

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*

C/CAG BOARD MEETING NOTICE AND SAN MATEO COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION MEETING NOTICE

Meeting No. 390

Date: Thursday, February 12, 2026 Time: 6:30 p.m. Location: 1250 San Carlos Ave. 2 nd Floor, Auditorium San Carlos, CA 94070	Join by Webinar: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81561974431?pwd=C8lpz1qmnOzVap7qYZab8pbSrMWjNz.1 Webinar ID: 815 6197 4431 Password: 021226 Join by Phone: (669) 900-6833
---	---

***** IN-PERSON MEETING WITH REMOTE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AVAILABLE *****

This meeting of the C/CAG Board of Directors will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public will be able to participate in the meeting remotely via the Zoom platform or in person at the location above. The Board welcomes comments, including criticism, about the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the Board and committees. Speakers shall not disrupt, disturb, or otherwise impede the orderly conduct of a Board meeting. For information regarding how to participate in the meeting, either in person or remotely, please refer to the instructions at the end of the agenda.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

2.0 PRESENTATIONS / ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 2.1 Receive a presentation from Climate Resilient Communities on climate resilience efforts in San Mateo County.

p. 1

3.0 ACTION TO SET AGENDA AND APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

This item is to set the final consent and regular agenda, and to approve the items listed on the consent agenda. All items on the consent agenda are approved by one action. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Board, staff, or public request specific

items to be removed for separate action.

- 3.1 Approval of Minutes from December 11, 2025, C/CAG Board and ALUC Meeting No. 389. ACTION p. 3
- 3.2 Review and accept the 2025 attendance report for the C/CAG Board and Committee meetings. ACTION p. 10
- 3.3 Review and approval of Resolution 26-01 determining that a proposed 5-story, 140-unit multi-family housing development at 500-580 Masonic Way, Belmont, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Carlos Airport. ACTION p. 22
- 3.4 Review and approval of Resolution 26-02 determining that a proposed 4-story, 35-unit residential project with 2 additional accessory dwelling units at 271 El Camino Real, San Bruno, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport. ACTION p. 30
- 3.5 Review and approval of Resolution 26-03 determining that a proposed 4-story, 20-unit residential project at 990 El Camino Real, San Bruno, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport. ACTION p. 37
- 3.6 Review and adopt Resolution 26-04 approving the population data to be used by C/CAG for calculation of member contributions and a variety of administrative related items. ACTION p. 44
- 3.7 Review and adopt Resolution 26-05 adding a voting Community/Community Based Organization (CBO) seat to the Resource Management and Climate Protection (RMCP) Committee roster, appointing Ortensia Lopez to the Community/CBO seat, and appointing Marc Hershman to the vacated C/CAG RMCP Committee Energy seat. ACTION p. 47
- 3.8 Review and approval of Resolution 26-06, authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 2 to the agreement with Gray Bowen Scott for on-call consultant services for Federal and State funded project coordination and grant administration, increasing the amount by \$50,000 to a revised not to exceed amount of \$410,000. ACTION p. 54
- 3.9 Review and adopt Resolution 26-07 authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute a \$20,000 supplemental agreement to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Master Funding Agreement to provide logistical, coordination, and support for an active transportation workshop. ACTION p. 59
- 3.10 Review and approval of C/CAG Legislative Priorities for 2026. ACTION p. 67
- 3.11 Receive executed \$49,000 contract with Transpo Group for professional services for \$6M BUILD Application for Countywide technology-based transportation safety improvements to implement C/CAG's Vision Zero efforts. ACTION p. 75

4.0 **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 4.1 Nominations for C/CAG Chair and Vice Chair for the March 2026 Election of Officers. ACTION p. 78
- 4.2 Receive a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan update INFORMATION p. 83
- 4.3 Receive a presentation on the upcoming Cycle 4 of One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program, and the FY 2026–2028 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program Calls for Projects.
 - 4.3.1 Review and approve the Fiscal Year 2026-2028 Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Call for Projects and Schedule. ACTION p. 91
- 4.4 Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.) POSSIBLE ACTION p. 95

5.0 **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

- 5.1 Chairperson’s Report
- 5.2 Board Members Report/Communication

6.0 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

7.0 **COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only**

- 7.1 Written Communication – 2 Letters p. 119

8.0 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Members of the public who wish to speak on matters not on the agenda will be given an opportunity to address the Board. Members of the public will have two minutes each to address the Board, unless a different time limit is established by the Chair. Please refer to the instructions at the end of this agenda for details regarding how to provide public comments.

9.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

Next scheduled meeting March 12, 2026

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Courtyard, 555 County Center, Redwood City, CA, and on C/CAG’s website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board has designated the office of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County

Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>. Please contact Mima Crume at (650) 599-1406 to arrange for inspection of public records.

ADA REQUESTS: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Mima Crume at (650) 599-1406 or mcrume@smcgov.org by 10:00 a.m. prior to the meeting date.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING HYBRID MEETINGS: Members of the public may address the Board as follows:

Written comments should be emailed in advance of the meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. Your written comment should be emailed to mcrume@smcgov.org.
2. Your email should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda.
3. Members of the public are limited to one comment per agenda item.
4. If your emailed comment is received at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, it will be provided to the C/CAG Board members, made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda. Emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be provided to the C/CAG Board members and included in the administrative record of the meeting as soon as practicable.

Spoken comments will be accepted during the meeting in person and through Zoom. Public comments will be taken first by speakers in person followed by via Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

***In-person participation:**

1. If you wish to speak to the Board, please fill out a speaker's slip located on the 2nd floor auditorium side table against the wall. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Board and included in the official record, please hand it to the C/CAG Clerk who will distribute the information to the Board members and staff.

***Remote participation:**

1. The C/CAG Board meeting may be accessed through Zoom at the online location indicated at the top of this agenda.
2. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting using an internet browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
3. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by your name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
4. When the C/CAG Clerk or Chair call for the item on which you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." The Clerk will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called on to speak. If calling in via phone, press *9 to raise your hand and when called upon press *6 to unmute.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to the time allotted.

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact C/CAG staff:

Executive Director: Sean Charpentier (650) 599-1409 or scharpentier@smcgov.org

Clerk of the Board: Mima Crume (650) 599-1406 or mcrume@smcgov.org

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Receive a presentation from Climate Resilient Communities regarding ongoing climate resilience efforts in San Mateo County.

(For further information please contact Dan Sternkopf at dsternkopf@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors receive a presentation from Climate Resilient Communities regarding ongoing climate resilience efforts in San Mateo County.

BACKGROUND

Climate Resilient Communities (CRC) is a community-based non-profit organization born out of East Palo Alto and rooted in cultural fluency and deep community trust. Since being founded in 2016, CRC has evolved into a leading regional voice for equitable climate resilience. Its model centers on empowering those most impacted by climate threats to lead the work of adaptation through resident-driven programs and neighborhood Climate Change Community Teams (CCCTs).

CRC's core areas of focus are 1.) Resilient Adaptation, 2.) Resilient Education, 3.) Resilient Homes, 4.) Resilient Leadership, 5.) Resilient Readiness, and 6.) the CCCTs. CRC's programs build stronger alliances between residents, schools, local government programs and community-based organizations and these partnerships can create resilience against climate-related stresses such as sea-level rise and economic instability.

C/CAG's Stormwater Program has partnered with CRC on various projects and programs. CRC supported the OneWatershed Project as the lead community-based organization. Additionally, CRC has recently completed a grant funded residential rain garden installation pilot project in East Palo Alto that aligns with countywide stormwater efforts. CRC has also supported some of C/CAG's recent major federal grant application efforts as the community partner, most notably with C/CAG's \$60M NOAA grant application, and with C/CAG's \$20M EPA grant application.

Equity Impacts and Considerations

CRC's supporting role to C/CAG has been that of a community-based organization working to increase the adaptive capacity of communities in San Mateo County through a community-centered engagement process. This work aligns with C/CAG's focus on prioritizing underserved communities via the Stormwater Program.

ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are available on the C/CAG website (See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>

1. CRC Presentation

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*

C/CAG BOARD & SAN MATEO COUNTY ALUC MEETING NOTICE

MINUTES

Meeting No. 389

December 11, 2025

*****HYBRID MEETING - IN-PERSON AND BY VIDEOCONFERENCE*****

This meeting of the C/CAG Board of Directors was held in person and by teleconference. Members of the public were able to participate in the meeting remotely via the Zoom platform and in person.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Vice Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll call was taken.

AGENCY:	IN-PERSON:	ABSENT:	REMOTE AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconference Location:
Atherton		Absent		
Belmont		Absent		
Brisbane		Absent		
Burlingame	Peter Stevenson			
Colma		Absent		
Daly City	Juslyn Manalo			
East Palo Alto	Martha Barrangan			
Foster City	Stacy Jimenez			
Half Moon Bay	Debbie Ruddock			
Hillsborough	Sophie Cole			
Menlo Park		Absent		
Millbrae	Anders Fung			
Pacifica	Sue Beckmeyer			
Portola Valley	Rebecca Flynn			
Redwood City		Absent		
San Bruno	Michael Salazar			
San Carlos		Absent		
San Mateo	Lisa Diaz-Nash			
South San Francisco	Eddie Flores			
Woodside		Absent		
San Mateo County		Absent		

C/CAG EX-OFFICIO (NON-VOTING) MEMBERS				
AGENCY:	IN-PERSON:	ABSENT:	REMOTE AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconference Location:
SMCTA		Absent		
SMCTD		Absent		

C/CAG Staff Present (In-Person):	C/CAG Staff Present (Remote):
Sean Charpentier – Executive Director	Van Ocampo
Melissa Andrikopoulos – Legal Counsel	
Mima Crume – Clerk of the Board	
Audrey Shiramizu	Members of the Public (In-Person):
Eva Gaye	Josh Abrams – 21 Elements
Dan Sternkopf	Rachel Ozer Bearson – 21 Elements
Jeff Lacap	
Matt Petrofsky	Members of the Public (Remote):
Reid Bogert	Praveena Samaleti – TJKM
Susy Kalkin	
Kaki Cheung	

Other members of the public were in attendance remotely via the Zoom platform or in person.

2.0 PRESENTATIONS / ANNOUNCEMENTS

2.1 Presentation from Community Planning Collaborative on the 21 Elements effort.

The Board received a presentation on the 21 Elements program regarding program activities, recent accomplishments, and the current and upcoming work plan supporting countywide housing policy implementation. Presenters highlighted collaborative efforts to provide technical assistance and shared resources to local jurisdictions, including work related to new housing legislation, Below Market Rate (BMR) housing administration, ADUs, anti-displacement initiatives, and the Grand Nexus and Feasibility Study.

Board members asked questions related to Housing Element implementation, future planning efforts, and affordable housing practices, and presenters responded.

2.2 Receive presentation from SamTrans on the Grand Boulevard Initiative Action Plan.

The Board received an informational presentation on the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI), a countywide effort led by SamTrans in partnership with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) and C/CAG to improve safety, mobility, and coordination along El Camino Real (State Route 82).

Presenters summarized the GBI Action Plan, which establishes a shared framework to advance safety, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements while coordinating countywide and local priorities and supporting future grant funding. Preliminary timelines, cost considerations, and funding strategies were also discussed.

Board members asked questions regarding business impacts, parking and speed

management, environmental considerations, funding and phasing, and jurisdictional coordination. Staff and project partners responded and outlined next steps.

No action was taken.

3.0 ACTION TO SET AGENDA AND APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

This item is to set the final consent and regular agenda, and to approve the items listed on the consent agenda. All items on the consent agenda are approved by one action. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Board, staff, or public request specific items to be removed for separate action.

- 3.1 Approval of Minutes from November 13, 2025, C/CAG Board and ALUC Meeting No. 388. APPROVED
- 3.2 Review and approval of Resolution 25-73 determining that a proposed 8-story mixed-use residential/commercial project at 170 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport. APPROVED
- 3.3 Review and approval of the Finance Committee’s recommendation of no change to the investment portfolio and accept the Quarterly Investment Report as of September 30, 2025. APPROVED
- 3.4 Review and accept the C/CAG Financial Statements (Audit) for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2025. APPROVED
- 3.5 Review and accept the C/CAG State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Planning, Programming & Monitoring Program (PPM) Final Project Expenditure Audit Report from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. APPROVED
- 3.6 Review and accept the Measure M Fund Financial Statements (Audit) for the Year Ended June 30, 2025. APPROVED
- 3.7 Review and approval of Resolution 25-22 authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute an agreement with Iteris, Inc to provide system integration and develop incident response plans for the Northern Cities Smart Corridor Project in an amount not to exceed \$425,000. APPROVED
- 3.8 Review and approval of the appointment of Marjory Ruiz Hidalgo to the C/CAG RMCP Committee Utility seat. APPROVED
- 3.9 Review and approval of Resolution 25-75 authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute an agreement between C/CAG and Ken Brown Strategic Consulting for federal advocacy consulting services for an amount not to exceed \$270,000 through December 31, 2027. APPROVED

- 3.10 Review and approval of Resolution 25-76 appointing Debbie Ruddock, City of Half Moon Bay, for the Coastal Region City/Town seat; Adam Rak, City of San Carlos, for the Central Region City/Town seat; and Marie Chuang, Town of Hillsborough, for the At-Large City/Town seat to the governing board of the San Mateo County Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District (OneShoreline). APPROVED
- 3.11 Review and approval of Resolution 25-78 adding a Non-Voting Seat for a MTC Commissioner from San Mateo County to the Legislative Committee Roster. APPROVED
- 3.12 Review and approval of the appointment of Gina Papan, MTC Commissioner, to the MTC Commissioner seat on the Legislative Committee. APPROVED

Executive Director Sean Charpentier provided a brief update on Consent Item 3.11, recommending the addition of a non-voting Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Commissioner seat to the Legislative Committee that would not count toward quorum. He noted that the item was reviewed by the Legislative Committee immediately prior to the meeting and was recommended for approval.

Board Member Stevenson MOVED to approve the consent agenda items 3.1 through 3.12. Board Member Manalo SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED 12-0-0**

4.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 4.1 Receive a presentation on Countywide Stormwater Program updates. INFORMATION

The Board received a presentation from Reid Bogert, Stormwater Program Director, providing an update on the Countywide Stormwater Program, including program activities, recent accomplishments, and upcoming challenges related to regulatory requirements and funding.

Highlights included progress on countywide compliance efforts, achievement of trash reduction requirements by most jurisdictions, climate resilience initiatives, grant-funded projects, and community outreach programs. Staff also discussed anticipated challenges associated with the 2027 Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit reissuance and limited funding resources.

Board members asked questions regarding coordination with local stormwater planning, funding mechanisms, climate resilience efforts, and grant opportunities. Staff responded to questions.

- 4.2 Conduct a public hearing on the final draft update to the Congestion Management Program and consider review and approval of Resolution 25-77 adopting the 2025 Congestion Management Program. (*Special Voting Procedures apply*) APPROVED

The Board received a final presentation on the 2025 Congestion Management Program (CMP), which CCAG prepares biennially in its role as the county’s congestion management agency. Staff summarized the CMP’s evaluation of transportation system performance and addressed comments previously received from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ), and the Board.

Staff provided clarification on corridor versus intersection level-of-service measures, data sources used in the analysis, interregional congestion considerations, and transit performance metrics. The Board had previously reviewed the draft CMP, which was made available for public comment.

The Vice Chair opened the public hearing. No public comments were received. The Board then closed the public hearing.

Board Member Peterson MOVED to close the public hearing. Board Member Manalo SECONDED. A roll call vote was conducted, **MOTION CARRIED 12-0-0.**

A Special Voting Procedure was taken by roll call. **MOTION CARRIED 12-0-0.**
 Results: 12 Agencies approving. This represents 57% of the agencies, representing 66% of the population.

Ayes:	Noes:	Absent:
		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		
South San Francisco		
		Woodside
		San Mateo County

4.3 Review and approval of the 2026 C/CAG Board Meeting calendar. APPROVED

The Board reviewed the proposed Board meeting calendar for the upcoming year. Executive Director Sean Charpentier noted that the calendar does not conflict with the League of California Cities Annual Conference and asked for Board direction regarding a potential summer hiatus.

Board members discussed whether to recess in July or August, with a majority expressing a preference for an August hiatus. Staff noted that the June agenda would be scheduled to accommodate items in advance of the summer recess, if possible.

Board Member Manalo MOVED to approve item 4.3 Board Member Fung SECONDED. A roll call vote was conducted, **MOTION CARRIED 12-0-0.**

- 4.4 Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.) **NO ACTION TAKEN**

The Board received an informational legislative update from Executive Director Sean Charpentier regarding anticipated and ongoing federal and state legislation, including housing and transportation-related measures and emerging issues related to e-bike regulation. Staff also provided a preview of anticipated federal and state budget and earmark requests. Board members asked questions regarding potential e-bike legislation, and staff responded by outlining C/CAG's anticipated involvement, including monitoring proposed bills, providing policy input, preparing a white paper on e-bike regulation, and coordinating with regional and state partners.

5.0 **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

5.1 Chairperson's Report

The Vice Chair provided brief remarks on behalf of the Chair, who was unable to attend, and thanked Board members for their participation over the past year, noting upcoming council and Board transitions and extending holiday well wishes.

5.2 Board Members Report/Communication

Board member Beckmeyer shared the passing of former council member and three-time mayor Mary Ann Nihart, recognizing her service to the City of Pacifica and San Mateo County, including her leadership as a past Chair of C/CAG. The Vice Chair expressed condolences on behalf of the Board and noted that the meeting would adjourn in her memory.

6.0 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

7.0 **COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only**

7.1 Written Communication – 5 Letters

8.0 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3, members of the public who wish to speak on matters not on the agenda will be given an opportunity to address the Board. Members of the public will have two minutes each to address the Board, unless a different time limit is established by the Chair. Please refer to the instructions at the end of this agenda for details regarding how to provide public comments.

There were no public comments.

9.0 **ADJOURNMENT** – 8:18 p.m.

The Board adjourned in honor of the life and service of Maryann Nihart.

Next scheduled meeting February 12, 2026

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and accept the 2025 attendance report for the C/CAG Board and Committee meetings.

(For further information, contact Mima Crume mcrume@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board review and accept the 2025 attendance reports for the C/CAG Board and Committee meetings.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Not applicable

BACKGROUND

There are 21 local government jurisdictions in San Mateo County (20 cities/towns and 1 County). C/CAG focuses on Countywide collaboration and creating alignment on solutions for the entire county. The C/CAG Board of Directors is one of the few organizations in the County that has a specified seat for each city/town and the County. In addition, C/CAG has an extensive system of committees, with a total of 8 standing committees to guide and advise the C/CAG Board of Directors. C/CAG has approximately 76 regular scheduled Brown Act meetings each year for C/CAG Board of Directors and C/CAG Committees. Including the Board of Directors and the 8 standing committees, there are a total of 139 seats, including 74 seats identified for elected officials. There are 107 elected councilmembers or County Supervisors in San Mateo County. In 2022, approximately 52 individual (unduplicated) local elected officials either served on the C/CAG Board of Directors or participated with a C/CAG Committee.

Periodically, the C/CAG Board receives reports of the attendance for the Board and its standing committees. Since each member jurisdiction appoints its C/CAG representative and alternate, C/CAG has not set an attendance requirement for Board meetings. However, the C/CAG Board adopted the following attendance policy for its standing committees:

“During any consecutive twelve-month period, members will be expected to attend at least 75% of the scheduled meetings and not have more than three consecutive absences. If the number of absences exceed these limits, the seat may be declared vacant by the C/CAG Chair.”

The attached attendance reports are provided for your acceptance.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

This item is necessary for the administration/operations of C/CAG.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Calendar year 2025 attendance reports for the C/CAG Board and eight (8) standing committees:

1. C/CAG Board
 - a) Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC)
 - b) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
 - c) Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ)
 - d) Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
 - e) Legislative Committee
 - f) Finance Committee
 - g) Resource Management & Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)
 - h) Stormwater Committee

City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) Board Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Representative/Alternate	Yrly Total	January Cancelled	February			March			April			May			June		
				In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location
Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis	9		1			1			1			1			1		
	Rick DeGolia	0		0			0			0			0			0		
Belmont	Julia Mates	8		1			1			1			0			1		
	Robin Pang-Maganaris	0		0			0			0			0			0		
Brisbane	Coleen Mackin	8		1			1			1			1			1		
	Cliff Lentz	0		0			0			0			0			0		
Burlingame	Peter Stevenson	8		1			0			1			1			1		
	Andrea Pappajohn	1		0			0			0			0			0		
Colma	Thomas Walsh	8		1			1			1			0			1		
	None	0		0			0			0			0			0		
Daly City	Juslyn Manalo	7		1			1				1		1			1		
	Roderick Daus-Magbual	0		0			0			0		1	0			0		
East Palo Alto	Martha Barragan	6		0			1			1			1			0		
	Mark Dinan	2		1			0			0			0			0		
Foster City	Stacy Jimenez	10		1			1			1			1			1		
	Art Kiesel	0		0			0			0			0			0		
Half Moon Bay	Debbie Rudduck	6		0			0			1			0			1		
	Paul Nagengast	2		0			1			0			1			0		
Hillsborough	Sophie Cole	9		1			0			1			1			1		
	Laurie Davies Adams	0		0			0			0			0			0		
Menlo Park	Cecilia Taylor	5		0	1		0			1				1		0		
	Betsy Nash	0		0			0			0			0			0		
Millbrae	Anders Fung	6		1			0			1			0			1		
	Reuben D. Holober	1		0			1			0			0			0		
Pacifica	Sue Beckmeyer	8		1			1			1			0			0		
	Greg Wright	2		0			0			0			1			1		
Portola Valley	Rebecca Flynn	9		1			1			1			1			0		
	Mary Hufty	1		0			0			0			0			1		
Redwood City	Elmer Martínez Saballos	8		1			1			1			0			1		
	Diane Howard	0		0			0			0			0			0		
San Bruno	Michael Salazar	10		1			1			1			1			1		
	Rico Medina	0		0			0			0			0			0		
San Carlos	Adam Rak	7		1			1			0			1			0		
	Pranita Venkatesh	0		0			0			0			0			0		
San Mateo	Lisa Diaz Nash	7		1			1			1			1			1		
	Adam Loraine	2		0			0			0			0			0		
South San Francisco	Eddie Flores	8		1			1			0			1			1		
	Flor Nicholas	1		0			0			1			0			0		
Woodside	Jenn Wall	0		0			0			0			0			0		
	Brian Dombkowski	1		0			0			0			0			0		
San Mateo County	Lisa Gauthier	7		1			1			0			1			0		
	Jackie Speier	0		0			0			0			0			0		
		167	0	18	1	0	17	0	0	17	1		15	1		16	0	0

1 - Board Member Attended

0 - Absent

* Attended Remotely as Member of Public

No Board Meeting

Cancelled

BOD Total Attendance

Number of BODs in attendance

City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) Board Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Representative/Alternate	Yrly Total	July Special	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	August No Mtg Scheduled	September	Remote AB 2449	October Special	Remote AB 2449	November	Remote AB 2449	December	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location			
			In-Person			In-Person	In-Person		In-Person		In-Person		In-Person					
Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis	9	1				1		1		1		0					
	Rick DeGolia	0					0		0		0		0					
Belmont	Julia Mates	8	1					1	1		1		0					
	Robin Pang-Maganaris	0					0		0		0		0					
Brisbane	Coleen Mackin	8	1				1		0		1		0					
	Cliff Lentz	0					0		0		0		0					
Burlingame	Peter Stevenson	8					1		1		1		1					
	Andrea Pappajohn	1	1				0		0		0		0					
Colma	Thomas Walsh	8	1				1		1		1		0					
	None	0					0		0		0		0					
Daly City	Juslyn Manalo	7	1				0		0		0		1					
	Roderick Daus-Magbual	0					0		0		0		0					
East Palo Alto	Martha Barragan	6	1				1		0		0		1					
	Mark Dinan	2					0		1		0		0					
Foster City	Stacy Jimenez	10	1				1		1		1		1					
	Art Kiesel	0					0		0		0		0					
Half Moon Bay	Debbie Rudduck	6	1				1		0		1		1					
	Paul Nagengast	2					0		0		0		0					
Hillsborough	Sophie Cole	9	1				1		1		1		1					
	Laurie Davies Adams	0					0		0		0		0					
Menlo Park	Cecilia Taylor	5	1				0			1	0		0					
	Betsy Nash	0					0		0		0		0					
Millbrae	Anders Fung	6	1				0		0		1		1					
	Reuben D. Holober	1					0		0		0		0					
Pacifica	Sue Beckmeyer	8	1				1		1		1		1					
	Greg Wright	2					0		0		0		0					
Portola Valley	Rebecca Flynn	9	1				1		1		1		1					
	Mary Hufty	1					0		0		0		0					
Redwood City	Elmer Martínez Saballos	8	1				1		1		1		0					
	Diane Howard	0					0		0		0		0					
San Bruno	Michael Salazar	10	1				1		1		1		1					
	Rico Medina	0					0		0		0		0					
San Carlos	Adam Rak	7	1					1	1		1		0					
	Pranita Venkatesh	0					0		0		0		0					
San Mateo	Lisa Diaz Nash	7	1				0		0		0		1					
	Adam Loraine	2					0		1		1		0					
South San Francisco	Eddie Flores	8	1				1		0		1		1					
	Flor Nicholas	1					0		0		0		0					
Woodside	Jenn Wall	0					0		0		0		0					
	Brian Dombkowski	1		1			0		0		0		0					
San Mateo County	Lisa Gauthier	7	1				1		1		1		0					
	Jackie Speier	0					0		0		0		0					
		167	20	1	0	0	14	1	1	14	1	0	17	0	0	12	0	0

