th St (Park Plaza Dr->Sullivan St) Industrial Rd (Harbor Blvd->S Harbor) Alameda De Las Pulgas (Woodside-> Stockbridge Ave) Lexington Ave (Bunker Hill Dr->Ticonderoga Dr) Elmer St (O'Neill Ave->Harbor Blvd) Washington St (87th St->Annie St) Canyon Road (Skyline -> County Boundary [North of Summit Dr.]) | Project consists of base repair, cape slurry, pavement striping and markings, access ramps, curb and gutter repair, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |
| Total LSR | \$12,657,000 | | | |

Increased to minimum allowed grant size.

* Jurisdiction will apply this funding to their BPPI or TLC project

San Mateo C/CAG

OBAG 2 Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) Program

| CITY / COUNTY | Board Approved Distribution on 8/11/16 (Rounded to 1,000) | Project Name | Project Location | Description of Work |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| SM County (Rural - FAS) | \$583,000 | Countywide Bridge Deck Maintenance Project | Bean Hollow Road (35C-0004) Pescadero Road (35C-0005) Stage Road (35C-0010) Pescadero Road (35C-0018) Verdi Road (35C-0024) Cloverdale Road (35C-0041) Crystal Springs Road (35C-0061) Industrial Way (35C-0072) Alpine Road (35C-0121) Alpine Road (County Bridge #1, Mindego Creek) Alpine Road (County Bridge #2, Alpine Creek) | Project consists of overlay, pavement striping and markings, repair railing, and other misc work |
| SM County (Rural - FAS) | \$309,000 | Canada Road Resurfacing Project | Canada Road (Freeway Entrance South Bound to Freeway Entrance North Bound) | Project consists of base repairs, asphalt overlay, pavement striping and markings, adjusting utilities to grade, and other misc work |
| Total FAS | \$892,000 | | | |

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 20, 2017
To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the updated San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy

(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 650-599-1409)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMP TAC review and recommend approval of the updated San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy.

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost for the preparation of the San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy is \$23,400.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

C/CAG Transportation Fund.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

As part of the adopted Plan Bay Area, and MTC Resolution 4202 adopted on July 27, 2016, congestion management agencies are required to adopt and update Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy. The next update is due by May 2017.

PDA's are locally-identified areas near existing or planned transit service that are planning to accommodate the majority of the region's projected growth in housing and jobs over the next three decades. These areas play a key role in the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy, which seeks to coordinate future land uses with transportation investments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The C/CAG Board of Directors approved the initial San Mateo County PDA Investment & Growth Strategy on May 9, 2013, as well as its first update on May 8, 2014. MTC Resolution 4202 requires that CMAs update their growth strategies on by May 2017 to assess changes in local jurisdiction housing production and, where appropriate, to assist local jurisdictions in

implementing policy changes to facilitate achieving housing targets set through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process. This update of the San Mateo County PDA Investment & Growth Strategy provides new information on the housing production, affordable housing policies, and anti-displacement and preservation policies of local jurisdictions in the county.

The 2017 update has been undertaken in coordination with all 21 jurisdictions, including the 14 jurisdictions that have designated PDAs, and information detailed in local and countywide transportation and other planning efforts. Activities include:

- Review of local jurisdictions' Housing Elements and Annual Progress Reports.
- Consultation with local planners across the county about housing production and policies, planning efforts related to PDAs.
- Review of local and countywide plans and studies, such as specific plans, community-based transportation plans, reports produced by the Grand Boulevard Initiative, 21-Elements and other regional and sub-regional planning efforts.
- Updates on transportation investments including infrastructure such as bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements, transportation for livable communities improvements that occurred inside of the PDAs and areas that support PDAs.
- Update on additional housing stock or employment centers inside of PDAs.
- New initiatives, policies, and programs since the last update, such as Home for All, anti-displacement chapter,

ATTACHMENT

- Draft San Mateo County Priority Development Area Investment & Growth Strategy update.

San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy

April 2017



This page intentionally left blank.

San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy 2017

I. Introduction 1
History of San Mateo County’s PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 1
Approval Process for the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 1
Report Organization 2

II. Background 3
Plan Bay Area 2040 3
Implementation of the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 6

III. San Mateo County Priority Development Areas 8
Projected Growth 10
Development Context 11
Development Feasibility and Readiness 14
Assessment of the San Mateo County PDAs 15

IV. Ongoing Countywide Efforts towards PDA Development 24
Vision for PDA Development 24
Strategies and Efforts to Encourage PDA Growth 24

V. Transportation Investments 30
OneBay Area Grant (OBAG) Program 30
Identifying Ongoing and Future Transportation Projects within PDAs 34

Appendix A: Profiles of San Mateo County PDAs
Appendix B: ABAG Growth Projections for San Mateo County, 2010-2040
Appendix C: RHNA Allocations for Jurisdictions in San Mateo County by AMI
Appendix D. Housing Production of Local Jurisdictions in San Mateo County, 2004-2016
Appendix E: Recent PDA Planning Efforts
Appendix F: OBAG 1 and Projects Funded in San Mateo County
Appendix G: C/CAG Criteria for OBAG 2 Grants

This page intentionally left blank.

I. Introduction

The San Mateo County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 was prepared by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) in accordance with the requirements of Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution 4035, Appendix A-6, and updated by MTC Resolution 4202 in 2016. Resolution 4202 A-8, as amended, requires that each County Congestion Management Agency (CMA) in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area develop a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to guide transportation investments in support of new development in the region's PDAs.

PDAs are locally identified areas near existing or planned transit service where the majority of the region's projected growth in housing and jobs over the next three decades is planned and anticipated to occur. PDAs play a key role in the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy, which seeks to coordinate future land uses with transportation investments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The objectives of the San Mateo County PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 are to:

- Provide updates on the 17 PDAs in San Mateo County;
- Track the progress of local jurisdictions in meeting the housing objectives established through their adopted Housing Elements and the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process;
- Document ongoing transportation and land use planning efforts throughout the county to focus growth and development in the PDAs; and,
- Establish a framework to guide transportation, housing and planning resources.

History of San Mateo County's PDA Investment & Growth Strategy

The initial San Mateo County PDA Investment & Growth Strategy was approved by C/CAG's Board of Directors in May 2013, and then updated in 2014 to be consistent with MTC Resolution 4035. The 2017 update describes planning progress in the county's designated PDAs, housing policies to facilitate achieving housing targets set through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process and recent housing production, discussion of residential displacement policies, and an update on implementation plans related to the county's PDAs.

Approval Process for the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017

The 2017 update has been undertaken in coordination with all 21 jurisdictions, including the 14 jurisdictions that have designated PDAs, and information detailed in local and countywide transportation and other planning efforts. Activities include:

- Review of local jurisdictions' Housing Elements and Annual Progress Reports;
- Consultation with local planners across the county about housing production and policies, and planning efforts related to the county's PDAs;

- Review of local and countywide plans and studies, such as specific plans, community-based transportation plans and complete streets, and reports produced by the Grand Boulevard Initiative, 21 Elements and other regional and sub-regional planning efforts;

San Mateo County’s PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 will be reviewed by several C/CAG advisory bodies, including C/CAG’s Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee and C/CAG’s Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee. Final review and approval of the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 will be with C/CAG’s Board of Directors.

Report Organization

The San Mateo County PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 document is organized into the following sections:

- I. **Introduction** — The Introduction provides an overview of the purposes of the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 and the process for approval.
- II. **Background** — The Background section provides background on the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy and implementation of the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy.
- III. **San Mateo County Priority Development Areas** — The San Mateo County Priority Development Areas section describes the 17 PDAs in San Mateo County and provides an update on local jurisdiction housing production and policies;
- IV. **Ongoing Countywide Efforts towards PDA Growth** — The Ongoing Countywide Efforts towards PDA Growth section provides an overview of ongoing efforts to support growth in the San Mateo County PDAs.
- V. **Transportation Investments** — The Transportation Investments section provides an overview of transportation investments administered by C/CAG, highlighting the OBAG program and other local funding programs designed to support growth and development in the PDAs.

II. Background

According to projections from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the San Francisco Bay Area is expected to experience significant population, employment, and housing growth over the next three decades. By 2040, the population of the Bay Area is projected to top nine million. This represents a 30 percent increase from the seven million Bay Area residents. The region is expected to accommodate about 820,000 new households and 1.3 Million new jobs by 2040. San Mateo County is projected to absorb a portion of the region's growth, with an estimated 128,700 new jobs, and 60,200 new housing units in the county by 2040. Table 1 includes an overview of ABAG's growth projections for San Mateo County.

Table 1: San Mateo County Population, Employment, and Housing Projections, 2010-2040

| | 2010 | 2040 | Growth 2010-2040 | % Change 2010-2040 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Employment | 343,300 | 472,100 | 128,700 | 38% |
| Households | 257,800 | 318,000 | 60,200 | 23% |

Source: Plan Bay Area Update 2040, Land Use Modeling Report (2017)

Plan Bay Area 2040

Plan Bay Area 2040 is the region's long-range transportation and land use plan. The effort to produce Plan Bay Area 2040 grew out of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), the California Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, which required each of the state's 18 metropolitan areas to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote compact, mixed-use commercial and residential development. ABAG and MTC began developing the initial plan in 2010. The current Plan Bay Area 2040, which included the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan, was approved by the ABAG and MTC in July 2013.

MTC and ABAG are currently updating Plan Bay Area 2040. The process for the update has involved analysis and public review of future development scenarios. In December 2016, MTC and ABAG adopted the Final Preferred Scenario for Plan Bay Area 2040 update. The Preferred Scenario provides a roadmap for accommodating projected household and employment growth in the nine-county Bay Area by 2040, as well as a transportation investment strategy for the region. The Preferred Scenario details how the region can achieve several outcomes that are essential to the success of Plan Bay Area 2040:

- Compliance with SB 375, the state's sustainable communities strategy law which mandates that the long-range plan reduce greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles; and,
- Provision of adequate housing for the region's projected population growth.

The Preferred Scenario is currently undergoing an environmental assessment under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), with the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and Draft Plan document expected to be released in Spring 2017. Final adoption of the updated Plan Bay Area 2040 is expected by mid-2017.

Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs)

To meet the goals of SB 375, Plan Bay Area 2040 encourages focused growth in the region’s PDAs, which are transit-served neighborhoods that are identified by local jurisdictions throughout the region as appropriate places to concentrate future growth and development. Focusing growth in the PDAs also enables regional housing needs to be addressed in a way that supports transit ridership. The PDAs across the region represent many types of places, from regional centers to neighborhood commercial nodes. The concept for these areas originated in the regional FOCUS program that ABAG initiated in 2006 to promote a more compact land use pattern for the Bay Area. During the development of the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy, the PDA framework was adopted as the foundation for identifying areas of future growth in the plan.

Priority Development Areas (PDAs) provide opportunities for the development of pedestrian-friendly “complete communities” where transit, jobs, schools, services, and recreation are conveniently located near people’s homes. To meet the goals of SB 375 regionally, Plan Bay Area encourages focused growth in the region’s PDAs, which are anticipated to accommodate approximately two-thirds of the region’s expected growth. The PDAs across the Bay Area represent many types of places, from regional centers to neighborhood commercial nodes. PDA typologies have been adopted and applied region-wide.

Plan Bay Area also identifies Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) throughout the region as a key part of its implementation framework. PCAs are regionally significant open/natural areas for which there exists broad consensus for long-term protection, but which also face near-term pressure for development. The PCAs and PDAs complement one another — promoting compact development within PDAs helps to reduce pressure to develop the region’s natural/open areas and agricultural lands.

Plan Bay Area 2040 — Achieving Regional Goals

The two key performance targets of the current Plan Bay Area 2040 are to reduce the region’s per capita greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by 15 percent by 2040 and to house 100 percent of the region’s projected population growth by income level, including the region’s need for very low, low and moderate income housing. Regionally, one housing unit was built for each new job created between 2011 and 2015¹ — this finding underscores the importance of proactive advancement of PDAs and Housing Element programs in San Mateo County.

¹ Plan Bay Area 2040 (2016)

The updated Plan Bay Area scenarios were rated on fourteen performance targets. The final preferred scenario **achieves** five key objectives: Climate Protection, Adequate Housing, Open Space and Agricultural Preservation, Middle Wage Job Creation, and Goods/Movement Congestion Reduction. The final preferred scenario **moves in the right direction** on five other key objectives: Health and Safe Communities, Affordable Housing, Non-Auto Mode Shift, Road Maintenance, and Transit Maintenance. However, the final preferred scenario **moves in the wrong direction** on three critical objectives: Housing and Transportation Affordability, Displacement Risk, and Access to jobs. Accordingly, local jurisdictions are encouraged to advance policies to respond to the challenges in these three arenas. This document includes an expanded discussion of Housing Affordability and Displacement Risk.

Plan Bay Area 2040 Investment Strategy

Plan Bay Area forecasts \$303 billion² in revenues from federal, state, regional and local sources to support improvements to the regional transportation system over the 28-year time horizon of the plan. Of this total, \$229 billion is considered “committed” to existing purposes (i.e. designated by law for a specific purpose or reserved by action of a governing board, a voter-approved expenditure plan, etc.), and \$74 billion is considered “discretionary” and available to support the plan’s land use and transportation investment strategies. The region generates a high rate of locally sourced dollars, for transportation projects. Accordingly most projected transportation funds are considered committed. Table 2 provides an overview of the investment strategy for the \$303 billion in expected revenues over the life of Plan Bay Area 2040.

Table 2: Plan Bay Area 2040, Preferred Scenario (Investments by function in billions of year of expenditure dollars)³

| Function | Committed | Discretionary | Total |
|--|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Operate and Maintain: Existing Transit | \$117.4 | \$39.6 | \$157.0 |
| Operate and Maintain: Roads, Bridges, and Freeways | \$47.4 | \$19.0 | \$66.0 |
| Expansion | \$22.5 | \$7.5 | \$30.0 |
| Modernize | \$42.0 | \$8.0 | \$50.0 |
| Total | \$229.0 | \$74.0 | \$303.0 |

Source: Plan Bay Area 2040, Preferred Scenario (2016)

Plan Bay Area 2040 and OneBayArea Grants (OBAG) Investment Strategy

Plan Bay Area 2040 includes a regional transportation investment strategy given \$303 billion. This section focuses on the forecasted \$74 billion in discretionary funds; these funds will be distributed and allocated in accordance with the Plan Bay Area and related countywide investment

² ABAG/MTC memo: Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Preferred Scenario Transportation Project List Update November 2016.

³ MTC/ABAG will update revenue projections when new resources are known (including new voter approved local measures).

strategies. MTC allocated \$320 million of the discretionary funds to the nine County Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) in the region to administer the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) program. The OBAG program is designed to reward jurisdictions that focus housing growth in PDAs by providing funding for a range of transportation improvement projects, including Transportation for Livable Communities, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and road preservation, and planning activities. OBAG funds are allocated to the CMAs based on population, past housing production, and future housing commitments, with additional weighting to acknowledge local jurisdiction efforts to produce low-income housing. Table 3 provides further detail on Plan Bay Area’s investment strategy for the \$74 billion in projected discretionary funds through 2040.

Table 3: Plan Bay Area Investment Strategy Summary - Discretionary Revenues (in billions of year of expenditure dollars)

| Strategy | Investment | Percent of Total |
|--|---------------|------------------|
| Operate and Maintain: Existing Transit | \$39.6 | 53% |
| Operate and Maintain: Roads, Bridges, and Freeways | \$19.0 | 26% |
| Expansion | \$7.5 | 11% |
| Modernize | \$8.0 | 10% |
| Total | \$74.0 | 100% |

Source: Plan Bay Area 2040, Preferred Scenario (2016)

Implementation of the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017

The authority to establish land use and housing policies that directly impact growth and development in the PDAs rests with the 21 local jurisdictions in the county. Different policies for development are necessary and appropriate in different parts of the county and the different types of PDAs. Successful implementation of the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017 will require coordinated planning and implementation by the jurisdictions across the county through supportive land use policies, favorable market conditions, available public resources and local support for new development.

Effective implementation must also rely on contributions and actions in each jurisdiction from the public sector, private sector, non-profit sector and the community as a whole in many areas, from transportation improvements and system linkages, to affordable housing and support services. This type of countywide collaboration and inter-jurisdictional coordination has been proven to be an efficient and effective approach in San Mateo County.


Partnerships

As the county with the largest number of local jurisdictions in the region, San Mateo County faces a unique set of challenges and opportunities in regards to multi-jurisdictional collaboration. The framework that C/CAG established and built over the last two decades has provided a

proactive process for local agencies in the county to work together on countywide issues and projects that benefit the region as a whole. Supporting and participating in these partnerships and collaborations is another strategy that C/CAG has used to encourage growth in the PDAs.

A brief description of several partnerships focused on countywide transportation, housing and land use issues, to which C/CAG is a key partner, is provided in section IV. Figure 1 identifies some of the key participants in the effective implementation of the San Mateo County PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017.

Figure 1: Agency Partners in PDA Investment & Growth Strategy 2017



III. San Mateo County Priority Development Areas

There are 17 Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in 14 of the 21 local jurisdictions in San Mateo County. Most are located on or near the El Camino Real corridor, which is a 43-mile state highway that extends the length of the San Francisco Peninsula from Daly City in the north to San Jose in the south. The 17 PDAs were identified by local jurisdictions in the county, who submitted applications to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) for the PDA designation, and characterized into several different place types based on their existing conditions and future expectations. These place types range from high intensity City Centers to moderate intensity Transit Neighborhoods and Town Center. Table 4 covers the definitions of the various types of PDAs in San Mateo County.


Table 4: Place Types of the Priority Development Areas in San Mateo County

| Place Type | Description |
|---------------------------|---|
| High Intensity | |
| City Center | Sub-regional center of economic and cultural activity with some regional destinations. Served by frequent dedicated regional transit with connections to frequent sub-regional and local service. |
| Medium Intensity | |
| Mixed-Use Corridor | Focus of local community and economic activity for areas without a distinct center. Served by sub-regional transit (in some cases dedicated) and local transit. |
| Suburban Center | Sub-regional center of economic activity with local amenities in traditionally suburban areas, with some sub-regional destinations. Served by dedicated regional transit with strong connections to sub-regional and local service. |
| Moderate Intensity | |
| Transit Town Center | Local center of economic and cultural activity with a range of housing options and local amenities. Served by dedicated regional or sub-regional transit with strong connections to local transit. |
| Transit Neighborhood | Residential neighborhoods with a variety of housing options, local retail, and services. Served by dedicated regional or sub-regional transit, with some connections to local transit. |

Source: Plan Bay Area Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy (2012)

Most of the PDAs in the county are classified as Mixed-Use Corridors or Transit Town Centers that are preparing for moderate or medium intensity growth. Figure 2 shows the location and geographic boundaries of the 17 PDAs in San Mateo County, highlighting their place type designations and location in relation to BART and Caltrain service.

Figure 2: Map of the Priority Development Areas in San Mateo County.



| | | | |
|---|--|----|--|
| 1 | Multi-City El Camino Real PDA | 10 | San Mateo: Rail Corridor |
| 2 | Daly City: Bayshore | 11 | San Mateo: El Camino Real |
| 3 | Daly City: Mission Street Corridor | 12 | Belmont: Belmont Village |
| 4 | Brisbane: San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area | 13 | San Carlos: Railroad Corridor |
| 5 | South San Francisco: Downtown | 14 | Redwood City: Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor |
| 6 | San Bruno: Transit Corridors | 15 | Redwood City: Downtown |
| 7 | Millbrae: Transit Station Area | 16 | Menlo Park: El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown |
| 8 | Burlingame: Burlingame El Camino Real | 17 | East Palo Alto: Ravenswood |
| 9 | San Mateo: Downtown | | |

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments Plan Bay Area Priority Development Areas (2013)
 Note: Map does not reflect PDA boundary revisions that have been submitted to ABAG since adoption of Plan Bay Area.


Appendix A provides a brief description of each of the 17 PDAs in San Mateo County. These descriptions provide an overview of existing conditions and highlight recent planning efforts. Status of advanced and current planning efforts underway in each PDA is included as part of

the 2017 update. Most jurisdictions have completed significant advanced planning in the PDA areas to enable anticipated housing and employment growth and related transportation improvements. Several jurisdictions have completed or are in the process of completing the necessary zoning changes to accommodate RHNA projections, consistent with Housing Element law, as necessary.

Projected Growth

Although the PDAs in San Mateo County span a diverse range of neighborhoods and communities, all are planning for growth over the next three decades. Reflecting the region’s focused approach toward development, despite comprising only a small portion of the county’s overall land area, the 17 PDAs are expected to carry nearly 70 percent of the county’s projected housing growth from 2010 to 2040. Figure 3 provides an overview of the projected growth in housing units and jobs in the PDAs by jurisdiction.

