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Harvey Rarback, Mayor
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This agenda contains a brief description of each item to be considered. Those wishing to address the City Council on any matter not listed on the Agenda, but within the jurisdiction of the City Council to resolve, may come forward to the podium during the Public Forum portion of the Agenda and will have a maximum of three minutes to discuss their item. Those wishing to speak on a Public Hearing matter will be called forward at the appropriate time during the Public Hearing consideration.

Please Note: Anyone wishing to present materials to the City Council, please submit seven copies to the City Clerk.

Copies of written documentation relating to each item of business on the Agenda are on file in the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall and the Half Moon Bay Library where they are available for public inspection. If requested, the agenda shall be available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132.) Information may be obtained by calling 650-726-8271.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, special assistance for participation in this meeting can be obtained by contacting the City Clerk’s Office at 650-726-8271. A 48-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable accommodations to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II).

http://hmbcity.com/

MEETING WILL CONCLUDE BY 11:00 PM UNLESS OTHERWISE EXTENDED BY COUNCIL VOTE
ROLL CALL / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. RESOLUTIONS AND STAFF REPORTS

2.A. HOUSING STUDY SESSION

Staff Recommendation: Receive a presentation and provide direction regarding the following housing initiatives: 1) Affordable Housing Fund; 2) Community Land Trusts; 3) Tenant Protection Measures; 4) Land Use Policy; and 5) Zoning Regulations.

STAFF REPORT

ATTACHMENT 1
ATTACHMENT 2
ATTACHMENT 3
ATTACHMENT 4

2.B. MID-SESSION LEGISLATION / GRANTS UPDATE

Staff Recommendation: Receive an update from Townsend Public Affairs on legislation and grants.

STAFF REPORT

2.C. MAIN STREET BRIDGE REHABILITATION UPDATE (CIP PROJECT NO. 759)

Staff Recommendation:

Receive report and by motion, accept the recommendation of the Main Street Bridge Advisory Committee on the barrier design for the Main Street Bridge Rehabilitation Project.

STAFF REPORT

ATTACHMENT 1
ATTACHMENT 2

2.D. CARTER PARK RENOVATION PROJECT UPDATE – PHASE ONE

Staff Recommendation:

Receive an update and informational presentation on Phase One of the Carter Park Renovation Project (Conceptual Design).

STAFF REPORT

ATTACHMENT 1

3. ORDINANCES AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.A. 2019-2020 SEWER SERVICE CHARGES
Staff Recommendation:
Conduct a public hearing and adopt a resolution approving the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Sewer Service Charges, direct staff to file the assessment roll and authorize the County Controller to place the assessment charges on the County of San Mateo Property Tax Roll and direct staff to bill assessments directly that are not on the tax roll.

STAFF REPORT

RESOLUTION

FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC FORUM

COMMISSION / COMMITTEE UPDATES

ADJOURNMENT
BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HALF MOON BAY

AGENDA REPORT

For meeting of: July 16, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

VIA: Bob Nisbet, City Manager

FROM: Jill Ekas, Community Development Director
      Bill Lowell, Housing Consultant to the City

TITLE: HOUSING STUDY SESSION

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive the presentation and provide direction regarding the following housing initiatives:
1. Affordable Housing Fund
2. Community Land Trusts
3. Tenant Protection Measures
4. Land Use Policy
5. Zoning Regulations

FISCAL IMPACT:
The fiscal impact of this agenda item is primarily limited to the costs of contract services and
staff time. Implementing any of the associated programs can be conducted with current staffing
levels, the support of the City Attorney’s office, and specialty contract services estimated to not
exceed $100,000 over the course of this fiscal year. The adopted budget for contract planning
services is adequate to cover this expense.

STRATEGIC ELEMENT:
This action supports all of the Strategic Plan Elements including Infrastructure and
Environment, Healthy Communities and Public Safety, Fiscal Sustainability, and Inclusive
Governance.

BACKGROUND:
The Half Moon Bay City Council has identified affordable housing as a multi-year City priority.
City Council specifically cited their desire to help facilitate development of new multi-family
rental development affordable to extremely low, very low- and low-income households. To that
end, numerous approaches need to be pursued.

The purpose of this report is to provide information about a wide range of housing topics that
are of interest to City Council and the community. To facilitate moving into these discussions, a
few background data points about Half Moon Bay’s population and housing inventory, as well as terms associated with affordable housing are presented below.