1 - Board Member Attended

0 - Absent

* Attended Remotely as Member of Public

No Board Meeting

Cancelled

BOD Total Attendance

Number of BODs in attendance

Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
City of Brisbane	Terry O'Connell				X	X	X				X		
City of Burlingame	Andrea Pappajohn				X	X	X				X		
City of Daly City	Pamela DiGiovanni					X	X						
City of Foster City	Patrick Sullivan				X	X					X		
City of Half Moon Bay	Patric Jonsson/Paul Nagengast ¹					Y	X				X		
City of Millbrae	Stephen Rainaldi				X	X	X				X		
City of Redwood City	Christopher Sturken					X	X						
City of San Bruno	Tom Hamilton				X	X	X				X		
City of San Carlos	Pranita Venkatesh												
County of San Mateo and Aviation Representative	Ray Meuller					X							
City of South San Francisco	Flor Nicolas					X	X				X		
Aviation Representative	Carol Ford				X	X	X				X		
Half Moon Bay Airport Pilots Association	Christopher Yakabe				Y								

- X - Committee Member Attended
- O - Other Jurisdictional Representative Attended
- Y - Designated Alternate Attended
- No Committee Meeting
- N/A - Not on Committee
- ☐ No Quorum

¹ Paul Nagengast appointed June 2025

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Burlingame	Desiree Thayer	x		x		x		x		x	x		
South San Francisco	Flor Nicolas			x		x		x		x	x		
Pacifica	Mary Bier	x		x		x				x			
Foster City	Patrick Sullivan	x		x				x		x	x		
Half Moon Bay	Paul Nagengast	N/A		N/A		x		x			x		
Redwood City	Isabella Chu	N/A		N/A		x		x			x		
Millbrae	Stephen Rainaldi	N/A		x		x		x		x	x		
Pacifica	Greg Wright	N/A		N/A		x		x		x	x		
Public (County of San Mateo)	Matthew Self	x								x	x		
Public (San Bruno)	Malcolm Robinson			x		x					x		
Public (Redwood City)	Jean Yang	N/A		N/A		x		x		x	x		
Public (Portola Valley)	Angela Hey	x		1		x		x		x	x		
Public (San Mateo)	Mike Swire	x				x		x		x	x		
Public (South San Francisco)	Justin Yuen	x		x				x					
Public (Daly City)	Alan Uy			x		x		x					

- X - Committee Member Attended**
- O - Other Jurisdictional Representative Attended**
- Y - Designated Alternate Attended**
- N/A - Not on Committee**
- No Committee Meeting**
- ⏏ No Quorum**

Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Attendance Report - 2025

Name	Representing	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
				(Canceled)			(Canceled)	(No Mtg.)		(Canceled)		(Canceled)	
Dick Brown (Woodside Town Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X		X	X			X				X
Tom McCune (Belmont City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X		AB 2449	X			X		X		
Mark Dinan (East Palo Alto Council Member)	Elected Official		X		X	X							
Stacy Jimenez (Foster City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X		X	X			X		X		XX
Stacy Miles Holland (Atherton Council Member)	Elected Official	X			X				X				
Juslyn Manalo (Daly City Council Member)	Elected Official				AB 2449								
Pranita Venkatesh (San Carlos Council Member)	Elected Official		X		X				X		X		X
Bob Nguyen (Millbrae Council Member)	Elected Official		X		X	X					X		X
Vacant (Council Member)	Elected Official												
Gina Papan (MTC Commissioner)	MTC Commissioner	X	R		X				X				X
Mollie Carter (Environmental Community)	Environmental Community	X			X	X			X		X		X
Richard Hedges (Public Member)	Public Member	X	X		Brown Act	X			X				X
Vacant (Business Community)	Business Community												
Deborah Penrose (Agencies with Transportation Interests)	Agencies with Transportation Interests				X						R		
Peter Ratto (San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans))	San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	X	X		X	X			X		X		
Pamela Herhold (Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART))	Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	X	X			X					X		X
Casey Fromson (Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain))	Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)				R						X		

X - Committee Member Attended
Remote Attendance
Blank-Absent
N/A - Not on Committee
AB 2449 - Remote attendance via AB 2449
R- Brown Act Remote attendance via Publicly Accessible Teleconference
Location
 **No Committee Meeting**

Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Name	Jan			Feb			Mar			Apr			May			June			Jul	August			Sept			Oct			Nov			Dec		
		In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.		In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf.			
Hillsborough Engineering	Paul Willis (Co-Chair)	X			X			X			X			X			X				X			X			X			X					
San Mateo County	Ann Stillman (Co-Chair)	Y			X			X			X			X			X				X			X			X			X					
SMCTA / SamTrans	Jessica Manzi	X			X			X			X			X			Y				X			X			X			X					
Atherton Engineering	Robert Ovadia	X			X			Y			X			X			X				X			X			X			X					
Belmont Engineering	Peter Brown/Ray Towne/Nisha Patel				X			X			X			X												X									
Brisbane Engineering	Randy Breault	X			X			X			X			X			X				X			X						X					
Burlingame Engineering	Syed Murtuza	X			X						X			X			X				X			X			Y								
C/CAG	Sean Charpentier	X			X			X			X			X			X				X			X						X					
Colma Engineering	Brad Donohue	Y			X						X			Y			X						X			Y									
Daly City Engineering	Richard Chau							X			X					X					X								X						
East Palo Alto	Humza Javed				X						X			X			X				X			X					X						
Foster City Engineering	Andrew Brozyna	X			X						X			Y			X				X			X			X								
Half Moon Bay Engineering	Maz Bozorqinia	X			X			X			X			X							X			X											
Menlo Park Engineering	Azalea Mitch					X		X			X										X			X			X			X					
Milbrae Engineering	Sam Bautista	Y			Y			Y			X			Y			X						Y						Y						
Pacifica Engineering	Lisa Petersen				Y			Y			X					X					X			Y			Y			X					
Redwood City Engineering	Matt Nichols/Tanisha Werner	X			X			X			X			X			X				X			X					X						
San Bruno Engineering	Matthew Lee	X			X						Y			Y			X						X			X			X						
San Carlos Engineering	Steven Machida	Y			X						X			X			Y				X			X			X			X					
San Mateo Engineering	Matt Fabry				X			X			Y			X			Y				X			X			X			X					
South San Francisco Engineering	Eunelune Kim	X			X						X			X							X			X			X			X					
Woodside Engineering	Yaz Emrani							X			X																								
Caltrans	Mohammad Suleiman					XX												XX						X											

X - Committee Member Attended

O - Other Jurisdictional Representative Attended

Y - Designated Alternate Attended

N/A - Not on Committee

■ No Committee Meeting

☐ No Quorum

* = Member change

XX = Non-Voting Member Attended via Zoom

Note: Board approved Reso 13-84 on October 12, 2023 approving the addition of alternate positions, removal of planner positions, and changing MTC and Caltrans to non-voting members.

Legislative Committee Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis		x	x	x	x	x			x		x	
Burlingame	Andrea Pappajohn		na	x	x		x			x		x	
East Palo Alto	Lisa Gauthier		na	x		x				x		x	
Foster City	Stacey Jimenez		x	x	x	x	x			x		x	x
Millbrae	Gina Papan - Chair		x		x	x	x			x		x	x
Millbrae	Anders Fung		x		x		x					x	x
Pacifica	Greg Wright		na	x	x	x	x			x		x	x
San Bruno	Michael Salazar (C/CAG Vice-Chair)		x	x	x	x	x			x		x	x
San Carlos	Adam Rak - Vice Chair (C/CAG Chair)		x	x		x						x	
South San Francisco	Eddie Flores		x	x		x	x			x		x	x

- X - Committee Member Attended
- O - Other Jurisdictional Representative
- Y - Designated Alternate Attended
- N/A - Not on Committee
- No Committee Meeting
- ⚡ No Quorum

Finance Committee Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Name	Feb			Apr			May			Aug			Dec		
		In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location	In-Person	Remote AB 2449	REMOTE Publicly Accessible Teleconf. Location
East Palo Alto	Carlos Romero	X			X			X			X			X		
Burlingame	Donna Colson (Committee Chair)	X			X			X						X		
San Carlos	Adam Rak (Committee Vice Chair/CAG Chair)	X			X			X								
San Bruno	Michael Salazar (C/CAG Vice Chair)	X			X			X			X			X		
Hillsborough	Marie Chuang				X						X			X		

- X - Committee Member Attended**
- O - Other Jurisdictional Representative Attended**
- Y - Designated Altern**
- N/A - Not on Committee**
-  **No Committee Meeting**
-  **No Quorum**

Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP) Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Name	Seat	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Burlingame	Donna Colson	Elected Official - Committee Chair		x	x	x			x				x	
County of San Mateo	Dave Pine	Elected Official							N/A			N/A	N/A	
County of San Mateo	Ray Mueller	Elected Official		N/A	N/A	x						x		
Menlo Park	Betsy Nash	Elected Official		x	x	x			x				x	
Millbrae	Bob Nyugen	Elected Official			x	x						x		
Pacifica	Sue Beckmeyer	Elected Official		x	x	x			x			x	x	
Portola Valley	Mary Hufty	Elected Official							N/A			N/A	N/A	
Portola Valley	Helen Wolter	Elected Official			N/A	N/A			x					
Redwood City	Kaia Eakin	Elected Official		x		x						x		
El Concilio of San Mateo County	Ortensia Lopez	Energy							x					
BAWSCA	Tom Francis	Water - Committee Vice Chair		x	x	x			x			x	x	
PG&E	Bill Chiang	Utility												
Filoli	Alex Fernandez	Nonprofit			x									
Sustainable SMC	Sarah Hubbard	Environmental			x	x			x			x	x	
Sares Regis Group	Jeff Smith	Business/Chamber of Commerce							N/A			N/A	N/A	
Sares Regis Group	Christina Donovan	Business/Chamber of Commerce		N/A	N/A	N/A			x			x		

X - Committee Member Attended

O - Other Jurisdictional Representative Attended

Y - Designated Alternate Attended

N/A - Not on Roster

V - Vacant

■ No Committee Meeting

⊞ No Quorum

Stormwater Committee Attendance Report - 2025

Agency	Representative	Position	Jan		Feb		Mar		Apr		May	Jun		Jul	Aug		Sept		Oct			Nov		Dec
			In-person	Remote Non-Voting	In-person	Remote Voting (AB 2449)	Remote Non-Voting	In-person	Remote Non-Voting	In-person		Remote Non-Voting	In-person		Remote Non-Voting	In-person	Remote Non-Voting	In-person	Remote Non-Voting	Remote AB2449	Remote Non-Voting	In-person	Remote Non-Voting	
Atherton	Robert Ovadia (Vice Chair/Chair - Novemeber)	Public Works Director	X		X			X	X			X			X		X					X		
Belmont	Nisha Patel/Edric Kwan	Public Works Director	O		X			X	X						Y		Y					Y		
Brisbane	Randy Breault (Chair)	Public Works Director/City Engineer	X		X			X	X			X			X							X		
Burlingame	Sved Murtuza	Public Works Director	Y		Y			Y				Y			Y		Y					X		
Colma	Brad Donohue	Director of Public Works and Planning	Y		X			X	X			X					X							
Daly City	Richard Chiu	Public Works Director						X	X			X			X							X		
East Palo Alto	Humza Javed/Anwar Mirza	Public Works Director/City Engineer			X				X	Y		Y			Y		Y					X		
Foster City	Andrew Brozyona	Public Works Director	X		X				X			X			X		X							
Half Moon Bay	Maziar Bozorqinia (Vice Chair - November)	City Engineer/Public Works Director	X		X			X	X						X		X					X		
Hillsborough	Paul Willis	Public Works Director			X			X	X			Y			X		X					X		
Menlo Park	Azalea Mitch	Public Works Director				X		X	X						X		X							
Millbrae	Sam Bautista	Public Works Director	Y		Y			Y	Y			Y			Y		Y					Y		
Pacifica	Roland Yip	Deputy Director of Public Works/City Engineer			X			X	Y			X			X		X					Y		
Portola Valley	Javad Mirsadi	Interim Town Engineer			X		X																	
Redwood City	Tanisha Werner	Director of Transportation and Engineering	X					X	O			Y					Y					Y		
San Bruno	Matthew Lee	Public Works Director	X		X				Y			X										X		
San Carlos	Steven Machida	Public Works Director	Y		X							Y			X		X					X		
San Mateo	Matthew Fabry	Public Works Director			X	X		X	Y			Y			X		X					X		
South San Francisco	Eunelune Kim	Public Works Director	X		X				X						X		X					X		
Woodside	Yaz Emrani	Public Works Director			X										X									
San Mateo County	Ann Stillman	Public Works Director	Y		X			X	X			X			X		X					X		
OneShoreline	Summer Bundv	Director of Prolects	N/A		N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A			N/A		X					X		
Regional Water Quality Control Board	Watershed Management Supervisor	Watershed Management Supervisor					O	X	O			O				O		O					X	

X - Committee Member Attended
O - Other Jurisdictional Representative Attended
Y - Designated Alternate Attended
■ - No Committee Meeting
N/A - Not on Committee
†† - No Quorum

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and approval of Resolution 26-01 determining that a proposed 5-story, 140-unit multi-family housing development at 500-580 Masonic Way, Belmont, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Carlos Airport.

(For further information please contact Susy Kalkin at kkalkin@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, approve Resolution 26-01 determining that a proposed 5-story, 140-unit multi-family housing development at 500-580 Masonic Way, Belmont, is consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Carlos Airport (San Carlos ALUCP), subject to the following conditions:

- *The City of Belmont shall advise the project sponsor of their obligation to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Overflight Policy 1 of the San Carlos ALUCP.*
- *Prior to issuance of a building permit, the City of Belmont shall require that the project sponsor provide evidence of a recorded ‘Overflight Notification’ on each residential parcel in accordance with Overflight Policy 2 of the San Carlos ALUCP. (An example for the Overflight Notification to be used to fulfill this condition is included in the amended San Carlos ALUCP, Appendix E, Exhibit E-4.)*

BACKGROUND

Belmont has processed an application for a 140-unit multi-family housing development at 500-580 Masonic Way, comprised of four levels of residential units above a surface level lobby and garage. The project was processed as a “By Right” development pursuant to State law, with the provision that it would be subject to an ALUCP consistency determination. The adopted Belmont Resolution 2025-68, **Attachment 3**, includes Conditions of Approval that address ALUCP consistency, as follows:

“Airport Hazards

- a) The project requires review by the Airport Land Use Commission prior to issuance of a building permit. The Community Development Department will prepare and submit the requisite application materials. The applicant may be asked to supply project specific data to assist in completing the application. The following conditions are typically applied by the Airport Land Use Commission:

- The applicant has an obligation to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Overflight Policy 1 of the San Carlos ALUCP.
 - The applicant shall provide evidence of a recorded ‘Overflight Notification’ on each residential parcel in accordance with Overflight Policy 2 of the San Carlos ALUCP. (An example for the Overflight Notification to be used to fulfill this condition is included in the amended San Carlos ALUCP, Appendix E, Exhibit E.
- b) Applicant shall comply with all applicable requirements of the FAA, including but not limited to the requirements of the Determination of No Hazard issued for the project on March 2, 2024. At the time of building permit submittal, applicant must determine whether they are required to file FAA Form 7460-1 for construction equipment. In order to do so, the applicant must determine the maximum height of any cranes to be used during construction. The determination shall be submitted in writing.”

The project falls within Airport Influence Area (AIA) B, the Project Referral Area for San Carlos Airport and is subject to ALUC review pursuant to California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 21676.5(a), as Belmont has not yet brought its General Plan and Zoning Ordinance into full compliance with the ALUCP. Accordingly, Belmont has referred the subject project for a determination of consistency with the San Carlos ALUCP.

DISCUSSION

I. ALUCP Consistency Evaluation

Four sets of airport/land use compatibility policies in the San Carlos ALUCP relate to the proposed project: (a) noise compatibility policies and criteria, (b) safety policies and criteria, (c) airspace protection policies and (d) overflight compatibility. The following sections address each issue.

(a) Noise Policy Consistency

The 60 dB CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) aircraft noise contour defines the threshold for airport noise impacts established in the San Carlos ALUCP. All land uses located outside this contour are deemed consistent with the noise policies of the ALUCP.

As shown on San Carlos ALUCP Exhibit 4-2, **Attachment 2a**, the subject property lies outside the bounds of the 60 dB CNEL contour and, therefore, the project is consistent with the San Carlos ALUCP noise policies and criteria.

(b) Safety Policy Consistency

Runway Safety Zones - The San Carlos ALUCP includes six sets of safety zones and related land use compatibility policies and criteria. As shown on San Carlos ALUCP Exhibit 4-3, **Attachment 2b**, the project site is not located within a Safety Zone, so is not impacted by the Safety Compatibility policies.

(c) **Airspace Protection Policy Consistency**

Structures Heights

Pursuant to Airspace Protection Policy 5, in order to be deemed consistent with the ALUCP, the maximum height of a new building must be the lower of (1) the height of the controlling airspace protection surface shown on Exhibit 4-4, or 2) the maximum height determined to not be a “hazard to air navigation” by the FAA in an aeronautical study prepared pursuant to the filing of Form 7460-1.

The height of the structure is approximately 78’-8” to the top of the rooftop mechanical screen. Given an existing site elevation of approximately 18’ above mean sea level (AMSL), the maximum height of the project would be approximately 97 ft. above mean sea level (AMSL). As shown on San Carlos ALUCP Exhibit 4-4, **Attachment 2c**, the Part 77 Airspace Protection Surface lies approximately 255’ ft AMSL, so the proposed project would be well below this surface, in compliance with the Airspace Protection policies of the ALUCP. Additionally, the applicant has filed Form 7460-1 with the FAA and received a determination of No Hazard, **Attachment 2d**. However, as noted in the application materials, it is likely that construction-related equipment will exceed the notification heights, so there is likely a need for further filings with the FAA. As discussed under the Background section above, Belmont has adopted conditions of approval that address this requirement, as noted below:

“Applicant shall comply with all applicable requirements of the FAA, including but not limited to the requirements of the Determination of No Hazard issued for the project on March 2, 2024. At the time of building permit submittal, applicant must determine whether they are required to file FAA Form 7460-1 for construction equipment. In order to do so, the applicant must determine the maximum height of any cranes to be used during construction. The determination shall be submitted in writing.”

Based on these factors, the project is determined to be compatible with Airspace Protection Policy 5.

Other Flight Hazards

In accordance with Airspace Protection Policy 6, within AIA B, certain land use characteristics are recognized as hazards to air navigation and, per Airspace Protection Policy 6, need to be evaluated to ensure compatibility with FAA rules and regulations. These characteristics include the following:

- Sources of glare, such as highly reflective buildings, building features, or blight lights including search lights, or laser displays, which would interfere with the vision of pilots in command of an aircraft in flight;
- Distracting lights that could be mistaken for airport identification lightings, runway edge lighting, runway end identification lighting, or runway approach lighting;
- Sources of dust, smoke, water vapor, or steam that may impair the visibility of a pilot in command of and aircraft in flight;
- Sources of electrical/electronic interference with aircraft communications/navigation equipment; or

- Any use that creates an increased attraction for wildlife, particularly large flocks of birds, that is inconsistent with FAA rules and regulations, including but not limited to *FAA Order 5200.5A, Waste Disposal Site On or Near Airports* and *FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports* and any successor or replacement orders or advisory circulars.

The proposed project does not include any features that would present unusual hazards to air navigation and therefore is determined to be compatible with Airspace Protection Policy 6.

(d) Overflight Compatibility Consistency

The San Carlos ALUCP contains two policies regarding overflight compatibility which are generally “buyer awareness” measures focused on informing prospective buyers and/or tenants of property within the vicinity of an airport about the airport’s impact on the property. Overflight Policy 1 – *Real Estate Transfer Disclosure* requires that a notice of potential for overflights be included among the disclosures made during real estate transactions. Overflight Policy 2 – *Overflight Notification Zone 2* requires that all new residential development projects, other than additions and accessory dwelling units (ADUs), within Overflight Notification Zone 2 (AIA B) incorporate a recorded overflight notification requirement as a condition of approval.

The Project Area is located within both the Airport Influence Area (AIA) A & B boundaries for San Carlos Airport, so is subject to the requirements of both Overflight Policies. As Belmont’s municipal code address does not include these requirements, the following conditions are recommended:

- The City of Belmont shall advise the project sponsor of their obligation to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Overflight Policy 1 of the San Carlos ALUCP.
- Prior to issuance of a building permit, the City of Belmont shall require that the project sponsor provide evidence of a recorded ‘Overflight Notification’ on each residential parcel in accordance with Overflight Policy 2 of the San Carlos ALUCP. (An example for the Overflight Notification to be used to fulfill this condition is included in the San Carlos ALUCP, Appendix E, Exhibit E-4.)

Airport Land Use Committee

The Airport Land Use Committee considered this application at its January 22, 2026 meeting, and recommended that it be determined consistent with the policies of the SFO ALUCP, subject to the conditions discussed above.

Equity Impacts and Considerations

The C/CAG Board of Directors is the designated Airport Land Use Commission for San Mateo County, which is mandated by State law to develop and administer ALUCPs for each airport in its jurisdiction. The overall purpose of developing ALUCP policies and procedures, and the companion ALUCP consistency review process, is to minimize the public’s exposure to excessive noise and

safety hazards while providing for the orderly expansion of airports. This planning effort is applied to all areas located within a geographic sphere known as the Airport Influence Area (AIA).

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution 26-01

The following attachments are available on the C/CAG website (See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>

2. ALUCP application

- a. San Carlos ALUCP Exh. 4-2 – Future Conditions (2035) Aircraft Noise Contours
- b. San Carlos ALUCP Exh. 4-3 – Safety Zones.
- c. San Carlos ALUCP Exh. 4-4 – Airspace Protection Surfaces
- d. FAA Determination of No Hazard
- e. Project plans

3. Belmont Resolution 2025-68

RESOLUTION 26-01

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY, ACTING AS THE SAN MATEO COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION, DETERMINING THAT A PROPOSED 5-STORY, 140-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AT 500-580 MASONIC WAY, BELMONT, IS CONDITIONALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN FOR THE ENVIRONS OF SAN CARLOS AIRPORT.

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), in its capacity as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, that,

WHEREAS, in accordance with the requirements of California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 21676(b) a local agency General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and/or any affected specific plan must be consistent with the applicable airport/land use criteria in the relevant adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Additionally, individual projects are subject to ALUC review pursuant to PUC Section 21676.5(a) if a local agency has not brought its General Plan and Zoning Ordinance into compliance with the ALUCP; and

WHEREAS, the City of Belmont has processed an application for an 5-story, 140-unit multi-family housing development at 500-580 Masonic Way, which falls within Airport Influence Area (AIA) B for San Carlos Airport, and has referred the project to C/CAG, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, for a determination of consistency with relevant airport / land use compatibility criteria in the *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Carlos Airport* (San Carlos ALUCP); and

WHEREAS, four airport/land use compatibility factors are addressed in the San Carlos ALUCP that relate to the project, including: (a) noise compatibility, (b) safety compatibility, (c) airspace protection compatibility, and (d) overflight compatibility, as discussed below:

- (a) Noise Compatibility – The 60 dB CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) aircraft noise contour defines the threshold for airport noise impacts established in the San Carlos ALUCP. All land uses located outside this contour are deemed consistent with the noise policies of the ALUCP. Per San Carlos ALUCP Exhibit 4-2, the subject property lies outside the bounds of the 60 dB CNEL contour and is therefore consistent with the San Carlos ALUCP noise policies and criteria.
- (b) Safety Policy Consistency – The San Carlos ALUCP includes six sets of safety zones and related land use compatibility policies and criteria. Per San Carlos ALUCP Exhibit 4-3, the project site is not located within a Safety Zone so is not impacted by ALUCP safety policies and criteria.
- (c) Airspace Protection Policy Consistency –
 1. Structure Height – Pursuant to Airspace Protection Policy 5, in order to be deemed

consistent with the ALUCP, the maximum height of a new building must be the lower of (1) the height of the controlling airspace protection surface shown on Exhibit 4-4; or 2) the maximum height determined to not be a “hazard to air navigation” by the FAA in an aeronautical study prepared pursuant to the filing of Form 7460-1. The proposed structures would have an overall maximum height of approximately 97 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). Per San Carlos ALUCP Exhibit 4-4, the Part 77 Airspace Protection Surface lies at approximately 255 ft AMSL, so the proposed project would be well below this surface, in compliance with the Airspace Protection policies. Additionally, the project sponsor has filed Form 7460-1 with the FAA and has received a determination of no hazard for the structure height.