Figure 3: Projected Growth in Housing Units and Jobs in the PDAs in San Mateo County by Jurisdiction, 2010-2040



Source: Plan Bay Area Final Forecast of Jobs, Population, and Housing (2013)

Note: Figure includes estimates for the projected growth in housing units and jobs in local PDAs that overlap with the Multi-City El Camino Real Corridor PDA.

Redwood City and the City of San Mateo, in particular, are expected to see significant growth from 2010 to 2040. Both jurisdictions rank among the top cities in the region in terms of their projected growth in housing units and jobs. Redwood City allows the highest densities for new development in the county, while San Mateo has significant amount of land located within PDAs. See Appendix A for Profiles of San Mateo County PDAs and Appendix B for further details on ABAG’s growth projections for the county’s 17 PDAs and 21 jurisdictions.

Development Context

In San Mateo County, new development faces challenges similar to those confronting many communities in the Bay Area. Key challenges include: increased rates of housing and commercial development, lack of available land, job salaries matched to housing affordability, community concerns about growth and change, and to the potential for displacement of current residents and housing prices and rents increase due to a shortage of supply and the high demand for affordable housing.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)⁴ requires that PDA growth strategies assess local jurisdiction efforts to approve sufficient housing for all income levels through the RHNA process and, where appropriate, to assist local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals.

Planning for Housing Matched to Jobs

Activities in local jurisdictions in the county since 2014, when the previous include the development and adoption of specific plans and zoning for PDAs, negotiated development agreements, implementation of affordable housing strategies, implementation of transportation plans and improvements (such as street connectors, bike and pedestrian connections, street amenities, etc.), and tracking down funding to enable improvements to be undertaken. Housing Elements are the primary tool for local jurisdictions to plan for and address affordable housing needs. All jurisdictions in San Mateo County have adopted Housing Elements that have been certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Each housing element contains multiple strategies for accommodating local RHNA needs. Following adoption of Housing Elements, jurisdictions complete implementing measures that can include specific plans, zoning changes, policy changes and development of new programs.

Housing Elements

Through the Housing Element update process, local jurisdictions have identified programs and policies to address local and their share of regional housing needs. Housing Elements include both strategies to enable new housing development in alignment with projected needs and more detailed polices about maintaining existing housing stock, achieving affordability goals, and addressing other housing policy issues. Twenty-one Elements assisted all the jurisdictions in the preparation of their housing elements and continues to be a key resource for San Mateo County jurisdictions to implement their housing element programs.

⁴ Resolution 4202 A-8, MTC

Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) Process

State law requires local jurisdictions to plan for their fair share of the region's housing need for people of all income levels through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process. This is the process by which each community in the Bay Area (and throughout California) is assigned its "fair share" of the region's housing need for the planning timeframe of their Housing Element, which is a part of each jurisdiction's General Plan. Once it receives its approved RHNA, each local jurisdiction must update their Housing Element to demonstrate land capacity and to show how they plan to meet the housing needs in their community. The Housing Element identifies housing opportunity sites and specific programs and policies to ensure that existing and future housing needs in the community are met.

The RHNA process typically involves two steps — First, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) determines the total housing need for each region in California. Second, as the Council of Governments for the San Francisco Bay Area, ABAG distributes this need to local jurisdictions in the region and identifies the share of each jurisdiction's distribution by income level. Income levels range from very low to above moderate and are defined in relation to the area median income (AMI) in each county. The number of housing units in each income level that a jurisdiction is allocated is based on a regional formula that aims to reduce concentrations of poverty and increase the mix of housing types among cities and counties equitably.

For the past two RHNA cycles, San Mateo County has formed a local countywide sub-RHNA to distribute its RHNA allocation among the 21 jurisdictions in the county. This practice began in 2005 when C/CAG worked with ABAG and local state representatives to pass legislation that provided the authority for jurisdictions within a county to self-administer the distribution of the countywide RHNA share to the jurisdictions. The sub-RHNA process enables the jurisdictions in San Mateo County to collaborate in establishing a countywide housing needs allocation methodology that was acceptable to the staff and elected officials in each of the county's 21 jurisdictions. In the most notable example of this local customization, the Town of Woodside and Redwood City moved their shared municipal boundary to facilitate the permitting and construction of permanent affordable housing for staff at Cañada Community College and adjusted their respective housing need allocations accordingly.

Appendix C provides an overview of the RHNA numbers for San Mateo County for the past two cycles by jurisdiction and income level.

Specific Plans


Specific plans are another tool that jurisdictions use to facilitate development. Specific plans are comprehensive planning documents that regulate land use and zoning for a particular area in a jurisdiction. Specific plans provide decision-makers, developers and the community with shared expectations about future development, thus facilitating the permitting process for new development consistent with community goals. Specific plans can address zoning, design, development standards and infrastructure necessary to support new housing and jobs. When specific development proposals are reviewed against the adopted plan, the environmental review for these projects can be streamlined and/or tiered to focus environmental review more efficiently. In recent years, several jurisdictions have undertaken these kinds of planning efforts to help facilitate development. Appendix D provides an overview of recent planning efforts completed within the last 10 years in the PDAs in San Mateo County.

Housing Production

The goal of Housing Elements and Specific Plans is to plan for and enable housing production. Housing production relies on private developers to pursue housing projects. Generally housing

development in the Bay Area is cyclical. The Bay Area has recently seen an uptick in development, since the 2008 global economic decline (see Figure 4).

Figure 4: San Mateo County Housing Production (2011 to 2016) By income



NOTE: Data for many jurisdictions not available for 2016

San Mateo County has produced roughly 17% of the projected housing needs over an 8-year period. Appendix C provides detailed housing production numbers for each jurisdiction in the county. The available data show that local jurisdictions in the county have made incremental progress in meeting their RHNA targets for the 2015-2022 cycle. Some jurisdictions issued only a few permits for housing, however several jurisdictions are currently reviewing a considerable number of permits for entitlement.

Specific plans and related re-zoning efforts are correlated with an increase in development interest. In some cities, the lack of growth may reflect an absence of developer interest or adequate public resources. In some cities, where lack of applications and development interest persists, additional advance planning work, public investment and infrastructure investment may be beneficial. Also many jurisdictions noted an uptick in interest an applications for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Coordinated tracking of entitled and pipeline projects on a countywide basis could enable local, county and regional actors to better understand the correlation between housing policies, job growth, housing demand, infrastructure investments, and development.

Table 5 indicates that San Mateo County as a whole has been most successful in producing housing affordable to above moderate-income households, producing 37% of the total need for the planning period. However, the county as a whole and the bay area continue to under produce housing affordable to very low, low and moderate-income households, and the county as a whole is producing less housing affordable to these households compared to the region — the region has produced 9% of the projected housing need for low-income households, while San Mateo County as a whole has only produced 5% of its projected low income housing need. The end of this chapter reviews ongoing affordable housing policy in each jurisdiction.

Table 5: Housing Production in San Mateo County compared to the Bay Area, 2015 -2023.

| | | San Mateo County | Bay Area Totals |
|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Very Low (0-50% AMI) | RHNA | 4,595 | 46,684 |
| | Permits Issued | 147 | 1,348 |
| | Percent of RHNA Met | 3% | 3% |
| Low (50-80% AMI) | RHNA | 2,507 | 28,940 |
| | Permits Issued | 117 | 2,688 |
| | Percent of RHNA Met | 5% | 9% |
| Moderate (80-120% AMI) | RHNA | 2,830 | 33,420 |
| | Permits Issued | 65 | 1,350 |
| | Percent of RHNA Met | 2% | 4% |
| Above Moderate (120%+ AMI) | RHNA | 6,486 | 78,950 |
| | Permits Issued | 2,384 | 22,077 |
| | Percent of RHNA Met | 37% | 28% |
| Total | RHNA | 16,418 | 187,994 |
| | Permits Issued | 2,713 | 27,463 |
| | Percent of RHNA Met | 17% | 15% |

Source: MTC/ABAG 2016 Housing Data

Development Feasibility and Readiness

Many regulatory tools and incentives are being used to enable quality new development to occur. Examples of some of these tools being used by local jurisdictions in San Mateo County include: specific plans, development agreements, State Density Bonus Law, local density bonus incentives beyond State Density Bonus Law, program EIRs, etc. Many jurisdictions provide CEQA analysis as part of their approval of policy or regulatory changes that helps streamline CEQA review when reviewing or implementing development projects. To a certain degree, jurisdictions with more land available for development and those with higher levels of anticipated growth have more confidence in their jurisdiction’s readiness for development – though many smaller jurisdictions are equally confident.

In 2013, MTC commissioned a study to assess the readiness and feasibility of the PDAs to accommodate the number of housing units envisioned by Plan Bay Area.⁵ Going beyond PDAs’ physical capacity for growth based on allowable densities per existing zoning ordinances, the study examined the “readiness” of a sample of 20 PDAs across the region to accommodate additional development, focusing on five key factors deemed to have a significant impact:

- Housing capacity estimate (based on current conditions and the Plan Bay Area forecast);
- Existing planning and entitlement process;

⁵ Plan Bay Area Priority Development Area Development Feasibility and Readiness Assessment (2013)

- Level of community support as demonstrated by elected official approval of PDA supportive land uses as well as history of neighborhood opposition;
- Market attractiveness; and
- Infrastructure capacity, unfunded needs, and financing capability.

The study found the sample of 20 PDAs to be “ready” to accommodate 62 percent of the growth allocated to them under existing conditions and identified several constraints to further development, such as inadequate infrastructure, the loss of redevelopment authorities, and neighborhood opposition to development. Under more favorable conditions that addressed several of these constraints, the study found that the sample PDAs would be ready to accommodate 80 percent of the growth allocated to them. Local policy actions identified in the study to further growth and development include adopting or expanding innovative land use regulations, establishing programmatic environmental impact reports, and developing PDA-specific capital improvement programs, among others.

Assessment of the San Mateo County PDAs

While a comprehensive PDA assessment based on the five key factors described in the previous section has not been conducted for San Mateo County, a number of planning efforts in the county have been completed that shed light on the feasibility and readiness for growth and development in the PDAs. Appendix D provides an overview of recent planning efforts completed within the last 10 years in the PDAs in San Mateo County. Information from these efforts can be used to understand how the limited transportation dollars flowing into the county can best be used to support focused growth in the PDAs.

Of the actions recommended by the MTC study to advance project readiness, innovative land use regulations and program EIRs are most common among San Mateo County jurisdictions. Capital plans associated with PDAs are less common, and capital planning varies greatly among the jurisdictions – in part related to (1) the scattered responsibility across multiple agencies, (2) the varied funding tools, including competitive grants, (3) development impact fees, (4) development agreements, and (5) other local sources. Technical assistance could increase the completion of PDA specific capital improvements programs among local jurisdictions.

C/CAG will continue to update and monitor the success of growth in the 17 PDAs in San Mateo County. Staff will continue to track the number of housing units, affordable housing units, and affordable housing policies that are produced and adopted throughout the county.

Efforts to Increase Readiness Since 2014

The El Camino Real corridor is championed as the clear vision for growth in the Peninsula. At present, the El Camino corridor remains largely auto-oriented with long stretches of low-density retail development, numerous surface parking lots, and limited pedestrian and bicycle facilities and connections. These conditions are being addressed in each community through efforts such as adoption of specific plans, zoning code updates, inclusionary programs and fees, and streetscape plans. In addition, the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI), which is a voluntary,

regional collaboration of cities, counties, and advocates, is striving to establish a shared vision of transformation for the corridor. Several jurisdictions, including Redwood City have made notable progress planning and in some cases implementing pedestrian, bicycle and streetscape improvements along the corridor. Further investment along the corridor remains a countywide priority to realize the transportation, housing and air quality goals of the Plan Bay Area.

Lack of Available Lands

The limited land availability, small and irregularly shaped parcels, fragmented ownership pattern, and limited site assembly tools can constrain desired new development. The dissolution of redevelopment agencies in 2012 eliminated a tool that local jurisdictions had used to assemble sites for new development to occur. Further, some jurisdictions may have challenges in identifying sufficient capacity for the next RHNA cycle.

In addition to the enactment of many affordable housing programs, many jurisdictions are finding an uptick in interest and construction of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). This increase in interest and construction activity related to ADUs can be credited to changes in State and local laws that allow for reduced parking and more flexibility around unit sizes. Most jurisdictions have implemented, or plan to implement updates to local ADU regulations in response to recent changes in State Law. ADUs are a valuable affordable housing strategy for jurisdictions lacking adequate large sites. The 21 Elements portal provides resources for jurisdictions interested in enhancing local programs.

Community and Decision-Maker Support for New Development

San Mateo County jurisdictions have seen meaningful growth in the past several years that has raised concerns about development impacts such as increased traffic, the fit with community, neighborhood context, community changes and other transportation related concerns. Many jurisdictions in the county are striving to encourage housing production along with new jobs, especially new affordable housing. Most jurisdictions find there is relatively strong support for affordable housing, as compared to market rate housing, due to housing affordability issues. In addition to the programs identified in each jurisdiction's housing element, both Home for All and 21 Elements are striving to provide informational materials to answer questions with the intent of creating greater community acceptance for housing and new development. A comprehensive countywide education campaign could provide some relief to local jurisdictions, especially as jurisdiction staff dedicate more time to planning and implementing infill development.

21 Elements – San Mateo County Housing Element Update Kit

In partnership with the San Mateo County Department of Housing, C/CAG sponsors the 21 Elements, also known as the San Mateo County Housing Element Update Kit, to help local jurisdictions prepare updates to their Housing Elements. The 21 Elements is a collaborative project made up of all 21 local jurisdictions in the county, along with partner agencies and stakeholder organizations, to encourage and assist with the production and certification of high quality Housing Elements. The group is staffed by a consultant and provides a unique forum for sharing resources, successful strategies, and best practices in regards to addressing housing needs throughout the county.

Prior to the 2014-2022 RHNA cycle, staff of the 21 Elements group successfully negotiated with HCD to enable streamlined processing of certified Housing Elements conforming to certain standards. It is anticipated that the 21 Elements group will significantly streamline the update process and reduce local jurisdiction costs, as 21 Elements staff will carry a substantial portion of the requisite workload at a relatively nominal shared cost.

Affordable Housing Needs

The severe shortage of workforce housing in the county that has resulted from years of slow housing growth and rapid economic development partly explains the county's rank as one of the most expensive counties in the nation in regards to housing costs. A 2014 study conducted by the National Low Income Housing Coalition found San Mateo County to be tied for first, along with San Francisco and Marin counties, as the least affordable counties for renting at fair market value in the country.

The lack of affordable housing for all income levels is a persistent challenge in the county and across the region. According to Plan Bay Area, employers throughout the region cite the historic imbalances in the Bay Area housing market as one of the most difficult aspects of recruiting and retaining high-quality employees. The problem of finding housing within a reasonable commute time from work is particularly acute for low-income workers, who the San Mateo County Department of Housing projects to make up 40 percent of the new jobs in the county over the coming decade. If more housing affordable to all income levels is not made available locally, an increasing number of workers will commute into the county from other parts of the region, which will exacerbate existing congestion and air quality issues throughout the county.

Most jurisdictions are able to accommodate the projected housing and job growth anticipated through the next RHNA cycle, however additional funding and tools are necessary to achieve the targeted affordability levels. Notably, many jurisdictions, especially larger or faster growing jurisdictions, have established affordable housing fees and inclusionary programs that help address affordability targets. However more resources are needed to respond to needs for affordable housing.

While development and increased investment in the PDAs can bring much-needed benefits to local neighborhoods, they can also result in market-driven displacement of lower-income residents due to rising rents and the conversion of rental units to condominiums. In the long-term, increasing the supply of housing will help to address the lack of affordable housing for all income levels in the county. However, tremendous construction activity would be needed to reduce housing prices to levels that would be affordable to low-income families. Given that low-income workers are projected to comprise 40 percent of the new workers in the county in the next decade, in the short-term, policies and strategies to produce and preserve housing that is accessible to low- and moderate-income households may be beneficial.

Affordable Housing Policies

For the 2017 update, local jurisdictions were surveyed, Housing Element Annual Reports were reviewed, and other available information, including resources referenced in the MTC guidelines, were used to understand existing policies designed to support the production and preservation of affordable housing in San Mateo County. This high level assessment revealed that cities vary in their policies and strategies to address affordable housing, but generally address affordability with the same set of tools. Recent State updates to the density bonuses law and accessory dwelling unit (ADU) programs have had a positive effect on local affordable housing policies — every jurisdiction in San Mateo County implements these required programs.

Affordable housing policies can be broadly divided into several categories: affordable housing production, local funding sources, and site and building regulation. Table 6 on the following page provides an overview of the affordable housing policies and strategies in place in the 21 jurisdictions in the county.

Nearly all jurisdictions in the county have a number of policies in place to address affordable housing. Most frequently, these policies are density bonuses or processes for streamlining the permitting of ADUs, both of which are required under state law. Additionally, the table demonstrates that more than two-thirds of the jurisdictions in the county have embraced some form of inclusionary zoning. Inclusionary policies require housing developers to provide a percentage of affordable housing on site, pay an in-lieu fee, or meet other conditions for compliance. Across the county, the inclusionary policies adopted by local jurisdictions vary primarily in regards to the percentage of affordable units and depth of affordability that housing developers are required to provide.

21 Elements ordained an affordable housing impact fee nexus study for 15 of the jurisdictions in the county. This collaborative approach saved local jurisdictions in the county both time and money, and resulted in a very thorough analysis of the nexus between new residential and commercial development and the impacts on housing needs. The nexus study identifies the permissible and recommended fee levels for each jurisdiction in the county for both residential and commercial development. These fee levels are specific to each city, based on local conditions, and set so as to not discourage development. Depending on jurisdictional

preferences, affordable housing fees may compliment or substitute for inclusionary housing programs.⁶ The majority of jurisdictions participated in the nexus study. As of March 2017, most jurisdictions have added or updated affordable housing as a result of this study.

Table 6: Affordable Housing, Funding and Building Regulations, in San Mateo County Jurisdiction, 2017.

| Jurisdiction | PDA's in Jurisdiction | Affordable Housing Production Strategies | | | Local Funding Sources | | | Site and Building Regulations | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|---|----------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | | Density Bonuses | Inclusionary/Below Market Rate Housing Policy | Housing Overlay Zone | Housing Impact Fee/ In-Lieu Fees for Inclusionary Policy | Commercial Linkage Fee | Housing Trust Fund | Land Banking/Parcel Assembly | Flexible Design Standards | Reduced Parking Requirements | Streamlined Permitting Process | Second Units | Add'l Height w/Public Benefit in certain zones |
| Atherton | None | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| Belmont | Belmont Village | (X) | (X) | | (X) | (X) | (X) | (X) | (X) | (X) | (X) | X | |
| Brisbane | San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area | X | X | (X) | (X) | (X) | | X | X | X | | X | |
| Burlingame | Burlingame El Camino Real | X | | | (X) | (X) | | | X | X | | X | |
| Colma | El Camino Real | X | X | | X | | X | | | X | X | X | |
| Daly City | Bayshore; Mission Boulevard | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| East Palo Alto | Ravenswood | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | | X | |
| Foster City | None | X | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | X | X | |
| Half Moon Bay | None | X | X | | X | | | | | | X | X | |
| Hillsborough | None | X | | | | | | | X | X | | X | |
| Menlo Park | El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | |
| Millbrae | Transit Station Area | X | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | |
| Pacifica | None | X | X | | X | | | | | | | X | |
| Portola Valley | None | | X | | X | | | | | | | X | |
| Redwood City | Broadway/Veterans Blvd Corridor; El Camino Real Corridor; Downtown | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| San Bruno | Transit Corridors | X | X | | X | | | | | X | | X | |
| San Carlos | Railroad Station | X | X | | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | |
| San Mateo | Grand Boulevard Initiative; Rail Corridor; Downtown | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X |
| South San Francisco | El Camino Real; Downtown | X | X | | | | | X | X | X | | X | |
| Unincorporated | North Fair Oaks; El Camino Real Corridor (Unincorporated Colma) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | | X | |
| Woodside | None | | | | | | | | | | | X | |


X – Policy in effect; (X) – Policy Under Consideration. Source: Jurisdiction Survey, March 2017.

⁶ Note: In Palmer/Fifth St Properties v, City of Los Angeles, the state court limited local jurisdiction’s ability to apply inclusionary zoning to rental housing, accordingly many jurisdictions have opted to replace and supplement inclusionary programs with affordable housing fees.