As of January 1, 2019, Half Moon Bay had a population of approximately 12,600 and approximately 4,700 housing units. Of these, approximately 70 percent are owner-occupied and 30 percent are renter-occupied. As documented in the 2015-2023 certified Housing Element, Half Moon Bay has almost 400 rental units with some form of affordability restriction for lower income households. These units comprise most of the larger multi-family developments and account for over 25 percent of the City’s rental housing stock. As compared to San Mateo County overall, the City has more mobile homes (above 10 percent of all City units versus 1 percent Countywide) and fewer multi-family (5+ units) buildings (10 percent of all City units versus 27 percent Countywide).

Average rental asking prices vary widely by housing type and size. A reasonable approximation for average asking rent is $3,100 per month. In order to afford this rent using the federal government standard of 30 percent of gross household income for rent, a household would need to earn approximately $120,000 per year. 25 percent of households in Half Moon Bay have income of less than $50,000 per year ($24 per hour). The high cost of living places an especially severe strain on low income families.

Recent residential development activity in Half Moon Bay includes large single-family homes as well as smaller infill units. Following adoption of the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) ordinance in December 2018, the City has seen an uptick in applications for these units. So far in 2019 there have been 15 applications (with one more currently pending) as counted through issuance of Measure D certificates, in contrast to the previous three years which saw only 9 ADUs (3 per year). Almost 20 units in multi-family and mixed-use developments are also in the pipeline. These include units that are currently under construction, were recently entitled, or for which the City is in receipt of an application. These units are spread out over 7 separate projects, most located within the City’s Town Center.

City Council has also approved two subdivisions in the Town Center that are required to include at least 20 percent of the total units as restricted and affordable to lower income households. No development proposals are pending for either site at this time, and staff will update Council should one come forward. In combination these two sites could yield at least 28 units (consisting of 10 single-family homes, 11 duplexes, and 2 triplexes), of which at least 9 units are to be affordable. The yield could be higher with incorporation of ADUs, use of the density bonus, or other mechanisms. Staff continues to work with interested developers on how to achieve higher buildouts using smaller, and thereby inherently more affordable, units.

---

1 State of California Department of Finance, 2019
2 American Community Survey, 2013-2017
3 US Census ACS 5-year
4 Town Center is defined pursuant to the Half Moon Bay draft Land Use Plan, Chapter 2. Development, December 2018
Generally, ADUs, manufactured homes and smaller multi-family developments including duplexes, triplexes and garden apartment comprise what has been referred to as the “missing middle” in urbanized areas. These unit types are not economically viable in higher density urban settings, nor can they compete with the Bay Area’s lucrative single-family market which remains strong despite the extreme prices of these units due to the high wealth of the Bay Area. However, in Half Moon Bay, the missing middle is an excellent fit within the City’s land use environment (policy and zoning) and suited to the sites that are most viable for development. Thus, in addition to focusing on how to bring forth a new affordable rental housing development, shifting the City’s market rate housing production to smaller unit types, especially within the Town Center, is already actively occurring.

The term “affordable housing” is used to refer to housing units that carry deed restrictions limiting rental rates or resale prices. The federal government defines affordable housing as housing that costs no more than 30 percent of household income (before taxes). In general, it is the price that a household can afford to pay for housing and still have enough income to pay for other essentials such as food and transportation.

Affordable housing is priced below market rates according to the above definition. The creation of these below market rate units requires subsidization. There are many sources of subsidy available from the federal, state and county governments. The largest source of subsidy, typically 50 percent of needed funding in a multi-family project, is federal and state tax credits. Additional local municipal funds were typically supplied by redevelopment agencies. Since the end of redevelopment in California several years ago, localities have developed new sources for affordable housing funds. These local sources are extremely important in early project development and are increased many times over by other funding sources.

There is an additional important way that deed restricted affordable housing is created in the private market. Cities such as Half Moon Bay have adopted inclusionary ordinances that require developers of multi-family projects to include a small percentage of below market rate units in the overall development. In such cases, the costs are factored into the overall development costs and there is no public subsidy. San Mateo County’s Home for All initiative prepared a glossary of terms that City Council may find it to be a helpful reference during the study session (Attachment 1).

DISCUSSION:
Affordable housing has been a multi-year City Council priority. In FY 18-19, the City completed:

- Home for All Community Conversations about Housing - July and October
- Affordable Housing Agreement for 940 Main Street subdivision – August 2018
- ADU Ordinance – December 2018
- Housing Consultant – Spring 2019
- Establishment of an Architectural Advisory Committee – June 2019
Significant progress was been made on these challenging projects:

- Draft Land Use Plan Chapters - in review with the Planning Commission – November 2018 – June 2019 (Public Works, the final chapter, is pending)
- Tenant Protection Measures Draft Ordinance – January 2019

For several years, as part of the on-going focus on affordable housing, staff continues to pursue opportunities for affordable housing projects. This involves meeting with affordable housing developers, educating market rate developers about their options, looking for appropriate sites, and seeking funding sources. These activities will continue in this fiscal year.