2. Other Flight Hazards – The project has been reviewed for compliance with Airspace Protection Policy 6, Other Flight Hazards, and has been found to include no features that would present unusual hazards to air navigation.
- (d) Overflight Compatibility Consistency – The San Carlos ALUCP contains two policies regarding overflight compatibility: Overflight Policy 1 – *Real Estate Transfer Disclosure* and Overflight Policy 2 – *Overflight Notification Zone 2*. As the application materials do not reflect the real estate disclosure requirements, conditions are included in Exhibit A to ensure compliance; and

WHEREAS, at its January 22, 2026 meeting, based on the factors listed above, the Airport Land Use Committee recommended that the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, determine that the project be found consistent with the policies and criteria of the SFO ALUCP.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments for San Mateo County, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, that subject to the conditions contained in Exhibit A, attached, the proposed 140-unit multi-family housing project located at 500-580 Masonic Way, Belmont, is determined to be consistent with the policies and criteria contained in the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Carlos Airport.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026.

Adam Rak, Chair

Resolution 26-01 – Conditions of Consistency Determination:

1. The City of Belmont shall advise the project sponsor of their obligation to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Overflight Policy 1 of the San Carlos ALUCP.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit the City of Belmont shall require that the project sponsor provide evidence of a recorded ‘Overflight Notification’ for each residential parcel in accordance with Overflight Policy 2 of the San Carlos ALUCP. (An example for the Overflight Notification to be used to fulfill this condition is included in the amended San Carlos ALUCP, Appendix E, Exhibit E-4.)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and approval of Resolution 26-02 determining that a proposed 4-story, 35-unit residential project with 2 additional accessory dwelling units at 271 El Camino Real, San Bruno, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport.

(For further information please contact Susy Kalkin at kkalkin@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, approve Resolution 26-02 determining that a proposed 4-story, 35-unit residential project with 2 additional accessory dwelling units at 271 El Camino Real, San Bruno, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport, subject to the following conditions:

- *Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor shall file Form 7460-1 with the FAA and provide to the City of San Bruno an FAA “Determination of No Hazard”.*
- *The City of San Bruno shall formally advise the project sponsor of their responsibility to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Policy IP-1 of the SFO ALUCP.*

BACKGROUND

Project Description

The proposed project includes construction of a 4-story, 35-unit multi-family residential development with two additional accessory dwelling units on a 0.57-acre site at 271 El Camino Real, south of Crystal Springs Rd.

The subject project is located within Airport Influence Area B (AIA B), the “Project Referral” area, for San Francisco International Airport (SFO). California Government Code Section 65302.3 states that a local agency General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and/or any affected specific plan must be consistent with the applicable airport/land use criteria in the relevant adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). Since the City of San Bruno has not amended its General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to reflect the policies and requirements of the current SFO ALUCP all proposed development projects within AIA B are subject to ALUC review per PUC Section 21676.5(a) and SFO ALUCP Policy GP-10.1. In accordance with these requirements, the City of San Bruno has referred the subject development project to C/CAG, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, for a determination of consistency with the SFO ALUCP.

ALUCP Consistency Evaluation

The SFO ALUCP contains policies and criteria to address four issues: (a) aircraft noise compatibility; (b) safety compatibility; (c) height of structures/airspace protection; and (d) real estate disclosure. The following sections describe the degree to which the project is compatible with each.

(a) Aircraft Noise Compatibility

The 65 dB CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) aircraft noise contour defines the threshold for airport noise impacts established in the SFO ALUCP. All land uses located outside of this contour are deemed consistent with the noise policies of the SFO ALUCP.

As shown on SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-6, **Attachment 3**, the subject property lies outside the bounds of the 65dB CNEL contour, and therefore the Project is determined to be consistent with the SFO ALUCP noise policies and criteria.

(b) Safety Compatibility

The SFO ALUCP includes five safety zones and related land use compatibility policies and criteria. As shown on SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-8, **Attachment 4**, the project site is located outside of the safety zones established in the SFO ALUCP, and therefore the safety policies and criteria do not apply to the Project.

(c) Height of Structures/Airspace Protection

Structure Height

Pursuant to the SFO ALUCP Policy AP-3, the maximum height of a new building must be the lower of (1) the height shown on the critical aeronautical surfaces map or (2) the maximum height determined not to be a “hazard to air navigation” by the FAA in an aeronautical study prepared pursuant to the filing of Form 7460-1.

As proposed, the structure would be a maximum of 55’-6” to the top of the stair tower. With a ground elevation of approximately 53.5 feet above mean sea level (MSL), the height of the project would therefore be about 109’ above MSL. As shown on **Attachment 5**, utilizing the SFO Online Airspace Tool, the critical aeronautical surface at the Project location is shown to be at an elevation of approximately 202’ above MSL, so the project would be well below this height. However, SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-11, **Attachment 6**, identifies that the Project is located in an area that requires FAA notification for structures 30’ or less in height.

Accordingly, the following condition is recommended:

- *Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor shall file Form 7460-1 with the FAA and provide to the City of San Bruno an FAA “Determination of No Hazard”.*

Other Flight Hazards

Within AIA B, certain land use characteristics are recognized as hazards to air navigation and, per SFO ALUCP Policy AP-4, need to be evaluated to ensure compatibility with FAA rules and regulations. These characteristics include the following:

- Sources of glare, such as highly reflective buildings, building features, or blight lights including search lights, or laser displays, which would interfere with the vision of pilots in command of an aircraft in flight
- Distracting lights that could be mistaken for airport identification lightings, runway edge lighting, runway end identification lighting, or runway approach lighting
- Sources of dust, smoke, water vapor, or steam that may impair the visibility of a pilot in command of an aircraft in flight
- Sources of electrical/electronic interference with aircraft communications/navigation equipment
- Any use that creates an increased attraction for wildlife, particularly large flocks of birds, that is inconsistent with FAA rules and regulations, including but not limited to FAA Order 5200.5A, Waste Disposal Site On or Near Airports and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports and any successor or replacement orders or advisory circulars.

The proposed project does not present any unusual design features or characteristics that would conflict with air navigation and is therefore determined to comply with SFO ALUCP Policy AP-4.

(d) Real Estate Disclosure

The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of SFO, the real estate disclosure area. Pursuant to Policy IP-1, notification is required, prior to sale or lease of property located within the AIA, of the proximity of the airport and that therefore the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations.

To ensure consistency with this provision the following condition is proposed:

- *The City of San Bruno shall formally advise the project sponsor of their responsibility to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Policy IP-1 of the SFO ALUCP.*

Airport Land Use Committee

The Airport Land Use Committee considered this application at its January 22, 2026 meeting, and recommended that it be determined consistent with the policies of the SFO ALUCP, subject to the conditions discussed above..

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The C/CAG Board of Directors is the designated Airport Land Use Commission for San Mateo County, which is mandated by State law to develop and administer ALUCPs for each airport in its jurisdiction. The overall purpose of developing ALUCP policies and procedures, and the companion ALUCP consistency review process, is to minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and

safety hazards while providing for the orderly expansion of airports. This planning effort is applied to all areas located within a geographic sphere known as the Airport Influence Area (AIA).

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution 26-02

The following attachments are available on the C/CAG website (See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>

2. ALUCP application, together with related project description and plan set excerpts
3. SFO ALUCP Exh. IV-6 – Noise Compatibility Zones
4. SFO ALUCP Exh. IV-8 –Safety Compatibility Zones
5. SFO Online Airspace Tool - iALP Readout
6. SFO ALUCP Exh. IV-11 – FAA Notification Form 7460-1 Area
7. Comment letter from SFO Planning and Environmental Affairs

RESOLUTION 26-02

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY, ACTING AS THE SAN MATEO COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION, DETERMINING THAT A PROPOSED 4-STORY, 35-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROJECT WITH 2 ADDITIONAL ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS AT 271 EL CAMINO REAL, SAN BRUNO, IS CONDITIONALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN FOR THE ENVIRONS OF SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), in its capacity as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, that,

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 65302.3 states that a local agency General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and/or any affected specific plan must be consistent with the applicable airport/land use criteria in the relevant adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) and furthermore, per PUC Section 21676.5(a) and Policy GP-10.1 of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport (SFO ALUCP), if a jurisdiction has not made its local plans consistent with the ALUCP all proposed development projects within AIA B may be subject to ALUC review; and

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno has received an application for development of a 4-story, 35-unit residential project with 2 additional accessory dwelling units at 271 El Camino Real (the Project), which is located within Airport Influence Area B of San Francisco International Airport (SFO); and

WHEREAS, the Project was referred to C/CAG, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, for a determination of consistency with the SFO ALUCP; and

WHEREAS, three sets of airport/land use compatibility policies and criteria in the SFO ALUCP relate to the Project: (a) noise compatibility; (b) safety compatibility; and (c) airspace protection, as discussed below:

- (a) Noise Compatibility – The 65 dB CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) aircraft noise contour defines the threshold for airport noise impacts established in the SFO ALUCP. Per SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-6, the Project lies outside the bounds of 65dB CNEL contour and therefore the Project is determined to be consistent with the SFO ALUCP noise policies and criteria.
- (b) Safety Compatibility – The SFO ALUCP includes five safety zones and related land use compatibility policies and criteria. Per SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-8, the project site is located outside of the safety zones established in the SFO ALUCP, and therefore the safety policies and criteria do not apply to the Project.
- (c) Airspace Protection
 - 1. Structure Height – Pursuant to SFO ALUCP Policy AP-3, the maximum height of a new building must be the lower of (1) the height shown on the SFO Critical Aeronautical Surfaces map or (2) the maximum height determined not to be a “hazard to air navigation” by the FAA in an aeronautical study prepared pursuant to the filing of Form 7460-1.

As proposed, the Project would be a maximum of approximately 109 feet above mean sea level (MSL). Utilizing the SFO Online Airspace Tool, the lowest critical aeronautical surface above the Project location is at an elevation of approximately 202 feet above MSL, so the project would be well below the critical airspace surface. However, as shown on SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-11, the Project is located in an area that requires FAA notification for structures 30' or less in height, and a determination from the FAA that the project will not be a hazard to air navigation. In acknowledgement of this requirement, a condition is included in this consistency determination to require this compliance,

2. Other Flight Hazards - Per SFO ALUCP Policy AP-4, certain land use characteristics are recognized as hazards to air navigation and projects need to be evaluated to ensure compatibility with FAA rules and regulations. The proposed project does not present any unusual design features or characteristics that would conflict with air navigation and is therefore determined to comply with SFO ALUCP Policy AP-4 ; and

WHEREAS, the Project site is located within the Airport Influence Area A (AIA A) of SFO, the real estate disclosure area. Pursuant to Policy IP-1, notification is required, prior to sale or lease of property located within the AIA, of the proximity of the airport and that the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations. This consistency determination includes a condition requiring that the City of San Bruno formally advise the project sponsor of the responsibility to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements; and

WHEREAS, at its January 22, 2026 meeting, based on the factors listed above, the Airport Land Use Committee recommended that the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, determine that the project be found consistent with the policies and criteria of the SFO ALUCP.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments for San Mateo County, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, that subject to the conditions contained in Exhibit A, attached, the Project is determined to be consistent with the applicable airport land use policies and criteria contained in the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026.

Adam Rak, Chair

Resolution 26-02 – Conditions of Consistency Determination:

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor shall file Form 7460-1 with the FAA and provide to the City of San Bruno an FAA “Determination of No Hazard”.
2. The City of San Bruno shall formally advise the project sponsor of their responsibility to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Policy IP-1 of the SFO ALUCP.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and approval of Resolution 26-03 determining that a proposed 4-story, 20-unit residential project at 990 El Camino Real, San Bruno, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport.

(For further information please contact Susy Kalkin at kkalkin@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, approve Resolution 26-03 determining that a proposed 4-story, 20-unit residential project at 990 El Camino Real, San Bruno, is conditionally consistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport, subject to the following conditions:

- *The City of San Bruno shall require that the residential units be sound insulated to achieve an indoor noise level of CNEL 45 dB or less from exterior sources.*
- *The property owner shall grant an avigation easement to the City and County of San Francisco prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed building or structure. The easement language shall be consistent with the sample included in the SFO ALUCP Appendix G.*
- *Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor shall file Form 7460-1 with the FAA and provide to the City of San Bruno an FAA “Determination of No Hazard”.*
- *The City of San Bruno shall formally advise the project sponsor of their responsibility to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Policy IP-1 of the SFO ALUCP.*

BACKGROUND

Project Description

The proposed project includes construction of a 4-story, 20-unit apartment development on a 0.26-acre site at 990 El Camino Real, just south of the I-380 eastbound on-ramp.

The subject project is located within Airport Influence Area B (AIA B), the “Project Referral” area, for San Francisco International Airport (SFO). California Government Code Section 65302.3 states that a local agency General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and/or any affected specific plan must be

consistent with the applicable airport/land use criteria in the relevant adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). Since the City of San Bruno has not amended its General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to reflect the policies and requirements of the current SFO ALUCP all proposed development projects within AIA B are subject to ALUC review per PUC Section 21676.5(a) and SFO ALUCP Policy GP-10.1. In accordance with these requirements, the City of San Bruno has referred the subject development project to C/CAG, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, for a determination of consistency with the SFO ALUCP.

ALUCP Consistency Evaluation

The SFO ALUCP contains policies and criteria to address four issues: (a) aircraft noise compatibility; (b) safety compatibility; (c) height of structures/airspace protection; and (d) real estate disclosure. The following sections describe the degree to which the project is compatible with each.

(a) Aircraft Noise Compatibility

The 65 dB CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) aircraft noise contour defines the threshold for airport noise impacts established in the SFO ALUCP.

As shown on SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-6, **Attachment 4**, the subject property lies within the bounds of the 65dB CNEL contour. Per SFO ALUCP Table IV-1, residential use is conditionally compatible within this noise contour subject to sound insulation requirements and provided an avigation easement is granted to the City and County of San Francisco. Accordingly, the following conditions are recommended:

- *The City of San Bruno shall require that the residential units be sound insulated to achieve an indoor noise level of CNEL 45 dB or less from exterior sources.*
- *The property owner shall grant an avigation easement to the City and County of San Francisco prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed building or structure. The easement language shall be consistent with the sample included in the SFO ALUCP Appendix G.*

Subject to these conditions, the proposed project would be consistent with the Noise Compatibility Policies of the SFO ALUCP.

(b) Safety Compatibility

The SFO ALUCP includes five safety zones and related land use compatibility policies and criteria. As shown on SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-8, **Attachment 5**, the project site is not located within a Safety Zone. Accordingly, the use is not impacted by the Safety Compatibility policies and is therefore determined consistent.

(c) Height of Structures/Airspace Protection

Structure Height

Pursuant to the SFO ALUCP Policy AP-3, the maximum height of a new building must be the lower of (1) the height shown on the critical aeronautical surfaces map or (2) the maximum

height determined not to be a “hazard to air navigation” by the FAA in an aeronautical study prepared pursuant to the filing of Form 7460-1.

As proposed, the structure would be a maximum of 53’-8” above ground height. With a ground elevation of approximately 54 feet above mean sea level (MSL), the height of the project would therefore be about 108’ above MSL. As shown on **Attachment 6**, utilizing the SFO Online Airspace Tool, the critical aeronautical surface at the Project location is at an elevation of approximately 243 feet above MSL, so the project would be approximately 135’ below this height. However, SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-11, **Attachment 7**, identifies that the Project is located in an area that requires FAA notification for structures of 30’ or less in height. Accordingly, the following condition is recommended:

- *Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor shall file Form 7460-1 with the FAA and provide to the City of San Bruno an FAA “Determination of No Hazard”.*

Other Flight Hazards

Within AIA B, certain land use characteristics are recognized as hazards to air navigation and, per SFO ALUCP Policy AP-4, need to be evaluated to ensure compatibility with FAA rules and regulations. These characteristics include the following:

- Sources of glare, such as highly reflective buildings, building features, or blight lights including search lights, or laser displays, which would interfere with the vision of pilots in command of an aircraft in flight
- Distracting lights that could be mistaken for airport identification lightings, runway edge lighting, runway end identification lighting, or runway approach lighting
- Sources of dust, smoke, water vapor, or steam that may impair the visibility of a pilot in command of an aircraft in flight
- Sources of electrical/electronic interference with aircraft communications/navigation equipment
- Any use that creates an increased attraction for wildlife, particularly large flocks of birds, that is inconsistent with FAA rules and regulations, including but not limited to FAA Order 5200.5A, Waste Disposal Site On or Near Airports and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports and any successor or replacement orders or advisory circulars.

The proposed project does not present any unusual design features or characteristics that would conflict with air navigation and is therefore determined to comply with SFO ALUCP Policy AP-4.

(d) Real Estate Disclosure

The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of SFO, the real estate disclosure area. Pursuant to Policy IP-1, notification is required, prior to sale or lease of property located within the AIA, of the proximity of the airport and that therefore the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations.

To ensure consistency with this provision the following condition is proposed:

- *The City of San Bruno shall formally advise the project sponsor of their responsibility to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Policy IP-1 of the SFO ALUCP.*

Airport Land Use Committee

The Airport Land Use Committee considered this application at its January 22, 2026 meeting, and recommended that it be determined consistent with the policies of the SFO ALUCP, subject to the conditions discussed above.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The C/CAG Board of Directors is the designated Airport Land Use Commission for San Mateo County, which is mandated by State law to develop and administer ALUCPs for each airport in its jurisdiction. The overall purpose of developing ALUCP policies and procedures, and the companion ALUCP consistency review process, is to minimize the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards while providing for the orderly expansion of airports. This planning effort is applied to all areas located within a geographic sphere known as the Airport Influence Area (AIA).

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution 26-03

The following attachments are available on the C/CAG website (See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>

2. ALUCP application, together with related project description and plan set excerpts
3. SFO ALUCP Exh. IV-6 – Noise Compatibility Zones
4. SFO ALUCP Exh. IV-8 –Safety Compatibility Zones
5. SFO Online Airspace Tool - iALP Readout
6. SFO ALUCP Exh. IV-11 – FAA Notification Form 7460-1 Area
7. Comment letter from SFO Planning and Environmental Affairs

RESOLUTION 26-03

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY, ACTING AS THE SAN MATEO COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION, DETERMINING THAT A PROPOSED 4-STORY, 20-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROJECT AT 990 EL CAMINO REAL, SAN BRUNO, IS CONDITIONALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN FOR THE ENVIRONS OF SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), in its capacity as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, that,

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 65302.3 states that a local agency General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and/or any affected specific plan must be consistent with the applicable airport/land use criteria in the relevant adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) and furthermore, per PUC Section 21676.5(a) and Policy GP-10.1 of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport (SFO ALUCP), if a jurisdiction has not made its local plans consistent with the ALUCP all proposed development projects within AIA B may be subject to ALUC review; and

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno has received an application for development of a 4-story, 20-unit residential project at 990 El Camino Real (the Project), which is located within Airport Influence Area B of San Francisco International Airport (SFO); and

WHEREAS, the Project was referred to C/CAG, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, for a determination of consistency with the SFO ALUCP; and

WHEREAS, three sets of airport/land use compatibility policies and criteria in the SFO ALUCP relate to the Project: (a) noise compatibility; (b) safety compatibility; and (c) airspace protection, as discussed below:

(a) Noise Compatibility – The 65 dB CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) aircraft noise contour defines the threshold for airport noise impacts established in the SFO ALUCP. Per SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-6, the Project lies within the 65dB CNEL contour and, per SFO ALUCP Table IV-1, residential use is conditionally compatible within this noise contour subject to sound insulation requirements and provided an avigation easement is granted to the City and County of San Francisco. To ensure consistency with the noise policies, conditions have been included in Exhibit A, attached, addressing both sound insulation and avigation easement provisions..

(b) Safety Compatibility – The SFO ALUCP includes five safety zones and related land use compatibility policies and criteria. Per SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-8, the project site is located outside of the safety zones established in the SFO ALUCP, and therefore the safety policies and criteria do not apply to the Project.

(c) Airspace Protection

1. Structure Height – Pursuant to SFO ALUCP Policy AP-3, the maximum height of a new building must be the lower of (1) the height shown on the SFO Critical

Aeronautical Surfaces map or (2) the maximum height determined not to be a “hazard to air navigation” by the FAA in an aeronautical study prepared pursuant to the filing of Form 7460-1.

As proposed, the Project would be a maximum of approximately 108 feet above mean sea level (MSL). Utilizing the SFO Online Airspace Tool, the lowest critical aeronautical surface above the Project location is at an elevation of approximately 243 feet above MSL, so the project would be well below the critical airspace surface. However, as shown on SFO ALUCP Exhibit IV-11, the Project is located in an area that requires FAA notification for structures 30’ or less in height, and a determination from the FAA that the project will not be a hazard to air navigation. In acknowledgement of this requirement, a condition is included in this consistency determination to require this compliance,

2. Other Flight Hazards - Per SFO ALUCP Policy AP-4, certain land use characteristics are recognized as hazards to air navigation and projects need to be evaluated to ensure compatibility with FAA rules and regulations. The proposed project does not present any unusual design features or characteristics that would conflict with air navigation and is therefore determined to comply with SFO ALUCP Policy AP-4 ; and

WHEREAS, the Project site is located within the Airport Influence Area A (AIA A) of SFO, the real estate disclosure area. Pursuant to Policy IP-1, notification is required, prior to sale or lease of property located within the AIA, of the proximity of the airport and that the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations. This consistency determination includes a condition requiring that the City of San Bruno formally advise the project sponsor of the responsibility to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements; and

WHEREAS, at its January 22, 2026 meeting, based on the factors listed above, the Airport Land Use Committee recommended that the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, determine that the project be found consistent with the policies and criteria of the SFO ALUCP.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments for San Mateo County, acting as the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission, that subject to the conditions contained in Exhibit A, attached, the Project is determined to be consistent with the applicable airport land use policies and criteria contained in the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026.

Adam Rak, Chair

Resolution 26-03 – Conditions of Consistency Determination:

1. The City of San Bruno shall require that the residential units be sound insulated to achieve an indoor noise level of CNEL 45 dB or less from exterior sources.
2. The property owner shall grant an avigation easement to the City and County of San Francisco prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed building or structure. The easement language shall be consistent with the sample included in the SFO ALUCP Appendix G.
3. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor shall file Form 7460-1 with the FAA and provide to the City of San Bruno an FAA “Determination of No Hazard”.
4. The City of San Bruno shall formally advise the project sponsor of their responsibility to comply with the real estate disclosure requirements outlined in Policy IP-1 of the SFO ALUCP.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and adopt Resolution 26-04 approving the population data to be used by C/CAG for calculation of member contributions and a variety of administrative related items.

(For further information, contact Sean Charpentier scharpentier@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board reviews and adopts resolution 26-04, approving the population data to be used by C/CAG for calculation of member contributions and a variety of administrative related items.

FISCAL IMPACT

Adopted population data will be used to determine C/CAG member agency contributions, special voting procedures, and other C/CAG programs.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Not applicable

BACKGROUND

The C/CAG Joint Powers Agreement authorizes the C/CAG Board to adopt the most recent population data to be used in C/CAG programs. The latest population data available is dated January 1, 2025, which was released by the State Department of Finance on May 1, 2025. C/CAG will use the information to determine member agency contributions, special voting procedures, and other C/CAG programs.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

This item is necessary for and improves the administration/operations of C/CAG.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution 26-04
2. Population figures provided by the State Department of Finance as of January 1, 2025.

RESOLUTION 26-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG) ADOPTING THE POPULATION DATA TO BE USED BY C/CAG FOR CALCULATION OF MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS AND A VARIETY OF ADMINISTRATIVE RELATED ITEMS

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

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Joint Powers Agreement uses the population data to perform county-wide planning activities, as approved by or directed by two-thirds (2/3) of the members representing two-thirds (2/3) of the population of the County, and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Joint Powers Agreement uses the population for special voting procedures, and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Joint Powers Agreement determines that C/CAG members' contribution is based upon its population, and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Joint Powers Agreement uses the population for termination and disposition of property, and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Joint Powers Agreement may be amended at any time with the agreement of the majority of the members representing a majority of the population of the County, and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Board of Directors shall establish by resolution the population figures to be utilized in determining the population of local governments based on the results of the decennial Federal census or population figures provided by the State Department of Finance.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the C/CAG approves the attached table as the population data to be used by C/CAG for calculation of member contributions and a variety of administrative related items.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026.