Displacement Risk – Anti-Displacement and Preservation Policies

San Mateo County and the Bay Area as whole are experiencing an affordable housing crisis. The demand for housing affordable to all but the wealthiest residents far exceeds the available supply. As a result, creating new housing and finding and keeping existing housing in San Mateo County that is within peoples’ means is a challenge, especially for lower and moderate-income individuals. Figure 5 below shows displacement potential in San Mateo County based on a U.C. Berkeley study known as the [Urban Displacement Project](#). *(The U.C. Berkeley study is based on census tract level data and should be considered more indicative of the relative severity of displacement and not an absolute mapping of specific locations. For example, the analysis includes areas such as San Bruno Mountain even though they contain no residential units).*

Figure 5: Mapping of Urban Displacement Project Data with PDA Boundaries in San Mateo County.



Note: Orange areas indicate moderate to High income tracts, see [Urban Displacement Project](#) for more information)

Residential displacement is the central mechanism for gentrification and occurs when a household is forced to move from its residence due to rent increases or loss of housing, despite the household having met all other conditions of occupancy. Displacement manifests itself in many forms, from physical (i.e., evictions, demolitions, physical renovations or change in use) to economic (i.e., rent increases). This often then results in the tenants’ inability to find housing in a neighborhood that was previously accessible and affordable.

Local, state and federal government policy for economic development, job growth, beautification, transit improvements and the like that will most likely occur within Priority Development Areas by improving PDAs and nearby neighborhoods and making them attractive for private investment. Accordingly, Plan Bay Area 2040 and related regional planning efforts have increased emphasis on anti-displacement, preservation and community stabilization policies. As stated by Miriam Zuk, Ph.D., U.C. Berkeley, generally, in stable neighborhoods, mobility is a choice rather than a forced situation — “Stable neighborhoods are characterized by low turnover where people can stay in place by choice in quality housing, contributing to family and community well-being, civic engagement, and the formation of social capital.”⁷

C/CAG adopted an OBAG 2 scoring criteria that included preservation and community stabilization policies (see Figure 6). Figure 7 shows tenant

protection strategies mapped onto four quadrants based on whether a particular strategy should be considered responsive OR preventative, and housing-focused OR people-focused.


Figure 6: Preservation and Community Stabilization Policies, C/CAG, for OBAG

Preservation Strategies and Community Stabilization Policies

1. Just Cause Eviction Protections
2. Rent Stabilization, Rent Control or Rent Regulation
3. Rent Review Board and Mediation
4. Mobile Home Rent Control
5. Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Preservation
6. Condominium Control Regulations
7. Foreclosure Assistance
8. Locally Required Relocation Assistance
9. Minimum Lease Terms
10. Voluntary “Good behavior” Rent Program
11. Rental Repair and Rehabilitation Program
12. Landlord-Tenant Counseling
13. Tenant Anti-Harassment Protections
14. Source of Income Non-Discrimination

Source: C/CAG Memo, OBAG 2 Grants, September 2016

Figure 7: Examples of Preservation and Community Stabilization Policies



⁷ Miriam Zuk, Ph.D., U.C. Berkeley, Urban Displacement Project, presentation at the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco on Investment without Displacement: Stabilizing Housing for Bay Area Renters, November 22, 2016

In San Mateo County, local jurisdictions have had varied rates of displacement or eviction in their communities. These variations do not seem to correlate to particular areas of the county or general tenure of the population. Table 7 shows current jurisdiction policies to address displacement.

Table 7: Anti-Displacement Policies in San Mateo County Jurisdiction, 2017

| Jurisdiction | PDA's in Jurisdiction | Anti-Displacement Policies | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|---|
| | | Condominium Conversion Ordinance | Just Cause Evictions | Rent Stabilization | Rental Repair and Rehabilitation Program | Rent review board and/or mediation | Mobile Home Rent Control | SRO (Single-Room Occupancy) Preservation | Foreclosure Assistance | Locally Required Relocation Assistance | Minimum Lease Terms for rentals | Voluntary ("Good Behavior") Rent Program | Landlord-Tenant Fair Housing Counseling | Tenant Anti-Harassment Policies | Source of Income Non-Discrimination Ordinance |
| Atherton | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Belmont | Belmont Village | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brisbane | San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area | X | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| Burlingame | Burlingame El Camino Real | X | | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| Colma | El Camino Real | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daly City | Bayshore; Mission Boulevard | X | | | | | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| East Palo Alto | Ravenswood | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| Foster City | None | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Half Moon Bay | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hillsborough | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Menlo Park | El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown | X | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Milbrae | Transit Station Area | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pacifica | None | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Portola Valley | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Redwood City | Broadway/Veterans Blvd Corridor; El Camino Real Corridor; Downtown | | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| San Bruno | Transit Corridors | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| San Carlos | Railroad Station | | X | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| San Mateo | Grand Boulevard Initiative; Rail Corridor; Downtown | X | | | X | | | | X | | | | | X | |
| South San Francisco | El Camino Real; Downtown | X | | | X | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| Unincorporated | North Fair Oaks; El Camino Real Corridor (Unincorporated Colma) | X | | | X | | X | | X | | | | | | |
| Woodside | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Jurisdiction Survey, March 2017.

Most jurisdictions are striving to address displacement concerns through increased supply of housing, especially affordable housing. A 2017 survey of San Mateo County jurisdictions found that jurisdictions have implemented only a few anti-displacement policies, including those outlined by C/CAG. 21 Elements will continue to work with local jurisdictions to research and develop policy solutions to respond to the growing displacement risk.

Other policies to Support Housing Development

In addition to affordable housing and anti-displacement policies, supportive transportation policies and investments can also play a key role in the success of housing development in the PDAs. Reduced parking requirements can support smaller-scale infill development, and transportation demand management (TDM) policies to mitigate the traffic impacts of new developments can help alleviate community concerns around increased congestion. Many jurisdictions reported recent implementation of modified parking requirements, especially near transit centers and stations.

Many jurisdictions reported plans to update CEQA analysis methodology from a Level of Service (LOS) standard to a Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) standard. However some municipalities expressed some concern that this shift in transportation analysis could cost valuable time by requiring engineers, community members, and key stakeholders to adapt to a new system and process and language. Countywide education and technical assistance could benefit these efforts.

IV. Ongoing Countywide Efforts towards PDA Development

Vision for PDA Development

Led by the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI), the redevelopment of the El Camino Real corridor provides the clear vision for growth and development in San Mateo County. Stretching from Daly City in the north to San Jose in the south, the 43-mile state highway provides significant opportunities to encourage mixed-use development, create pedestrian-oriented environments, and provide vibrant public spaces along the San Francisco Peninsula. In 2006, the GBI Task Force, made up of cities, counties, and advocates along El Camino Real, adopted a shared vision for the corridor and a set of guiding principles to achieve that vision. Since then, numerous studies and plans have been completed to provide cities, counties, and other agencies along the corridor a path to upgrade land uses, public services, and infrastructure.

Significant potential for development also exists off the El Camino Real corridor in the Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in East Palo Alto and South San Francisco. Planning efforts in these cities are underway or completed. While Brisbane's Baylands and Daly City's Bayshore neighborhoods in the northeastern corner of the county are not currently planned for high levels of growth, they may play a more significant role in the future depending on the outcomes of future planning processes.

The scale and type of development throughout the county's PDAs will not be uniform. The broad vision of encouraging mixed-use development, creating pedestrian-oriented environments, and providing vibrant public spaces will take on different forms depending on local community preferences, physical context, market conditions, and other factors.

Strategies and Efforts to Encourage PDA Growth

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) is committed to supporting local jurisdictions in achieving their visions for growth in their local PDAs. As a transportation planning and funding agency, however, C/CAG has limited ability to influence development outcomes. Future build out of the PDAs to address the projected growth in housing and jobs will be shaped by local land use regulations, the private market, local support for growth, and the availability of public resources to encourage development. While transportation investments can play a role in encouraging development, they cannot address all of the challenges and constraints that jurisdictions may face. Additionally, the loss of redevelopment agencies and the slowdown of transportation funding at the state and federal levels have created further constraints to realizing the vision for growth in the county.

San Mateo County local public agencies have long collaborated in efforts to support focused household and employment growth near transit and the creation of pedestrian-friendly communities. C/CAG will continue to support and facilitate countywide collaboration in four key areas: funding, planning, partnerships, and policy. This section provides a brief update on San Mateo County's progress in these areas.

Funding

As the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Mateo County, C/CAG administers and distributes state and federal funds for transportation at the local level. This funding, though relatively small, provides one key tool for C/CAG to encourage focused growth in the PDAs.

C/CAG distributes these state and federal transportation funds to local jurisdictions in the county in accordance with the rules and regulations established by their source as well as regional policies and guidelines. At the regional level, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has adopted several funding guidelines to address the objectives of the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy. For example, in order to be eligible for funding from the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) program, local jurisdictions demonstrated their commitment to addressing complete streets policies at the local level and have their Housing Elements for the 2007-2014 cycle certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Additionally, MTC required that 70 percent of OBAG funding be spent on projects located in, or in proximate access to, a PDA.

Given the limited amount of transportation funding available at the state and federal levels, C/CAG can be strategic in how it distributes the discretionary transportation funds that it administers, using criteria that rewards jurisdictions for housing production or targeting projects in high impact PDAs. 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 through the C/CAG Transit-Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program. This program and other funding programs C/CAG administers are discussed in further detail in Section V.

State and federal transportation funds cannot address all of a local jurisdiction's needs to maintain services and support desired new development. Accordingly, local jurisdictions are encouraged to develop capital plans in coordination with PDA goals and to adopt specific plans that consider transportation and other capital planning needs. Often a combination of transportation impact fees, mitigation fees, development agreements and local general funds can provide meaningful leverage with State or Federal funding for supporting infrastructure to be built.

Planning and Collaboration

With elected officials from each city and the County on its governing board, C/CAG has historically served as a forum for multi-jurisdictional problem solving and collaboration. C/CAG is the designated CMA for San Mateo County and functions as the county's transportation planning and funding agency, distributing state and federal funds for transportation at the local level based upon the rules and regulations established by the source of the funds. Through countywide planning efforts, such as the Congestion Management Program, the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy and Countywide wide transportation plan, C/CAG also implements goals and policies to guide transportation improvements across the county.

In addition to serving as the county's designated CMA, C/CAG also functions as the County's Airport Land Use Commission, implements the San Mateo County Energy Watch program, and coordinates the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention program. Given its position as a forum for multi-jurisdictional issues, the agency is a natural partner to countywide planning efforts involving transportation, housing, and land use issues. C/CAG will continue to sponsor or support these efforts, particularly those aimed at addressing challenges related to housing, transportation and growth in the county.

Key San Mateo County public entities that facilitate new development and land use implementation with C/CAG include:

- **San Mateo County Planning Directors/Staff.** C/CAG will utilize Planning Directors and staff from all 21 jurisdictions in the county on an as needed basis to distribute information, consult, and solicit feedback on the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy.
- **San Mateo County Department of Housing (DOH).** C/CAG will collaborate with the San Mateo County Department of Housing throughout the life of the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy on housing strategies, policies, and implementation countywide.
- **Home for All.** C/CAG will collaborate with Home for All, which is a countywide initiative that is working to inspire community action and address the County's jobs/housing gap. The Initiative's members include representatives from all sectors of the community and are focused on creating a future where everyone in San Mateo County has an affordable home.
- **Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI).** The Grand Boulevard Initiative is a historic inter-jurisdictional collaborative planning effort to achieve a shared vision for transformation of the El Camino Real corridor. Nineteen cities, two counties, two transit agencies, two CMAs, 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. C/CAG has supported and been a member of both the GBI Task Force and Working Committee since the inception of the initiative. Additionally, C/CAG has partnered with SamTrans, VTA, and the cities on numerous projects and planning efforts that aim to enable the revitalization and growth of the El Camino Real corridor.
- **San Mateo County Sub-Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process.** In order to address the need for a more open and participatory RHNA process, C/CAG has worked with the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and local state representatives to pass legislation that provided delegated authority for jurisdictions within a county to self-administer distribution of housing need for the RHNA process. Along with the County Department of Housing, C/CAG helped to facilitate this process, which enabled the 21 jurisdictions to work together to establish a

housing needs allocation methodology that would be acceptable to each of the jurisdictions in the county.

- **21 Elements.** Under the direction of the San Mateo County Department of Housing, C/CAG provides funding support to 21 Elements, which is a collaborative effort involving all 21 local jurisdictions in the county, along with partner agencies and stakeholder organizations, to implement affordable housing best practices that encourage and assist with the production of housing and certification of high quality Housing Elements. 21 Elements provides a unique forum for the 21 jurisdictions to share resources, successful strategies, and best practices in regards to addressing housing needs throughout the county. For example, 21 Elements coordinated the development of an affordable housing impact fee nexus study for jurisdictions in the county to support the adoption of local impact fee requirements for affordable housing.

Important San Mateo County public entities that facilitate transportation planning and investment include:

- **C/CAG Standing Committees.** C/CAG utilizes a Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee to review and vet program policies and criteria. Staff will draw on these committees as forums to review future updates to the San Mateo County PDA Investment & Growth Strategy and to engage our member agencies on the development and progress of the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy over time.
- **Local Transportation Agencies.** C/CAG will continue to coordinate with transportation agencies in the county and across the region, including, but not limited to, the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), Caltrain, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance, and MTC. The strategy of focusing transportation investments in the PDAs is expected to grow the demand for transit service in the county, and these transportation agencies and providers will be key partners in preparing to accommodate growth.

In recent years, C/CAG has participated in a number of countywide planning efforts by serving as the lead agency on a study or by providing local matching funds. A brief description of several of these planning efforts is provided below.

- **San Mateo County Housing Needs Study.** To formally document the large and growing gap between housing need and supply, in 2007, C/CAG partnered with the County of San Mateo Department of Housing and the Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) to produce and distribute the San Mateo County Housing Needs Study. This partnership resulted in a series of five policy primers on housing need, infill development, housing implications of the aging population, and the environmental effects of housing policy. Additionally, a Countywide Housing Production Strategy was published.

- **Community-Based Transportation Plans.** From 2004 to 2012, C/CAG sponsored the development of four Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) for East Palo Alto, Daly City Bayshore, North Central San Mateo, San Bruno, and South San Francisco. Additionally, in 2009, C/CAG secured a Caltrans Environmental Justice grant to support the development of a CBTP for the low-income population throughout the county. Through local community engagement and outreach processes, these CBTPs identified community transportation needs as well as projects and programs to support those needs.
- **Grand Boulevard Multimodal Transportation Plan.** In 2007, C/CAG partnered with the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) on a Caltrans planning grant for El Camino Real. The result was the Grand Boulevard Multimodal Transportation Corridor Plan, which aims to facilitate smart growth development on the El Camino Real corridor along the San Francisco Peninsula. The plan includes a multimodal access strategy, an evaluation of the potential impacts of Bus Rapid Transit along the corridor, and a toolkit of streetscape and traffic design measures that achieve complete streets goals, support transformation, and align with Caltrans practices.
- **GBI Economic & Housing Opportunities Assessment Phase I.** Parallel to the effort to develop the Grand Boulevard Multimodal Transportation Plan, C/CAG partnered with the Silicon Valley Community Foundation and MTC to fund the development of the GBI Economic & Housing Opportunities Assessment. This evaluation examined alternative growth scenarios for the El Camino Real corridor and assessed the potential fiscal benefits of transforming the corridor into a vibrant, multimodal corridor through the intensification of housing and employment.
- **GBI: Removing Barriers to Sustainable Communities project.** In 2010, SamTrans, in partnership with C/CAG and VTA, was awarded a U.S. Department of Transportation TIGER II Planning grant in the amount of \$1.1 million to fund the development of concrete strategies to removing barriers to the implementation of the GBI vision. The grant funded three distinct, but interrelated projects that address key challenges to development along the El Camino Real corridor. These three projects are nearly all complete, and a brief description of each is provided below.
- **Designing El Camino Real as a Complete Street.** This project facilitates the design of four complete streets demonstration projects on El Camino Real that could serve as a model for addressing challenges to transforming auto-dominated state highways into balanced multimodal corridors. Using the street design guidelines from the Multimodal Transportation Corridor Plan, preliminary designs (up to 40 percent) for complete streets segments on El Camino Real were developed for four case studies in Daly City, South San Francisco, San Bruno, and San Carlos.
- **Infrastructure Needs Assessment and Financing Strategy.** This project evaluates the readiness of infrastructure in the El Camino Real Corridor to accommodate future

development that is consistent with anticipated growth projections and local plans and policies. The study provides an estimate for the cost of infrastructure improvements necessary to implement the GBI vision and identifies potential funding and financing sources for communities to make those improvements.

- **GBI Economic & Housing Opportunities Assessment (ECHO) Phase II.** ECHO Phase II addresses the common challenges that communities along the El Camino Real corridor face in attracting new infill development. Four jurisdictions along the corridor are examined as case studies for challenges to implementing the GBI vision, and a toolkit of implementation strategies is provided to help all GBI cities move forward with infill development in the El Camino Real corridor.

Policy Support

Supportive transportation policies can play a key role in the success of infill development in the PDAs. For instance, reduced parking requirements can support smaller-scale infill development, and transportation demand management (TDM) plans and policies can mitigate the traffic impacts of new developments that can help alleviate community concerns around increased congestion. C/CAG can play a role in helping jurisdictions develop local transportation policies that are consistent with the vision for supporting focused growth in the PDAs.

As the CMA for San Mateo County, C/CAG helps to establish countywide transportation policies and standards through its Congestion Management Program and Countywide Transportation Plan. Given that increased congestion associated with higher densities or building heights is a key issue in the public debate over infill development, C/CAG can reexamine its land use impact analysis program and traffic impact analysis (TIA) guidelines to encourage the use of context-sensitive trip generation rates. An MTC study that assessed the development feasibility of a sample of PDAs across the region found that the potential traffic impacts of infill development projects could be overstated by standard Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) vehicle trip rates.⁸ Using these rates to analyze the impacts of projects in areas well-served by transit or other alternative forms of transportation may result in an exaggerated need for traffic mitigation measures, such as new or expanded roads.

While public sector funding, planning, partnerships, and policy may provide a supportive context for growth in the county, development in the PDAs will ultimately depend on the private market and the interests of the development and investment community. Local jurisdictions conduct feasibility analyses when establishing land use controls and related public benefits requirements, to ensure that controls and requirements do encourage development. Architects can help determine whether a particular regulation will attract development, while a financial consultant can help inform decisions about exactions and process benefits.

⁸ Plan Bay Area Priority Development Area Development Feasibility and Readiness Assessment (2013)

V. Transportation Investments

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Mateo County, administers a number of federal, state, and local funding transportation funds. Funds that flow into San Mateo County from the state and federal levels pass through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and are subject to priorities and criteria established to implement the One Bay Area Plan.

Plan Bay Area 2040, the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy and 2040 Regional Transportation Plan jointly developed by MTC and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), directs approximately \$14 billion of the \$60 billion in discretionary transportation funds anticipated in the region over the 28-year life of the plan to supporting focused growth in the region's Priority Development Areas (PDAs). These funds provide support for several programs administered by the CMAs in the region, including the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) program and the Local PDA Planning program.

OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program

OBAG 1 Grants and Extension

Plan Bay Area allocated \$320 million to the nine CMAs in the region over the first four years of the plan to administer the OBAG program. This funding was designed to reward jurisdictions that focus housing growth in PDAs through their planning and zoning policies and for their actual production of housing units. Funding for the OBAG 1 program was derived from several sources, including the Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), the Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP), and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

OBAG funding provides support for a range of transportation improvement projects, including 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 (PCAs).

OBAG 1 funds were allocated to the CMAs based on population, past housing production, and future housing commitments, with additional weighting to acknowledge local jurisdiction efforts to produce low-income housing. This methodology linked transportation investments to housing growth. Under the policies of previous long-range regional transportation plans, such as Transportation 2035, discretionary transportation funds were allocated to the CMAs primarily based on population. Given that San Mateo County is home to approximately 10 percent of the population in the region, C/CAG previously received approximately 10 percent of the region's discretionary transportation funds. Under the OBAG 1 funding formula, which includes additional factors for housing commitments and production, C/CAG received less funding, approximately 8 percent of the region's discretionary funds.

OBAG 1 in San Mateo County

San Mateo received \$26.5 Million in funds from the OBAG 1 round, which funded 33 projects in 15 jurisdictions. Twenty-one of the OBAG funded projects included complete streets elements. San Mateo County invested 83% of OBAG 1 funds in PDAs. Appendix F provides more details about OBAG 1 in San Mateo County including a list of the projects that were awarded funds, some details about major projects and a discussion of the grant allocation process.