For FY 19-20, City Council confirmed their interest in the affordable housing fund, community land trusts, and tenant protection measures. Those efforts will be supported by the City’s housing consultant. In addition to the Council directed programs, staff has identified a need to improve the City’s municipal code to better facilitate affordable, inclusionary, and market rate housing developments, especially within the Town Center. Staff, in collaboration with the City Attorney, is preparing to bring forward a suite of zoning amendments for Planning Commission consideration this month.

At the study session, the housing consultant and staff will present on the following topics: affordable housing fund, community land trusts, tenant protection measures, strategies for housing policy, strategies for zoning regulations, as well as additional considerations.

**Affordable Housing Fund:**
The City of Half Moon Bay’s Affordable Housing Fund (AHF) contains approximately $2.5M. The fund was first established with affordable housing in lieu fees contributed from the first three phases of the Carnoustie subdivision pursuant to a development agreement. That initial contribution amounted to over $2M at the end of the FY 18-19. In the FY 19-20 budget, City Council approved $400K of general fund monies to increase the AHF, in line with their continued focus on affordable housing. Council confirmed that a priority for FY 19-20 is to establish means for allocating and replenishing the AHF over time.

At the study session, the City’s housing consultant and staff will present and support City Council in a discussion that will lead to the following:

- Guidelines for the Use of Affordable Housing Funds
- Process for Affordable Housing Fund Distribution
- Affordable Housing Funding Sources

The following information in this staff report provides background for City Council to prepare for that discussion.

**Guidelines for the Use of Affordable Housing Funds:** Currently, 16 of the 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County have ordinances that provide mechanisms for generating affordable housing funds such as: in-lieu fees for new housing development, dedicated hotel occupancy taxes, and/or impact fees on new housing and/or commercial development. In general, the enabling ordinances provide a very brief description of examples of potential uses, but no direction for
eligibility or prioritization of uses. The City of Half Moon Bay’s Below Market Rate Ordinance includes means for City Council to approve payment of fees in-lieu of providing affordable units within subdivisions or other types of development proposals for ownership housing involving ten or more units.

Among all of the jurisdictions in San Mateo County, only Redwood City has adopted a policy regarding the allocation of affordable housing funds. East Palo Alto has included spending goals and targets in its adopted housing strategic plan. San Mateo County includes priorities in its annual notice of funding availability (NOFA) process to award its affordable housing funds. Indeed, a wider search around the Bay Area and the remainder of the state finds only a few policies and these tend to be in large jurisdictions that are also entitlement areas for Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME funds and which historically may have received significant redevelopment funds. Their policies reflect the need to address funding that derives from a variety of sources that operate within differing regulatory goals and restrictions. Policy examples from other jurisdictions are contained in Attachment 2.

Excerpts from the County’s Affordable Housing NOFA funding priorities and guidelines are included in Attachment 3. The purpose for providing this as a reference document to this report is to highlight local context for how affordable housing development proposals are rated. Half Moon Bay does not currently have, nor is it anticipated to have high-density zoning, mass transit, or other characteristics necessary to qualify as a priority area for infill housing relative to other urban areas in the County. Consequently, Half Moon Bay will need to establish its own criteria identifying the qualities required for sites and projects suited to the local needs which are distinct from most of the rest of the County. Staff has started this process through the Land Use Plan update.

As part of the research conducted for this report, the City’s housing consultant contacted the San Mateo County Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) and housing consultants who support San Mateo County’s 21 Elements initiative. Both sources cautioned against adoption of overly specific policies, and instead suggested that small and medium size cities consider adopting “guiding principles” combined with eligible uses. This is similar to Redwood City’s recently established approach wherein the guiding principles and eligible uses leave sufficient flexibility to respond to emerging opportunities, evolving community needs and changing market conditions within a firm framework.

Considerations for guiding principles include the following:
- **Availability**: Create and preserve the greatest number of affordable housing units.
- **Affordability**: Increase the percentage of affordable units at the most deeply affordable levels.

---

5 21 Elements is co-sponsored and coordinated by the San Mateo County Department of Housing (DOH) and the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG). It is a collaborative planning project that helps all the jurisdictions in San Mateo County address their housing needs and is a resource for the 21 San Mateo County jurisdictions (twenty cities and San Mateo County) for Housing Element updates.
• Local Critical Work Force: Increase ability to provide housing at affordable levels for teachers and other school personnel, emergency and law enforcement personnel and/or city employees. In Half Moon Bay, the local critical work force could also be defined to include workers in the service and agriculture industries which are priority Coastal Zone land uses.