Adam Rak, Chair

City/County Population Estimates by Department of Finance					
	January 1, 2025	January 1, 2024 (Info Only)	January 1, 2023 (Info Only)	January 1, 2022 (Info Only)	January 1, 2021 (Info Only)
County/City	Population				
Total San Mateo County	748,337	741,565	737,644	744,662	765,245
Atherton	7,007	6,976	6,678	6,718	6,896
Belmont	28,206	26,931	26,793	27,203	26,470
Brisbane	4,676	4,661	4,648	4,721	4,579
Burlingame	31,552	30,513	30,136	30,283	29,746
Colma	1,411	1,410	1,359	1,370	1,659
Daly City	102,155	101,458	101,471	102,875	108,599
East Palo Alto	29,133	29,078	28,586	28,963	30,350
Foster City	32,658	32,581	32,703	33,056	32,842
Half Moon Bay	11,303	11,238	11,226	11,308	12,309
Hillsborough	11,254	11,116	10,962	11,018	11,391
Menlo Park	33,311	33,140	32,478	33,034	34,825
Millbrae	23,164	23,093	22,487	22,512	22,509
Pacifica	37,217	37,062	37,082	37,533	37,890
Portola Valley	4,285	4,249	4,247	4,289	4,560
Redwood City	82,073	81,863	81,495	82,344	85,182
San Bruno	42,631	42,152	42,054	42,656	44,936
San Carlos	29,535	29,420	29,496	29,837	29,814
San Mateo	104,315	103,352	103,318	103,779	103,045
South San Francisco	65,397	64,601	64,323	64,492	67,135
Woodside	5,206	5,133	5,128	5,212	5,628
Balance of County	61,848	61,538	60,974	61,459	64,880
Department of Finance					
Demographic Research Unit					
Phone: (916) 323-4086					
For more information: https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates-e1/					
Released on May 1, 2025					

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: That the C/CAG Board of Directors review and approve Resolution 26-05 adding a voting Community/Community Based Organization (CBO) seat to the Resource Management and Climate Protection (RMCP) Committee roster, appointing Ortensia Lopez to the Community/CBO seat, and appointing Marc Hershman to the vacated C/CAG RMCP Committee Energy seat.

(For further information, contact Sean Charpentier at scharpentier@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors review and approve Resolution 26-05 adding a voting Community/Community Based Organization (CBO) seat to the Resource Management and Climate Protection (RMCP) Committee roster, appointing Ortensia Lopez to the Community/CBO seat, and appointing Marc Hershman to the vacated C/CAG RMCP Committee Energy seat

FISCAL IMPACT

None

BACKGROUND

The RMCP seats seven elected officials plus one seat each from the following six specialties: energy, water, utility, nonprofit, business/chamber of commerce, and environmental organization, for a total of 13 seats.

The RMCP Committee meets on the third Wednesday of the month (as needed) at 3:00 p.m., in either San Mateo at 155 Bovet Rd. or, as a backup location, in Redwood City at County Center.

ANALYSIS

Originally called the Utilities Sustainability Task Force (USTF), the Committee developed a San Mateo County Energy Strategy for the county, which was adopted by every city in San Mateo County in 2009.

Since then, the scope and complexity of the RMCP Committee's work has expanded significantly beyond its original focus on energy planning. Currently the RMCP Committee is responsible for providing information and recommendations to CMEQ and the C/CAG Board on items related to resource conservation and climate action. The Committee also tracks the progress of two main C/CAG programs, the San Mateo County Energy Watch (SMCEW) and the Regionally Integrated Climate Action Planning Support Collaborative (RICAPS). The Committee also seeks to integrate equity into resource conservation and climate actions, including workforce development, access by constituents,

and inclusion of input by community-based organizations. Most recently, in coordination with BAWSCA, the Committee is exploring actions to reduce demand on potable water supplies, such as One Water programs, as well as on electrification and the long-term resilience of homes and communities throughout the County.

The RMCP Committee seeks to ensure the capacity and subject-matter expertise necessary to effectively address this expanded portfolio, support informed policy development, and maintain continuity as new initiatives are integrated into C/CAG's resource conservation and climate action programs.

The RCMP Committee currently has a utility seat, which is occupied by Marjory Ruiz from PG&E. The RMCP Committee also currently has an energy seat. Ortensia Lopez, former Executive Director at El Concilio of San Mateo County, has held the energy seat and contributed to the RMCP Committee for over 9 years. The RMCP would benefit from having both PG&E and Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE) representation on the Committee given the complexity and comprehensiveness of the energy efficiency challenges and opportunities.

C/CAG staff have a three-part recommendation for the C/CAG Board:

1. The creation of a new "Community/CBO" seat on RMCP. Members wishing to occupy this seat must either reside within San Mateo County, or work for a CBO based in San Mateo County.
2. The appointment of current RMCP Committee member Ortensia Lopez to the new "Community/CBO" seat. Ortensia Lopez wishes to continue contributing to the RMCP.
3. The appointment of Marc Hershman, Director of Government Affairs at PCE, to the "Energy Seat". See attachment 2 for a copy of Marc Hershman's letter of interest.

See Attachment 1 Exhibit A for redlined RMCP Committee Roster that reflects these changes. If these changes are approved by the Board, the RMCP would have a total of 14 voting members.

At the January 21, 2026 RMCP meeting the RMCP Committee reviewed these proposed changes and voted to recommend that C/CAG staff recommend them to the C/CAG Board.

Staff recommends that the C/CAG Board of Directors review and approve Resolution 26-05 adding a voting Community/Community Based Organization (CBO) seat to the Resource Management and Climate Protection (RMCP) Committee roster, appointing Ortensia Lopez to the Community/CBO seat, and appointing Marc Hershman to the vacated C/CAG RMCP Committee Energy seat.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The C/CAG Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee considers equity in its positions on programs. Decisions made in relation to transportation, housing, stormwater, and climate resilience have the potential to impact our most vulnerable communities in San Mateo County. The C/CAG Equity Assessment identified the addition of an equity-oriented seat to committees as an opportunity to ensure diverse perspectives.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution 26-05
 - Exhibit A: Updated roster
2. Letter of Interest – Marc Hershman

RESOLUTION 26-05

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY SPECIFYING THE MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS FOR THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND CLIMATE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Board established the C/CAG Resource Management and Climate Protection (RMCP) Committee, originally called the Utilities Sustainability Task Force (USTF) in 2009; and

WHEREAS, since 2009 the scope and complexity of the RMCP Committee's work has expanded significantly beyond its original focus on energy planning and now includes providing information and recommendations to CMEQ and the C/CAG Board on items related to resource conservation and climate action; and

WHEREAS, the RMCP Committee seeks to ensure it has the capacity and subject-matter expertise necessary to effectively address this expanded portfolio, support informed policy development, and maintain continuity as new initiatives are integrated into C/CAG's resource conservation and climate action programs by adding a voting Community/Community Based Organization (CBO) seat to the Committee roster; and

WHEREAS, the Community/CBO seat would be subject to appointments by the C/CAG Board of Directors upon recommendation or interest; and

WHEREAS, appointees to the Community/CBO seat must either reside within San Mateo County, or work for a CBO that is based in San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, the RCMP Committee currently has a Utility seat, which is occupied by Marjory Ruiz from PG&E; and

WHEREAS, the RMCP Committee currently has an Energy seat, which is occupied by Ortensia Lopez, former Executive Director at El Concilio of San Mateo County, who has held this seat and contributed to the RMCP Committee for over 9 years and who resides within San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, the RMCP would benefit from having both PG&E and Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE) representation on the Committee given the complexity and comprehensiveness of the energy efficiency challenges and opportunities; and

WHEREAS, Marc Hershman, Director of Government Affairs at Peninsula Clean Energy has submitted a letter of interest to join the RMCP Committee in the Energy seat; and

WHEREAS, at the January 21, 2026, RMCP meeting the Committee reviewed these proposed changes and voted to recommend that C/CAG staff recommend them to the C/CAG Board; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that as set forth in Exhibit A to this resolution:

1. The Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee shall be comprised of 14 voting members, including seven elected officials plus one seat each from the following seven specialties: community/CBO, energy, water, utility, nonprofit, business/chamber of commerce, and environmental organization.
2. Current RMCP Committee member Ortensia Lopez, former Executive Director at El Concilio of San Mateo County and current resident, is appointed to the new “Community/CBO” seat.
3. Marc Hershman, Director of Government Affairs at PCE, is appointed to the “Energy Seat.”

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026.

Adam Rak, Chair

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

<p>Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (Proposed February 2026December 2025)</p>	
<p>Elected Officials (7)</p>	
<p>Donna Colson – <u>Committee Chair</u> Councilmember City of Burlingame dcolson@burlingame.org</p>	<p>Sue Beckmeyer Councilmember City of Pacifica sbeckmeyer@pacificagov.gov</p>
<p>Kaia Eakin Councilmember City of Redwood City keakin@redwoodcity.org</p>	<p>Ray Mueller County Supervisor – District 3 County of San Mateo SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org</p>
<p>Betsy Nash Councilmember City of Menlo Park bnash@menlopark.gov</p>	<p>VACANT</p>
<p>Bob Nguyen Councilmember City of Millbrae bnguyen@ci.millbrae.ca.us</p>	
<p><u>Stakeholder Representatives (67)</u></p>	

Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee

(Proposed February 2026~~December 2025~~)

<p><u>Energy</u></p>	<p>Marc Hershman Director Of Government Affairs Peninsula Clean Energy mhershman@peninsulacleanenergy.com Ortensia Lopez Executive Director El Concilio of San Mateo County or10sia@el-concilio.com</p>
<p><u>Water</u></p>	<p>Tom Francis – <u>Committee Vice Chair</u> Water Resources Manager Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency tfrancis@bawsca.org</p>
<p><u>Utility</u></p>	<p>Marjory Ruiz Hidalgo Senior Government Relations Representative Pacific Gas and Electric Company Marjory.ruiz@pge.com</p>
<p><u>Nonprofit</u></p>	<p>Alex Fernandez Chief Operating Officer Filoli Center afernandez@filoli.org</p>
<p><u>Business/Chamber of Commerce</u></p>	<p>Christina Donovan Senior Project Manager Saris Regis CDonovan@srgnc.com</p>
<p><u>Environmental</u></p>	<p>Sarah Hubbard Executive Director Sustainable San Mateo County shubbard@sustainableanmateo.org</p>
<p><u>Community/CBO</u> *Members of this seat must either reside within, or work for a CBO based in, San Mateo County</p>	<p>Ortensia Lopez Former Executive Director El Concilio of San Mateo County or10sia@el-concilio.com</p>



January 12, 2026

Mr. Sean Charpentier
Executive Director
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

RE: Appointment to the C/CAG Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)

Dear Chair Colson, Executive Director Charpentier and RMCP Committee:

I am excited to apply to fill any vacancy for the Energy Seat, or other applicable seat, on the Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP). I am familiar with and support the mission of the RMCP developing climate strategies and sustainability.

In my current position as Peninsula Clean Energy's (PCE) Director of Government Affairs and previously, as District Director for state Senator Jerry Hill, I have worked closely and extensively with San Mateo County and each of its 20 cities.

I am very familiar with the operations of C/CAG. While a member of the Millbrae City Council I served on the C/CAG Board of Directors, the C/CAG Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee and the C/CAG Legislative Committee.

I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to advance the work of the RMCP as a member of the Committee.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Marc Hershman", is written over the closing text.

Marc Hershman
Director of Government Affairs

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director

Subject: Review and approval of Resolution 26-06, authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 2 to the agreement with Gray Bowen Scott for on-call consultant services for Federal and State funded project coordination and grant administration, increasing the amount by \$50,000 to a revised not to exceed amount of \$410,000.

(For further information or questions, contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board review and approve Resolution 26-06, authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 2 to the agreement with Gray Bowen Scott for on-call consultant services for Federal and State funded project coordination and grant administration, increasing the amount by \$50,000 to a revised not to exceed amount of \$410,000.

FISCAL IMPACT

The budget would increase by \$50,000, from \$360,000 to a new not to exceed amount of \$410,000. Actual expenditures will be determined based on specific tasks orders to be approved by the Executive Director. Authorization to proceed will be issued to consultants only after approval to execute a specific task order has been given.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding will come from a combination of C/CAG's allocated share of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) planning and programming funds and Congestion Relief Program (CRP) funds.

BACKGROUND

C/CAG, acting as the County Transportation Agency (CTA) for San Mateo County is the MTC delegated agency responsible for the planning, project selection, programming, and monitoring of certain County's share of federal and state transportation funding.

CTAs are the delegated program administration of programming policies adopted by MTC for both Federal and State funding. CTAs are involved with ensuring that outreach requirements are met, that project sponsors meet minimum eligibility requirements, and that proposed projects are consistent with federal, state, and regional program requirements.

C/CAG is responsible for planning and programming the overall delivery of this county's federal transportation funds as well as monitoring Caltrans administered programs (Highway Bridge Program and Highway Safety Improvement Program). C/CAG staff must take corrective action when projects are at risk of not delivering within the regional and state deadlines. C/CAG staff also monitors the invoicing activity of project sponsors to ensure that transportation funds are not rescinded due to inactivity.

C/CAG is also responsible for programming and facilitating the delivery of projects associated with the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This involves working with Caltrans and stakeholders on developing and delivering major state highway improvement projects. The purpose of retaining an on-call consultant is to assist staff with the performance of CTA delegated responsibilities.

On June 8, 2023, the C/CAG Board approved Resolution 23-58 authorizing a two year on-call contract for project coordination services with Gray Bowen Scott (GBS), expiring on June 30, 2025. The original agreement with GBS specified on-call services on a task order basis in an amount not to exceed \$300,000 total for Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2024-25.

In June 2025, the C/CAG Board approved Amendment No. 1 (per Resolution 25-46) authorizing an increase to the budget by \$60,000 to a revised not to exceed amount of \$360,000 and extending the term through June 30, 2026 to support the upcoming One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 4 Call for Project process.

Currently, C/CAG staff meet on a weekly basis with GBS to review the project delivery status of more than 30 state/federal-aid projects in 13 jurisdictions in the county totaling \$62 million to ensure that the projects meet their timelines per MTC Resolution 3606. If there are issues, C/CAG and GBS work with the project sponsors (typically the cities and the County) and partner agencies (MTC, Caltrans, California Transportation Commission) to resolve the issue. Through this proactive effort, San Mateo County often is recognized on its ability of its project sponsors to meet funding requirements and deliver projects in a timely manner.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff request a budget augmentation of \$50,000 is proposed to be added to ensure the consultant has enough capacity to support additional funding programs that C/CAG is scheduled to administer this calendar year including: Lifeline Transportation Program, Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA 3), and Transportation for Clean Air Program.

In Spring 2026, C/CAG staff proposes to enter into a new agreement for on-call consultant services for Federal and State funded project coordination and grant administration and plans to issue an RFQ return to the C/CAG Board prior to the contract expiration in June 2026.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Project monitoring supports equitable outcomes by reducing the risk of project delivery failures that disproportionately affect smaller jurisdictions with limited staffing capacity. Strengthening C/CAG's ability to monitor project delivery, ensure compliance with regional and state requirements, and support project sponsors through complex funding processes helps keep projects on schedule and

preserves funding intended to benefit underserved communities.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution 26-06
2. Project Delivery Monitoring List
3. Draft Agreement (The document is available on the C/CAG website. See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>)

RESOLUTION 26-06

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY AUTHORIZING THE C/CAG EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY AND GRAY BOWEN SCOTT FOR ON CALL CONSULTANT SERVICES FOR FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDED PROJECT COORDINATION AND GRANT ADMINISTRATION, INCREASING THE AMOUNT BY \$50,000 TO A REVISED NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT OF \$410,000

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

WHEREAS, C/CAG is a joint powers agency designated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) as the County Transportation Agency (CTA) for San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, C/CAG, acting as the CTA is responsible for project selection, programming, and overall program delivery of federal aid and state transportation funds received by the County; and

WHEREAS, at its June 8, 2023, meeting, the C/CAG Board approved Resolution 23-58 authorizing the agreement between C/CAG and Gray Bowen Scott (GBS) for on-call consultant services to assist C/CAG staff with the performance of CTA delegated responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, in June 2025, the C/CAG Board approved Resolution 25-46 authorizing execution of Contract Amendment No. 1 to augment the budget by \$60,000 and extend the contract term to June 30, 2026, to provide sufficient capacity to support the upcoming OBAG 4 Call for Project process; and

WHEREAS, to ensure the consultant has enough capacity to provide an additional level of support needed for additional Call for Project processes, there is a need to augment the budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the C/CAG Chair is authorized to execute Amendment No. 2 to the agreement with Gray Bowen Scott for on-call consultant services for Federal and State funded project coordination and grant administration, increasing the amount by \$50,000 to a revised not to exceed amount of \$410,000. Be it further resolved that the C/CAG Executive Director is authorized to negotiate the final scope and terms of the Agreement and related materials prior to execution by both parties, subject to legal counsel approval as to form.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026.

Adam Rak, Chair

Project Delivery Monitoring List (as of January 26, 2026)

ID#	Project Sponsor	Project Name	Funding Received	Funding Program
1	Burlingame	Rollins Road Bicycle and Ped Improvement 5171(029)	\$ 2,800,000	Surface Transportation Funds (STP)/Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ)
2	Menlo Park	Middle Ave Caltrain Ped. and Bicycle Undercrossing	\$ 5,000,000	
3	Redwood City	Roosevelt Avenue Traffic Calming 5029(041)	\$ 3,120,000	
4	Redwood City	Bay Road Complete Street Rehabilitation 5029(042)	\$ 750,000	
5	Redwood City	Bay Road Complete Street Rehabilitation 5029(042)	\$ 3,057,000	
6	South San Francisco	School St/Spruce Ave and Hillside Blvd Safety and Access Imps STPL-5177(054)	\$ 3,128,000	
7	SMCTA	19th Ave/Fashion Island Blvd Complete Street Class IV	\$ 3,375,000	
8	Colma	El Camino Real Complete Street, Mission Rd to SSF	\$ 4,640,000	
9	Atherton	Alameda de las Pulgas Traffic and Safety Imps CPFCDL-5261 (011)\	\$ 560,000	Community Project Funding / Congressionally Directed Spending (CPFCDL)
10	Atherton	Alameda de las Pulgas Traffic and Safety Imps CPFCDL-5261 (011)	\$ 1,440,000	
11	Woodside	Woodside Road Bike and Ped Improvements E of I-280 Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Near Woodside High School	\$ 100,000	
12	Woodside	Woodside Road Bike and Ped Improvements E of I-280 Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Near Woodside High School	\$ 700,000	
13	CCAG	Improve US 101 operations near Rte 92	\$ 1,000,000	
14	Menlo Park	Middle Ave Caltrain Ped. and Bicycle Undercrossing	\$ 9,000,000	
15	Half Moon Bay	Eastside Parallel Trail Segment 2 Highway I/Frenchman's Creek Intersection and Bike/Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 1,500,000	
16	Half Moon Bay	Eastside Parallel Trail Segment 2 Highway I/Frenchman's Creek Intersection and Bike/Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 500,000	
17	Pacifica	Resurfacing Sharp Park Priority Development Area	\$ 800,000	
18	Burlingame	Old Bayshore Highway Streetscape Project	\$ 500,000	
19	East Palo Alto	Fordham St. - Sustainable Streets	\$ 109,000	
20	Colma	El Camino Real Bike/Ped Improvement/Sustainable Streets (Segment A Teglia to Mission Rd. Design Funds)	\$ 370,500	
21	Daly City	Bayshore & Woodrow Wilson Elementary Sustainable Streets Project	\$ 370,500	
22	Daly City	Serramonte Street Resurfacing Project	\$ 1,000,000	
23	East Palo Alto	East Bayshore Road Safety Improvements	\$ 850,000	
24	SMCTA	19th Ave/Fashion Island Blvd Complete Street Class IV	\$ 500,000	
25	CCAG	Managed Lanes, Rt 380 to SF County line (PPNO 658M)	\$ 1,700,000	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
26	Pacifica	Manor Drive Overcrossing Improv Project	\$ 5,000,000	
27	San Mateo (City)	Delaware Street Safe Routes to School Corridor (ATP Regional)	\$ 1,401,000	Active Transportation Program (ATP)
28	Daly City	John Daly Boulevard Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements	\$ 1,304,000	Housing Incentive Pool Program (HIP)
29	Redwood City	Jefferson Avenue Safety Improvements	\$ 1,011,000	
30	Redwood City	Page Street Bike Boulevard	\$ 310,000	
31	San Mateo (City)	El Camino Real/Humbolt St./Hillsdale Blvd. Intersection Safety	\$ 959,000	Local Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
32	South San Francisco	South San Francisco Traffic Signal Safety Improvements	\$ 1,527,120	
33	South San Francisco	Bridge No. 35C0148R, Grand Avenue WB over Caltrain UPRR Industrial, 0.1 mi E of US 101 REHABILITATION	\$ 3,833,349	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)

\$62,215,469

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and adopt Resolution 26-07 authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute a \$20,000 supplemental agreement to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Master Funding Agreement to provide logistical, coordination, and support for an active transportation workshop.

(For further information or questions, contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

Review and adoption of Resolution 26-07 authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute a \$20,000 supplemental agreement to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Master Funding Agreement to provide logistical, coordination, and support for an active transportation workshop.

FISCAL IMPACT

C/CAG would receive \$20,000 per the supplemental agreement.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

MTC will provide \$20,000 in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Surface Transportation Block Program (STBP) Grant funds for this effort.

BACKGROUND

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is leading the Active Transportation & Vision Zero Regional Coordination (AT-VZ Project), working with cities, towns, and counties to achieve a vision of a safe, accessible, connected “all ages and abilities” active transportation network that meets regional Vision Zero goals. The project will convene knowledge-sharing sessions and best practice workshops for staff from Bay Area cities, towns, and counties. These county-focused workshops aim to achieve MTC's Active Transportation Plan goals:

- Implement the Active Transportation Network;
- Implement the Complete Streets (CS) Policy; and
- Achieve Vision Zero in the Bay Area.

The Project will feature one peer exchange and one workshop in each county to help address major barriers to implementing “all ages and abilities” (AAA) design on the Active Transportation Network and/or the High Injury Network. The project will train local staff on data collection on "all ages and abilities" facilities and develop a communications toolkit for promoting project performance to the public. The project will also develop a regional strategy and roadmap for achieving Vision Zero in the Bay Area.

MTC, in coordination with its consultant team, will lead and facilitate the Countywide Active Transportation – Vision Zero Workshop in San Mateo County. C/CAG will be the lead partnering agency for the County.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that C/CAG review and adopt Resolution 26-07 authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute a \$20,000 supplemental agreement to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Master Funding Agreement to provide logistical, coordination, and support for an active transportation workshop.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

MTC's AT-VZ Project implements MTC's Regional Safety/Vision Zero Policy to encourage and support actions towards eliminating traffic fatalities and serious injuries in the Bay Area by 2030. Per MTC, traffic safety is a significant transportation challenge, and in the United States over 30,000 people are killed annually in traffic collisions. In the Bay Area alone, over 400 fatalities and 2,000 serious injuries occur on Bay Area roads each year. These deaths disproportionately affect communities of color, low-income communities, youth, the elderly, and those walking and biking. The project aims to help each Bay Area county understand and implement vision zero policies to reduce these serious injuries and fatalities on Bay Area roadways.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution 26-07
2. Draft Supplemental Agreement between C/CAG and MTC

RESOLUTION 26-07

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG) AUTHORIZING THE C/CAG EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A \$20,000 SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT TO THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC) MASTER FUNDING AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE LOGISTICAL, COORDINATION, AND SUPPORT FOR AN ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKSHOP

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

WHEREAS, C/CAG is the designated Congestion Management Agency responsible for the development and implementation of the Congestion Management Program for San Mateo County, and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is leading the Active Transportation & Vision Zero Regional Coordination (AT-VZ Project), working with cities, towns, and counties to achieve a vision of a safe, accessible, connected “all ages and abilities” active transportation network that meets regional Vision Zero goals; and

WHEREAS, C/CAG will be the lead partnering agency for the San Mateo County Active Transportation – Vision Zero Workshop in San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, the MTC will provide \$20,000 to C/CAG to fund the implementation of the Active Transportation Workshop.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the Executive Director is authorized to execute a \$20,000 supplemental agreement to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Master Funding Agreement to provide logistical, coordination, and support for an active transportation workshop, and further authorize the C/CAG Executive Director to negotiate the final agreement prior to execution by the Executive Director, subject to approval by C/CAG Legal Counsel as to form.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026.