Local PDA Planning Program

In November 2012, MTC approved providing approximately \$20 million in STP funds to the nine CMAs in the region to implement local PDA Planning programs. The goal of this program is to help local jurisdictions plan for growth in their PDAs. Building on the regional PDA and Station Area Planning programs administered by MTC, the local PDA Planning program was intended to help PDAs become more development ready and streamline the entitlement process by providing support for a range of planning activities, such as the development of specific plans and programmatic environmental impact reports (EIRs).

Local PDA Planning in San Mateo County

PDA planning funds were allocated to the CMAs using the OBAG program distribution formula. C/CAG had \$1,692,000 available to award to eligible projects. C/CAG distributed these funds to four jurisdictions through a competitive funding process. C/CAG awarded points for projects that intensified land uses and increase the supply of housing, including affordable housing, and jobs in areas around transit stations, downtowns, and transit corridors; assisted in streamlining the entitlement process and help PDAs become more development ready; and addressed challenges to achieving infill development and higher densities. See Table 8 below for details on funded planning projects.

Table 8: Local PDA Planning projects funded in San Mateo County.

| Jurisdiction | Project | Scoring Panel Recommendation |
|--------------|--|------------------------------|
| Redwood City | Downtown Transit Area Improvements and Streetcar Feasibility | \$450,000 |
| Belmont | Belmont Village Implementation Plan | \$440,000 |
| Millbrae | Millbrae Priority Development Area Specific Plan | \$500,000 |
| C/CAG | PDA Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program | \$302,000 |
| Total | | \$1,692,000 |

OBAG 2 Grants and Program Requirements

In 2015 MTC and ABAG adopted Resolution 4204 outlining and approving the OBAG 2 Grant Program. OBAG 2 funding is based on anticipated future federal transportation program apportionments from the regional Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Programs. Originally, the programming capacity estimated for OBAG 2 amounted to \$790 million. The revised total STP/CMAQ funding for OBAG 2 is \$862 million.

In OBAG 2, the county distribution formula is updated to use the latest housing data from the Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG). The formula is also based on housing over a longer time frame, considering housing production between 1999 and 2006 (weighted 30%) and between 2007 and 2014 (weighted 70%) in order to mitigate the effect of the recent recession and major swings in housing permit approvals.

The OBAG 2 formula places additional emphasis on housing production and the share of affordable housing within both production and RHNA. The formula also expands the definition of affordable housing to include housing for moderate-income households in addition to low- and very low-income households. Furthermore, housing production is capped at the total RHNA allocation.

OBAG 2 continues to provide the same base share of the funding pot (40%) to the county CMAs for local decision-making. The program allows CMAs the flexibility to invest in various transportation categories, such as Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and roads preservation, and planning and outreach activities. In addition to the base county program, two previously regional programs, Safe Routes to School and the Federal-Aid Secondary (rural roads), have been consolidated into the county program with guaranteed minimum funding amounts to ensure the programs continue to be funded at specified levels. CMAs will continue to report on their outreach process as part of their solicitation and selection of projects for OBAG.

As a condition to access funds, local jurisdictions need to continue to align their general plans' housing and complete streets policies⁹ as a part of OBAG 2 and as separately required by state law. OBAG 2 also includes requirements for anti-displacement policies and conformance with the State Surplus Land Act.

OBAG 2 in San Mateo County

Countywide, half of all OBAG funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 31, 2020. All remaining OBAG funds must be submitted for construction by January 31, 2023. Non-infrastructure projects and Preliminary Engineering (PE) phases are expected to be obligated in the first year of the program. Table 9 shows the adopted OBAG 2 framework.

⁹ As of February 2016 all jurisdiction in San Mateo County are in compliance with the requirement.

Table 9: Projected OBAG 2 funds for San Mateo County.

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Local Street and Roads (LSR) Maintenances and Rehabilitation | \$12.1 M |
| Planning and Outreach | \$5.08M |
| Transportation and Livable Communities (TLC) | \$5.9M |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP) | \$5.9M |
| Safe Routes to School (SRTS) | \$2.6M |
| Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) Program (required by statute) | \$892,000 |
| TOTAL | \$32.5 M |

Source: August 2016 – C/CAG Memo “Review and approval of revisions to the Board adopted OBAG 2 Framework

Eligibility Requirements

In San Mateo County 70% of OBAG 2 grants must be spent on PDAs within the County. Projects can qualify if the project connects to a PDA or provides “proximate access”. In order to prevent the concentration of OBAG 2 funds to any one jurisdiction, a maximum of \$1 Million per project and \$1.5 Million per jurisdiction between both the BPIP and TLC programs. The minimum grant for the BPIP and TLC is \$250,000. An additional scoring criterion that included affordable housing preservation strategies and/ or community stabilization policies in PDAs or TPAs was added to the TLC and BPIP competitive programs. OBAG 2 screening and scoring criteria can be found in Appendix G.

Definition of “Proximate Access” for OBAG 2 Grants

1. The project provides direct access to a PDA; or
2. The project is within one mile radius of a PDA boundary; or
3. The project is project is located on a street that hoses a transit route, which directly leads to a PDA; or
4. The project is located within ½ mile of one or more stops for two or more public or shuttle bus lines, or within ½ mile of a rail or regional transit station, that is connected to a PDA; or
5. The project provides a connection between a Transit Oriented Development (TOD), as defined by C/CAG and a PDA.
6. The project is a bicycle/pedestrian facility that is included in an adopted bicycle/pedestrian plan within San Mateo County and is part of a network that leads to a PDA.

C/CAG updated the definition of proximate access for OBAG 1 by extending the radius from ½ mile to one mile.

Identifying Ongoing and Future Transportation Projects within PDAs

C/CAG will continue to support jurisdictions in identifying transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes. C/CAG supported and administered the development of five Community-Based Transportation Plans in San Mateo County, which identified local transportation needs and projects and programs to address those needs. Additionally, C/CAG partnered with SamTrans on an Infrastructure Needs Assessment and Financing Strategy for the El Camino Real corridor, which evaluated the readiness of infrastructure in the corridor to accommodate future development consistent with the growth anticipated by ABAG and by local plans and policies.

C/CAG will continue to support local jurisdictions in identifying capital improvements necessary to help PDAs grow. Infrastructure improvement programs and related financing and phasing plans will improve the shovel readiness of major improvements and put local agencies in the county in a better position to obtain federal, state, and regional funding.

Appendix A: Profiles of San Mateo County PDAs

| PDA | Description |
|--|---|
| <p>Belmont Belmont Village <i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i></p> | <p>Belmont Village Mixed-Use Corridor. The Belmont Village PDA encompasses the downtown area surrounding the Caltrain station located at the intersection of El Camino Real and Ralston Avenue in the City of Belmont. Bordered by low-density residential districts, the area is largely auto-oriented and dominated by surface parking lots. Amenities in and around the PDA include SamTrans bus routes; the Belmont Caltrain station; the Belmont Civic Center; Twin Pines Park; Village Center shopping; Notre Dame de Namur University; US 101 and 280; and a pedestrian/bicycle bridge that connects downtown Belmont to the San Francisco Bay Trail, Belmont Sports Complex, and major employers.</p> <p>2017 Update: Through the recently developed Belmont Village Specific Plan (BVSP), the City is planning for high-quality mixed-use development and affordable housing in the PDA, while at the same time making sure to preserve Belmont’s small-town character and pristine open space. This effort includes implementing zoning and design controls. The BVSP, in concert with the City’s comprehensive 2035 General Plan Update is anticipated to accommodate 1,600 additional households and 4,800 new jobs.</p> |
| <p>Brisbane San Francisco/ San Mateo Bi- County Area <i>Suburban Center</i></p> | <p>The San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County PDA includes several adjacent neighborhoods on both sides of the San Francisco-San Mateo county line. The Brisbane Gateway and Baylands area is located on the San Mateo County side and is comprised of the 25-acre Brisbane Gateway subarea and 655-acre Baylands subarea adjacent to US 101 and near several transit connections, including the Bayshore Caltrain station, the Balboa Park BART station, and the T-Third Street Light Rail line. Additionally, Muni and SamTrans operate several public transit routes in the area.</p> <p>2017 Update: The City of Brisbane is preparing a Precise Plan for the Gateway subarea (“Parkside at Brisbane Village”) that will implement affordable housing overlay zoning to accommodate 228 housing units, consistent with the City’s 2015-2023 Housing Element. The City of Brisbane is processing a specific plan for the Baylands area, a former municipal landfill and rail yard site and the largest undeveloped parcel on the San Francisco Peninsula. The Baylands area encompasses one-third of the city’s total land area. The City’s goal is to redevelop this urban brownfield site as a model of sustainability for the region.</p> |
| <p>Burlingame Burlingame El Camino Real <i>Transit Town Center</i></p> | <p>The Burlingame El Camino Real PDA encompasses a half mile buffer centered on El Camino Real that runs the length of the city, from Burlingame’s northern border with Millbrae to its southern border with San Mateo. The southern end of the PDA includes the Burlingame CalTras station and Downtown Burlingame, which is recognized as the commercial and retail heart of the city. The northern end of the PDA, which is walking distance from the intermodal Millbrae BART/Caltrain station, primarily consists of older office buildings. As in neighboring Millbrae, interest at the northern end is mostly in residential development. In 2010, the Burlingame City Council adopted the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan, which sets forth policies and regulations to enhance downtown vibrancy through a diverse mix of retail and housing uses, bicycle, pedestrian and other improvements to and from downtown, and other amenities to enhance peoples’ experience in the downtown and adjacent areas.</p> <p>2017 Update: The City is currently updating its General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Preliminary direction is to allow a more intensive mix of uses at the northern end of the PDA to capitalize on the proximity of the area to the Millbrae Intermodal Station. Completion of the update to the Burlingame General Plan is anticipated to occur by January 2018, and zoning consistency amendments are expected soon thereafter. The plan will accommodate 1,232 new units by 2030.</p> |
| <p>Daly City Bayshore</p> | <p>The Bayshore neighborhood is a large, primarily residential neighborhood located in northeastern Daly City. Centered on the Geneva Avenue commercial corridor, the PDA borders the cities of Brisbane</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Transit Town Center</i></p> | <p>and San Francisco. A historic draw for the area is the Cow Palace, which is an indoor arena that was built in 1941. The Geneva Avenue corridor is envisioned as the heart and soul of the Bayshore community, fulfilling a strong desire by neighborhood residents for a safe, friendly, and attractive destination, with more landscaping, trees, and shop fronts. A number of transit services operate in or near the Bayshore neighborhood, including SamTrans route 24, Muni route 9, and the T-Third Street Light Rail. Although the Bayshore Caltrain station is located nearby, pedestrian and bicycle access to the station from the Bayshore PDA is limited.</p> <p>2017 Update: Some of the larger sites within the PDA have been discussed with applicants in early pre-development conversations. Collaboration with San Francisco and Brisbane on transportation planning issues is ongoing.</p> |
| <p><i>Daly City Mission Street Corridor Mixed-Use Corridor</i></p> | <p>The Mission Street Corridor PDA, which extends from the Daly City BART station at its northern end to the Colma BART station at its southern end, encompasses a total of 146 acres. It is set in a narrow buffer around San Jose Avenue and Mission Street. The corridor features low-rise stores alongside smaller lot single-family homes. At the northern end of the PDA there is a mixed-use neighborhood and the "Top of the Hill," which is one of the best-served public transit locations in the Bay Area. The nearby Daly City BART station and convergence of SamTrans and Muni at the "Top of the Hill" is encouraging redevelopment. In 2013, a new transit plaza and several pedestrian and streetscape improvements were completed in the area. In addition, the parcels along Mission Street were re-designated to commercial mixed-use.</p> <p>2017 Update: The City is undertaking planning work to adjust building heights, parking controls, and retail zoning regulations. Some of the larger sites in Daly City are still in pre-development discussions, however, a 52 unit affordable housing development is moving forward through the approval process. This effort will ensure a mix of uses and will increase the availability of housing in the area.</p> |
| <p><i>East Palo Alto Ravenswood Transit Town Center</i></p> | <p>The Ravenswood PDA in the City of East Palo Alto encompasses approximately 350 acres in the southeastern portion of the county next to the San Francisco Bay. At present, the PDA exhibits a variety of existing land uses, from single-family homes on University Avenue and small corner stores on Bay Road, to industrial uses and vacant parcels in the Ravenswood Business District. Significant changes are planned to transition the PDA from a heavy industrial area to a community with office, research and design, retail, live-work, and residential uses. Current commuting patterns among residents of the PDA are dominated by automobile travel, in part due to the lack of convenient and affordable transit options in the area. SamTrans and an AC Transit Dumbarton Express Shuttle provide limited service in the PDA, and the nearest Caltrain station in Palo Alto is four miles away. The Four Corners Specific Plan was adopted in September of 2012 and has transformed the heavy industrial area into a mixed-use opportunity for the City for the next 30 years.</p> <p>2017 Update: The City is in the final stages of updating its General Plan. The Ravenswood/4 Corners Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan covers the largest potential in the City for new development, increased parklands/open space, enhanced economic activity, and an improved jobs-housing balance. The City is striving to enhance public-private partnerships, seek funding for infrastructure improvements, market the area to technology companies, secure long-term sources of water, and pursue catalytic development projects that attract additional development. The Ravenswood TOD Specific Plan envisions a pedestrian-friendly main street along Bay Road with ground floor retail and residential uses on the upper floors.</p> |
| <p><i>Menlo Park El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown Transit Town Center</i></p> | <p>The El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown PDA is the retail and service commercial center of Menlo Park. It includes the blocks on both sides of El Camino Real from the city's northern border with Atherton to the San Mateo-Santa Clara county line in the south. The heart of Menlo Park's downtown is at the intersection of Santa Cruz Avenue and El Camino Real, near the Menlo Park Caltrain station. Uses lining the adjacent El Camino Real corridor include small retail, restaurant, and personal service establishments; grocery stores; office buildings; hotels/motels; and automotive service stations. The area is served by Caltrain, SamTrans buses that provide connections to other locations within San</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Mateo County, VTA buses that serve nearby Santa Clara County, and public and private shuttles connecting to key local destinations and employment centers. In 2012, the City completed the Downtown Specific Plan for the area that establishes a framework for private and public improvements for the next several decades. The Downtown Specific Plan boundaries are co-terminus with the City's PDA boundary.</p> <p>2017 Update: The Downtown Specific Plan continues to be effectively implemented. Recently, the City has been undertaking a number planning projects focused on the east side of Highway 101 that support enhancements and connections throughout the City. On November 29, 2016, the City Council certified the ConnectMenlo Environmental Impact Report and approved updates to the General Plan Land Use and Circulation Elements. The ConnectMenlo General Plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update has been a multi-year comprehensive process that represents a vision for a live/work/play environment in the M-2 Area.</p> |
| <p>Millbrae Transit Station Area <i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i></p> | <p>The Millbrae Transit Station Area PDA encompasses the area within the immediate vicinity of the Millbrae BART/Caltrain station. It is generally bounded by the Burlingame city limits on the south; the Millbrae Avenue/US 101 freeway interchange in the east; El Camino Real and Broadway in the west; and Victoria Avenue, the City's public works storage yard, and the Highline Canal in the north. Just southeast of the area is Millbrae's downtown district, which includes numerous restaurants and specialty shops. Immediately north of the station planning area is the Bayside Manor residential neighborhood, which is made up of single-family homes. The Millbrae BART/Caltrain station provides the city with far-reaching transit service from San Francisco to San Jose. SamTrans buses provide local service along El Camino Real and connections to San Francisco and San Mateo County. An intensification of land uses is planned for the area, and a number of major projects are already in the pipeline to transform the PDA into a vibrant area with multiple land uses.</p> <p>2017 Update: The Station Area Specific Plan update is underway. Environmental review was recently completed. BART has pursued a public private partnership for some of their property in the PDA. Nearly 400 new housing units are currently under review.</p> |
| <p>Redwood City Downtown <i>City Center</i></p> | <p>Redwood City's Downtown PDA has become a vibrant entertainment center, with dense residential development, destination for shopping and dining, cultural center, major transit hub, and dynamic workplace district. Encompassing several city blocks surrounding the Redwood City Caltrain station, the PDA is generally bordered by Veterans Boulevard, Brewster Avenue, Maple Street, and El Camino Real/Adams Street. The city has taken significant steps in recent years to make its vision for the downtown area a reality, including street improvements to make the downtown more pedestrian-friendly. Additionally, the city has developed a Downtown Parking Management Plan and Downtown Precise Plan to ensure that future development enhances the area's pedestrian-and transit-oriented qualities. Attractions and amenities in the area include Courthouse Square, Century Theatres, Sequoia Station, and the Fox Theatre. The Redwood City Caltrain station provides connections to San Francisco, San Jose, and other Peninsula cities, and SamTrans provides bus connections.</p> <p>2017 Update: The Downtown PDA plan will enable 2,500 units, 500,000 square feet of Office and over 100,000 square feet of other commercial uses. The plan establishes a goal that 15% of all units built will be available at affordable levels. There has been considerable residential development in downtown, especially of market rate units, and the city is nearing the market rate cap established in the plan. The City has adopted impact fees and provides density bonuses and other incentives to achieve below market rate affordable housing goals. In addition, the City is currently studying the feasibility of a streetcar to connect the transit center to other areas in the downtown and elsewhere.</p> |
| <p>Redwood City <i>Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor</i></p> | <p>The Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor PDA is located directly east of the Downtown PDA in Redwood City, adjacent to US 101. The corridor is home to four of the city's largest employers and has major facilities for both the local city government and the County of San Mateo. Further job growth is planned for the area, including several activity nodes and employment areas. New zoning for the area supports high-density mixed-use development, walk-able workplace areas, light industrial</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i> | <p>incubator areas, and healthcare workplace areas. A number of plans have been completed in the PDA within the past decade, including the Kaiser Hospital Precise Plan, the Stanford Precise Plan, and the North Main Precise Plan. SamTrans and local commuter shuttles serve the area, and a streetcar system has been proposed to link the eastern half of the corridor with Downtown and the Redwood City Caltrain station.</p> <p>2017 Update: Several residential developments have been entitled in this area, adding about 700 units to the area. In addition to a 100% affordable housing project, other developments are including 20% of the units at below market rate affordable levels.</p> |
| <p>San Bruno Transit Corridors <i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i></p> | <p>The San Bruno Transit Corridors PDA is a 700-acre triangular shaped area that includes several developing commercial corridors: San Mateo Avenue, El Camino Real, San Bruno Avenue, and Huntington Avenue. The area includes the San Bruno BART station, Tanforan shopping mall, and The Crossings development site at its northern end. At its southern end is the San Bruno Caltrain station, which has been relocated to the corner of San Bruno and San Mateo Avenues. This relocation has provided a major impetus for planning and development in the area. In 2013, the City of San Bruno adopted the Transit Corridors Plan, which provides a new vision for the city's Downtown core area centered on San Mateo Avenue and neighboring streets. The plan outlines policies, design guidelines, and development standards to encourage a stronger retail environment, a mix of housing opportunities and commercial uses, and improved pedestrian and multi-modal connections in the area.</p> <p>2017 Update: San Bruno has increased the area covered by this PDA. The City has nearly completed a zoning update for the entire city, which will implement the transit corridors plan. In 2014 the voters approved height increases along the transit corridors to five stories, with seven story heights limits allowed closer to the transit station. Planning for other transportation improvements and amenities are currently underway.</p> |
| <p>San Carlos Railroad Corridor <i>Transit Town Center</i></p> | <p>Located along El Camino Real, the San Carlos Railroad Corridor PDA encompasses the area around the San Carlos Caltrain station, including the city's downtown area along Laurel and Walnut streets and the primarily industrial and low-intensity manufacturing areas between the Caltrain tracks and US 101. On the west side of the PDA, the City has adopted policies to guide redevelopment and targeted revitalization to promote transit-oriented development, increased retail sales, employment growth, and housing. Revised zoning for the area was completed for the area in 2011. The PDA's east side, which provides a majority of the city's employment and sales tax revenues, contains older industrial buildings that provide unique spaces for a number of businesses. Surrounding the PDA are predominantly single-family residential areas. The San Carlos Caltrain station and SamTrans buses, that provide service along El Camino Real, connect the PDA to destinations throughout San Mateo County.</p> <p>2017 Update: Several residential projects are currently underway, including several below market rate affordable housing developments.</p> |
| <p>San Mateo Downtown <i>City Center</i></p> | <p>San Mateo's Downtown PDA generally encompasses the area within one-quarter mile of the Downtown Train Station. Recognized as the center of the city, the area is largely commercial and includes fairly recent developments such as the Downtown Cinema, Downtown Train Station, and New Main Street Garage. Central Park lies just outside of the boundaries of the PDA, and new street improvements to enhance walkability and pedestrian access are planned. The area has received growing interest from software companies and startups seeking flexible workspaces.</p> <p>2017 Update: Recently, the City initiated an update to the Downtown Specific Plan. In addition, several sites in the area are attracting new housing or office projects, including two sites the City has issued RFPs for on former redevelopment agency properties. The city adopted a Downtown Parking Management Plan to improve the use of existing parking spaces, enhance parking services for downtown visitors and employees, and to identify future parking needs for the area.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>San Mateo El Camino Real <i>Mixed-Use</i> <i>Corridor</i></p> | <p>The El Camino Real PDA in the City of San Mateo comprises approximately 160 acres of land along El Camino Real, between State Route 92 and the border with the City of Belmont. Conveniently located within a half-mile of both the Hayward Park and Hillsdale Caltrain stations, the PDA is mostly devoted to commercial uses that serve surrounding neighborhoods in San Mateo, including the Hillsdale Shopping Center, financial institutions, goods and services centers, small businesses, and restaurants. El Camino Real serves as a primary route for many SamTrans buses and provides connections to cities along the Peninsula.</p> <p>2017 Update: While this area has development challenges associated with aggregating land and the variability in lot sizes and ownership, the City approved a 68-unit housing development in 2016 and has provided improvements to the Hillsdale Shopping Center. Both of these projects include enhancements to the public realm for pedestrians.</p> |
| <p>San Mateo Rail Corridor <i>Transit</i> <i>Neighborhood</i></p> | <p>Adjacent to the San Mateo El Camino Real PDA, the Rail Corridor PDA covers an area of land in the City of San Mateo nestled between Hillsdale Boulevard, 16th Avenue, El Camino Real, and US 101. In 2005, the city adopted a Rail Corridor Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Plan for the area, which envisioned replacing underutilized land within walking distance of the two Caltrain stations in the area with higher-intensity, mixed-use development to increase housing opportunities, reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles, and to promote transit ridership.</p> <p>2017 Update: There are over 2,200 residential dwelling units that have either been entitled, are under construction or have been recently completed in the Rail Corridor area. Over 20% of the housing units are below market rate affordability levels. New developments include Bay Meadows, Station Park Green, Hines offices and other individual developments. Transportation efforts include establishing a transportation management agency (TMA), implementing transportation demand management (TDM) requirements with new development entitlements and coordinating grade separations with Caltrain (SamTrans) to improve pedestrian and bicycle systems. Improvements to the Hillsdale transit station are ongoing.</p> |
| <p>South San Francisco Downtown <i>Transit Town</i> <i>Center</i></p> | <p>Situated west of US 101 next to the South San Francisco Caltrain Station, South San Francisco's Downtown PDA includes the oldest commercial and residential areas of the city, including the Grand Avenue Commercial District and adjoining residential areas. Access to the Caltrain station from all directions is limited by the highway, including ramps and overpasses. In 2015, the city adopted the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan (DSASP), focused on development opportunities in the Downtown within ¼ mile of the Caltrain station. The DSASP also includes strategies to improve accessibility between the Caltrain station, Downtown, and the regional employment center east of US 101, which houses several biotechnology companies and other large employers. In the downtown area, SamTrans buses provide connections to the South San Francisco, Colma, and Daly City BART stations.</p> <p>2017 Update: There are several planning efforts underway to enhance the area. The relocation and upgrade of the Caltrain station will have significant regional transportation benefits. There is also a study underway to consider rezoning portions of the East of 101 area to allow for residential development, which will increase residential capacity in the City, create a jobs/housing balance East of 101, and help to create a destination and sense of place.</p> |
| <p>Multi-City El Camino Real <i>Mixed-Use</i> <i>Corridor</i></p> | <p>The multi-city El Camino Real PDA is set along a one-quarter-mile buffer along El Camino Real, extending the length of the corridor through downtowns and central business districts in Daly City, Colma, South San Francisco, San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, Redwood City, Menlo Park, and unincorporated neighborhoods in San Mateo County. As a designated State Route (SR 82), El Camino Real is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The corridor carries high volumes of vehicle traffic, and the streetscape lining the roadway is predominantly auto-oriented. Current land use patterns consist of relatively low-density development, with the exception of Burlingame, which is characterized by predominantly medium-density residential development, and limited locations of high population and</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>employment density. Although the corridor is almost entirely auto-dominated, it is also well-served by transit. BART and Caltrain stations are within walking distance of all 11 cities located along the El Camino Real corridor. Additionally, SamTrans provides bus service along the corridor from San Francisco to Menlo Park.</p> <p>City staff and elected officials from 19 jurisdictions in both San Mateo and Santa Clara counties have been engaged in a joint effort to transform the El Camino Real corridor into a “grand boulevard of meaningful destinations.” Known as the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI), the voluntary collaboration of cities, counties, and advocates has adopted a vision statement and guiding principles for the corridor, and is continuing work to identify improvements and provide guidance for the jurisdictions along the corridor.</p> <p>2017 Update: To date, several cities along El Camino Real have completed planning efforts and rezoned portions of the corridor to encourage higher-intensity, mixed-use development, and housing at higher densities. Currently, the City of Belmont is implementing mixed used zoning in this PDA. However, for some cities, such as San Mateo, small, fragmented parcels continue to be a barrier to redevelopment in this PDA. Redwood City is in the process of identifying and prioritizing key pedestrian and bicycle improvements in the area. South San Francisco is working to relocate their civic center to increase housing capacity within close proximity to the BART Station, including several acres of port property. The county has completed two of four proposed rezoning phases underway within the PDA for the North Fair Oaks area. Environmental review for all three phases has been completed. The County has also identified streetscape improvements for the area.</p> |
|--|---|