• Supportive: Increase ability to serve high-risk populations such as senior or disabled or homeless households.

• Prevention: Increase housing security for renters and homeowners at risk of homelessness through the use of emergency aid.

• Leverage: Favor uses that have the ability to supplement project funding with other local, state and federal sources.

Examples of eligible uses include:

• Purchase land for affordable housing: Bank land directly or by funding a developer of affordable housing to purchase a suitable site.

• Support construction of affordable housing: Provide funding for pre-development expenses.

• Leverage other funds: Provide permanent funding for affordable housing development to add a local layer that supports leveraging larger funding sources; explore tagging onto the County NOFA process.

• Create deeper levels of affordability: Provide funds to increase the affordability of existing affordable units in either 100 percent affordable or inclusionary developments.

• Preserve existing affordable housing stock: Provide funding for rehab loans with deed restrictions or a purchase by a not-for-profit

• Establish affordable ADUs: Finance development of ADUs in exchange for affordability deed restrictions for low income renters.

• Support homelessness prevention: Provide funding to local service providers.

• Coordinate with other agencies: Seek opportunities with local public entity landowners (SamTrans, schools districts).

Process for Affordable Housing Fund Distribution: Distribution options include formal competitive processes such as a NOFA, less structured competitive processes that might center on a request for proposals (RFP) designed to bring forth creative proposals that can be further developed by the applicant and the city, and/or an over the counter (OTC) process.

• Notice of Funding Availability: A formal NOFA is useful when a significant amount of funding is available for a well-defined purpose that is expected to be of interest to several providers who wish to compete for the funds. This formal process is extremely time consuming for all parties and assumes a fixed time schedule. An example is the County’s Department of Housing which issues a NOFA once every year for developers of large affordable multi-family projects.
• Request for Proposals: The less formal RFP is typically used for services, but could also be used for development related expenses. The relative informality of the RFP enables the City and applicant to develop the service or project together.

• “Over the Counter:” An OTC process provides maximum flexibility. Applications can be received at any time and, within guidelines and eligibility criteria, for any type of proposed use. Appropriate City oversight can be protected by setting financial limits on the amount of funding available, per project, per unit, and/or over a specified period of time. This approach simplifies the approval process. For example, City Council could establish clear criteria for per unit allocations according to affordability levels. Staff would then be able to assure affordable housing developers in early phases of project development about the City’s most likely level of financial support. City Council would have ultimate approval authority.

If and when the City is able to consider a larger tax credit project, the City’s housing consultant recommends that the City piggyback onto the County’s competitive process. Other than large tax credit projects, the City’s housing consultant also recommends that the City maintain its flexibility to respond to projects and programs by using RFP and OTC processes.

Affordable Housing Funding Sources: Sixteen jurisdictions in the county have enacted mechanisms to fund the development of new affordable housing. The most common method for doing so is the adoption of commercial and/or residential impact fees (fourteen jurisdictions have adopted either or both types of fees). Other jurisdictions collect in lieu fees in connection with an inclusionary requirement, as Half Moon Bay does, or dedicate a portion of another fee or tax such as a hotel occupancy tax.

Impact fees for commercial developments are the most popular mechanism. To that end, the Community Development Director has already committed to participate in the 21 Elements pending commercial impact fee nexus study. The cost of this study to the City will be under $10,000, which can be funded through the Planning contract services budget. Due to the strong economy, reasonable commercial impact fees are not an impediment to commercial development. In a deep or long recession, a City could always consider temporary adjustments if the fees become a barrier to desired development.

Residential impact fees can be applied to all new dwellings or reserved for larger multi-family developments where fees can be spread across a larger number of future occupants. Considering the region’s housing shortage, reasonable questions can be raised with regard to adding additional costs to such crucially needed development. Staff suggests that City Council consider prioritizing development as established in the Draft Land Use Plan update wherein the Town Center has been identified as the most appropriate location for infill residential and mixed-use development. Staff does not recommend establishing residential impact fees for mixed-use or multi-family residential development within the Town Center or within multi-family zoning districts. Such impact fees would add to the already high cost to develop housing locally, especially with the increasingly high cost of nonpriority water allocations. However,
Council may wish to consider establishing impact fees outside the Town Center for low density market rate development, such as single-family homes.