Adam Rak, Chair

SUPPLEMENT NO. 3
To MASTER FUNDING AGREEMENT
Between METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
and CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY
for ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION – VISION ZERO WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION

This Supplement No. 3 to the Master Funding Agreement (“Supplement” or “Agreement”) is entered into this August 15, 2026, by and between METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (“MTC”) and CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (“AGENCY”), also known as “C/CAG”, and supplements the Master Funding Agreement, dated July 1, 2017 by and between MTC and AGENCY.

Pursuant to this Supplement, MTC agrees to provide an amount not to exceed twenty-thousand dollars (\$20,000.00) in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Surface Transportation Block Program (STBP) Grant funds administered by the California Department of Transportation, and programmed through the One Bay Area Grant 3 (OBAG 3) program. This is to fund the implementation of the Active Transportation Workshop hosted by AGENCY.

The Supplement Project work, as described in Annex I, will commence on January 1, 2026, and be completed no later than December 31, 2026. MTC will disburse funds to AGENCY for its implementation of the Active Transportation – Vision Zero Workshop during this time.

The clauses selected below and attached as exhibits to the Master Funding Agreement shall apply to AGENCY’s performance of the applicable Supplement Project scope of work hereunder: There are no insurance requirements for this Project.

- Exhibit B-1, Additional Terms and Conditions (General), Paragraph A
- Exhibit B-1, Additional Terms and Conditions (General), Paragraph B
- Exhibit B-2, Additional Terms and Conditions (Federally Required Clauses)
- Exhibit B-3, Additional Terms and Conditions (State Required Clauses)
- Exhibit B-4, Additional Terms and Conditions (Prevailing Wage Rates, Apprenticeships, and Payroll Records, Non-Federally-Funded Agreements)
- Exhibit B-5, Additional Terms and Conditions (Prevailing Wage Rates, Apprenticeships, and Payroll Records, Federally-Funded Agreements)
- Exhibit B-6, Additional Terms and Conditions (Regional Toll Funds including RM1, RM2, and AB1171)
- Exhibit B-7, Additional Terms and Conditions (Regional Discretionary Federal Funds including STP and CMAQ)

Payment to AGENCY shall be due in the firm fixed amount of twenty thousand dollars and no cents (\$20,000.00) as set forth in Annex II for AGENCY’s work in implementing the Active Transportation Workshop.

All invoices shall be submitted electronically via email to MTC at acctpay@bayareametro.gov or in writing to:

Attention: Accounting Section
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Payment shall be made by MTC within thirty (30) days of receipt of an acceptable invoice, approved by the MTC Project Manager or a designated representative.

The MTC Project Manager for the Supplement Project is Diane Dohm, (415) 778-4429, ddohm@bayareametro.gov. The AGENCY Project Manager for the Supplement Project is Audrey Shiramizu, (650) 599-1406, ashiramizu@smcgov.org.

This Supplement is supplemental to the Master Funding Agreement; all terms and conditions of the Master Funding Agreement, as may be amended, remain unchanged hereby.

Capitalized terms used but not defined herein shall have the respective meanings assigned to them in the Master Funding Agreement.

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF
GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO
COUNTY**

Andrew B. Fremier, Executive Director

Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Annex I
Project Description and Scope of Work

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION:
 COUNTYWIDE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION–VISION ZERO WORKSHOP
DETAILED SCOPE FOR TASKS AND PRODUCTS**

Project Title

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION FY 2026 and FY 2027 – Countywide Active Transportation–Vision Zero Workshop (AT-VZ Workshop)
--

Project Manager(s)

Name	Agency
Audrey Shiramizu	CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY
Diane Dohm	MTC

Overview & Description

MTC completed its first Active Transportation Plan, which updated MTC’s Complete Streets (CS) Policy (MTC Resolution No. 4493), identified an Active Transportation (AT) Network, and prioritized a 5-Year Implementation Plan (IP). The AT Network is a 3,244-mile network created using regionally significant segments of locally adopted plans/networks with equity, mode shift, and safety as the core elements. The CS Policy and AT Network will help the Bay Area reach mode shift, equity, and safety goals. During the AT Plan process, MTC heard the need for various forms of AT Technical Assistance (TA), including project design assistance, help completing state Active Transportation Program (ATP) and other AT grant applications, as well as educational capacity-building assistance (e.g., workshops focused on working together with emergency response staff to deliver Complete Streets projects). As part of the 5-Year IP, MTC launched an AT TA Program to spur the implementation of MTC’s CS Policy and AT Network while securing additional statewide ATP and other AT funding for the region. In December 2023, the MTC Commission approved a technical assistance award of \$1,000,000 for workshops, funded with OBAG 3 funding.

The Active Transportation Workshop Program goal is to provide jurisdictions with county-focused trainings to help reach the AT Plan goals of implementing the AT Network and CS Policy. MTC is coordinating with the County Transportation Agencies (CTAs) to implement one training in their county to help address one of their biggest barriers to implementing “All Ages and Abilities” design on the AT Network, while strengthening data collection and communication practices region wide. “All Ages and Abilities” is a design principle defined in MTC’s CS Policy as a facility that effectively serves the mobility needs of children, older adults, and people with disabilities and in doing so, works well for everyone else.

MTC, in coordination with consultant team, will lead and facilitate the Countywide Active Transportation – Vision Zero Workshop in San Mateo County. AGENCY as the partnering CTA will complete the following:

1. Secure a physical location with hybrid technology ability. Act as the local point of contact to the venue if not using own venue. Pay venue if needed.
2. Engage members to attend by sending at least three group and one individual email(s) to member agencies asking them to RSVP.
3. Work with MTC on the curriculum and, if desired, reserve a vehicle to transport participants to field location.
4. Order food/drink, if desired.
5. Assist MTC with staffing and hosting the event. At least one C/CAG staff person will attend event.
6. Provide post-event feedback to MTC and help to collect post-workshop surveys from members.

**Annex II
 Project Schedule, Budget and Payment**

FIRM-FIXED PAYMENT

AGENCY will meet the milestones and make the deliverables on the due date set forth in the table below. MTC will pay AGENCY upon receipt of an invoice identifying the project deliverable or milestone. AGENCY shall submit an invoice identifying the project deliverable or milestone for which payment is sought no later than thirty (30) days after MTC's acceptance of such deliverable/milestone. MTC's payment shall be due in the firm fixed amounts indicated below:

#	Deliverable/Milestone	Due Date:	Amount Due
1	Secure a physical location with hybrid technology ability. Act as the local point of contact to the venue if not using own venue. Pay venue if needed.	January – May 2026	\$20,000
2	Engage members to attend by sending at least 3 group and one individual email(s) to member agencies requesting RSVP.	March - June 2026	
3	Work with MTC on the curriculum and, if desired, reserve a vehicle to transport participants to field location	March - June 2026	
4	Order food/drink, if desired	March – June 2026	
5	Assist MTC with staffing/hosting event. At least one C/CAG staff person will attend event.	March – June 2026	
6	Provide post-event feedback to MTC and help to collect post-workshop surveys from members.	June- September 2026	
		TOTAL	\$20,000

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026
To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors
From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director
Subject: Review and approval of C/CAG Legislative Priorities for 2026

(For further information or response to questions, contact Matt Petrofsky at mpetrofsky@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the C/CAG Board of Directors review and approve the C/CAG Legislative Priorities for 2026.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

BACKGROUND

In 2024, C/CAG staff worked with C/CAG's legislative consultant, Shaw Yoder Antwih Smeltzer & Lange to review and update the 2023 Legislative Priorities document for the 2024 Legislative Session, taking into consideration the need to review and update language related to equity, the Brown Act, and transportation funding. The Legislative Committee recommended edits to the document provided and also identified a working group of three members: Fung, Rak, and Salazar, to work on a reorganized document later in 2024 for the 2025 Legislative Session. That document was presented to the C/CAG Legislative Committee at the December 11, 2025 meeting. The Committee reviewed, provided final comments and adopted them as the 2026 Legislative Priorities, provided here to the C/CAG Board for adoption. Those 2026 Legislative Priorities are provided as attachment to this staff report.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

In the development of the C/CAG Equity Assessment, Framework, and Action Plan, C/CAG committed to updating its annual Legislative Priorities Document with priorities related to equity. The updated document includes an added Policy #10, specifically for Equity, with two priorities included, as follows:

10.1 Support/advocate for legislation that advances the goals in C/CAG's Equity Assessment and Action Plan, and projects and programs in C/CAG's Community Based Transportation Plans.

10.2 Support legislation that supports equity efforts to ensure that all households can participate in and benefit from the transition to clean energy.

These new priorities are focused on serving C/CAG's adopted Equity Focus Areas and more broadly on all households in San Mateo County. Staff recommends that the new Equity Policy Section be updated annually with the full review of the Legislative Priorities document.

ATTACHMENT

1. Final Draft 2026 Legislative Priorities

2026 C/CAG LEGISLATIVE POLICIES

Policy #1 - Protect local revenue.

- 1.1 Support stakeholders and initiatives that protect and/or increase local revenues.
- 1.2 Provide incentives and tools to local government to promote economic vitality.
- 1.3 Work toward improving the State's disadvantaged community screening tools with a focus on San Mateo County communities' needs.
- 1.4 Support appropriate new State and local funding for economic development and affordable housing.
- 1.5 Pursue and support efforts that direct State and regional funds equitably to ensure a return to source.
- 1.6 Ensure that all State mandates and delegated responsibilities are fully reimbursed. Oppose State actions that delegate responsibilities to local jurisdictions without full reimbursement for resulting costs.

Policy #2 – Strengthen local government.

- 2.1 Support State actions that provide funding for local agencies to plan, incentivize, and mitigate for future housing development.
- 2.2 Support State actions that allow flexibility for local agencies to pool resources and share credit on their housing production reports.
- 2.3 Oppose State actions that would inhibit local agencies' ability to make decisions that address the specific needs of that community.
- 2.4 Oppose State actions that would withhold funding (including transportation) from jurisdictions based on housing production performance outcomes.
- 2.5 Monitor legislation and ballot initiatives that impact local housing and land-use authority and oppose and legislation that would usurp a local government's authority regarding land-use decisions.
- 2.6 Support legislation that identifies revenue to fund airport/land use compatibility plans.

Policy #3 - Protect water quality and support sustainable stormwater management.

- 3.1 Focus efforts on securing additional revenue sources and achieving cost effectiveness for both C/CAG and its member agencies in meeting funding State and federally mandated stormwater compliance efforts.

- a. Advocate for funding to support implementation of San Mateo County Stormwater Resource Plan, San Mateo County Sustainable Streets Master Plan, San Mateo County Regional Collaborative Program, and local Green Infrastructure Plans.
 - b. Advocate for inclusion of water quality and stormwater management as a priority for funding in State resources and climate bonds and protect against a statewide geographically unbalanced North-South allocation of resources.
 - c. Track and advocate for resources for stormwater management in State and Federal grant and loan programs. (included in 1.6 above)
 - d. Pursue and support efforts that address stormwater issues at statewide or regional levels and thereby reduce the cost share for C/CAG and its member agencies and limit the need to implement such efforts locally.
 - e. Advocate for regulatory streamlining and better integration between parallel statewide efforts to manage stormwater for water quality improvement, long-term climate change adaptation, and groundwater recharge.
 - f. Work with legislators to pursue additional funding for stormwater projects in San Mateo County, including funding for regional stormwater management efforts through the San Mateo County Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District, and advancing schoolyard greening initiatives in partnership with school districts, regional-scale multi-benefit stormwater capture projects, and programmatic implementation of regional-scale distributed green stormwater infrastructure.
 - g. Support mechanisms that allow credit trading approaches for stormwater management and water quality improvement.
- 3.2 Advocate to support legislative strategies towards achieving long-term reductions in harmful bacteria, trash, plastics, mercury, PCBs, and other pollutants discharging to the Bay and ocean and to reduce flooding, recharge groundwater, adapt to a changing climate, and otherwise enhance the health of local communities.
- a. Support efforts to secure statewide legislation mandating abatement of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in building materials prior to demolition of relevant structures, in accordance with requirements in the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board's Municipal Regional Permit.
 - b. Pursue and support efforts that control pollutants at the source and extend producer responsibility, especially regarding trash and litter control, including but not limited to microplastics, tire wear byproducts and other vehicle related pollutants, and emerging contaminants of concern.
 - c. Support efforts to place the burden/ accountability of reporting, managing, and meeting municipal stormwater requirements on the responsible source rather than the cities or county, such as properties that are known pollutant hot spots and/or third-party utility purveyors.
 - d. Advocate for integrated, prioritized, and achievable stormwater regulations that protect

water quality and beneficial uses and account for limitations on municipal funding.

- e. Pursue and support pesticide and rodenticide regulations that protect water quality and reduce pesticide toxicity.

Policy #4 - Advocate and support an integrated and flexible approach to funding.

- 4.1 Advocate for appropriate and effective integrated and flexible approaches to both funding and project types for statewide and regional infrastructure efforts including stormwater management, transportation, affordable housing, and both climate action and adaptation (resiliency).

Policy #5 - Support lowering the 2/3rd super majority vote for local special purpose taxes and fees.

- 5.1 Support constitutional amendments that reduce the vote requirements for special purpose taxes and fees.
- 5.2 Oppose bills that impose restrictions on the expenditures, thereby reducing flexibility, for special taxes category.
- 5.3 Oppose constitutional amendments that increase the threshold for voter approval requirements for revenue measures or that impose burdensome restrictions on state and local government's ability to raise revenues.

Policy #6 - Protect and support transportation funding and policies aligned with C/CAG's priorities.

- 6.1 Maximize the Bay Area's and San Mateo County's fair share of overall State revenue and any State General Fund surplus revenue invested in local/regional transportation.
- 6.2 Support efforts that protect transportation revenues from being pledged, transferred, or used for non-transportation purposes.
- 6.3 Support the implementation of AB 102 and SB 125 (Transit Recovery), SB 1 (Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017) programs and monitor the implementation of Executive Order N-19-19, N-79-20, and the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI), which call for aligning transportation spending with the state's climate goals.
- 6.4 Monitor and engage in the planning for and potential implementation of new transportation funding sources, including identifying viable alternatives to the gas tax; and regional proposals to study congestion pricing.
- 6.5 Monitor legislation related to the California high-speed rail project as it affects our San Mateo County region.
- 6.6 Support legislation that identifies funding for active transportation, complete streets, and bike/pedestrian infrastructure projects, including multi-benefit projects that integrate transportation improvements with green stormwater infrastructure.
- 6.7 Support efforts to secure the appropriation and allocation of "cap and trade" revenues for

investment in housing and sustainable communities, clean transportation, urban greening, and clean energy projects within San Mateo County.

- 6.8 Support or sponsor efforts that finance and/ or facilitate operational improvements on the state highway system and highway corridors in San Mateo County, including the 101 Express Lanes project and the 101/92 Interchange.
- 6.9 Support alternative contracting and project delivery methods, such as Public Private Partnerships, design-build, and job-order contracting that could result in project cost savings, such as accelerated deployment of technology including fiber optic cable for connected vehicle deployment, access to broadband capabilities, and more cost effective distributed green infrastructure for stormwater management.
- 6.10 Monitor the implementation of the new bridge toll program (Regional Measure 3) and advocate for an appropriate share of new revenues for projects in San Mateo County and for the funding identified in RM3 for projects in San Mateo County the funding identified in RM3 for projects in San Mateo County.
- 6.11 Monitor and engage in the effort to seek authorizing legislation and voter approval for a regional funding measure for transportation.
- 6.12 Support efforts that incentivize ridership and improve integration & connectivity among Bay Area transit systems. Monitor legislation that promotes transit-oriented development.
- 6.13 Support policies, including expanding community broadband access and technological advancements to encourage telecommuting, and others aimed at reducing vehicle miles traveled and associated traffic congestion by reducing the share of commuting by single-occupant vehicles.
- 6.14 Support efforts to improve the performance of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) and express lanes.
- 6.15 Monitor or support legislation improving bicycle and pedestrian safety. In particular, support the implementation of AB 43 and authorization of automated speed enforcement technology to enforce speed limits and other elements of Vision Zero.
- 6.16 Support legislation that would amend Government Code Section 65089.20 to increase the maximum voter-approved vehicle license fee from its existing \$10 to enhance revenue for congestion and pollution mitigation programs.
- 6.17 Support efforts to create local VMT/GHG mitigation programs to assist in reaching SB 375 GHG reduction goals.
- 6.18 Monitor legislation and funding opportunities for integration of autonomous vehicles and infrastructure.
- 6.19 Support and monitor efforts to facilitate the deployment of transformative transportation technologies with the goal of accelerating safety, mobility, environmental, equity and economic benefits associated with new mobility technologies. Additionally, ensure strong

federal vehicle safety standards while also preserving the ability of state and local agencies to continue to set policies governing the operation of vehicles on highways and local roads, regardless of whether they are driven autonomously or manually.

- 6.20 Support legislation that streamlines project delivery, including simplifying grant applications, streamlining CEQA, and accelerating project permit approvals.

Policy #7 - Support bold climate protection action, Greenhouse Gas reduction, and energy conservation and resilience legislation

- 7.1 Support incentive approaches toward implementing AB 32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006), SB 32 (extension of the target date and goals), and AB 398 (Cap and Trade), and legislation that supports electrification of infrastructure and the adoption of alternative fuel technologies.
- 7.2 Monitor climate legislation that would conflict with or override projects approved by the voters.
- 7.3 Support funding for both transportation and housing investments, which support the implementation of SB 375 (Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008), so that housing funds are not competing with transportation funds.
- 7.4 Support legislation requiring the state to survey and collect greenhouse gas and other emission data and publish emission inventories for local governments.
- 7.5 Monitor the regulatory process for implementing SB 743 (Evaluation of Transportation Impacts in CEQA) and impacts the new regulations may have on congestion management plans.
- 7.6 Support legislation that would require recording of vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as part of vehicle registration and initiatives to provide VMT and vehicle data from the DMV to evaluate trends in community greenhouse gas emissions and transit project outcomes.
- 7.7 Support efforts that ensure continued funding for ratepayer-funded local government partnerships to foster energy efficiency, electrification, and resilience, or expand funding for generation and use of renewable and/ or clean energy sources (wind, solar, etc.).
- 7.8 Work to initiate legislation that provides new funding and incentives for building energy electrification, transition to electric vehicles, or other greenhouse gas reducing initiatives, in support of local government climate action plans and the Governor's Executive Orders N-19-19 and N-79-20.
- 7.9 Support funding for electric vehicle and bike charging infrastructure, electric power storage capacity, and rebates for electric vehicle purchase.
- 7.10 Support legislation that supports Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE) objectives and oppose proposed legislation that impairs that effort.
- 7.11 Support legislation that provides local government access to data necessary for completing

greenhouse gas emission inventories, or legislation that requires the State to provide emissions data and develop community-scale greenhouse gas emission inventories and make them publicly available.

- 7.12 Support efforts that will engage the business community in making contributions to community improvements associated with stormwater, transportation congestion relief and mobility options, affordable housing, greenhouse gas emissions reductions, electrification, and energy resilience.
- 7.13 Support legislative efforts to create a unified voice in San Mateo County and to manage integrated water issues including sea level rise, flooding, coastal erosion, and stormwater vulnerabilities.
- 7.14 Support legislation to provide funding and policy guidance on wildfire preparedness and emergency response to local jurisdictions.
- 7.15 Monitor efforts to address emergency preparedness and response activities by PG&E.
- 7.16 Support State, regional, and local grid reliability plans and efforts, and expanded communication with utility customers.

Policy #8 - Protection of water user rights and access to sustainable water supply

- 8.1 Support the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Association (BAWSCA) efforts in the protection of water user rights for San Mateo County users.
- 8.2 Support legislation that provides funding for development of alternative sources of water supply, resources for municipal water supply conservation, and water capture initiatives.

Policy #9 – Brown Act Policy

- 9.1 Monitor and Support Brown Act reforms that provide flexibility, facilitate public engagement, provide greater control over un-protected meeting interruption, and allow for transparent, accessible, and participatory remote public meetings; with the goals of increasing participation from board members, committee members, and the public; and reducing vehicle miles traveled.

Policy #10 – Equity Policy

- 10.1 Support/advocate for legislation that advances the goals in C/CAG’s Equity Assessment and Action Plan, and projects and programs in C/CAG’s Community Based Transportation Plans.
- 10.2 Support legislation that supports equity efforts to ensure that all households can participate in and benefit from the transition to clean energy.

AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026
To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director
Subject: Receive executed \$49,000 contract with Transpo Group for professional services for \$6M BUILD Application for Countywide technology-based transportation safety improvements to implement C/CAG’s Vision Zero efforts.

(For further information, contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors receive the executed \$49,000 contract with Transpo Group for professional services for \$6M BUILD Application for Countywide technology-based transportation safety improvements to implement C/CAG’s Vision Zero efforts.

FISCAL IMPACT

The contract amount is \$49,000.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Staff plans to utilize Congestion Relief Program funds to cover the cost of application development.

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Transportation’s Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) Grant Program provides competitive federal funding for surface transportation projects that deliver significant national and regional benefits, particularly in the areas of safety, state of good repair, economic competitiveness, environmental sustainability, and quality of life. The program is well suited to innovative, multimodal, and technology-enabled projects that can be scaled across jurisdictions and demonstrate measurable safety outcomes.

C/CAG continues to prioritize roadway safety as a core policy objective, consistent with the Countywide Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP), the identification of the High Injury Network (HIN), and the agency’s broader efforts to reduce serious injuries and fatalities for all road users. In alignment with these priorities, staff is pursuing the BUILD grant to implement a countywide safety initiative.

The project will deploy innovative traffic signal technologies, including multimodal detection systems that are integrated with the traffic signal controller to trigger real-time safety

interventions for road users. Compared to traditional strategies that are statically deployed, this technology will dynamically respond to changes at the intersection – triggering safety interventions only when they are needed – helping to enhance safety for vulnerable road users, while minimizing delay and impacts to drivers. The project will also deploy emergency vehicle preemption along coastal and rural Highway 1, improving emergency responder safety and response times. The project aims to represent all C/CAG member agencies, with intersections being selected throughout the county using a data-driven approach that leverages findings from the LRSP and HIN.

Consultant Procurement

The fiscal year 2026 BUILD Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) was released in December 2025 and the application is due February 24, 2026. Because of the approaching deadline and lengthy application process, C/CAG embarked on a fair selection process to select a consultant to lead C/CAG’s application submittal. Between December 2025 and January 2026, C/CAG reached out to three firms on the C/CAG consultant bench to solicit proposals: Iteris Inc., Parsons, and Transpo Group. The proposals were evaluated based on the following criteria: the firm’s expertise and experience, scope, fee, and schedule. Following the evaluation, C/CAG recommended selecting Transpo Group to provide professional services.

In addition to BUILD, staff anticipates that the project application may be refined and packaged for other potential funding opportunities, such as member directed funding and the federal Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Implementation Program, depending on eligibility, timing, and Committee feedback. Transpo Group will provide professional services as needed for other potential funding opportunities.

Due to the timing of the BUILD application due date, C/CAG issued a Notice to Proceed (NTP) to Transpo Group on January 16, 2026. With the NTP, Transpo Group agreed to C/CAG’s standard terms and conditions and to adhere to the scope of work and rates in their proposal. C/CAG and Transpo Group officially entered into an agreement in February 2026 to develop the application materials for the BUILD grant and other potential grant opportunities, in an amount not to exceed \$49,000. Since the total contract value is below \$50,000, it falls within the Executive Director’s delegated signing authority.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed concept is intended to improve safety outcomes in areas with high concentrations of severe and fatal crashes, as identified through the High Injury Network and the LRSP. By prioritizing locations with demonstrated safety needs and vulnerable road users, the project has the potential to advance equitable investment in communities that experience disproportionate traffic safety impacts.

ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are available on the C/CAG website (*See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting*) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>

1. Agreement between C/CAG and Transpo Group for application development.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Nominations for C/CAG Chair and Vice Chair for the March 2026 Election of Officers.

(For further information, please contact Sean Charpentier at scharpentier@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors make nominations for Chair and Vice Chair for the March 2026 Election of Officers in accordance with the C/CAG By-Laws.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

REVENUE SOURCE

None.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The C/CAG Bylaws established a process to have nominations for officers at the February meeting and then have voting at the following meeting, in March. The objective is to provide Board Members with background information to assist them in casting their votes. Nominations shall only be made by voting members of the Board of Directors. The Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons shall be voting members of the Board, as well. Nominations do not require a second or vote. Nominations for officers of the Board of Directors shall be made from the floor only at the regular February Board meeting. Nominations of the Chairperson shall precede nominations of the Vice Chairperson.