Appendix B: ABAG Growth Projections for San Mateo County, 2010-2040

| | Jobs | | | | Housing Units | | | | Households | | | |
|--|--------|--------|-----------|----------|---------------|--------|-----------|----------|------------|--------|-----------|----------|
| | 2010 | 2040 | 2010-2040 | % Growth | 2010 | 2040 | 2010-2040 | % Growth | 2010 | 2040 | 2010-2040 | % Growth |
| Atherton | 2,610 | 3,160 | 550 | 21% | 2,530 | 2,750 | 220 | 9% | 2,330 | 2,580 | 250 | 11% |
| Belmont | 8,180 | 10,450 | 2,270 | 28% | 11,030 | 12,150 | 1,120 | 10% | 10,580 | 11,790 | 1,210 | 11% |
| Belmont Village | 1,250 | 2,500 | 1,250 | | 920 | 1,830 | 910 | | 890 | 1,790 | 900 | |
| Brisbane | 6,780 | 7,670 | 890 | 13% | 1,930 | 2,180 | 250 | 13% | 1,820 | 2,090 | 270 | 15% |
| San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area | 500 | 960 | 460 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Burlingame | 29,540 | 37,780 | 8,240 | 28% | 13,030 | 16,700 | 3,670 | 28% | 12,360 | 16,170 | 3,800 | 31% |
| Burlingame El Camino Real | 12,290 | 17,920 | 5,630 | | 7,610 | 10,870 | 3,260 | | 7,170 | 10,530 | 3,360 | |
| Colma | 2,780 | 3,200 | 420 | 15% | 430 | 680 | 240 | 58% | 410 | 660 | 250 | 61% |
| Daly City | 20,760 | 26,580 | 5,820 | 28% | 32,590 | 36,900 | 4,310 | 13% | 31,090 | 35,770 | 4,680 | 15% |
| Bayshore | 1,100 | 3,230 | 2,130 | | 1,590 | 3,580 | 1,990 | | 1,550 | 3,510 | 1,960 | |
| Mission Street Corridor | 3,770 | 5,200 | 1,430 | | 2,270 | 3,310 | 1,050 | | 2,070 | 3,210 | 1,150 | |
| East Palo Alto | 2,670 | 3,680 | 1,000 | 38% | 7,820 | 8,670 | 860 | 11% | 6,940 | 8,340 | 1,400 | 20% |
| Ravenswood | 790 | 1,210 | 420 | | 1,030 | 1,880 | 860 | | 970 | 1,830 | 860 | |
| Foster City | 13,780 | 17,350 | 3,570 | 26% | 12,460 | 13,350 | 900 | 7% | 12,020 | 12,950 | 930 | 8% |
| Half Moon Bay | 5,030 | 6,020 | 990 | 20% | 4,400 | 4,660 | 270 | 6% | 4,150 | 4,410 | 260 | 6% |
| Hillsborough | 1,850 | 2,250 | 410 | 22% | 3,910 | 4,230 | 310 | 8% | 3,690 | 4,010 | 320 | 9% |
| Menlo Park | 28,890 | 34,980 | 6,090 | 21% | 13,090 | 15,090 | 2,000 | 15% | 12,350 | 14,520 | 2,170 | 18% |
| El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown | 5,620 | 7,650 | 2,050 | | 1,130 | 2,050 | 920 | | 1,010 | 1,980 | 970 | |
| Millbrae | 6,870 | 9,300 | 2,430 | 35% | 8,370 | 11,400 | 3,020 | 36% | 7,990 | 11,050 | 3,060 | 38% |
| Transit Station Area | 1,340 | 3,370 | 2,040 | | 280 | 2,710 | 2,420 | | 270 | 2,650 | 2,390 | |
| Pacifica | 5,870 | 7,100 | 1,230 | 21% | 14,520 | 15,130 | 610 | 4% | 13,970 | 14,650 | 680 | 5% |
| Portola Valley | 1,500 | 1,770 | 270 | 18% | 1,900 | 2,020 | 130 | 6% | 1,750 | 1,900 | 160 | 9% |
| Redwood City | 58,080 | 77,480 | 19,400 | 33% | 29,170 | 37,890 | 8,720 | 30% | 27,960 | 36,860 | 8,900 | 32% |
| Downtown | 10,430 | 14,060 | 3,630 | | 1,060 | 6,310 | 5,250 | | 990 | 6,180 | 5,190 | |
| Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor | 8,480 | 11,900 | 3,420 | | 770 | 2,300 | 1,530 | | 730 | 2,250 | 1,520 | |
| San Bruno | 12,710 | 16,950 | 4,240 | 33% | 15,360 | 19,820 | 4,460 | 29% | 14,700 | 19,170 | 4,470 | 30% |
| Transit Corridors | 6,620 | 10,520 | 3,900 | | 4,330 | 7,660 | 3,330 | | 4,140 | 7,450 | 3,320 | |
| San Carlos | 15,870 | 19,370 | 3,510 | 22% | 12,020 | 13,800 | 1,780 | 15% | 11,520 | 13,390 | 1,870 | 16% |
| Railroad Corridor | 1,940 | 3,090 | 1,150 | | 460 | 1,230 | 770 | | 440 | 1,200 | 760 | |
| San Mateo | 52,540 | 72,950 | 20,410 | 39% | 40,010 | 50,200 | 10,180 | 25% | 38,230 | 48,620 | 10,390 | 27% |
| Downtown | 4,370 | 6,970 | 2,600 | | 540 | 1,610 | 1,070 | | 500 | 1,560 | 1,060 | |
| El Camino Real | 2,260 | 5,660 | 3,410 | | 880 | 2,080 | 1,200 | | 840 | 2,030 | 1,200 | |

| | Jobs | | | | Housing Units | | | | Households | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| | 2010 | 2040 | 2010-2040 | % Growth | 2010 | 2040 | 2010-2040 | % Growth | 2010 | 2040 | 2010-2040 | % Growth |
| Rail Corridor | 8,810 | 18,590 | 9,800 | | 520 | 5,180 | 4,660 | | 500 | 5,080 | 4,580 | |
| South San Francisco | 43,550 | 53,790 | 10,240 | 24% | 21,810 | 28,740 | 6,920 | 32% | 20,940 | 27,900 | 6,970 | 33% |
| Downtown | 2,530 | 6,800 | 4,270 | | 1,590 | 4,700 | 3,120 | | 1,510 | 4,600 | 3,090 | |
| Woodside | 1,760 | 2,060 | 310 | 17% | 2,160 | 2,250 | 90 | 4% | 1,980 | 2,080 | 110 | 5% |
| San Mateo County Unincorporated | 23,570 | 31,180 | 7,600 | 32% | 22,510 | 27,470 | 4,960 | 22% | 21,070 | 26,170 | 5,100 | 24% |
| Midcoast | 1,870 | 2,640 | 770 | | 3,900 | 4,900 | 1,000 | | 3,670 | 4,660 | 990 | |
| Multi-City El Camino Real PDA | 66,960 | 95,590 | 28,660 | 43% | 46,710 | 71,390 | 24,690 | 53% | 44,100 | 69,360 | 25,270 | 57% |
| Daly City * | 3,820 | 5,210 | 1,380 | | 5,960 | 7,230 | 1,270 | | 5,570 | 7,000 | 1,430 | |
| Colma | 2,120 | 2,400 | 280 | | 410 | 650 | 240 | | 390 | 640 | 250 | |
| South San Francisco | 4,740 | 6,120 | 1,380 | | 5,670 | 9,200 | 3,530 | | 5,450 | 8,970 | 3,520 | |
| San Bruno * | 7,190 | 10,290 | 3,100 | | 4,350 | 6,930 | 2,580 | | 4,150 | 6,730 | 2,580 | |
| Millbrae * | 4,560 | 6,280 | 1,730 | | 2,910 | 5,100 | 2,190 | | 2,730 | 4,950 | 2,230 | |
| San Mateo * | 17,100 | 29,020 | 11,940 | | 13,180 | 19,990 | 6,810 | | 12,490 | 19,400 | 6,910 | |
| San Carlos * | 10,040 | 12,350 | 2,300 | | 3,570 | 4,730 | 1,160 | | 3,350 | 4,600 | 1,250 | |
| Redwood City * | 7,360 | 9,670 | 2,310 | | 4,820 | 7,020 | 2,210 | | 4,560 | 6,830 | 2,280 | |
| Menlo Park * | 5,520 | 7,510 | 2,000 | | 2,850 | 3,850 | 1,000 | | 2,650 | 3,730 | 1,080 | |
| Uninc Daly City | 300 | 410 | 120 | | 400 | 430 | 30 | | 320 | 400 | 80 | |
| North Fair Oaks | 3,600 | 5,650 | 2,050 | | 2,540 | 6,180 | 3,640 | | 2,400 | 6,030 | 3,630 | |
| Unincorporated County | 610 | 680 | 70 | | 50 | 80 | 30 | | 40 | 80 | 30 | |

Source: Plan Bay Area Final Forecast of Jobs, Population, and Housing (2013)

* Indicates sections of the Multi-City El Camino Real PDA that overlap with another PDA. Job and housing totals may duplicate jobs and housing already listed in that city.

Appendix C: RHNA Allocations for Jurisdictions in San Mateo County, by AMI (2007-2014 and 2014-2022)

| | 2007-2014 RHNA | | | | | 2014-2022 RHNA | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| | Very Low 0-50% AMI | Low 51-80% AMI | Moderate 81-120% AMI | Above Moderate 120%+ AMI | Total | Very Low 0-50% AMI | Low 51-80% AMI | Moderate 81-120% AMI | Above Moderate 120%+ AMI | Total |
| Atherton | 19 | 14 | 16 | 34 | 83 | 35 | 26 | 29 | 3 | 93 |
| Belmont | 91 | 65 | 77 | 166 | 399 | 116 | 63 | 67 | 222 | 468 |
| Brisbane | 91 | 66 | 77 | 167 | 401 | 25 | 13 | 15 | 30 | 83 |
| Burlingame | 148 | 107 | 125 | 270 | 650 | 276 | 144 | 155 | 288 | 863 |
| Colma | 15 | 11 | 13 | 26 | 65 | 20 | 8 | 9 | 22 | 59 |
| Daly City | 275 | 198 | 233 | 501 | 1,207 | 400 | 188 | 221 | 541 | 1,350 |
| East Palo Alto | 144 | 103 | 122 | 261 | 630 | 64 | 54 | 83 | 266 | 467 |
| Foster City | 111 | 80 | 94 | 201 | 486 | 148 | 87 | 76 | 119 | 430 |
| Half Moon Bay | 63 | 45 | 53 | 115 | 276 | 52 | 31 | 36 | 121 | 240 |
| Hillsborough | 20 | 14 | 16 | 36 | 86 | 32 | 17 | 21 | 21 | 91 |
| Menlo Park | 226 | 163 | 192 | 412 | 993 | 233 | 129 | 143 | 150 | 655 |
| Millbrae | 103 | 74 | 87 | 188 | 452 | 193 | 101 | 112 | 257 | 663 |
| Pacifica | 63 | 45 | 53 | 114 | 275 | 121 | 68 | 70 | 154 | 413 |
| Portola Valley | 17 | 12 | 14 | 31 | 74 | 21 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 64 |
| Redwood City | 422 | 304 | 358 | 772 | 1,856 | 706 | 429 | 502 | 1,152 | 2,789 |
| San Bruno | 222 | 160 | 188 | 403 | 973 | 358 | 161 | 205 | 431 | 1,155 |
| San Carlos | 137 | 98 | 116 | 248 | 599 | 195 | 107 | 111 | 183 | 596 |
| San Mateo | 695 | 500 | 589 | 1,267 | 3,051 | 859 | 469 | 530 | 1,242 | 3,100 |
| South San Francisco | 373 | 268 | 315 | 679 | 1,635 | 565 | 281 | 313 | 705 | 1,864 |
| Unincorporated | 343 | 247 | 291 | 625 | 1,506 | 153 | 103 | 102 | 555 | 913 |
| Woodside | 10 | 7 | 8 | 16 | 41 | 23 | 13 | 15 | 11 | 62 |
| Total | 3,554 | 2,504 | 3,142 | 6,538 | 15,738 | 4,595 | 2,507 | 2,830 | 6,486 | 16,418 |




Figure 8: RHNA Allocations for Jurisdictions in San Mateo County, by AMI. 2007-2014 and 2014-2022

Appendix D. Housing Production of Local Jurisdictions in San Mateo County, 2004-2016

| Jurisdiction | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Total 2015-2016 |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|------|------|------|-----------------|
| Atherton | 3 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 |
| Very Low | 5 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Above Moderate | -2 | 0 | -2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| Belmont | 3 | 8 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moderate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Above Moderate | 3 | 7 | 7 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| Brisbane | 1 | 3 | 39 | 39 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Above Moderate | 1 | 3 | 39 | 38 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Burlingame | 0 | 49 | 0 | 13 | 48 | 0 | 48 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Moderate | 0 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 6 | | 6 |
| Above Moderate | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 42 | | 42 |
| Colma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Above Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Jurisdiction | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Total 2015-2016 |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Daly City | 11 | 3 | 256 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 47 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 21 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 52 | | 2 | | 2 |
| Moderate | 5 | 2 | 0 | | 6 | | 6 |
| Above Moderate | 6 | 1 | 183 | | 39 | | 39 |
| East Palo Alto | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Above Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Foster City | 307 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 709 | 74 | 783 |
| Very Low | 15 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 83 | 0 | 83 |
| Low | 40 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 49 | 0 | 49 |
| Moderate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 14 |
| Above Moderate | 247 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 563 | 74 | 637 |
| Half Moon Bay | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Low | 0 | 51 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 32 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Above Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Hillsborough | 24 | 34 | 26 | 18 | 22 | 15 | 37 |
| Very Low | 9 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| Low | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Above Moderate | 10 | 20 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 10 |

| Jurisdiction | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Total 2015-2016 |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| Menlo Park | 4 | 9 | 51 | 71 | 748 | 66 | 814 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 25 | 45 | 70 |
| Low | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 20 | 4 | 24 |
| Moderate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Above Moderate | 3 | 8 | 42 | 9 | 703 | 17 | 720 |
| Millbrae | 7 | 1 | 57 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | 0 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Above Moderate | 7 | 1 | 55 | 54 | 0 | | 0 |
| Pacifica | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 22 | 30 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Above Moderate | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 19 |
| Portola Valley* | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 |
| Very Low | 2 | 2 | | | 7 | | 7 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | | | 2 | | 2 |
| Moderate | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Above Moderate | 2 | 3 | | | 14 | | 14 |
| Redwood City | 157 | 785 | 394 | 1128 | 160 | 256 | 416 |
| Very Low | 0 | 14 | 0 | | | | 0 |
| Low | 55 | 26 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 19 |
| Moderate | 5 | 36 | 22 | | | | 0 |
| Above Moderate | 97 | 709 | 372 | 1126 | 157 | 240 | 397 |

| Jurisdiction | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Total 2015-2016 |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|------|------|------|-----------------|
| San Bruno | 323 | 19 | 14 | 2 | 10 | 87 | 97 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low | 154 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Moderate | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 41 | 42 |
| Above Moderate | 15 | 19 | 13 | 1 | 9 | 42 | 51 |
| San Carlos* | 5 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 23 | 249 | 272 |
| Very Low | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| Low | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Above Moderate | 3 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 23 | 276 | 299 |
| San Mateo* | 27 | 251 | | 189 | 394 | 162 | 556 |
| Very Low | 0 | 74 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 |
| Moderate | 3 | 3 | 9 | 70 | 18 | 2 | 20 |
| Above Moderate | 24 | 174 | 493 | 119 | 353 | 148 | 501 |
| South San Francisco | 16 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 41 | 106 | 147 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Moderate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 23 |
| Above Moderate | 16 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 92 | 120 |
| Unincorporated* | 57 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 |
| Very Low | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Low | 7 | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Moderate | 4 | 2 | | | 6 | | 6 |
| Above Moderate | 46 | 34 | | | 17 | | 17 |

| Jurisdiction | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Total 2015-2016 |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Woodside | 8 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 11 |
| Very Low | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Low | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Moderate | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Above Moderate | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| TOTAL | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | |
| Very Low | 141 | 158 | 40 | 150 | 132 | 83 | 215 |
| Low | 263 | 64 | 64 | 27 | 110 | 40 | 150 |
| Moderate | 179 | 51 | 23 | 91 | 70 | 65 | 135 |
| Above Moderate | 472 | 1,038 | 733 | 1,515 | 1,984 | 921 | 2,905 |
| TOTAL | 1,055 | 1,311 | 860 | 1,783 | 2,296 | 1,109 | 3,405 |

SOURCES: 2014 PDA Investment and Growth Strategy, Jurisdiction Survey 2017, Annual Progress Reports on Housing Elements, and Blue text indicates information gathered from ABAG/MTC 2016 RHNA data. Empty fields indicate no data available, zeros indicate no housing produced.

Appendix E: Recent PDA Planning Efforts

| PDA | Recent Planning Efforts |
|--|--|
| Belmont Belmont Village | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belmont Village Element (2013) • Belmont Village Specific Plan (draft 2016) • General Plan Update, including interim zoning update (draft 2016) • Climate Action Plan (2016) |
| Brisbane San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brisbane Baylands Specific Plan (2011) • Bi-County Transportation Study (2013) • Brisbane Baylands Draft Environmental Impact Report (2013) • Candlestick Interchange Preliminary Study Report (2013) • Updated Circulation Element of the General Plan (2015) • Parkside at Brisbane Village Precise Plan (Draft Plan to be released April 2017) |
| Burlingame Burlingame El Camino Real | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan (2011) • General Plan and Zoning Code update (in process 2017) |
| Colma Multi-City El Camino Real Mixed-Use Corridor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town of Colma Land Use and Urban Design Strategy (2014) |
| Daly City Bayshore | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bayshore Community-Based Transportation Plan (2008) • Visitacion Valley/Schlage Lock Design for Development (2009) • Bayshore Intermodal Station Access Study (2012) • Bi-County Transportation Study (2013) |
| Daly City Mission Street Corridor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission Street – Junipero Serra Boulevard Commercial Business District Redevelopment Area Implementation Plan (2006) • Daly City BART Station Access Improvement Plan (2012) • Daly City BART Station Area Specific Plan Amendments (in progress) |
| East Palo Alto Ravenswood | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Palo Alto Community-Based Transportation Plan (2004) • Bay Access Master Plan (2007) • Ravenswood/4 Corners TOD Specific Plan (2013) |
| Menlo Park El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Camino Real & Downtown Vision Plan (2008) • El Camino Real Corridor & Downtown Specific Plan (2012) • El Camino Real Corridor Study (in progress) |

| | |
|--|---|
| Millbrae Transit Station Area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan Amendments (in progress) |
| Redwood City Downtown | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan (2011) |
| Redwood City Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan (2011) • Mixed-Use Corridor Zoning Districts (2011) |
| San Bruno Transit Corridors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Bruno/South San Francisco Community-Based Transportation Plan (2012) • Transit Corridors Plan (2012) |
| San Carlos Railroad Corridor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Development Area Regulations (2011) |
| San Mateo Downtown | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downtown Area Plan (2009) • North Central San Mateo Community-Based Transportation Plan (2011) • Downtown Parking Management Plan (2014) • Downtown Plan Update – <i>initiated</i> |
| San Mateo El Camino Real | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Camino Real Master Plan (2001) • Hillsdale Station Area Plan (2011) |
| San Mateo Rail Corridor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail Corridor TOD Plan (2005) • Hillsdale Station Area Plan (2011) |
| South San Francisco Downtown | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South El Camino Real Plan (2010) • El Camino Chestnut Avenue Area Plan (2011) • South San Francisco Downtown Station Area Plan (2015) |
| Multi-City El Camino Real | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South San Francisco BART Transit Village Plan (2004) • South San Francisco – South El Camino Real General Plan Amendments (2011) • Grand Boulevard Multimodal Corridor Plan (2010) • Grand Boulevard Economic Housing and Opportunities Assessment (2010) • North Fair Oaks Community Plan (2011) • South San Francisco – El Camino Real & Chestnut Area Plan (2011) • TIGER II Complete Streets Study (2013) |

Appendix F: OBAG 1 and Projects Funded in San Mateo County

San Mateo County OBAG Programs and Projects

The OBAG 1 funds were administered by C/CAG for distribution to local jurisdictions. Under OBAG, the CMAs are responsible for local project solicitation, evaluation, and selection for the county. The CMAs issued their calls for projects, conducted public outreach, evaluated proposals, and selected projects in roughly one year's time following the establishment of the program. MTC Resolution 4035 provides guidance to the CMAs in administering these funds and identifies three key funding requirements:

- At least 70 percent of their OBAG investments to the PDAs;
- Cities must adopt a complete street policy resolution no later than January 31, 2013; and
- Cities must adopt and have their General Plan Housing Element certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2007-2014 Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) cycle prior to January 31, 2013.

OBAG 1 funds were distributed on a competitive basis to local jurisdictions based on the program guidelines adopted by the C/CAG Board of Directors. As per MTC requirements, in order to be eligible for OBAG funding, all 21 local jurisdictions in the county adopted a complete streets policy resolution and had their Housing Elements for the 2007-2014 RHNA cycle certified by HCD. Additionally, C/CAG met and exceeded the requirement that at least 70 percent of OBAG funds be spent within or in "proximate access to" a PDA.

Definition of Proximate Access – OBAG 1

1. Project provides direct access to a PDA (e.g., a road, sidewalk, or bike lane that leads directly into a PDA); or
2. Project is within ½ mile of a PDA boundary; or
3. Project is located on a street that hosts a transit route, which directly leads to a PDA; or
4. Project is located within ½ mile of one or more stops for two or more public or shuttle bus lines, or within ½ mile of a rail station or regional transit station, that is connected to a PDA; or
5. Project provides a connection between a transit-oriented development (TOD), as defined by C/CAG, and a PDA; or
6. Project is a bicycle/pedestrian facility that is included in an adopted bicycle/pedestrian plan within San Mateo County and is a part of a network that leads to a PDA.

In San Mateo County fund were allocated for five categories of projects: the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program, the Transportation for Livable Communities Program, Local Streets and Roads Preservation, the Transit-Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program, and a Grand Boulevard Complete Streets Project. A brief description of these programs and projects is provided below.

- **Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP).** The BPIP program is designed to build upon and enhance the San Mateo County bicycle network and pedestrian environment to encourage the use of active transportation and to better connect San Mateo County to local destinations and the multimodal transportation network. The program funds a wide variety of bicycle and pedestrian improvements, including Class I, II, and III bicycle facilities; bicycle education; outreach; bicycle sharing and parking; sidewalks; ramps; pathways and pedestrian bridges; user safety and supporting facilities; and traffic signal actuation.
- **Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.** The TLC Program provides transportation funding aimed at improving the built environment to promote alternative transportation as well as create inviting public spaces. The program funds capital projects that support community-based transportation projects that bring new vibrancy into downtown areas, commercial cores, high-density neighborhoods, and transit corridors, enhancing their amenities and ambiance while making them places where people want to live, work and visit. Projects include amenities such as wider sidewalks, curb bulb outs, pedestrian scale street furniture, pedestrian scale street lighting, crosswalks, storm water management, and other streetscape enhancements.
- **Local Streets and Roads Preservation (LS&R).** This category of funding supports the preservation of local streets and roads on the federal-aid network. Eligible activities include pavement rehabilitation projects, preventative maintenance projects, and non-pavement activities and projects, such as the rehabilitation or replacement of existing features on the roadway facility (i.e. storm drains, curbs, gutters, culverts, etc.).
- **Local Streets and Roads Preservation – Bicycle and Pedestrian Components (LS&R-BP).** In 2012, C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) adopted a funding exchange framework that provided local jurisdictions in the county the option of exchanging the OBAG LS&R funds committed to them in 2010 for State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) funds that SMCTA had received. Twelve jurisdictions opted to exchange their OBAG LS&R funds for SLPP funds from SMCTA, totaling approximately \$4.8 million. In exchange, an equal portion of OBAG LS&R funds, under the discretion of the SMCTA, were directed towards bicycle and pedestrian components of the US 101/Broadway interchange project and the San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement project, sponsored by Caltrans the City of Pacifica respectively.
- **C/CAG Transit-Oriented Development Housing Incentive (TOD Incentive) Program.** The C/CAG TOD Incentive program, which received an award from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for Smart Growth Policies and Regulations in 2002, 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, which can be used by local jurisdictions to fund projects that meet the eligibility requirements of the funding source (i.e., CMAQ, STP, etc.). To encourage affordable housing, the program provides an additional incentive of up to \$250 per affordable bedroom for developments with a minimum of 10 percent of the units set aside for low or moderate-income households.

- **Grand Boulevard Complete Streets Project.** As a follow-up to the Grand Boulevard Initiative: Removing Barriers to Sustainable Communities project described in Section IV, C/CAG partnered with the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) to complete the design and construction of a complete streets project on El Camino Real. SamTrans secured a grant to bring one of the four complete streets demonstration projects in Daly City, South San Francisco, San Bruno, and San Carlos to 100 percent design, and C/CAG contributed \$1,991,000 in OBAG STIP funds to construct the project. Following a competitive process, South San Francisco was awarded the funds.

In San Mateo County OBAG 1 round, which funded 33 projects, in 15 jurisdictions. Twenty-one of the OBAG funded projects included complete streets implementation. San Mateo County invested 83% of OBAG 1 funds in PDAs and areas that support PDAs with proximate access. More details about the San Mateo County OBAG 1 grants can be found in MTC's OBAG 1 Report Card.

San Mateo County OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Projects – OBAG 1 Report Card

| SAN MATEO COUNTY OBAG ROUND 1 GRANTS | | | |
|---|--|----------|---------------|
| Atherton | Various Streets and Roads | LSR □ | \$285,000 |
| Belmont □ | Ralston Avenue Pedestrian Route | TLC □ | \$250,000 |
| | Various Streets and Roads | LSR □ | \$534,000 |
| | Old County Road Bike and Pedestrian Imps | Bike/Ped | \$270,000 |
| Burlingame | Carolan Avenue Complete Streets and Road | Bike/Ped | \$986,000 |
| Caltrans □ | US 101 / Broadway Interchange Bike/Ped Imps | Bike/Ped | \$3,613,000 |
| Daly City | Daly City Various Streets and Roads | LSR | \$562,000 |
| | John Daly Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian | TLC | \$1,000,000 |
| East Palo Alto □ | Bay Road Bike and Ped Imps. Phase II and III | TLC | \$1,000,000 |
| Menlo Park | Park Menlo Park Various Streets and Roads Preservation | LSR | \$427,000 |
| | Various Streets Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements | Bike/Ped | \$797,000 |
| Millbrae | Various Streets and Roads | LSR | \$445,000 |
| Pacifica | □ Palmetto Avenue Streetscape | TLC | □ \$1,000,000 |
| | Linda Mar Blvd Preservation | LSR | \$431,000 |
| | San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement | Bike/Ped | \$1,141,000 |
| Portola Valley □ | Portola Valley Various Streets and Roads | LSR | □ \$224,000 |
| Redwood City | Various Streets and Roads | LSR | \$548,000 |
| | Middlefield Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps | Bike/Ped | \$1,752,000 |
| San Bruno | San Bruno Avenue Pedestrian Improvements | Bike/Ped | \$265,000 |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------|------------------------|
| | San Bruno Avenue Street Median | TLC | \$735,000 |
| San Carlos | Crestview Drive Pavement Rehabilitation | LSR | \$412,000 |
| | San Carlos Streetscape and Pedestrian Imps | TLC | \$850,000 |
| | El Camino Real Ped Upgrades (Grand TLC Boulevard Initiative) | TLC | \$182,000 |
| San Mateo C/CAG | CMA Base Planning Activities | Planning | \$2,673,000 |
| | CMA Planning Activities Augmentation | Planning | \$752,000 |
| | PDA Planning Augmentation | Planning | \$84,000 |
| South San Francisco | Grand Blvd. Initiative Streetscape Project | TLC | \$1,991,000 |
| | Citywide Sidewalk Gap Closures | Bike/Ped | \$357,000 |
| | Grand Blvd Pedestrian | TLC | \$1,000,000 |
| San Mateo City | Mount Diablo Ave. Rehabilitation | LSR | \$270,000 |
| | North Central Pedestrian Improvements | TLC | \$1,000,000 |
| | Citywide Crosswalk Improvements | TLC | \$368,000 |
| San Mateo County | Semicircular Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Imps | Bike/Ped | \$320,000 |
| SAN MATEO TOTAL | | | \$26,52 Million |

Source: OBAG 1 Report Card


One Bay Area Grant Projects San Mateo County



Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Planning, Financing and Coordinating
Transportation for the nine-county
San Francisco Bay Area

Analytical Services

Geographic Information Systems



● — **OBAG Projects**
 Priority Development Areas

Source: MTC ABAG TomTom
Cartography: MTC GIS/December 2013
File G:\arcgis\workspace\obag\OBAG_Planet_Maps\map_profile_Matmap.mxd

Scale:
 1 in = 3 miles

In a PDA *
 Not in a PDA

● Bicycle/Pedestrian
● Local Streets and Roads (LSR)
● Safe Routes to Schools
▲ Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)
 Not Mappable

* In a PDA or connects to or provides proximate access to a PDA.

San Mateo County OBAG Projects

- Bicycle/Pedestrian**
- 1 Carolan Avenue Complete Streets and Road Diet
 - 2 Menlo Park Various Streets Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps
 - 3 Middlefield Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps
 - 4 Old County Road Bike and Pedestrian Imps
 - 5 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement Bike/Ped Imps
 - 6 Semicircular Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Imps
 - 7 US 101 / Broadway Interchange Bike/Ped Imps
- Local Streets and Roads**
- 8 Atherton Various Streets and Roads Preservation
 - 9 Belmont Various Streets and Roads Preservation
 - 10 Crestview Drive Pavement Rehabilitation
 - 11 Daly City Various Streets and Roads Preservation
 - 12 Menlo Park Various Streets and Roads Preservation
 - 13 Millbrae Various Streets and Roads Preservation
 - 14 Mount Diablo Ave. Rehabilitation
 - 15 Pacifica Linda Mar Blvd Preservation
 - 16 Redwood City Various Streets and Roads Preservation
- Transportation for Livable Communities**
- 17 Bay Road Bike and Ped Imps, Phase II and III
 - 18 El Camino Real Ped Upgrades (Grand Boulevard Initiative)
 - 19 Grand Blvd. Initiative Streetscape Project
 - 21 John Daly Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
 - 22 Palmetto Avenue Streetscape
 - 23 Ralston Avenue Pedestrian Route Improvements
 - 24 San Bruno Avenue Pedestrian Improvements
 - 25 San Bruno Avenue Street Median Improvements
 - 26 San Carlos Streetscape and Pedestrian Imps
 - 27 South San Francisco Grand Blvd Pedestrian Imps
- Not Mappable**
- 28 South San Francisco Citywide Sidewalk Gap Closures
 - 29 Portola Valley Various Streets and Roads Preservation
 - 30 PDA Planning Augmentation - San Mateo
 - 31 San Mateo Citywide Crosswalk Improvements
 - 32 North Central Pedestrian Improvements
 - 33 CMA Base Planning Activities

Appendix G: OBAG 2 Scoring and Screening Criteria

| Overall OBAG 2 Requirements C/CAG OneBayArea Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Screening Requirements Fiscal Years 2017/2018 – 2021/2022 MTC OBAG 2 Overall Program Goals Requirements and Minimum Screening Requirements | |
|---|---|
| MTC OBAG Program Goals | MTC's funding approach to integrate the region's federal transportation program with California's climate law (Senate Bill 375, Steinberg, 2008) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. MTC OBAG program goals are intended to reward local agencies that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process, produce housing, and target project investments to the region's Priority Development Areas (PDAs). |
| 70% of OBAG Funds spent in PDAs | MTC requires a minimum of 70% of all OBAG funds be invested in ABAG approved Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or in proximate access to PDAs. Safe Routes to School is not subject to this requirement. |
| Timely Use of Funds | Countywide, half of all OBAG funds must be obligated by January 31, 2020. All remaining OBAG funds must be obligated by January 31, 2023. Non-infrastructure projects and Preliminary Engineering (PE) phases are expected to be programmed and obligated in the first program year. |
| Minimum Screening Requirements | |
| CMAQ fund source | Project must be for new or expanded transportation projects that reduce emissions. Maintenance projects are not allowed. Local Streets and Roads is funded through STP fund sources. |
| Construction Phase | Project cannot be a design only project. Project funds may cover some design cost but project must include a fully funded construction phase. Non-infrastructure projects (e.g. Educational and Outreach) are federally categorized as a construction phase. |
| Map project location in relation to a PDA | All project locations must be mapped. Projects not located directly in a PDA must show where project is located in proximity to a PDA. See attached definition of "proximate access to a PDA". See scoring criteria for further information. |
| Online Complete Street Checklist | The MTC Complete Streets online checklist must be completed for each project application. |
| MTC OBAG 2 Checklist for Local Compliance | Applicant agency is required to fill out and submit the MTC OBAG 2 Checklist for Local Compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202 |
| Minimum Local Match | Federally required 11.47% of total project cost in local funds (non-federal cash match). For capital improvement projects, fully funding with design with local funds towards overall project match (toll credits) is highly encouraged. |
| Local Match Limitations | No "In-kind" match allowed. For capital improvement projects, fully funding with design with local funds towards overall project match (toll credits) is highly encouraged. |
| Single Point of Contact | Every recipient of OBAG 2 funds will need to identify and maintain a single point of contact for the implementation of all FHWA administered funds within that agency. This person must have sufficient knowledge in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out. |
| Eligible Applicants | Federally recognized local agencies in San Mateo County (e.g. Cities, County, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Transit District) and entities with existing executed Master Agreements with Caltrans Local Assistance. |
| Minimum/ Maximum Grant Size | Minimum \$250,000 per project. Maximum grant funds per project is \$1,000,000. Maximum allowable grant funds per jurisdiction is \$1,500,000 (for BPIP and TLC combined). |
| Housing Element | Applicant agency is required to have its general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-22 RHNA prior to June 30, 2016. The agency's annual housing Housing Element Report must be submitted to HCD each year through the end of the OBAG 2 program (FY 2022) in order to be eligible for funding. |
| Complete Streets Resolution or Letter | Applicant agency must have an MTC approved complete streets policy resolution no later than December 31, 2016. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement through a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 after January 1, 2010. |
| Surplus Lands Resolution | Applicant agency must meet MTC's Surplus Land Requirement for OBAG 2 prior to CMA submitting its program, through adoption of a resolution demonstrating compliance with the State's Surplus Land Act (AB 2135 amended). Charter Cities are exempt unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities are subject to the provisions of the act. |