All nominated candidates should provide background information in advance of the March Board meeting such that the material can be included in the packet for the Board's consideration. For those candidates nominated, please provide the background information to Mima Crume (mcrume@smcgov.org) by February 27, 2026.

CURRENT OFFICERS:

Adam Rak has served two terms as Chair and is not eligible to serve another term as Chair.
Michael Salazar has served two terms as Vice Chair and is not eligible to serve another term as Vice Chair.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Selection of a Chair and Vice Chair is required by the C/CAG By Laws.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Article IV of the Bylaws related to Officers.
2. Cover sheet for nominees to submit background information.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the Board of Directors shall consist of a Chairperson and one Vice Chairperson.

Section 2. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be elected from among the nominees by the Board of Directors at the March meeting to serve for a term of twelve (12) months commencing on April 1. There shall be a two-term limit for each office. That is, a member may not serve more than two consecutive terms as the Chairperson, and not more than two consecutive terms as Vice Chairperson. An officer shall hold his or her office until he or she resigns, is removed from office, is otherwise disqualified to serve, or until his or her successor qualifies and takes office.

Section 3. Nomination for officers of the Board of Directors shall be made from the floor only at the regular February Board meeting. Nominations shall be made only by voting members of the Board of Directors.

Section 4. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson must be a regularly designated, voting member (e.g., not an alternate, or an ex-officio member) of the Board of Directors.

Section 5. Nominations and election of the Chairperson shall precede nominations and election of the Vice Chairperson. Voting shall be public for all offices.

Section 6. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Board, may call special meetings when necessary, and shall serve as the principal executive officer. The Chairperson shall have such other powers, and shall perform such other duties which may be incidental to the office of the Chairperson, subject to the control of the Board.

Section 7. In the absence or inability of the Chairperson to act, the Vice Chairperson shall exercise all of the powers and perform all of the duties of the Chairperson. The Vice Chairperson shall also have such other powers and shall perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Board of Directors.

Section 8. A special election to fill the vacant office shall be called by the Board of Directors if

the Chairperson or the Vice Chairperson is unable to serve a full term of office.

Section 9. All officers shall serve without compensation.

Section 10. The Chairperson or the Vice Chairperson may be removed from office at any time by a majority vote of those members present at a duly constituted meeting of the Board.

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*

Due Date: February 27, 2026

DATE:

TO: Attn: Mima Crume
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA, 94063

RE: C/CAG Candidate background material for C/CAG Chair or Vice Chair
nominations

The attached is candidate background material for your information.

From:

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Receive a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan update
(For further information, contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board receive a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).

FISCAL IMPACT

This presentation is information only, and has no fiscal impact associated with this action. The cost to update the CTP is \$399,992.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Per Resolution 24-59, C/CAG entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) to collectively participate in funding the cost to complete the upcoming update of the CTP in San Mateo County. The total cost of this effort to be split 50/50 between C/CAG and SMCTA. C/CAG share of funding will come from the C/CAG Congestion Relief Fund.

BACKGROUND

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLANS

A Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) establishes a long-range vision and goals for the transportation system, as well as recommends transportation project priorities and strategies that will achieve the vision and goals over time. This presentation provides the Committee with an overview of the Countywide Transportation Plan update process, key regional planning context, and early outreach efforts. It is intended to inform future policy discussions related to project prioritization and active transportation.

The CTP is a primary input into the preparation of the San Francisco Bay Area's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS, also referred to as "Plan Bay Area") prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). As such, CTPs play a critical role in informing regional transportation and land use planning efforts.

PLAN BAY AREA

In 2021, MTC adopted the third iteration of Plan Bay Area, Plan Bay Area 2050, which connects the elements of housing, the economy, transportation, and the environment through 35 strategies that aim to make the Bay Area more equitable for all residents and more resilient in the face of unexpected challenges. In the short-term, the Plan's implementation plan identifies more than 80 specific actions for MTC, ABAG, and partner organizations to take over the next five years to make headway on each of the 35 strategies and achieving Plan Bay Area goals and objectives.

Currently, MTC is developing Plan Bay Area 2050+, a limited and focused update to Plan Bay Area 2050. It is an opportunity to refine select plan strategies to integrate the lessons of the last three years since the adoption of Plan Bay Area. Additionally, this approach will enable continued progress implementing the strategies of Plan Bay Area 2050.

MTC has developed a set of guidelines to provide context for coordinated transportation and land use planning in the San Francisco Bay Area by developing a common planning framework between CTPs and the RTP/SCS, reflective of state and regional climate and equity goals.

The next major update of Plan Bay Area is expected to begin in 2026 and be adopted in 2029. As stated in the CTP guidelines from MTC, MTC recommends that CTPs should be completed by 2026 to inform the next major update to Plan Bay Area.

SAN MATEO COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

As one of responsibilities as the County Transportation Agency (CTA), C/CAG prepares the CTP for San Mateo County. The last iteration of the CTP, the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan 2040 (SMCTP 2040), was adopted by the C/CAG Board on February 9, 2017. Since that time, the county's population and employment have increased substantially, several major transportation projects and planning efforts have been completed, and a rapid change in commute patterns brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, MTC has issued updated guidelines on how CTPs should be updated and many policies regarding equity and climate have changed at the local, regional, state, and federal levels. This CTP update is a collaboration between C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA).

Beginning in November 2025, C/CAG and SMCTA staff have been presenting to various transportation related committees in the first phase of outreach. Leveraging almost 5 years' worth of recent public engagement through other transportation planning efforts in the county, staff have been using this valuable data to help shape and validate the draft vision and goals for the CTP, particularly as they relate to changing travel patterns and user experiences across the County. To date, staff has presented at 42 forums throughout the county, see Attachment 2 for full list of presentations. Staff will return to the Board in Summer 2026 to provide another update to the development of the plan.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan is a countywide plan that advances equity by ensuring all residents in San Mateo County have access to safe and reliable modes of transportation by recommending transportation project priorities and strategies that will achieve the vision and goals over time.

ATTACHMENTS

1. CTP Presentation List
2. San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan Update Presentation (The document is available on the C/CAG website. See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>)

San Mateo Countywide Transportation Update - 1st Round of Engagement Presentations

Date	Committee
Wednesday, 11/5/25	City of Brisbane Complete Streets Safety Committee
Thursday, 11/6/2025	City of Half Moon Bay Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Monday, 11/10/25	Hillsborough Town Council
Wednesday, 11/12/2025	City of Foster City Citizens Sustainability Advisory Committee (CSAC) Meeting
Wednesday, 11/12/2025	Midcoast Community Council
Thursday, 11/13/2025	City of Burlingame Traffic, Safety, & Parking Commission (TSPC)
Monday, 11/17/25	City of San Carlos Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC)
Tuesday, 11/18/25	SamTrans San Mateo County Paratransit Advisory Council (PAC)
Tuesday, 11/18/25	Town of Atherton Transportation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Committee
Wednesday, 11/19/2025	City of East Palo Alto Public Works & Transportation Commission (PWTC)
Wednesday, 11/19/2025	Caltrain (JPB) Citizens Advisory Committee
Thursday, 11/20/2025	Commute.org Board of Directors
Thursday, 11/20/2025	Caltrain Bicycle and Active Transportation Advisory Committee (BATAC)
Thursday, 11/20/2025	Town of Woodside Circulation Committee
Monday, 11/24/25	San Mateo County Commission on Disabilities
Monday, 12/1/25	Supervisor Speier
Wednesday, 12/3/25	City of South San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Friday, 12/5/25	BART Staff
Tuesday, 12/9/25	Pescadero Municipal Advisory Council
Tuesday, 12/9/25	City of Redwood City Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
Wednesday, 12/10/25	Supervisor Gauthier
Tuesday, 12/16/25	Supervisor Corzo
Thursday, 12/18/25	San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Tuesday, 1/13/26	SAMCEDA Housing, Land Use, and Transportation (HLUT) Committee
Tuesday, 1/13/26	City of South San Francisco Traffic Safety Commission (TSC)
Wednesday, 1/14/2026	City of Menlo Park Complete Streets Commission
Wednesday, 1/14/2026	City of San Mateo Sustainability and Infrastructure Commission (S&I / SIC)
Wednesday, 1/14/2026	Colma Town Council Meeting
Friday, 1/16/2026	Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) Staff
Thursday, 1/22/26	C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (BPAC)
Thursday, 1/22/26	North Fair Oaks Community Council
Monday, 1/26/26	C/CAG CMEQ Committee
Tuesday, 1/27/26	San Mateo County Regional Climate Action Planning Suite (RICAPS)
Wednesday, 1/28/26	San Mateo County Transportation Equity Allied Movement Coalition (TEAMC)
Wednesday, 1/28/26	SamTrans Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Thursday 1/29/26	City of Foster City Traffic Review Committee
Tuesday, 2/3/26	San Mateo County Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee
Tuesday, 2/5/26	San Mateo County Transportation Authority Board of Directors
Friday, 2/6/26	Town of Portola Valley Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Traffic Safety Committee
Wednesday, 2/11/26	City of Pacifica Climate Action and Resilience Committee

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Receive a presentation on the upcoming Cycle 4 of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program, and the FY 2026–2028 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program Calls for Projects.

(For further information, contact Sean Charpentier scharpentier@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board receive a presentation on the upcoming Cycle 4 of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program, and the FY 2026–2028 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program Calls for Projects.

FISCAL IMPACT

For the OBAG 4 program, funding levels are expected to be similar to prior cycles, although the amount available for local discretionary projects is reduced due to the expiration of one-time funds and set aside for a regional program. The estimated funding available for the County is \$20 - \$25 million.

On the TDA Article 3 program, approximately \$4.7 million is expected to be available for a three-year period, covering fiscal year 2026 to 2028. This includes \$800,000 for planning activities and \$3.9 million for capital projects.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The OBAG 4 program is funded with Federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and related federal sources administered by MTC.

The TDA Article 3 program funds originate from Local Transportation Fund (¼-cent sales tax) and State Transit Assistance (fuel tax-based revenues).

BACKGROUND

C/CAG administers two of the County’s most significant discretionary transportation funding programs for local agencies: the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) County & Local Program, and the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Together, these programs provide cities, the County, and joint powers agencies with a coordinated pipeline of capital and planning funding for active transportation, complete streets, safety, and mobility

projects.

Program Overview and Policy Alignment

One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4)

The OBAG program is Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)’s framework for investing federal transportation funds to advance regional housing, climate, and transportation goals in the bay area. As in the previous cycle, MTC will take a lead role in developing guidance, establishing county nomination targets, and making final project selections for the County & Local Program.

Several policy updates will shape OBAG 4, including MTC’s Transit Priority Policy for Roadways (TPPR), which will require roadway projects to incorporate transit-supportive elements through the Complete Streets Checklist. Additionally, many of the project sponsor requirements established under OBAG 3 will continue to apply under OBAG 4, including the need for an up-to-date Local Roadway Safety Plan and compliance with state housing laws including a Certified Housing Element.

Eighty percent (80%) of the OBAG 4 (FY 2027–2030) funds will need to be invested in locations near Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit-Oriented Communities (TOCs). Given this regional focus, OBAG 4 will likely be most competitive for projects in higher-density, transit-rich areas.

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3

The TDA Article 3 program provides funding for local bicycle and pedestrian planning and capital projects throughout San Mateo County. To promote broad countywide participation, the program is positioned to support jurisdictions that do not contain a Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Priority Development Area (PDA) or are not located within or adjacent to a Transit-Oriented Community (TOC). This is intended to encourage high-quality bicycle and pedestrian investments in jurisdictions that have historically had fewer opportunities to access regional active transportation funding, while maintaining the program’s core emphasis on safety, network connectivity, equity, and readiness.

Funding Structure and Eligibility

OBAG 4 Program – Preliminary Parameters

Based on discussions with local agencies and anticipated MTC guidance, C/CAG is considering the following framework elements:

Element	Proposed Parameters
Minimum Grant	\$1,000,000
Maximum Grant	\$4,000,000
Eligible Projects	Complete streets, safety, transit-supportive, green infrastructure, and eligible STBG/CMAQ uses
Policy Focus	Transit priority, PDAs, TOCs, Complete Streets

Category	Amount
Total Grant Fund Available	\$4.7 Million
Planning Projects	\$800,000 (maximum \$200,000 per project)
Capital Projects	\$3.9 million (maximum \$750,000 per project)
Eligible Projects	Comprehensive Bicycle or Pedestrian plans or capital improvements
Local Match	Minimum 10%

Eligible applicants include all 20 cities, the County of San Mateo, and local joint powers agencies.

Call for Projects Schedules

OBAG 4 (Anticipated timeline)

C/CAG Action	Tentative Dates	MTC Action
Present proposed OBAG 4 Framework and Process to C/CAG Committees	March 2026	MTC Commission approval of OBAG 3 Program Guidelines and Nomination Targets
C/CAG Board approval of OBAG 4 Framework and Process	April 2026	MTC Staff to review and approve of CTA proposed OBAG 4 Process
OBAG 4 County & Local Program Call for Projects Issued to Local Jurisdictions and Agencies	May 2026	
Call for Projects Application Period	May – June 2026	
OBAG 4 screening, scoring, and development of project nominations for MTC	July – August 2026	
Present recommendations to C/CAG Committees	August 2026	
Project nomination list approved by the C/CAG Board	September 2026	
OBAG 4 prioritized nominations due to MTC	September 30, 2026	
MTC’s Project Evaluation Process	October – December 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MTC’s evaluation of OBAG 4 project nomination lists from CTAs - CMAQ emissions benefits and cost effectiveness analysis - MTC & CTA discussions of preliminary staff recommendation
Project sponsors to submit information into the TIP	January 2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MTC Commission approval of County & Local program of projects

TDA Article 3

Key milestones include:

Milestone	Date
Board Approval of Call	February 12, 2026 (anticipated)
Release Call for Projects	February 16, 2026
Applications Due	April 16, 2026
BPAC Scoring Period	May–June 2026
Board Approval of Awards	September 10, 2026

Next Steps

Staff will return to the Board in the next few months once MTC finalizes the final OBAG framework. On a separate item today, staff is seeking Board approval to release the TDA Article 3 Call for Projects. Staff will begin application outreach and provide technical assistance.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Both OBAG and TDA programs incorporate equity-based scoring and policy alignment to prioritize underserved communities, including Equity Focus Areas and MTC Equity Priority Communities. The TDA program also includes targeted incentives for jurisdictions outside PDAs and TOCs to ensure equitable geographic access to funding.

ATTACHMENT

The following attachments are available on the C/CAG website (*See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting*) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>.

1. Presentation on OBAG Cycle 4 and TDA Article 3 Program

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026
 To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors
 From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director
 Subject: Review and approve the Fiscal Year 2026-2028 Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Call for Projects and Schedule.

(For further information, contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board reviews and approves the Fiscal Year 2026-2028 Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Call for Projects and Schedule.

FISCAL IMPACT

It is expected that approximately \$4.7 million will be available for the FY 2026-2028 Cycle of the Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA 3) Program.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

TDA 3 funds are derived from the following sources:

- Local Transportation Funds (LTF), derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide
- State Transit Assistance Fund (STA), derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.

BACKGROUND

Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA 3) funds are made available by the state and allocated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to C/CAG on a formula basis. As the program administrator for San Mateo County, C/CAG issues a call for project nominations for eligible bicycle and/or pedestrian projects within the county. Eligible applicants include the 20 cities, the County, and any joint powers agencies in San Mateo. Approximately \$4.7 million will be available for the FY 2026-2028 Cycle.

Of the \$4.7M available for this grant cycle, \$800,000 is allocated for planning projects and the remaining \$3.9M for capital projects. Should either category be undersubscribed, any uncommitted funds may be reallocated to the other program category. The maximum grant awards are \$200,000 for planning projects and \$750,000 for capital projects. Project sponsors are required to provide a minimum local match of 10% for both project types.

Call for Projects Schedule

A Call for Projects Schedule is included in Table 1.

Table 1: Proposed TDA Article FY 2026-2028 Call for Projects Schedule

Activity	Date*
BPAC Recommends Board Approval of the Call for Projects and Overall Schedule	January 22, 2026
C/CAG Board Approval of Call for Projects and Schedule	February 12, 2026
Release Call for Projects	February 16, 2026
Application Workshop	February 24, 2026
Community Outreach Meeting	February 26, 2026
Preliminary Discussions on Application Concepts (optional office hours)	Feb. 24-March 10, 2026
Applications Due	April 16, 2026
C/CAG Conducts Completeness and Technical Evaluation	May 1, 2026
C/CAG Distributes Applications and Score Sheets to BPAC	May 4, 2026
BPAC Scoring/Evaluation Period	May 4, 2026 – June 30, 2026
Project Sponsor Presentation to BPAC	May 28, 2026
BPAC Scoring Sheets due to C/CAG Staff	June 30, 2026
Committee Deliberation and makes Board Recommendations	July 23, 2026
C/CAG Board Approval	September 10, 2026

**Dates may be adjusted as needed*

Application Evaluation

C/CAG staff will convene a panel, consisting of C/CAG staff and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), to review and evaluate applications.

Table 2 shows the evaluation criteria and weights that will be used by the panel to evaluate projects. Based on the evaluation of all eligible TDA 3 applications and funding availability, C/CAG staff and this Committee will recommend a project funding list to the C/CAG Board for approval.

Table 2: TDA Article FY 2026-2028 Evaluation Criteria

Planning Projects	Capital Projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Description – 5% of score • Community Support – 7% of score • Meets Program Objectives – 73% of score • Funding and Local Match – 15% of score <p>Total Percentage: 100%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Description – 5% of score • State of Readiness – 20% of score • Community Support – 7% of score • Meets Program Objectives – 53% of score • Funding and Local Match – 15% of score <p>Total Percentage: 100%</p>

Changes from prior cycles:

Staff heard from the BPAC and other committees that applying for grants can be difficult for smaller jurisdictions and may discourage some from applying. To promote broad countywide participation, staff propose giving points to jurisdictions that do not contain a Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Priority Development Area (PDA) or are not located within or adjacent to a Transit-Oriented Community (TOC). This is intended to encourage high-quality bicycle and pedestrian investments in jurisdictions that have historically had fewer opportunities to access regional active transportation funding, while maintaining the program’s core emphasis on safety, network connectivity, equity, and readiness.

Staff propose reducing the number of points given to applicants that have not received funding in the past 10 years from 5 points to 3 points and allocating those remaining 2 points to applicants from jurisdictions without an MTC PDA or TOC.

At the January 22, 2026 BPAC meeting, the Committee reviewed the TDA 3 Call for Projects and Schedule. The Committee recommended forwarding the Call for Projects process to the C/CAG Board for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board reviews and approves the Fiscal Year 2026-2028 Cycle Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Call for Projects and Schedule.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

In recent years, C/CAG has worked to prioritize equity and incentivize the development of more TDA 3 projects in underserved areas. For example, for the FY2024-2025 cycle, staff updated the scoring criteria to include more points for projects located within C/CAG Equity Focus Areas (EFA) or MTC Equity Priority Communities (EPCs). Additionally, maximum points were awarded if a project was located mostly in an EFA or EPC and provided the minimum local match. This equity-based scoring criteria and will continue to be applied in the FY 2026–2028 cycle to support equitable investment.

Like previous cycles, C/CAG will distribute this Call for Projects to C/CAG’s Community Based Organization (CBO) list. C/CAG will continue to outreach to CBOs and interested members of the

public to learn more about the TDA 3 program, project eligibility, and to encourage public members to advocate for local projects that they would like to see built or improved within their communities.

ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are available on the C/CAG website (*See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting*) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>.

1. TDA Article 3 FY 2026-2028 Call for Projects Letter and Application Instructions

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)

(For further information, contact Matt Petrofsky at mpetrofsky@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

C/CAG staff recommend that the C/CAG Board of Directors review the legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)

FISCAL IMPACT

N/A

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

The C/CAG Legislative Committee receives monthly written reports and oral briefings from C/CAG's State legislative advocate, Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange (Consultant). Important legislative topics and any votes on positions taken or other actions recommended by the Legislative Committee to the C/CAG Board are reported to the full C/CAG Board through this item.

At Legislative Committee meetings, held prior to the Board meetings, the Committee will mainly receive updates from the Consultant on State budget and any additional information from Sacramento on bills discussed in the attached C/CAG Legislative Update. In addition, the consultant may discuss transportation or other program funding and changes in legislative leadership and committee assignments.

The attached report (Attachment 1) from the Consultant may include various updates from Sacramento with respect to the legislative timelines, State Budget, changes in leadership and committee rosters and chairs, State grant programs, recent committee hearings, and bill progress of

interest to C/CAG since the Committee and Board last met.
Attachment 1 has an updated report from Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange.

SB 677 (Wiener) Letter

At the December 11th C/CAG BOD meeting, staff mentioned that early in 2026 there might be amendments proposed to the approved SB 79 (Wiener), which authorizes high residential densities within ½ mile of a qualifying transit stations.

On January 5th, Senator Wiener introduced SB 677, which would amend SB 79 by adding ferry stations and clarifying a few more items. The League submitted an oppose unless amended position.

On January 6th C/CAG submitted a comment letter to Senator Wiener outlining a few concerns, including supporting the League's request for more time, the potential negative impact on planning for Bus Rapid Transit projects, additional analysis on the inclusion of the ferry locations, and the potential impacts on small businesses and the cities' ability to require ground floor retail.

The letter was submitted prior to C/CAG Legislative Committee and Board of Directors review to meet State committee review windows. C/CAG staff would like to request that the Legislative Committee recommend that the Board of Directors ratify the attached C/CAG letter. Also attached is the League's letter, and bill text of SB 677.

Upcoming Federal and State Applications

There are several Federal and State funding opportunities that C/CAG is planning on applying to.

1. **\$6m – Countywide Federal BUILD (late February) and/or SS4A (early Summer?) grant applications**
 - a) Concept 1: Dynamic Extension of Pedestrian Walk Times
 - b) Concept 2: Dynamic No Turn on Red
 - c) Concept 3: Emergency Vehicle Preemption

2. **\$1.88m - HUD Highway Infrastructure Program earmark (Early March)**
 - a) \$350,000 - East Palo Alto Fordham Street green infrastructure, const.
 - b) \$500,000 - Daly City Washington Elementary and Bayshore Elementary Sustainable Infrastructure-Complete planning and design
 - c) \$1.5m - South San Francisco Grand Ave Sustainable Street Design (Planning & Design)

3. **\$1.5m - NOAA funds earmark (Early March)**
 - a) One Watershed Strategic Plan planning effort.

4. **\$1.8m – Federal Highway Infrastructure Program earmark (Early March)**

- a) A subset of the BUILD grant focusing on highest priority intersection safety investments in South San Francisco, San Mateo, Foster City, and Redwood City.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The C/CAG Board of Directors considers equity in its positions on legislation and has included equity language in the annual Legislative Priorities document for C/CAG Board review and approval. Decisions made in relation to transportation, housing, stormwater, and climate resilience have the potential to impact our most vulnerable communities in San Mateo County.

ATTACHMENTS

1. C/CAG Legislative Update, February 1, 2026 from Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange
2. C/CAG Legislative Spreadsheet from Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange
3. C/CAG comment letter for SB677
4. League letter for SB677
5. Bill text for 677

Below are informational links:

- [Recent Joint ABAG MTC Legislation Committee Agendas](#)
- [California State Association of Counties \(CSAC\) bill positions and tracking](#)
- [California Associations of Councils of Government \(CALCOG\) bill tracking](#)
- Full Legislative search is available for specific bills at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>
- [2025 California State Calendar of Legislative Deadlines](#)
- San Mateo County Delegation
 - [Legislation from Assemblymember Marc Berman](#)
 - [Legislation from Assemblymember Diane Papan](#)
 - [Legislation from Assemblymember Catherine Stefani](#)
 - [Legislation from Senator Josh Becker](#)
 - [Legislation Senator Scott Wiener](#)
- Bill Tracker for C/CAG by SYASL: [C/CAG Bill Tracking](#)
- Current client roster for Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange - <https://syaslparters.com/clients/>



1415 L Street
Suite 1000
Sacramento
CA, 95814
916-446-4656

January 30, 2026

To: Board of Directors
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

From: Matt Robinson, Andrew Antwih and Lizzie Guansona
Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange

Re: **STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – February 2026**

Legislative Update

The Legislature reconvened on January 5 for the start of the second year of the two-year session. Two-year bills introduced in 2025 that remained in their first house (House of Origin) had to pass out of their House of Origin by January 31. For bills newly introduced in 2026, the deadline for bill introductions is February 20.