| C/CAG OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Scoring Criteria Fiscal Years 2017/2018 – 2021/2022 Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvement Program | | |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Program Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage active transportation. • Build out the bicycle and pedestrian network. • Reduce vehicle trips. | |
| Eligible Types of Projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New construction and major reconstructions of paths, tracks, or areas for the use by pedestrian or other non-motorized means of transportation when economically feasible and in the public interest. • Permanent bicycle racks. • Other improvements include bulb outs, sidewalk widening, cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossings, pedestrian street lighting, pedestrian medians and refuges. • Signal modification for bicycle detection. • Secure bicycle storage facilities and other facilities, including bicycle lanes, for the convenience and protection of bicyclists, in both public and private areas • Outreach and educational programs. <p>* Note: Fund source is intended to reduce vehicle trips and must not fund exclusively recreational projects. Facility hours of operations must reasonably support bicycle/ pedestrian needs during commute hours.</p> | |
| Fund Source | | |
| CMAQ fund source | Project must be for new or expanded transportation project. Maintenance projects are not allowed. | |
| Scoring Criteria | | Maximum Score |
| Location in relation to a Priority Development Area | Projects are located in a PDA or in Proximity to a PDA (Note: MTC mandates that 70% of all OBAG funds are to be located in a PDA or in proximate access to a PDA) (In a PDA =10pts, In proximate access to a PDA =5pts) | 10 |
| RHNA/ Housing Production | Jurisdiction formula based on MTC OBAG distribution factors, which is based on population, RHNA, and housing production. | 5 |
| Location in a BAAQMD CARE Communities | If project is in a BAAQMD defined CARE community or freight transportation center or improvements implement "Best Practices" as identified by the Air District's Planning Healthy Places guidelines. (0-2) | 2 |
| Community of Concern | Project location in relation to Communities of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC or locally identified as part of Community based Transportation Plans. Project is identified in one of the Community Based Transportation Plans developed in San Mateo County or the Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities. (Project is in a CBTP -10pts, Project is located in or serves a COC -5pts) | 10 |
| Housing Anti-Displacement | Project is located in a PDA or Transit Priority Area (TPA) that has affordable housing preservation strategies and/or community stabilization policies. (Anti-Displacement) {1 or more policies = 1 point} | 1 |
| User Benefit | Project has a high need (2 points) Project is a safety project (3 points) Project is expected to have high use (3 points) Project is expected to have a high return on investment (2 points) Project meets the intent and goals of the program (4 points) | 14 |
| Planning | Project is listed in an adopted planning document (e.g. bike plan, pedestrian plan, or area planning document). | 5 |
| Connectivity/ Improves Transportation Choices | Project connects or improves access to housing/ jobs/ "high quality" transit (4 points) Project connects a gap in a bicycle or pedestrian network. (4 points) Project encourages multi modal access with a "complete streets" approach. (4 points) Project is located in or near dense job centers, in proximity to transit, and housing with reduced parking requirements and travel demand Management (TDM) programs or Project improves transportation choices for all income levels (2 points) | 14 |
| Support | Project has council approval and community support. | 10 |
| Match Funds | Project exceeds the minimum match for the project (11.47-20% -2pts, 21-30%-5pts, 30%-40 -7 pts, 40%+- 10pts) | 10 |
| Readiness | Project is free of Right of Way complications (project has secured encroachment permits, or is entirely on city property) | 5 |
| | Project has secured all regulatory agency permits (e.g. BDCD, RWQCB, CCC, USFWS) | 5 |
| | Project is 100% designed (1-5) | 5 |

| C/CAG OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Scoring Criteria Fiscal Years 2017/2018 – 2021/2022 Transportation For Livable Communities (TLC) Program | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Program Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create enjoyable and safe multi modal experiences. • Facilitate multi modal mobility. • Enhance connections between alternative modes of transportation. • Enhancements that support community based transportation that brings vibrancy to downtown areas, commercial cores, high density neighborhoods, and transit corridors. <p>Note: TLC projects must facilitate multimodal transportation (e.g. no landscape only projects)</p> | |
| Eligible Types of Projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetscape improvements such as improved sidewalks, street furniture and fixtures, pedestrian scaled lighting, way finding signage, landscaping, and bicycle pedestrian treatments that focus on high-impact, multi-modal improvements. Project must contain multi-modal elements (no beautification/ landscape only projects). • Complete streets improvements such as bulb outs, sidewalk widening, cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossings, pedestrian street lighting, pedestrian medians and refuges. • Transit station improvements (plaza, station access, bike parking), transit access projects (connecting housing to jobs and mixed land use to transit). • Transportation Demand Management project such as car sharing, vanpooling coordination and information, and Clipper related projects. <p>Note: TLC projects must facilitate multimodal transportation</p> | |
| Fund Source | | |
| CMAQ fund source | Project must be for new or expanded transportation project. Maintenance projects are not allowed. | |
| Scoring Criteria | | Maximum Score |
| Location in relation to a Priority Development Area | Projects are located in a PDA or in Proximity to a PDA (Note: MTC mandates that 70% of all OBAG funds are to be located in a PDA or in proximate access to a PDA) (In a PDA =10pts, within 1/4 mi of a PDA=8pts, within 1/2 mi of a PDA = 5pts, within 1 mi of a PDA or in proximate access to a PDA = 2pts) | 10 |
| RHNA/ Housing Production | Jurisdiction formula based on MTC OBAG distribution factors, which is based on population, RHNA, and housing production. (1-5) | 5 |
| Location in a BAAQMD CARE Communities | If project is in a BAAQMD defined CARE community or freight transportation center or improvements implement "Best Practices" as identified by the Air District's Planning Healthy Places guidelines. (0-2) | 2 |
| Community of Concern | Project location in relation to Communities of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC or locally identified as part of Community based Transportation Plans. Project is identified in one of the Community Based Transportation Plans developed in San Mateo County or the Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities. (Project is in a CBTP or Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities = 5pts, Project is located in or serves a COC = 3pts) | 5 |
| Housing Anti-Displacement | Project is located in a PDA or Transit Priority Area (TPA) that has affordable housing preservation strategies and/ or community stabilization policies. (Anti-Displacement) (1 or more policies = 1 point) | 1 |
| User Benefit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has a high need (3 points) Project is a safety project (4 points) Project is expected to have high use (4 points) Project is expected to have a high return on investment (3 points) Project meets the intent and goals of the program (3 points) | 19 |
| Planning | Project is listed in an adopted planning document (e.g. bike plan, pedestrian plan, station area plan, transit plan, or other area planning document). (1-5) | 5 |
| Connectivity/ Improves Transportation Choices | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project connects or improves access to housing/ jobs/ "high quality" transit (4 points) Project connects a gap in a bicycle or pedestrian network. (4 points) Project encourages multi modal access with a "complete streets" approach. (4 points) Project is located in or near dense job centers, in proximity to transit, and housing with reduced parking requirements and travel demand Management (TDM) programs or Project improves transportation choices for all income levels (4 points) | 16 |
| Support | Project has council approval and/ or community support. (1-5) | 5 |
| Match Funds | Project exceeds the minimum match for the project (11.47% minimum) - (1-10) | 10 |
| Readiness | Project is free of Right of Way complications (project has secured encroachment permits, or is entirely on city property). (1-4) | 4 |
| | Project has secured all required regulatory agency permits (e.g. BCDC, RWQCB, CCC, USFWS). (1-4) | 4 |
| | Project is designed (0-100%). (1-10) | 10 |

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 20, 2017
To: CMP TAC
From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director
Subject: Review and comment on the candidate project list for Regional Measure 3 funding

(For further information or response to questions, contact Sandy Wong at 650 599-1409)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) review and comment on the candidate project list for Regional Measure 3 funding.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

BACKGROUND

Regional Measure 3 (RM3) would increase the tolls on the region's seven state-owned toll bridges by \$1 to \$3, potentially generating \$1.7 billion to \$5 billion over 25 years. As a fee, a simple majority of voters would be needed to approve the measure. But it must first be authorized by the state through legislation.

Bridge toll is a fee, and must benefit the payers of the fee. Projects funded by RM3 must provide benefits in the toll bridge corridors. Regional Measure 1 funded primarily a small set of bridge replacement and expansion projects. Regional Measure 2 funded a much larger set of bridge, highway, and transit projects in the bridge corridors. For more information, please see attached MTC memo of December 8, 2016.

In anticipation of upcoming development of RM3 legislation, staff reached out to member agencies and transit agencies in San Mateo County and developed the candidate project list. In the upcoming months, as more information regarding RM3 legislation becomes available, revision of the list may be brought back for timely decisions.

ATTACHMENT

- Regional Measure 3 (RM3) – San Mateo County Candidate Project List
- MTC Memo of December 8, 2016

| Regional Measure 3 (RM3) - San Mateo County Candidate Project List | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Sponsor | Project | Location | Project Description |
| SMCTA/ C/CAG | US 101 Managed Lanes (South of I-380) | San Antonio Rd (Santa Clara County) to I-380 | Add 22 miles of managed lanes (HOV and/or HOT) in San Mateo County |
| SMCTA/ C/CAG | US 101 Managed Lanes (North of I-380) | US 101 from I-380 to SF County Line | Add northbound and southbound managed lane (HOV and/or HOT) from I-380 to San Francisco County line. |
| SamTrans | Dumbarton Corridor | Dumbarton SR 84 and Dumbarton Rail bridge, and approaches | Mix of transportation improvements to address both congestion on the Dumbarton Bridge (Highway 84) and connecting roadways, as well as the rehabilitation and repurposing of the Dumbarton rail bridge to the south. |
| SamTrans | SamTrans El Camino Real Corridor | Palo Alto to Daly City | Add rapid transit in the ECR corridor |
| Caltrain | Calmod 2.0 | SF to San Jose | Full conversion to 100% EMU + capacity increase + longer platforms (\$475m); broadband (\$30m); Maintenance Facility improvements (\$36m); level boarding & platform extensions (\$250M) |
| SM/Foster City | 101/92 Interchange improvements | San Mateo/Foster City | Array of alternatives that would improve traffic flow and increase mobility within the heavily congested 101/92 Interchange |
| Redwood City | Woodside Interchange | US 101/SR 84 Woodside Interchange | Improve the US 101/Woodside Interchange. |
| Various | Bicycle/Pedestrian facilities | Various | Improvements to bicycle/pedestrian access connected to toll corridors, including the San Francisco Bay Trail. |
| WETA | Expanded Ferry Service RWC | Redwood City | The new Redwood City terminal will open between 2022 and 2026, offering ferry service to San Francisco. |
| WETA | Expanded Ferry Service SSF | South San Francisco | In June of 2012, construction of the new South San Francisco terminal was completed and service was launched. |
| City of East Palo Alto | University Avenue Improvements | University Ave between Highway 101 and the Dumbarton Bridge | Improve traffic and safety through this major transportation corridor between Highway 101 and the Dumbarton Bridge. |
| Various | Grade Separation | Various | Grade separation connected to toll corridors. |



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
TEL 415.778.6700
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Commission

DATE: December 8, 2016

FR: Executive Director

RE: Regional Measure 3

Background

Included in the Commission's Draft Advocacy Program for 2017 is a recommendation that the Commission sponsor legislation authorizing MTC to place on the ballot a measure asking Bay Area voters to approve a bridge toll increase to fund congestion relief projects for improved mobility in the bridge corridors. This memo and the attachments include information for your discussion and policy direction as we seek to pass legislation in 2017 to achieve this goal.

Attached to this memo are the following documents.

- A map showing the major investments included in Regional Measures 1 and 2 – RM1 and RM2 (Attachment A)
- Key Policy Considerations (Attachment B)
- Charts that include data on the county of origin of the toll payers, the relative size of the toll collections at each of the toll bridges and registered voter information (Attachment C)

Process

Unlike local sales tax measures where the Legislature has provided a general grant of authority to a county to create an expenditure plan to be placed on the ballot, RM1 and RM2 included an expenditure plan written and adopted by the Legislature as part of its normal bill passage process. The toll program is also unique in that it is regional in nature and the tolls are pooled together to fund projects throughout the bridge system. The toll revenue provides a benefit to those paying the fees (i.e. toll bridge users) or mitigates for the activity associated with the fees. As fees, toll increases are subject to a simple majority vote, rather than two-thirds. In the case of RM1 and RM2, and MTC's regional gas tax authorization statute, the vote is tallied region-wide, rather than county-by-county.

In 2003, when RM 2 was under consideration by the Legislature, then Senate Pro Tem Don Perata created a special Select Committee that held a number of public hearings to solicit public input on the expenditure plan. Concurrently, MTC hosted a Technical Advisory Committee that met monthly to provide interested parties — transit operators, CMA's and other stakeholders — an opportunity to propose projects and discuss the attributes of proposals as they emerged in an open public forum.

We expect a similar process to begin in earnest when the Legislature convenes in January 2017, with a goal of passing a bill in 2017 so that a measure can be placed on the ballot in 2018.

Workshop Focus

At your December workshop, staff hopes to solicit your guidance on the key policy considerations and draft principles outlined in Attachment B as well as any other related issues of concern to the Commission. We would expect to return to the Legislation Committee at regular intervals in 2017 to review further details about the Regional Measure 3 bill as it develops, including specific projects proposed for potential funding.



Steve Heminger


SH:RR
Attachments



Voter Approved Toll Bridge Measures Deliver Big Returns

Year after year, in good economic times and bad, Bay Area residents rank transportation as one of their highest priorities. Voters have proved this time and again at the ballot box, including through the passage of Regional Measure 1 in 1988 and Regional Measure 2 in 2004. These measures raised tolls on the Bay Area's seven state-owned toll bridges — and delivered dozens of the most important transportation investments of the past generation.

With these projects now completed or under construction, it's time for voters to consider a third regional measure for the Bay Area's next generation of improvements.



| REGIONAL MEASURE 1 | Amount (\$ millions) |
|---|----------------------|
| New Benicia-Martinez Bridge | \$1,200 |
| Carquinez Bridge Replacement | \$518 |
| Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Rehabilitation | \$117 |
| San Mateo-Hayward Bridge Widening | \$210 |
| I-880/SR 92 Interchange Replacement | \$235 |
| Bayfront Expressway Widening | \$36 |
| Richmond Parkway | \$6 |
| US 101/University Avenue Interchange Improvements | \$4 |

| REGIONAL MEASURE 2 | Amount (\$ millions) |
|--|----------------------|
| Transbay Transit Center ¹ | \$353 |
| e-BART/Hwy 4 Widening ² | \$269 |
| BART to Warm Springs ^{1,2} | \$304 |
| BART Oakland Airport Connector ¹ | \$146 |
| Solano Co. I-80 HOV Lanes & Cordelia Truck Scales ¹ | \$123 |
| SMART Rail | \$82 |
| AC Transit Bus Rapid Transit ² | \$78 |
| Transit Center Upgrades and New Buses (Regionwide) | \$65 |
| I-580 HOV Lanes | \$53 |
| Ferry Vessels ² | \$46 |
| Caldecott Tunnel Fourth Bore | \$45 |
| Transit Technology (Clipper®, 511®, Signals) | \$42 |
| Contra Costa I-80 HOV Lanes | \$37 |
| BART Tube Seismic Retrofit ² | \$34 |
| San Francisco Third Street Light Rail | \$30 |
| BART Central Contra Costa Crossover | \$25 |
| Safe Routes to Transit Projects | \$23 |
| Other Regional Projects | \$356 |
| Transit Operations Support (Annual) | \$41 |

¹ Amount shown includes other toll revenue in addition to RM2
² Under construction

Draft Principles for Regional Measure 3

Bridge Nexus

Ensure all projects benefit toll payers in the vicinity of the San Francisco Bay Area’s seven state-owned toll bridges

Regional Prosperity

Invest in projects that will sustain the region’s strong economy by enhancing travel options and improving mobility in bridge corridors

Sustainability

Ensure all projects are consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040’s focused growth and greenhouse gas reduction strategy

State of Good Repair

Invest in projects that help restore bridges and transportation infrastructure in the bridge corridors

Demand Management

Utilize technology and pricing to optimize roadway capacity

Freight

Improve the mobility, safety and environmental impact of freight

Resiliency

Invest in resilient bridges and approaches, including addressing sea level rise

Regional Measure 3 – Key Policy Considerations



When should the vote take place?

We recommend either the primary or general election in 2018. This will require the Legislature to pass the enabling legislation no later than the end of August 2017.

How large of a toll hike should we seek?

A comparison of the revenue yield from a \$1–\$3 toll surcharge as well as a comparison of toll rates on other bridges are shown in the tables below. A multi-dollar toll surcharge could be phased in over a period of years.

| Toll Surcharge Amount | Annual Revenue | Capital Funding Available (25-year bond) |
|-----------------------|----------------|--|
| \$1 | \$127 million | \$1.7 billion |
| \$2 | \$254 million | \$3.3 billion |
| \$3 | \$381 million | \$5.0 billion |

Toll Rate Comparisons

| Facility | Standard Auto Toll | Carpool Toll |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| BATA Bridges | \$5.00 | \$2.50 |
| Golden Gate Bridge | \$7.50/\$6.50 Plate/FasTrak | \$4.50 |
| MTA Verrazano Narrows Bridge | \$11.08 ¹ /\$16.00 EZ-Pass/Cash | \$3.08 ^{1,2} |
| Port Authority of New York/New Jersey (Bridges and Tunnels) | \$10.50/\$12.50/\$15.00 Off-Peak/Peak/Cash | \$6.50 |

¹Results from EZ-Pass discount rate
Average rate, based on 24 trips





Which counties should vote on the toll increase?

Regional Measure 1 (1988) and Regional Measure 2 (2004) were placed on the ballot in only seven of the nine Bay Area counties; Napa and Sonoma were excluded. We propose that all nine counties be included in Regional Measure 3.

Should toll revenue be used for operating purposes?

If a portion of toll revenue is reserved for operating funding (such as to subsidize transit service), the capital funding shown in the table on the prior page would be reduced. For example, for every 10% of total revenue reserved for operating purposes under a \$2 toll scenario, the capital yield from toll revenue bonds would be reduced by approximately \$300 million. Accordingly, we recommend restricting operating funding to the smallest possible amount. If an operating program is created, we recommend establishing performance standards similar to those in Regional Measure 2 as a condition of funding eligibility.

Should congestion pricing be expanded?

The \$6 peak/\$4 off-peak weekday toll on the San Francisco-Bay Bridge has successfully reduced congestion on that span by encouraging some commuters to change their time or mode of travel. The \$6/\$4 differential toll also raises about the same amount of revenue as would a flat \$5 toll on that span. To further reduce congestion, we suggest consideration of a greater discount between the peak and off-peak rate for the Bay Bridge in Regional Measure 3.

Should a FasTrak® discount be authorized?

The Golden Gate Bridge district offers FasTrak Discounts to incentivize more drivers to sign up for FasTrak, since electronic toll collection significantly speeds up traffic throughput on the bridge. RM 3 is an opportunity to remove a statutory restriction that currently prohibits BATA from offering similar FasTrak discounts. We recommend pursuing this change to help reduce delays and associated emissions.

Should trucks pay an additional toll?


The last toll hike approved by the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) in 2010 included a substantial increase in the axle-based rate paid by commercial vehicles and trucks. As a result, we recommend that Regional Measure 3 be a flat surcharge added to all vehicles crossing the seven state-owned bridges.

What kind of projects should be considered for funding?

Since bridge tolls are fees and not taxes, the use of toll revenue should benefit the payers of the fee. In other words, the projects funded by Regional Measure 3 should provide safety, mobility, access, or other related benefits in the toll bridge corridors. Regional Measure 1 funded primarily a small set of bridge replacement and expansion projects. By contrast, Regional Measure 2 funded a much larger set of both bridge, highway, and transit projects in the bridge corridors. Given the region's significant needs on all modes, we expect that Regional Measure 3 will resemble its immediate predecessor in the breadth and modal mix of projects.




Share of Bridge Toll Revenue by Bridge




Source: FY16 Toll Revenues Collected by Bridge, MTC Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, June 30, 2016

Share of Toll Revenue by County of Residence



Source: 2015 MTC FasTrak Data - Average Typical Weekday Transactions by County of Billing Address

Share of Voters by County



Source: 2016 California Secretary of State Report of Registration (registered voters by county as of 10/24/2016)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 20, 2017
To: C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC)
From: Jeff Lacap, Transportation Programs Specialist
Subject: Regional Project and Funding Information

(For further information, contact Jeff Lacap at 650-599-1455 or jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

Regional project and funding information.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

C/CAG staff routinely attends meetings hosted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and receives information distributed from MTC pertaining to federal funding, project delivery, and other regional policies that may affect local agencies. Attached to this report includes relevant information from MTC.

FHWA policy for inactive projects

Caltrans requires administering agencies to submit invoices at least once every 6 months from the time of obligation (E-76 authorization). The current inactive list is attached (Attachment 1). Project sponsors are requested to visit the Caltrans site regularly for updated project status at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/Inactiveprojects.htm>

Pavement Management Program (PMP) Certification

The current PMP certification status listing is attached (Attachment 2). Jurisdictions without a current PMP certification are not eligible to receive regional funds for local streets rehabilitation and will have projects removed from MTC's obligation plans until their PMP certification is in good standing. Jurisdictions who are currently in P-TAP Cycle 17 have their certification status listed as "pending" and are given an expiration date of April 30, 2017. This is to allow jurisdictions who are in the process of updating their PMP certifications for P-TAP Cycle 18 enough time to send MTC a city signed certification letter for an extension.

Certification letters must be received by MTC no later than April 30, 2017 to ensure that their PMP certifications will not lapse between P-TAP Cycle 17 and 18. Contact Christina Hohorst, PTAP Manager, at (415) 778-5269 or chohorst@mtc.ca.gov if you need to update your certification.

Project Delivery

1. One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Obligation Status Report for FY 2017-18

The OBAG obligation status report for FY 2017-2018 is attached for your reference (Attachment 3). The jurisdictions listed in this report are required to deliver a complete, funding obligation Request for Authorization (RFA) package to Caltrans Local Assistance by November 1, 2017 for this upcoming fiscal year. Funds that do not meet the obligation deadline of January 31, 2018 are subject to re-programming by MTC. Project sponsors can track the E-76 status of their projects at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/E-76-status.php>.

OBAG 2 Deadlines

1. Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) Requirements

Per Resolution 4202, it is required for all funding recipients of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG2) Program to provide updated information to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS). This study provides data to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on the physical condition and the performance characteristics of the road system. .

MTC is requesting traffic counts on all public streets and roads under your jurisdiction (not on State roads) for calendar year 2016 to be submitted by **Friday, April 28, 2017**. If possible, please also provide information on the facility type, number of through lanes and speed limit for each count location. In order to stay in compliance for OBAG2 funding, please be sure to submit updated public road data to HPMS for your respective jurisdictions by the due date. If you have any questions on submitting your HPMS data, please contact Ben Espinosa, Transportation Planner, at bespinosa@mtc.ca.gov.

2. Surplus Lands Resolution

To be eligible to receive OBAG 2 County Program funding, general law cities and counties must adopt a resolution verifying they are in compliance with the California Surplus Land Act in the disposition of publicly-owned surplus land. Although the Act applies to all public agencies throughout the state (including charter cities and transit agencies), at this time, the resolution is required only for general law cities and counties seeking funding through the OBAG 2 County Program. A sample resolution is available on the OBAG 2 website:

<http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/obag-2>

3. Housing Element Annual Progress Report

All local jurisdictions are required to submit Housing Element Annual Reports to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) by April 1. Compliance with this requirement will be monitored throughout the OBAG 2 funding period by CMA and MTC staff. This requirement is annual. The first progress report required for OBAG 2 funding is the 2016 Housing Element Progress Report, due April 1, 2017.

4. Statewide Needs Assessment

As a condition of funding, local jurisdictions must fully participate in the biennial Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Report. Information on past reports is available at: <http://www.savecaliforniastreet.org/about-us/>

Participation in the Statewide Needs Assessment is biennial. The survey for the 2018 Needs Assessment is anticipated in mid-2017.

Miscellaneous MTC/Caltrans Federal Aid Announcements

1. 2016 Regional Pavement Condition Summary Report

MTC's Regional Streets & Roads Program staff has completed the 2016 regional pavement condition summary report. The PCI numbers presented in the 2016 regional pavement condition summary report reflect the information contained in each jurisdiction's StreetSaver® database. The 2016 PCI scores are weighted by pavement section area. Please be aware that the PCI scores are based on pavement conditions as of 12/31/2016.

The 2016 Jurisdiction Ranking Summary is attached for your reference (Attachment 4). If you have any questions regarding the draft report, please contact Sui Tan at stan@mtc.ca.gov.

2. Resident Engineers Academy

The Resident Engineers Academy provides core training in state and federal regulations for Local Agency Resident Engineers. The Academy, partially subsidized by Caltrans, is ideal for both seasoned and newly-hired Resident Engineers. There are training sessions in San Jose in April and San Francisco in May.

More information can be found here: <http://www.californialtap.org/index.cfm?pid=1077>

ATTACHMENTS

1. Caltrans Inactive Obligation Project List for San Mateo County as of April 4, 2017
2. MTC's PMP Certification Status of Agencies within San Mateo County as of March 20, 2017
3. FY 2017-18 OBAG Obligation Status Report for San Mateo County as of April 10, 2017
4. MTC's 2016 Regional Pavement Condition Summary Report – Jurisdiction Ranking

| Status | Agency Action Required | Agency | Description | Last Expenditure Date | Last Action Date | Total Cost | Federal Funds | Expenditure Amount | Unexpended Balance |
|----------|---|--|--|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Inactive | Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately. | Caltrans | SR 92 AND EL CAMINO REAL (SR82), UPGRADE INTERCHANGE | 3/28/2016 | 3/28/2016 | \$3,986,801.00 | \$1,966,800.00 | \$1,767,802.74 | \$198,997.26 |
| Inactive | Carry over project. Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress. | Daly City | JOHN DALY BOULEVARD FROM MISSION STREET TO DELONG STREET PEDESTRIAN AND BIKE FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS | | 3/2/2016 | \$3,335,069.00 | \$1,290,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,290,000.00 |
| Inactive | Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017 | East Palo Alto | FORDHAM ST/PURDUE AVE, BAY RD BETWEEN NEWBRIDGE ST AND GLORIA WAY, , PULGAS AVE/RUNNYMEDE ST, PULGAS AVE BETWEEN O'CONNOR ST AND MYRTLE ST. CONST SIDEWALKS, RAMPS, INSTALL CROSSWALK LIGHTING | 5/19/2016 | 3/9/2017 | \$768,540.00 | \$579,700.00 | \$42,000.00 | \$537,700.00 |
| Inactive | Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress. | Menlo Park | WILLOW RD - MIDDLEFIELD TO HAMILTON, UPGRADE SIGNALS | 6/9/2016 | 6/9/2016 | \$253,000.00 | \$202,400.00 | \$106,206.40 | \$96,193.60 |
| Inactive | Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately. | Millbrae | MILLBRAE DOWNTOWN AND EL CAMINO REAL CORRIDOR, MILLBRAE PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA SPECIFIC PLAN | 3/8/2016 | 3/8/2016 | \$650,000.00 | \$500,000.00 | \$2,799.91 | \$497,200.09 |
| Inactive | Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately. | Millbrae | MILLBRAE AVE FROM EL CAMINO REAL (SR82) TO SR101 , AND MAGNOLIA AVE. FROM TAYLOR BLVD TO LACRUZ AVE. ROAD REHABILITATION | | 3/10/2016 | \$595,358.00 | \$445,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$445,000.00 |
| Inactive | Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately. | Redwood City | BRIDGE PARKWAY OVER MARINE WORLD LAGOON, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE | 2/24/2016 | 2/24/2016 | \$75,000.00 | \$66,398.00 | \$32,436.86 | \$33,961.14 |
| Inactive | Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately. | Redwood City | BRIDGE PARKWAY(RIGHT) OVER MARINE WORLD LAGOON, EAST OF MARINE WORLD PARKWAY, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE | 2/24/2016 | 2/24/2016 | \$75,000.00 | \$66,398.00 | \$32,436.86 | \$33,961.14 |
| Inactive | Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately. | Redwood City | VARIOUS BRIDGES IN CITY OF REDWOOD CITY, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE | 2/17/2015 | 2/17/2015 | \$30,000.00 | \$26,559.00 | \$13,249.74 | \$13,309.26 |
| Inactive | Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately. | Redwood City | MAIN ST, VETERANS BLVD, AND MAPLE ST OVER REDWOOD CREEK, BRIDGE PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE | 2/24/2016 | 2/24/2016 | \$26,250.00 | \$23,239.00 | \$457.75 | \$22,781.25 |
| Inactive | Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017 | Redwood City | MULTIPLE SCHOOLS IN REDWOOD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, NON INFRASTRUCTURE, SRTS EDUCATION | 6/9/2016 | 6/9/2016 | \$204,000.00 | \$204,000.00 | \$176,259.83 | \$27,740.17 |
| Inactive | Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017 | Redwood City | WHIPPLE AND VETERANS, ROAD REHABILITATION | 4/1/2016 | 4/1/2016 | \$999,648.00 | \$548,000.00 | \$246,180.20 | \$301,819.80 |
| Inactive | Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017 | Woodside | PORTOLA RD IN THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE IN SAN MATEO COUNTY, 0.25 MI E OF SR 84, BRIDGE REPLACEMENT | 4/7/2016 | 4/7/2016 | \$188,760.00 | \$167,109.00 | \$83,968.77 | \$83,140.23 |
| Inactive | Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017 | Woodside | KINGS MOUNTAIN RD OVER WEST UNION CREEK; 0.05 MI EAST OF TRIPP RD, BRIDGE REHABILITATION | 4/7/2016 | 4/7/2016 | \$135,090.00 | \$119,595.00 | \$86,712.99 | \$32,882.01 |
| Inactive | Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017 | Woodside | PORTOLA RD REPLACE CULVERT , HEAD WALL, TRASH RACK | 5/3/2016 | 5/6/2016 | \$105,687.00 | \$93,565.00 | \$26,452.77 | \$67,112.23 |
| Future | Submit invoice to District by 08/21/2017 | City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County | COUNTYWIDE NON INFRASTRUCTURE SR2S PROGRAM NON INFRASTRUCTURE, SRTS EDUCATION | 9/6/2016 | 9/6/2016 | \$2,436,461.00 | \$2,157,000.00 | \$1,765,806.58 | \$391,193.42 |
| Future | Invoice returned to agency. Resubmit to District by 08/21/2017 | San Mateo | CITYWIDE, CITY CAR SHARE PROGRAM NON-INFRASTRUCTURE | 9/20/2016 | 9/20/2016 | \$265,152.00 | \$210,000.00 | \$81,499.68 | \$128,500.32 |
| Future | Submit invoice to District by 08/21/2017 | San Mateo | DOWNTOWN SAN MATEO: EL CAMINO REAL TO DELAWARE , 9TH TO TILTON AVE REPLACE EXISTING PARKING METERS WITH SMART METERS AND INSTALL PARKING AVAILABILITY SIGNS AT CITY FACILITIES | | 8/17/2016 | \$150,000.00 | \$115,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$115,000.00 |
| Future | Submit invoice to District by 08/21/2017 | San Mateo County | UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY NEAR MENLO PARK,SAN GREGORIO & PESCADAR, BRIDGE PRECENTATIVE MAINTENANCE | 7/25/2016 | 7/25/2016 | \$161,020.00 | \$142,551.00 | \$123,531.68 | \$19,019.32 |
| Future | Submit invoice to District by 08/21/2017 | South San Francisco | ORANGE AVE AT C AND B STREET, CONSTRUCT CURB EXTENSIONS SPEED FEED BACK | 9/15/2016 | 9/15/2016 | \$358,512.00 | \$119,300.00 | \$67,209.99 | \$52,090.01 |
| Future | Submit invoice to District by 08/21/2017 | South San Francisco | MISSION RD AND EVERGREEN, INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNALS | 9/2/2016 | 9/2/2016 | \$457,800.00 | \$310,000.00 | \$257,883.21 | \$52,116.79 |
| Future | Submit invoice to District by 08/21/2017 | South San Francisco | EL CAMINO REAL (SR82: PM20.6-20.9) DR CHESTNUT TO ARROYO AVE IMPROVE PED. CROSSINGS, BULB OUT, ADA RAMPS | 8/2/2016 | 1/9/2017 | \$1,596,000.00 | \$1,000,000.00 | \$52,979.93 | \$947,020.07 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| PMP Certification March 10, 2017 | Expired |
| | Expiring within 60 days |
| | Certified |

* "Last Major Inspection" is the basis for certification and is indicative of the date the field inspection was completed.

| County | Jurisdiction | Last Major Inspection* | Certified | P-TAP Cycle | Certification Expiration Date |
|---------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| Marin | Ross* | 8/31/2014 | Yes | 15 | 9/1/2017 |
| Marin | San Anselmo* | 10/31/2014 | Yes | 15 | 11/1/2017 |
| Marin | San Rafael | 11/30/2016 | Yes | 17 | 12/1/2018 |
| Marin | Sausalito* | 11/30/2014 | Yes | 15 | 12/1/2017 |
| Marin | Tiburon | 9/30/2015 | Yes | 16 | 10/1/2017 |
| Napa | American Canyon | 10/31/2013 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| Napa | Calistoga | 8/31/2014 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| Napa | Napa | 12/31/2013 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| Napa | Napa County | 8/31/2016 | Yes | 17 | 9/1/2018 |
| Napa | St. Helena* | 8/31/2014 | Yes | 15 | 9/1/2017 |
| Napa | Yountville* | 8/31/2014 | Yes | 15 | 9/1/2017 |
| San Francisco | San Francisco | 4/30/2016 | Yes | 16 | 5/1/2018 |
| San Mateo | Atherton | 8/31/2016 | Yes | 17 | 9/1/2018 |
| San Mateo | Belmont* | 11/30/2014 | Yes | 15 | 12/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | Brisbane | 7/31/2016 | Yes | 17 | 8/1/2018 |
| San Mateo | Burlingame | 1/31/2016 | Yes | 16 | 2/1/2018 |
| San Mateo | Colma | 9/30/2015 | Yes | 16 | 10/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | Daly City | 12/31/2014 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| San Mateo | East Palo Alto | 8/31/2013 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| San Mateo | Foster City | 8/31/2015 | Yes | 16 | 9/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | Half Moon Bay | 12/31/2015 | Yes | 16 | 1/1/2018 |
| San Mateo | Hillsborough | 9/30/2014 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| San Mateo | Menlo Park | 4/30/2016 | Yes | 16 | 5/1/2018 |
| San Mateo | Millbrae* | 7/31/2014 | Yes | 15 | 8/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | Pacifica | 7/31/2015 | Yes | 16 | 8/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | Portola Valley | 9/30/2015 | Yes | 16 | 10/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | Redwood City* | 12/31/2014 | Yes | 15 | 1/1/2018 |
| San Mateo | San Bruno | 6/30/2015 | Yes | 16 | 7/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | San Carlos | 8/31/2016 | Yes | 17 | 9/1/2018 |
| San Mateo | San Mateo | 11/30/2015 | Yes | 16 | 12/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | San Mateo County | 8/31/2013 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| San Mateo | South San Francisco | 10/31/2015 | Yes | 16 | 11/1/2017 |
| San Mateo | Woodside | 10/31/2016 | Yes | 17 | 11/1/2018 |
| Santa Clara | Campbell | 7/31/2015 | Yes | 16 | 8/1/2017 |
| Santa Clara | Cupertino | 8/31/2014 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| Santa Clara | Gilroy | 4/30/2015 | Yes | 17 | 5/1/2017 |
| Santa Clara | Los Altos | 7/31/2015 | Yes | 16 | 8/1/2017 |
| Santa Clara | Los Altos Hills* | 6/30/2014 | Yes | 15 | 7/1/2017 |
| Santa Clara | Los Gatos | 2/29/2016 | Yes | 16 | 3/1/2018 |
| Santa Clara | Milpitas* | 8/31/2014 | Yes | 15 | 9/1/2017 |
| Santa Clara | Monte Sereno | 5/31/2013 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |
| Santa Clara | Morgan Hill | 8/31/2013 | Pending | 17 | 4/30/2017 |

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

STP-CMAQ Obligation Status Report

Fiscal Years: FY 17/18

April 11, 2017

| County | Sponsor | Project Name | Phase | TIP ID | Status | Fund Code | Fed Project Data | | FY | | | Fund Programming Information | | | Obligation Information | | | Balance | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------|-------|-------|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|------|------------------------|----------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| | | | | | | | Prefix | ID | Appn | Prog | STP Amt | CMAQ Amt | Total Amt | Date | STP Amt | CMAQ Amt | Total Amt | Remaining | |
| San Mateo County | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| San Mateo | East Palo Alto | Bay Rd Bicycle/Ped Improvements Phase | CON | SM-070004 | ACTIVE | CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG | | | 17/18 | 17/18 | | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | | | 1,000,000 |
| San Mateo | Redwood City | Middlefield Road Bicycle / Ped | CON | SM-130022 | ACTIVE | CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG | | | 17/18 | 17/18 | | | 1,752,000 | | 1,752,000 | | | | 1,752,000 |
| San Mateo | SF City/County | Southern Skyline Blvd. Ridge Trail | CON | SM-130031 | ACTIVE | STP-T4-2-PCA-REG | | | 17/18 | 17/18 | 1,000,000 | | | | 1,000,000 | | | | 1,000,000 |
| San Mateo | SSF | SSF Citywide Sidewalk Gap Closure | CON | SM-130003 | ACTIVE | CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG | | | 17/18 | 17/18 | | | 357,000 | | 357,000 | | | | 357,000 |
| San Mateo | SamTrans | El Camino Real Traffic Signal Priority | CON | SM-170008 | PROPOSED | CMAQ-T4-2-TPL-REG | | | 17/18 | 17/18 | | | 3,459,000 | | 3,459,000 | | | | 3,459,000 |
| San Mateo | San Bruno | San Bruno Ave Street Medians | CON | SM-130019 | ACTIVE | CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG | CML | 5226(022) | 17/18 | 17/18 | | | 735,000 | | 735,000 | | | | 735,000 |
| San Mateo | San Mateo | San Mateo Citywide Crosswalk | CON | SM-130020 | ACTIVE | CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG | | | 17/18 | 17/18 | | | 368,000 | | 368,000 | | | | 368,000 |
| San Mateo | San Mateo | San Mateo Downtown Parking Tech | CON | SM-150016 | ACTIVE | CMAQ-T4-2-CIP-REG | | | 17/18 | 17/18 | | | 1,385,000 | | 1,385,000 | | | | 1,385,000 |
| San Mateo County Totals | | | | | | | | | | | 1,000,000 | 9,056,000 | 10,056,000 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,056,000 | |

Attachment 1: DRAFT

2016 Jurisdiction Ranking Summary

Year-over-Year Ranking

| Best | 2016 |
|---------------|---------------|
| Dublin | 87 |
| Clayton | 86 |
| El Cerrito | 85 |
| Daly | 84 |
| Brentwood | 83 |
| Palo Alto | 83 |
| Colma | 83 |
| Foster City | 82 |
| Union City | 82 |
| Solano County | 81 <i>tie</i> |
| San Ramon | 81 <i>tie</i> |

| Worst | 2016 |
|---------------|---------------|
| Larkspur | 42 |
| Petaluma | 45 |
| Martinez | 45 |
| Millbrae | 51 |
| Sonoma County | 51 |
| Cotati | 52 |
| Belmont | 52 |
| Napa County | 52 |
| Calistoga | 52 |
| Pacifica | 53 <i>tie</i> |
| Vallejo | 53 <i>tie</i> |
| St Helena | 53 <i>tie</i> |

| Greatest Increase | 2016 |
|-------------------|--------------|
| East Palo Alto | 15 |
| Orinda | 13 |
| Suisun City | 10 |
| Hillsborough | 9 |
| Cupertino | 8 |
| Antioch | 7 |
| Daly City | 7 |
| Mountain View | 6 |
| Morgan Hill | 6 <i>tie</i> |
| San Carlos | 6 <i>tie</i> |

| Greatest Decrease | 2016 |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Half Moon Bay | -4 |
| American Canyon | -4 |
| Pittsburg | -4 |
| Martinez | -3 <i>tie</i> |
| Burlingame | -3 <i>tie</i> |
| Belvedere | -3 <i>tie</i> |
| Richmond | -3 <i>tie</i> |
| Pleasanton | -3 <i>tie</i> |

3-Year Moving Average Ranking

| Best | 2016 |
|---------------|---------------|
| Dublin | 85 |
| El Cerrito | 84 |
| Brentwood | 84 |
| Colma | 84 |
| Clayton | 83 |
| Union City | 82 |
| Foster City | 82 |
| Palo Alto | 81 |
| San Ramon | 80 <i>tie</i> |
| Solano County | 80 <i>tie</i> |

| Worst | 2016 |
|---------------|---------------|
| Larkspur | 41 |
| Petaluma | 46 |
| Martinez | 48 |
| Sonoma County | 49 |
| Vallejo | 51 |
| Napa County | 52 |
| Millbrae | 52 |
| Cotati | 52 |
| Calistoga | 52 |
| Orinda | 54 <i>tie</i> |
| Pacifica | 54 <i>tie</i> |
| Belmont | 54 <i>tie</i> |

Updated 2017-03-17