For information about key legislative and budget deadlines for next year, please see the 2026 Legislative Calendar [here](#).

Governor Newsom Releases Proposed FY 2026-27 Budget

On January 9, Governor Newsom released his [proposed Fiscal Year \(FY\) 2026-27 budget](#), based on the latest economic forecasts available to the Governor and the Department of Finance (DOF). Due to significantly improved tax revenue collection in late 2025, the Governor and DOF project that the State faces a \$2.9 billion deficit – a significant departure from the Legislative Analyst’s Office’s projection last year of an \$18 billion deficit. The Governor has proposed a \$348.9 billion balanced budget with \$23 billion in total reserves. This is up from \$321.1 billion in total spending, with \$15.7 billion in reserves, from the FY 2025-26 final budget.

Of interest to C/CAG, the budget proposes programmatic changes to modernize the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSCP) and align it with the Governor’s recent state agency reorganization, which created the California Housing and Homelessness Agency (effective July 1, 2026). The affordable housing component of the AHSCP will be nested within CHHA within the Housing Development and Homelessness Committee (HDFC) to better leverage complementary subsidies, streamline administration, and accelerate project delivery while maintaining AHSCP’s rigorous climate and sustainability standards. The Governor’s Budget proposes to provide up to \$560 million for the affordable housing component from the state’s Cap-and-Invest program. The sustainable communities and agricultural land conservation components of AHSCP will continue to be administered by the Strategic Growth Council and be updated to support more flexible, catalytic infrastructure investments aligned with regional priorities, maximizing the impact of limited resources to more effectively deliver

climate-aligned housing. The Governor’s Budget proposes to provide up to \$240 million for the affordable housing component from the state’s Cap-and-Invest program. We expect to see more details on this proposal in early February in forthcoming trailer bills from the Department of Finance.

Additionally, the Governor is proposing to appropriate \$2.1 billion for the Climate Bond (Proposition 4) for a variety of programs, including \$107 million to “continue investments that help protect coastal communities against these impacts, safeguard local economies, conserve and restore biodiversity and natural areas, elevate tribal knowledge and stewardship, and improve public access to the coast.”

In the months ahead, the Legislature’s budget subcommittees will begin hearing the various budget proposals put forth by Governor Newsom.

Senate President pro Tempore Announces Senate Leadership and Committee Changes

In December, we reported that Senator Monique Limón (D-Santa Barbara) began to transition into the role of Senate President Pro Tempore on November 17, assuming the top leadership position in the State Senate from Senator Mike McGuire (D-North Coast). Pro Tem Limón’s official swearing-in ceremony took place on January 5 in Sacramento.

As one of her first official acts, Pro Tem Limón announced changes to Senate Leadership and committee appointments on December 23.

We note that the Chairs of the following committees that oversee policy and fiscal matters of interest to C/CAG have changed:

- **Senate Appropriations Committee:** Transitions from Senator Anna Caballero (D-Merced) to Senator Sabrina Cervantes (D-Riverside)
- **Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee:** Transitions from **Senator Scott Wiener (D-San Francisco)** to Senator John Laird (D-Santa Cruz)
- **Senate Budget Subcommittee No. 2 on Resources, Environmental Protection, and Energy:** Transitions from Senator Ben Allen (D-Pacific Palisades) to Senator Eloise Gómez Reyes (D-Colton)
- **Senate Energy, Utilities & Communications Committee:** Transitions from **Senator Josh Becker (D-Menlo Park)** to Senator Ben Allen (D-Pacific Palisades)
- **Senate Natural Resources and Water:** Transitions from Senator Monique Limón (D-Santa Barbara) to **Senator Josh Becker (D-Menlo Park)**
- **Senate Housing Committee:** Transitions from Senator Aisha Wahab (D-Silicon Valley) to Senator Jesse Arreguín (D-Oakland)

We note that the Chairs of the following committees that oversee policy and fiscal matters of interest to C/CCAG will remain the same:

- **Senate Budget Subcommittee No. 5 on Corrections, Public Safety, Judiciary, Labor and Transportation Committee:** Remains Senator Laura Richardson (D-San Pedro)
- **Senate Environmental Quality Committee:** Remains Senator Catherine Blakespear (D-Encinitas)
- **Senate Local Government Committee:** Remains Senator Maria Elena Durazo (D-Los Angeles)

- **Senate Transportation Committee:** Remains Senator Dave Cortese (D-San Jose)

Leadership appointments and changes to Budget and Budget Subcommittees, and Natural Resources and Water Committee took effect immediately. All other changes are effective February 1, 2026.

As a reminder, here are the committee assignments for the San Mateo County Legislative Delegation, as of February 1, 2026:

- Assemblymember Marc Berman: Business & Professions (Chair); Elections; Governmental Organization; Insurance
- Assemblymember Diane Papan: Water, Parks, and Wildlife (Chair); Environmental Safety & Toxic Materials; Judiciary; Transportation; Utilities & Energy
- Assemblymember Catherine Stefani: Budget; Elections; Health; Judiciary; Local Government
- Senator Josh Becker: Human Services (Chair); Natural Resources and Water (Chair); Energy, Utilities & Communications; Insurance; Transportation
- Senator Scott Wiener: Elections and Constitutional Amendments (Chair); Judiciary; Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection; Public Safety; Transportation; Rules

Bills with Positions

SB 239 (Arreguín) Brown Act Teleconferencing Advisory Bodies – SUPPORT REQUEST AMENDMENTS (2-YR BILL)

This bill would authorize a subsidiary body to use alternative teleconferencing provisions and would impose requirements for notice, agenda, and public participation. The bill would require the subsidiary body to post the agenda at the primary physical meeting location. The bill would require the members of the subsidiary body to visibly appear on camera during the open portion of a meeting that is publicly accessible via the internet or other online platform and would require the subsidiary body to list a member of the subsidiary body who participates in a teleconference meeting from a remote location in the minutes of the meeting. The bill would require the legislative body that established the subsidiary body electing to use teleconferencing pursuant to these provisions to establish the subsidiary body by charter, ordinance, resolution, or other formal action to make specified findings by majority vote, before the subsidiary body uses teleconferencing for the first time and every 12 months thereafter. The bill would require the subsidiary body to approve the use of teleconference by a two-thirds vote before using teleconferencing. Elected officials serving on a subsidiary body would be required to post their location and open the location to the public when participating remotely. ***This bill is a two-year bill and was passed off the Senate Floor on January 27, 2026. This bill will be amended to no longer deal with the Brown Act.*** To see the votes on this bill, please click [here](#).

SB 601 (Allen) Waste Discharge – OPPOSE (2-YR BILL)

This bill expands the NPDES/WDR permits under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act to cover previously unregulated waterways as defined by the Clean Water Act, now including “nexus waters” to essentially mean any waters of the state not designated as navigable under federal law, except for wetlands, which are protected under the State Wetland Policy. The bill would thereby significantly increase the types and number of regulated waterways and the costs to municipalities of implementing new water quality objectives for the expanded nexus waters. Importantly, it would also expand citizen suit provisions under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act applicable to all newly regulated nexus waters, creating significant risk of liability and associated costs to municipalities and public utility

rate payers. ***This bill is a two-year bill in the second house and can move in June.*** To see the votes on this bill, please click [here](#).

Bills of Interest

SB 908 (Wiener) Senate Bill 79 Clean up – WATCH/COMMENTS/CONCERNS

As a brief reminder, SB 79 requires that a residential development proposed within one-half or one-quarter mile of a transit-oriented development stop be subject to specified development standards. Senator Wiener introduced SB 908 to act as a clean-up bill for SB 79. As a reminder, C/CAG submitted a letter on January 6, 2026 requesting the following items to be addressed in clean-up legislation: (1) extend the implementation deadline to be in alignment with initiation of the next RHNA cycle; (2) only include completed bus rapid transit stations projects; (3) reconsider impacts of the current definition of ferry service, and; (4) clarify that SB 79 does not preclude cities from requiring ground floor retail in its high-density mixed-used developments. ***We recommend C/CAG submit an updated letter to Senator Wiener.***

AB 1557 (Papan) Electric Bicycles – RECOMMEND SUPPORT

Current law defines an electric bicycle as a bicycle equipped with fully operable pedals and an electric motor that does not exceed 750 watts of power. AB 1557 clarifies the existing e-bike power restriction by specifying that the 750W limit on motors applies to maximum peak output. This closes the loophole that manufacturers have been using to build and distribute overly-powerful e-bikes. Electric bicycles that have a maximum capability of producing more than 750W will cease to be legally classified as e-bikes.

AB 1569 (Davies) Electric Bicycle Pupil Safety Program – WATCH

This bill would require each school that allows pupils in kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12 to park a class 1, 2, or 3 electric bicycle on campus during regular school hours to require pupils to complete the electric bicycle safety and training program developed by the Department of the California Highway Patrol or a related safety course as a condition for parking on campus. The bill would also require a pupil to submit proof of completion of the above-described course to their school before parking their class 1, 2, or 3 electric bicycles on the school campus during school hours. The bill would exempt schools that adopted a policy related to electric bicycle safety, on or before January 1, 2027, from these requirements.

For a full list of bills we are tracking for C/CAG, please click [here](#).

Bill	Description	Position	Status
SB 239 (Arreguin)	Brown Act – allows the use of teleconferencing for subsidiary bodies of a local agency	Support and Seek Amendments	Active / Bill will be substantially amended
SB 601 (Allen)	Expands Nexus waters protections	Oppose	Active / In Assembly Appropriations Committee
SB 677 (Wiener)	SB 79 Clean Up - makes changes to the definitions of “high-frequency commuter rail” and “commuter rail”	Watch/Comments/Concerns	Active / Bill will no longer address SB 79 (see SB 908)
SB 908 (Wiener)	SB 79 Clean Up Vehicle - details TBD	Watch/Comments/Concerns	Introduced / Pending Referral
AB 259 (Rubio)	Brown Act – allows the use of teleconferencing for board/council members	Support	Dead
AB 1557 (Papan)	Clarifies the existing e-bike power restriction of 750W applies to maximum peak output	Recommend Support	Introduced / Pending Referral
AB 1569 (Davies)	Requires pupils to complete the electric bicycle safety and training program as a condition for parking on campus	Watch	Introduced / Pending Referral



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

January 6, 2026

The Honorable Scott Wiener
1021 O Street, Room 8620
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 677 (Wiener) Comments

Dear Senator Wiener:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) represents all 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County and advocates for those who live, work, and play in San Mateo County. Supporting feasible and achievable compact development along major transit routes is an important goal to help us achieve our mobility goals. C/CAG recognizes that amendments to SB 79 are necessary to achieve its goals. C/CAG has the following comments on SB 677.

First, cities need more time to adjust and adequate time to update their plans, if necessary. We support the League of California Cities's request for a time extension for the implementation of SB 79 so that it complies with the initiation of the next RHNA cycle. Additional time will give cities the ability to potentially adjust their local plans to comply with SB 79. A July 2026 effective date does not give cities any time to budget for planning changes, much less to analyze and implement them.

Second, the inclusion of future bus rapid transit stations that have yet to be constructed could jeopardize the planning and support for bus rapid transit expansions. Current law applies SB 79 to bus rapid transit projects that are included in the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (MTC's Plan Bay Area), regardless of if the project has funding committed, has been fully environmentally cleared, or has begun construction. The potential to trigger SB 79 developments around potential bus rapid transit stations in the planning phase may actually ensure that these projects are never completed, having a detrimental impact on transit service. Instead, SB 79 should be amended to only be in effect around bus rapid transit stations once a project is complete.

Third, there needs to be more outreach and analysis on the definition of ferry service. The inclusion of ferries based on frequencies would allow residential development on any commercial zoned land within ½ mile of a qualifying ferry station. There might be commercial uses within the ½ mile zone that are incompatible with residential uses.

Fourth, the potential impact on and displacement of small businesses is a concern. Small businesses provide necessary jobs, services, and goods for our cities. Furthermore, thriving groundfloor retail is necessary for the creation of walkable downtown. Groundfloor retail improves the quality of life for the residents and creates support for the higher densities. SB 677 should include language that clarifies that SB 79 does not preclude cities from requiring groundfloor retail in its high-density mixed-use developments.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on SB 677. The C/CAG Board of Directors will continue to review and comment on this legislation as it moves through the legislative cycle.

Please contact Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director, at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Adam Rak, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

CC:
Assemblymember Papan
Assembly Member Berman
Assemblymember Stefani
State Senator Becker
State Senator Weiner
State Senator Aisha Wahab

January 4, 2026

The Honorable Scott Wiener
Member, California State Senate
1021 O Street, Suite 8620
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 677 (Wiener) Housing development: transit-oriented development.
Notice of OPPOSE UNLESS AMEND *(As of January 5, 2026)*

Dear Senator Wiener,

The League of California Cities (Cal Cities) must regretfully oppose unless amended SB 677 (Wiener), a proposed cleanup bill to SB 79 (2025). While SB 677 makes technical and clarifying changes, it also expands SB 79 by requiring approval of high-density housing near ferry stops with limited environmental review and public engagement, and by exempting mobilehome parks and RV parking sites from SB 79's requirements.

Although Cal Cities opposed SB 79 as it moved through the Legislature, we recognize that, now enacted, a comprehensive cleanup is necessary to ensure workable implementation. Cities continue to face significant challenges interpreting SB 79, and early implementation issues have already emerged. SB 677 presents an important opportunity to address these challenges; however, the measure does not go far enough.

Cal Cities believes any SB 79 cleanup must address the following key issues:

- aligning the implementation date with the 7th RHNA cycle;
- requiring clear guidance and technical assistance from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD);
- clarifying expectations related to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH); and
- providing clearer definitions and standards for implementation.

SB 79's July 1, 2026 start date should be delayed to align with the 7th RHNA cycle. Under current law, cities must implement SB 79 on the same date HCD is required to release guidance, leaving no time for cities to clearly understand requirements or develop compliant alternative plans. Aligning implementation with RHNA would allow cities the needed time to incorporate SB 79 in a coordinated manner.

Additionally, HCD must be required to provide comprehensive guidance and technical assistance, including clarity on geographic applicability, qualifying transit, capacity standards, and review of alternative plans. Without clear guidance and collaboration, cities will be setup to fail, regardless of their best intentions.



Cal Cities also seeks greater clarity on how SB 79 will be evaluated for AFFH compliance. Cities support AFFH but remain concerned that unclear expectations could result in findings of noncompliance and requirements to plan for housing beyond RHNA obligations.

Finally, SB 677 should be amended to require clearer standards related to density bonus, height limits, and geographic scope. Ambiguities in key provisions invite legal challenges and hinder timely project approval.

For these reasons, Cal Cities must oppose unless amended SB 677. We appreciate the author's continued engagement and look forward to working on additional cleanup provisions to SB 79.

Sincerely,


Brady Guertin
Legislative Advocate

Cc: The Honorable Aisha Wahab
Members, Senate Housing Committee
Alison Hughes, Chief Consultant, Senate Housing Committee
Kerry Yoshida, Consultant, Senate Republican Caucus



SB-677 Housing development: transit-oriented development. (2025-2026)

SHARE THIS:

Date Published: 01/05/2026 02:00 PM

AMENDED IN SENATE JANUARY 05, 2026

AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 09, 2025

AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 01, 2025

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE— 2025–2026 REGULAR SESSION

SENATE BILL

NO. 677

Introduced by Senator Wiener
(Coauthor: ~~Assembly Member Wicks~~)

February 21, 2025

~~An act to amend Section 4751 of the Civil Code, and to amend Sections 65852.21, 65913.4, and 66411.7 of the Government Code, relating to land use.~~ *An act to amend Sections 65912.156, 65912.157, and 65912.158 of the Government Code, relating to land use.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 677, as amended, Wiener. Housing development: ~~streamlined approvals.~~ *transit-oriented development.*

Existing law requires that a housing development project, as defined, within a specified distance of a transit-oriented development (TOD) stop, as defined, be an allowed use as a transit-oriented housing development on any site zoned for residential, mixed, or commercial development, if the development complies with certain applicable requirements, as provided. Among these requirements, existing law establishes requirements concerning height limits, density, and residential floor area ratio in accordance with a development's proximity to specified tiers of TOD stops, as provided; prohibits a proposed development under these provisions from being located on sites where the development would require demolition of housing, or that was previously used for housing, that is subject to rent or price controls, as provided; and requires a development to meet specified labor standards that require that a specified affidavit be signed under penalty of perjury, under specified circumstances. Existing law specifies that a development proposed pursuant to these provisions is eligible for streamlined, ministerial approval, as provided. Existing law defines, among other terms, the term "transit-oriented development stop" for purposes of these provisions to mean a major transit stop, as defined by specified law, and to additionally include stops on a route for which a preferred alternative has been selected or are identified in a regional transportation improvement program, that is served by specified types of transit services, exclusive of certain new transit routes or extensions not identified in the applicable regional

transportation plan on or before January 1, 2026, as specified. Existing law also defines the term "Tier 2 transit-oriented development stop" for these purposes to mean a TOD stop within an urban transit county, as defined, excluding a Tier 1 transit-oriented development stop, as defined, served by light rail transit, by high-frequency commuter rail, or by bus service meeting specified standards.

This bill would revise the definition of "transit-oriented development stop" to instead mean a major transit stop, as defined, that is served by the above-described types of transit services, exclusive of any newly planned transit route or extension that was not identified in the applicable regional transportation plan on or before January 1, 2026, as specified. The bill would also revise the definitions of "transit-oriented development stop" and "Tier 2 transit-oriented development stop" to include stops served by high-frequency ferry service, as defined. The bill would delete the definition of "rail transit" and, instead, define the term "rail transit station" for purposes of these provisions, as specified. The bill would additionally prohibit a transit-oriented housing development under these provisions from being located on an existing parcel of land or site governed under the Mobilehome Residency Law, the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law, the Mobilehome Parks Act, or the Special Occupancy Parks Act. By increasing the duties of local officials, and by expanding the crime of perjury, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

Existing law authorizes a transit agency's board of directors to adopt agency TOD zoning standards for district-owned real property located in a TOD zone, as defined, which establishes minimum zoning requirements for an agency TOD project for, among other things, residential floor area ratio, as provided.

This bill would remove the specification that the TOD zoning standards for floor area ratio be for residential floor area ratio only, thereby requiring that the ordinance establish floor area ratio standards generally for district-owned real property within the TOD zone.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for specified reasons.

~~(1) Existing law, the Planning and Zoning Law, requires a proposed housing development containing no more than 2 residential units within a single-family residential zone to be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or hearing, if the proposed housing development meets certain requirements:~~

~~This bill would require ministerial approval for proposed housing developments containing no more than 2 residential units on any lot hosting a single-family home or zoned for 4 or fewer residential units, notwithstanding any covenant, condition, or restriction imposed by a common interest development association:~~

~~Existing law prohibits ministerial approval for proposed housing developments that would require the demolition or alteration of housing that, among other things, has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years:~~

~~This bill would provide an exception to that prohibition for housing located in a county subject to a state of emergency declaration, as specified. The bill would also provide an exemption to the prohibition if a structure on the development site that includes at least one housing unit was involuntarily damaged or destroyed by an earthquake, other catastrophic event, or the public enemy:~~

~~Existing law authorizes a local agency to impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards on the proposed housing development, except as specified, including that (1) the imposed standards may not have the effect of physically precluding a unit from being at least 800 square feet in floor area, (2) a local agency's authority to impose, among other things, setbacks, is restricted, and (3) the local agency is prohibited from imposing standards that do not apply uniformly to development within the underlying zone:~~

~~This bill would revise and recast those provisions to, among other things, as to the exceptions specified above, raise the minimum size of a unit to 1,750 net habitable square feet, revise a local agency's authority to impose setbacks, and, in addition to objective standards, prohibit a local agency from imposing permitting requirements that do not apply uniformly to development within the underlying zone, except as specified. The bill would prohibit a local agency from imposing a low-income deed restriction or covenant that restricts rents, as specified. The bill would prohibit local agencies from using or imposing any standards other than those provided by its provisions:~~

~~Existing law authorizes a local agency to adopt an ordinance to implement these provisions:~~

~~This bill would require a local agency that has adopted an ordinance to submit a copy of that ordinance to the~~

Department of Housing and Community Development within 60 days after adoption, as specified. The bill would authorize the department to review the ordinance and submit written findings to the local agency as to whether the ordinance is in compliance with these provisions. Should the department conclude an ordinance is not in compliance, the bill would establish a process for the department to notify the local agency and the local agency to amend the ordinance or adopt the ordinance without changes, as provided. The bill would require the local agency to include the ordinance with the annual housing element report.

The bill would prohibit a local agency from denying a proposed housing development due to the presence of preexisting issues under specified conditions, including that the issues do not present a threat to public health and safety:

The bill would also require a local agency to provide applicants with a single application for a housing development that falls under these provisions and also involves an urban lot split to review both applications concurrently:

This bill would prohibit the imposition of an impact fee, as defined, upon a proposed housing development that is less than 1,750 square feet and require any impact fees imposed on proposed developments of 1,750 square feet or greater to be charged proportionately:

(2)The Planning and Zoning Law authorizes a development proponent to submit an application for a multifamily housing development that is subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process, as provided, and not subject to a conditional use permit, if the development satisfies specified objective planning standards. These standards include that, among other things, the development is subject to a requirement mandating a minimum percentage of below market rate housing because the locality's latest production report reflects there were fewer units of affordable housing issued building permits than required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that period and the project seeking approval dedicates 50 percent of the units to affordable housing, as specified. The standards include that the development is not located on a site that meets specified environmental criteria. The standards also include that the development is not located on a site that would require the demolition of specified types housing, including, among others, a historic structure that was placed on a national, state, or local historic register.

The bill would revise the first planning standard so that it would be met if a development meets the above-described criteria and dedicates 20 percent of the units to affordable housing, as specified. The bill would revise the second planning standard so that it would be met if a development is not located within a site that meets specified criteria. The bill would revise the third planning standard to instead include a development is not located on a site that would require the demolition of a property individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources historic or of a contributing structure located within a historic district included on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. The bill would also exempt a proposed housing development from restrictions on demolition if a structure on the development site that includes at least one housing unit was involuntarily damaged or destroyed by an earthquake, other catastrophic event, or the public enemy:

Existing law provides that a development is consistent with the objective planning standards in these provisions if there is substantial evidence that would allow a reasonable person to conclude that the development is consistent and prohibits a local government from determining a development is in conflict on a specified basis, as provided:

This bill would require the local government to bear the burden of proof in any evaluation of a development related to compliance with objective planning standards related to specified environmental criteria, as provided. The bill would require a local government to demonstrate, with a preponderance of the evidence, that the development does not comply with the applicable environmental criteria established under state or federal law, as provided:

Existing law defines a "reporting period" as either the first or last half of the regional housing needs assessment cycle:

This bill would require the reporting period to instead include each quarter of the regional housing needs assessment cycle:

(3)The Subdivision Map Act vests the authority to regulate and control the design and improvement of subdivisions in the legislative body of a local agency and sets forth procedures governing the local agency's processing, approval, conditional approval or disapproval, and filing of tentative, final, and parcel maps, and the modification of those maps. Existing law requires a local agency to ministerially approve a parcel map for an

~~urban lot split that meets certain requirements, including that one parcel is not smaller than 40% of the lot area of the original parcel and the owner of the parcel being subdivided has not previously subdivided an adjacent parcel using an urban lot split, as provided.~~

~~This bill would remove the requirement that one parcel of a split lot be no smaller than 40% of the lot area of the original parcel and would exempt both newly created lots from following certain additional requirements, as specified. The bill would also remove the prohibition against owners who have previously subdivided an adjacent parcel using an urban lot split.~~

~~Existing law prohibits ministerial approval for a proposed urban lot split that would require the demolition or alteration of housing that, among other things, has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.~~

~~The bill would exempt a lot split from restrictions on demolition if a structure on the development site that includes at least one housing unit was involuntarily damaged or destroyed by an earthquake, other catastrophic event, or the public enemy.~~

~~Existing law authorizes a local agency, except as provided, to impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards related to the design or improvements of a parcel subject to an urban lot split, including that the imposed standards may not have the effect of physically precluding a unit being constructed on either of the resulting parcels from being at least 800 square feet. Existing law allows a local agency to require specified conditions when considering an application for a parcel map for an urban lot split, including access requirements.~~

~~This bill would revise and recast those provisions to, among other things, prohibit a local agency from imposing standards that would have the effect of physically precluding an urban lot split from occurring or a unit being constructed on either of the resulting parcels from being at least 1,750 net habitable square feet. The bill would also revise and recast the restrictions on a local agency's authority to impose a setback, as provided. The bill would prohibit a local agency from imposing a driveway requirement width requirement, as provided.~~

~~This bill would specify that a local agency's access requirement may not physically preclude the lot split from occurring if another access method would facilitate the lot split.~~

~~The bill would require a local agency to provide applicants with a single application for an urban lot split that falls under these provisions and also includes a proposed housing development that falls under the provisions discussed above to review both applications concurrently.~~

~~Under existing law, a local agency must require an applicant for an urban lot split to sign an affidavit stating that the applicant intends to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence, as specified.~~

~~This bill would remove the requirement that an applicant sign an affidavit stating that the applicant intends to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence and prohibit a local agency from using or imposing any additional standards, except as specified.~~

~~Existing law authorizes a local agency to adopt an ordinance to implement these provisions:~~

~~This bill would require a local agency that has adopted an ordinance to submit a copy of that ordinance to the Department of Housing and Community Development within 60 days after adoption, as specified. The bill would authorize the department to review the ordinance and submit written findings to the local agency as to whether the ordinance is in compliance with these provisions. Should the department conclude an ordinance is not in compliance, the bill would establish a process for the department to notify the local agency and the local agency to amend the ordinance or adopt the ordinance without changes, as provided.~~

~~The bill would require a local agency to ministerially review a condominium map that would subdivide a specified housing development, as provided. The bill would prohibit the imposition of an impact fee upon an urban lot split, as specified.~~

~~(4) Existing law authorizes a local agency, by ordinance, to provide for the creation of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in areas zoned for residential use and requires ministerial approval of ADUs, as specified.~~

~~Existing law, the Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act, governs the management and operation of common interest developments. Existing law makes void and unenforceable any covenant, restriction, or condition contained in any deed, contract, security instrument, or other instrument affecting the transfer or sale of any interest in a planned development, and any provision of a governing document, that effectively prohibits or unreasonably restricts the construction or use of an accessory dwelling unit or junior accessory dwelling unit~~

~~on a lot zoned for single-family residential use that meets the above-described requirements established for those units, except as provided.~~

~~This bill would, additionally, apply the above-described provisions to housing developments and urban lot splits receiving ministerial approval, as specified.~~

~~(5) Existing law, the California Coastal Act of 1976, establishes the California Coastal Commission and prescribes the powers and responsibilities of the commission with regard to the regulation of development along the California coast.~~

~~Existing law specifies that proposed housing developments and urban lot splits considered ministerially under the above-described provisions may be required to obtain a coastal development permit, but a local agency is not required to hold public hearings for coastal development permit applications, as provided.~~

~~This bill would express the intent of the Legislature to achieve the goal of increasing the supply of housing in the coastal zone while also protecting coastal resources and public coastal access, as provided.~~

~~(6) The bill would define key terms and make nonsubstantive and conforming changes.~~

~~(7) By increasing the duties of local agencies with respect to land use regulations, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.~~

~~(8) The bill would include findings that changes proposed by this bill address a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair and, therefore, apply to all cities, including charter cities.~~

~~(9) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.~~

~~This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.~~

Vote: majority Appropriation: no Fiscal Committee: yes Local Program: yes

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 65912.156 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65912.156. For purposes of this chapter, the following definitions apply:

(a) "Adjacent" means within 200 feet of any pedestrian access point to a transit-oriented development stop.

(b) "Commuter rail" means a public ~~rail~~ transit *rail* service not meeting the standards for heavy rail or light rail, excluding California High-Speed Rail and Amtrak Long Distance Service.

(c) "Department" means the Department of Housing and Community Development.

(d) "Heavy rail transit" means a public electric railway line with the capacity for a heavy volume of traffic using high-speed and rapid acceleration passenger rail cars operating singly or in multicar trains on fixed rails, separate rights-of-way from which all other vehicular and foot traffic are excluded, and high platform loading. "Heavy rail transit" does not include California High-Speed Rail.

(e) "High-frequency commuter rail" means a *public* commuter *or intercity* rail ~~service operating station with~~ a total of at least 48 *passenger* trains *on average* per ~~day~~ *weekday* across ~~both all~~ directions, not including temporary service changes of less than one month or unplanned disruptions, and not meeting the standard for very high frequency commuter rail, at any point in the past three years.

(f) "High-frequency ferry service" means a year-round public transit ferry service operating 15 departures on average per weekday, not including temporary service changes of less than one month or unplanned disruptions, at any point in the past three years.

~~(f)~~

(g) "High-resource area" means an area designated as highest resource or high resource on the most recently adopted version of the opportunity area maps published by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee and the department.

~~(g)~~

(h) "Housing development project" has the same meaning as defined in Section 65589.5, but does not include a project of which any portion is designated for use as a hotel, motel, bed and breakfast inn, or other transient lodging. For the purposes of this subdivision, the term "other transient lodging" does not include either of the following:

(1) A residential hotel, as defined in Section 50519 of the Health and Safety Code.

(2) After the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, a resident's use or marketing of a unit as short-term lodging, as defined in Section 17568.8 of the Business and Professions Code, in a manner consistent with local law.

~~(h)~~

(i) "Light rail transit" includes streetcar, trolley, and tramway service. "Light rail transit" does not include airport people movers.

~~(i)~~

(j) "Net habitable square footage" means the finished and heated floor area fully enclosed by the inside surface of walls, windows, doors, and partitions, and having a headroom of at least six and one-half feet, including working, living, eating, cooking, sleeping, stair, hall, service, and storage areas, but excluding garages, carports, parking spaces, cellars, half-stories, and unfinished attics and basements.

~~(j)~~

(k) "Low-resource area" means an area designated as low resource on the most recently adopted version of the opportunity area maps published by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee and the department.

~~*(k)* "Rail transit" has the same meaning as defined in Section 99602 of the Public Utilities Code.~~

(l) "Major transit stop" has the meaning defined in Section 21064.3 of the Public Resources Code, including stops on a route for which a preferred alternative has been selected or are identified in an applicable federally or state-mandated transportation improvement program.

(m) "Rail transit station" means any passenger rail station, except for a passenger rail station served exclusively by a long-distance route as defined in Section 24102 of Title 49 of the United States Code.

~~(n)~~

(n) "Residential floor area ratio" means the ratio of net habitable square footage dedicated to residential use to the area of the lot.

~~(m)~~

(o) "Transit-oriented development zone" means the area within one-half mile of a transit-oriented development stop.

~~(n)~~

(p) "Tier 1 transit-oriented development stop" means a transit-oriented development stop within an urban transit county served by heavy rail transit or very high frequency commuter rail.

~~(o)~~

(q) "Tier 2 transit-oriented development stop" means a transit-oriented development stop within an urban transit county, excluding a Tier 1 transit-oriented development stop, served by light rail transit, by high-frequency commuter rail, *by high-frequency ferry service*, or by bus service meeting the standards of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 21060.2 of the Public Resources Code.

~~(p)~~

(r) "Transit-oriented development stop" means a major transit ~~stop, as defined by Section 21064.3 of the Public Resources Code, and also including stops on a route for which a preferred alternative has been selected or which are identified in a regional transportation improvement program,~~ stop that is served by heavy rail transit, very high frequency commuter rail, high frequency commuter rail, *high-frequency ferry service*, light rail transit, or

bus service within an urban transit county meeting the standards of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 21060.2 of the Public Resources Code. ~~When a new~~ *It shall not include any newly planned* transit route or extension ~~is planned~~ that was not identified in the applicable regional transportation plan on or before January 1, 2026, ~~those stops shall not be eligible as transit-oriented development stops~~ 2026, unless they would be eligible as Tier 1 transit-oriented development stops. If a county becomes an urban transit county subsequent to July 1, 2026, then bus service in that county shall remain ineligible for designation of a transit-oriented development stop.

(q)

(s) "Urban transit county" means a county with more than 15 ~~passenger~~ rail *transit* stations.

(r)

(t) "Very high frequency commuter rail" means a *public* commuter *or intercity* rail ~~service station~~ with a total of at least 72 *passenger* trains *on average* per ~~day~~ *weekday* across ~~both all~~ directions, not including temporary service changes of less than one month or unplanned disruptions, at any point in the past three years.

SEC. 2. Section 65912.157 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65912.157. (a) A housing development project shall be an allowed use as a transit-oriented housing development on any site zoned for residential, mixed, or commercial development within one-half or one-quarter mile of a transit-oriented development stop, if the development complies with the applicable of all of the following requirements:

(1) A transit-oriented housing development project allowed under this chapter shall include at least five dwelling units and meet the greater of the following:

(A) A minimum density of at least 30 dwelling units per acre.

(B) The minimum density required under local zoning, if applicable.

(2) The average total area of floor space for the proposed units in the transit-oriented housing development project shall not exceed 1,750 net habitable square feet.

(3) For a transit-oriented housing development project within one-quarter mile of a Tier 1 transit-oriented development stop, all of the following apply:

(A) A local government shall not impose any height limit less than 75 feet.

(B) A local government shall not impose any maximum density of less than 120 dwelling units per acre.

(C) A local government shall not enforce any other local development standard or combination of standards that would physically preclude achieving a residential floor area ratio of up to 3.5.

(D) A development that achieves a minimum density of 90 dwelling units per acre and that otherwise meets the eligibility requirements of Section 65915, including, but not limited to, affordability requirements, shall be eligible for additional concessions pursuant to Section 65915, as specified in subdivision (d).

(4) For a transit-oriented housing development project further than one-quarter mile but within one-half mile of a Tier 1 transit-oriented development stop, and within a city with a population of at least 35,000, all of the following apply:

(A) A local government shall not impose any height limit less than 65 feet.

(B) A local government shall not impose any maximum density standard of less than 100 dwelling units per acre.

(C) A local government shall not enforce any other local development standard or combination of standards that would physically preclude achieving a residential floor area ratio of up to 3.

(D) A development that achieves a minimum density of 75 dwelling units per acre and that otherwise meets the eligibility requirements of Section 65915, including, but not limited to, affordability requirements, shall be eligible for additional concessions pursuant to Section 65915, as specified in subdivision (d).

(5) For a transit-oriented housing development project within one-quarter mile of a Tier 2 transit-oriented development stop, all of the following apply:

(A) A local government shall not impose any height limit less than 65 feet.

(B) A local government shall not impose any maximum density standard of less than 100 dwelling units per acre.

(C) A local government shall not enforce any other local development standard or combination of standards that would physically preclude achieving a residential floor area ratio of up to 3.

(D) A development that achieves a minimum density of 75 dwelling units per acre and that otherwise meets the eligibility requirements of Section 65915, including, but not limited to, affordability requirements, shall be eligible for additional concessions pursuant to Section 65915, as specified in subdivision (d).

(6) For a transit-oriented housing development project further than one-quarter mile but within one-half mile of a Tier 2 transit-oriented development stop, and within a city with a population of at least 35,000, all of the following apply:

(A) A local government shall not impose any height limit less than 55 feet.

(B) A local government shall not impose any maximum density standard of less than 80 dwelling units per acre.

(C) A local government shall not enforce any other local development standard or combination of standards that would physically preclude achieving a residential floor area ratio of up to 2.5.

(D) A development that achieves a minimum density of 60 dwelling units per acre and that otherwise meets the eligibility requirements of Section 65915, including, but not limited to, affordability requirements, shall be eligible for additional concession pursuant to Section 65915, as specified in subdivision (d).

(b) For purposes of this chapter, the distance of a transit-oriented housing development project from a transit-oriented development stop shall be measured in a straight line from the nearest edge of the parcel containing the proposed project to a pedestrian access point for the transit-oriented development stop.

(c) A local government may still enact and enforce standards, including an inclusionary zoning requirement that do not, alone or in concert, prevent achieving the applicable development standards of subdivision (a). A local government shall not adopt any requirement, including, but not limited to, increased fees or inclusionary zoning requirements, that applies to a project solely or partially on the basis that the project is seeking approval as a transit-oriented housing development, except as necessary for the requirements of this chapter.

(d) A transit-oriented housing development project under this section shall be eligible for a density bonus, incentives or concessions, waivers or reductions of development standards, and parking ratios pursuant to Section 65915 or a local density bonus program, using the density allowed under this section as the base density. If a development proposes a height under this section in excess of the local height limit, then a local government shall not be required to grant a waiver, incentive, or concession pursuant to Section 65915 for additional height beyond that specified in this section, except as provided in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65915. A development shall be eligible for the following additional concessions, if it meets the applicable density threshold specified for its location:

(1) For a development providing housing for extremely low income households, three additional concessions.

(2) For a development providing housing for very low income households, two additional concessions.

(3) For a development providing housing for low-income households, one additional concession.

(e) Notwithstanding any other law, a transit-oriented housing development project that meets any of the eligibility criteria under subdivision (a) and is immediately adjacent to a transit-oriented development stop shall be eligible for an adjacency intensifier to increase the height limit by an additional 20 feet, the maximum density standard by an additional 40 dwelling units per acre, and the residential floor area ratio by 1 prior to the application of Section 65915.

(f) A development proposed pursuant to this section shall comply with Section 66300.6, including any local requirements or processes implementing the provisions of Section 66300.6. This subdivision shall apply to any city or county.

(g) A development proposed pursuant to this section shall comply with any applicable local demolition and antidisplacement standards established through a local ordinance.

(h) A development proposed pursuant to this section shall not be located on ~~either~~ *any* of the following:

(1) A site containing more than two units where the development would require the demolition of housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power that has been occupied by tenants within the past seven years.

(2) A site that was previously used for more than two units of housing that were demolished within seven years before the development proponent submits an application under this section and any of the units were subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power.

(3) An existing parcel of land or site governed under the Mobilehome Residency Law (Chapter 2.5 (commencing with Section 798) of Title 2 of Part 2 of Division 2 of the Civil Code), the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law (Chapter 2.6 (commencing with Section 799.20) of Title 2 of Part 2 of Division 2 of the Civil Code), the Mobilehome Parks Act (Part 2.1 (commencing with Section 18200) of Division 13 of the Health and Safety Code), or the Special Occupancy Parks Act (Part 2.3 (commencing with Section 18860) of Division 13 of the Health and Safety Code).

(i) A development proposed pursuant to this section shall include housing for lower income households by complying with one of the following requirements:

(1) (A) Any of the following:

(i) At least 7 percent of the total units, as defined in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (9) of subdivision (o) of Section 65915, are dedicated to extremely low income households, as defined in Section 50106 of the Health and Safety Code.

(ii) At least 10 percent of the total units, as defined in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (9) of subdivision (o) of Section 65915, are dedicated to very low income households, as defined in Section 50105 of the Health and Safety Code.

(iii) At least 13 percent of the total units, as defined in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (9) of subdivision (o) of Section 65915, are dedicated to lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code.

(B) This paragraph shall not apply to any development of 10 units or less.

(C) All units dedicated to extremely low income, very low income, and low-income households pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall meet both of the following:

(i) The units shall have an affordable housing cost, as defined in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code, or an affordable rent, as defined in Section 50053 of the Health and Safety Code.

(ii) The development proponent shall agree to, and the local agency shall ensure, the continued affordability of all affordable rental units included pursuant to this section for 55 years and all affordable ownership units included pursuant to this section for a period of 45 years.

(2) If a local inclusionary housing requirement mandates a higher percentage of affordable units or a deeper level of affordability than that described in paragraph (1), then the local inclusionary housing requirement mandate shall apply in place of the requirements in paragraph (1).

(j) A development proposed pursuant to this chapter shall be consistent with the height, noise, and safety standards of an adopted airport land use compatibility plan or Department of Defense Air Installation Compatible Use Zones developed pursuant to Section 21675 of the Public Utilities Code, and of otherwise applicable objective fire safety standards established pursuant to the California Building Code, the California Fire Code, the California, Wildland-Urban Interface Code, the Health and Safety Code, the Public Resources Code, or Chapter 6.8 (commencing with Section 51175) of Part 1 of Division 1 of Title 5 of this code.

(k) Any transit-oriented housing development pursuant to this section shall meet the labor standards of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (F), and (G) of paragraph (8) of subdivision (a) of Section 65913.4 for any building over 85 feet in height, which shall be applicable to the building.

(l) For purposes of subdivision (j) of Section 65589.5, a proposed housing development project that is consistent with the applicable standards from this chapter, as well as applicable local objective general plan and zoning standards that do not alone or in concert prevent achieving those standards, and as modified by any incentive, concession, or waiver under Section 65915, shall be deemed consistent, compliant, and in conformity with an

applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision. This subdivision shall not require a ministerial approval process or modify the requirements of Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code.

(m) Beginning on January 1, 2027, a local government that denies a housing development project meeting the requirements of this section that is located in a high-resource area shall be presumed to be in violation of the Housing Accountability Act (Section 65589.5) and immediately liable for penalties pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (k) of Section 65589.5, unless the local government demonstrates, pursuant to the standards in subdivisions (j) and (o) of Section 65589.5, that it has a health, life, or safety reason for denying the project.

(n) This section shall not apply to a local agency until July 1, 2026, unless the local agency adopts an ordinance or local transit-oriented development alternative plan deemed compliant by the department before July 1, 2026. It shall not apply within an unincorporated area of a county until the 7th regional housing needs allocation cycle.

SEC. 3. Section 65912.158 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65912.158. (a) For the purposes of this section, "agency transit-oriented development project" means a housing development project or mixed use residential project that meets all of the following requirements:

- (1) A minimum of 50 percent of the total square footage of the project is dedicated to residential purposes.
- (2) A minimum of 20 percent of the total number of units shall be restricted for the affordable lower income households and shall be subject to a recorded affordability restriction for at least 55 years in the case of rental units and 45 years in the case of owner occupied units, unless a local ordinance or the terms of federal, state, or local tax credit, or other project financing requires a longer period of affordability.
- (3) The average total floor area of floor space for the proposed units in the housing development project shall not exceed 1,750 net habitable square feet.
- (4) The parcel or parcels on which the project is located is an infill site, as defined in Section 21061.3 of the Public Resources Code.
- (5) The transit-oriented development parcels on which the transit-oriented development project would be located was not acquired through eminent domain on or after July 1, 2025.
- (6) The parcels on which the transit-oriented development project would be located are owned by the agency and either:
 - (A) The parcels are adjacent to a transit-oriented development stop for which the agency operates service, or form a contiguous area adjacent to such a transit-oriented development stop.
 - (B) At least 75 percent of the project area is located within one-half mile of a transit-oriented development stop for which the agency operates service or plans to provide service and was owned by the agency on or before January 1, 2026.

(b) (1) A transit agency's board of directors may adopt by resolution agency transit-oriented development zoning standards for district-owned real property located in a transit-oriented development zone. These standards shall establish minimum local zoning requirements for height, density, ~~residential~~ floor area ratio, and allowed uses, that shall apply to an agency transit-oriented development project, that shall be consistent with Section 65912.157.

- (2) Adopted agency transit-oriented development zoning standards shall establish, for each transit station, the lowest permissible maximum standard for height, density, and ~~residential~~ floor area ratio, and a list of approved residential, retail, and commercial uses.
- (3) The agency transit-oriented development zoning standards adopted by the board of directors shall not adopt a lowest permissible maximum standard for density or ~~residential~~ floor area ratio below the level permitted under Section 65912.157, and shall not prohibit residential use.
- (4) The agency transit-oriented development zoning standards shall not establish density standards that exceed 200 percent of the maximum density established in Section 65912.157.

(c) The adoption of, and amendments to, the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards shall comply with all of the following:

(1) The transit agency shall hold a public hearing to receive public comment on the proposed agency transit-oriented development zoning standards or proposed changes to the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards. The transit agency shall conduct direct outreach to relevant local governments and to communities of concern around each station. Before or during the scoping meeting, the transit agency shall consult with each local government in which the station is located, as well as any relevant infrastructure agencies. The consultation required pursuant to this section shall include all of the following:

(A) A review of the housing needs of the jurisdiction.

(B) A review of the transit-oriented development approved and built in the past year in the jurisdiction.

(C) A review of any transit-oriented development projects proposed by the transit agency in the jurisdiction for the past year.

(D) A discussion of any obstacles to development of any project proposed by the transit agency.

(2) Not less than 30 days before a public hearing of the board to consider the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards, the transit agency shall provide public notice and make the draft standards available to the public.

(3) The board shall adopt or reject any proposed agency transit-oriented development zoning standards at a publicly noticed meeting of the board not less than 30 days following the original public hearing.

(d) Objective standards adopted pursuant to paragraph (b) shall not preempt or otherwise displace local discretionary standards that apply to hotel, motel, bed and breakfast, or other transient lodging use, including short-term lodging, as defined in Section 17568.8 of the Business and Professions Code. For the purposes of this subdivision, the term "other transient lodging" does not include a residential hotel, as defined in Section 50519 of the Health and Safety Code.

(e) Where local zoning is inconsistent with the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards for a station, the local jurisdiction may adopt a local zoning ordinance that conforms to the transit-oriented development zoning standards.

(f) (1) A local government shall not be required to approve any height limit in excess of the standard for development adjacent to the transit-oriented development stop under Section 65912.157.

(2) The transit agency shall make a finding as to whether the local zoning ordinance conforms to the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards. Local zoning shall remain in place unless the transit agency determines that it does not conform to the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards. If, according to the transit agency's finding, the local zoning ordinance does not conform to the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards after two years of the date that the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards are adopted by the board for that station, the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards shall become the local zoning for any district-owned parcels that are eligible under this section, except for any height limit in excess of the standard for development adjacent to the transit-oriented development stop under Section 65912.157. For each station, a local jurisdiction may update zoning for transit agency-owned land to comply with agency transit-oriented development zoning standards until the time that the transit agency enters into an exclusive negotiating agreement with a developer for an agency transit-oriented development project.

(g) (1) The transit agency's approval of agency transit-oriented development zoning standards shall be subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code). The district shall serve as the lead agency for California Environmental Quality Act review for transit-oriented development zoning standards.

(2) Any subsequent California Environmental Quality Act review of rezoning to conform with agency transit-oriented development zoning standards, and of eligible transit-oriented development projects proposed and on district-owned land, shall incorporate the environmental review document certified for the transit-oriented development zoning standards consistent with Section 21094 of the Public Resources Code. A public agency shall not prepare an environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration for rezoning pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (f) to implement agency transit-oriented development zoning standards or for a transit-oriented development project subsequent to the transit agency's certification of an environmental review document for approval of agency transit-oriented development zoning standards unless the public agency finds, based on substantial evidence, that the rezoning or transit-oriented development project creates

a significant effect on the environment that was not analyzed in the prior environmental review document, and mitigated or avoided.

(h) A local agency may adopt objective, written development standards, conditions, and policies that apply to development on district-owned property, provided that they demonstrate their consistency with the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards. In the event that the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards, objective planning standards, general plan, or design review standards are mutually inconsistent, the agency transit-oriented development zoning standards shall be the controlling standards. To the extent that the zoning standards do not resolve inconsistencies, the general plan shall be the controlling standard.

(i) Zoning in effect as a result of this section shall be considered the same as locally approved zoning for all purposes, including the Density Bonus Law and the Housing Accountability Act.

(j) Any agency transit-oriented development project shall comply with the antidisplacement requirements of Section 66300.6.

(k) A local government shall not be required to approve any height limit under this section greater than the height limit specified in this chapter for development adjacent to the relevant tier of a transit-oriented development stop. A transit agency shall not set a maximum height, density, or ~~residential~~ floor area ratio below that which would be allowed for the site under this chapter.

(l) If nonresidential development is included in an agency transit-oriented development project, at least 25 percent of the total planned units affordable to lower income households shall be made available for lease or sale and permitted for use and occupancy before or at the same time with every 25 percent of nonresidential development made available for lease or sale and permitted for use and occupancy.

(m) The development applicant for an agency transit-oriented development project proposed pursuant to this section shall certify that the labor standards in paragraphs (8) and (9) of subdivision (a) of Section 65913.4 will be met in project construction, and those standards shall apply if the project is approved by the public agency. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, this subdivision shall not apply if all contractors and subcontractors performing work on the development are subject to a project labor agreement with the transit agency that was entered into before July 1, 2026, that requires the payment of prevailing wages to all construction workers employed in the execution of the development and provides for the enforcement of that obligation through an arbitration procedure. For the purposes of this subdivision, "project labor agreement," has the same meaning as set forth in paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section 2500 of the Public Contract Code.

SEC. 4. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act or because costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 12, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Written Communications - Information Only (2 Letters)

(For further information, please contact Mima Crume at mcrume@smcgov.org)

BACKGROUND

This item is for information only and is available for review as attachments at the link provided below.

1. **2/5/2026** – The Honorable Sam Liccardo RE: Thank you for your support in the FY2026 Community Project Funding process.
2. **12/18/2025** – MTC Public Information, Attn: Draft Plan/Draft EIR Comment RE: Comments on MTC/ABAG Draft Plan Bay Area 2050+ Report and Environmental Impact Report.

ATTACHMENTS

1. The written communications are available on the *C/CAG website*. See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Board Meeting at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>)