**Community Land Trusts:**
The community land trust (CLT) is a model of affordable housing and community development. CLTs are nonprofit organizations that hold land in perpetuity for the benefit of the users of the land. In the case of affordable housing, CLTs own the land and/or the buildings, so that residents can buy or rent their dwellings at **below market prices**.

CLTs can be useful for acquiring vacant or developed land with the intention of developing or preserving housing at affordable levels. Most CLTs, especially in California, are small in size and limited in experience. Therefore, CLT frequently partner with experienced developers and property managers.

Distinct from CLTs, cities, public agencies and redevelopment agencies (in states other than California) also can acquire to facilitate affordable housing development. Land so acquired is then sold or leased on a long-term basis to a housing developer that commits to a community benefit such as affordability. In Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County and its Housing Authority acquired land and leased it for 99 years to MidPen Housing for the development of Half Moon Village (160 affordable units) and Mercy Housing for the development of Coastside Senior Housing (40 affordable units plus a senior center and adult day health center).

In preparation for the study session, City Council may wish to review additional resources about CLTs. Two recent studies that contain useful current information about CLT’s are:

- Community Land Trusts: Irving, April 2019:  
- Strategies for Sustainable Growth in Community Land Trusts, March 2019:  

The Grounded Solutions Network is a wealth of information on numerous affordable housing topics including CLTs ([www.groundedsolutions.org](http://www.groundedsolutions.org)). Locally, the Bay Area Consortium of Community Land Trusts (BACCLT) provides a central collaborative function for local CLT’s and states their purpose as:

“**BACCLT’s goals include collectively sharing efforts, skills and resources to efficiently facilitate marketing, resale listings, and access to additional mortgage financing; supporting the development of new local CLTs; and providing additional resident, homeowner support, education and community building.**”

Finally, the Wikipedia listing (Attachment 4) is helpful for a quick summary regarding the background and various terms and components of CLTs.
The City’s housing consultant will be prepared to support City Council in a discussion on this topic at the study session. In particular, he will be prepared to highlight local implementation, the role of cities, and the prospects for encouraging CLTs in Half Moon Bay.

**Tenant Protection Measures:**
Over a course of meetings in fall 2018, City Council provided input and directed staff to prepare a draft tenant protection ordinance for community input. In January 2019, Council considered a draft ordinance at a study session. Throughout these sessions it became apparent that there is both significant support for tenant protection measures as well as serious concern about them. Council directed staff to conduct additional research regarding tenant protection measures and then to proceed with community engagement before returning with a revised ordinance for Council consideration. Staff has completed research; however, concurrent with this work, the state legislature brought forth numerous bills with both tenant protection and rent stabilization measures that could supplement and/or supersede any City specific regulations. Thus, instead of duplicating the effort, staff has been following the progress of these bills and providing updates to the Council Legislative Affairs subcommittee.

The state legislature is currently considering AB 1482, which would impose a variety of tenant protection measures statewide. Specifically, it would impose “just cause” eviction standards on all residential tenancies of 12 months or more, require a one-month relocation payment for “no-fault just cause” evictions, such as when the owner wants to move in or remove the unit from the market, and limit annual rent increases to 7 percent plus a cost of living increase, or 10 percent, whichever is less. There are some exceptions, including for most detached single-family homes and for homes constructed within the last 10 years. Also note that AB 1482 is intended as an emergency measure, and would automatically sunset in 2023. AB 1482 is set for hearing in the Senate Judiciary committee on July 9, 2019; media reports indicate that the rent increase limits are more likely to move forward than the other aspects of the bill. During this session, the legislature also considered amending the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act to allow broader application of rent control (AB 36). This measure, however, does not appear to be moving forward, nor do any of the others.

Staff will report out about any updates to the status of AB 1482 at the study session. At this point, because none of the other measures are progressing, staff proposes that work recommence on the local ordinance for tenant protection measures. We seek Council’s feedback regarding our recommendations for proceeding with tenant protection measures as summarize below:

**Scope of draft ordinance:** The draft ordinance presented to the community and City Council in January included four measures; we propose proceeding with three of them: minimum lease terms, enhanced notice, and mediation.

Staff recommends proceeding with these three measures because they protect tenants without creating a financial burden for landlords. These measures do not limit rent increases for new and/or renewed leases and are therefore not rent stabilization (aka rent control) measures,
which are strongly opposed by the real estate community. They also will not conflict with AB 1482 should it pass.

The fourth measure was relocation assistance, which we do not recommend pursuing at this time. This recommendation is informed by research and in response to community concern. In January, real estate professionals noted that most of the City’s rental housing is owned by “mom and pop” landlords and consists of smaller developments with four or fewer units. Staff confirmed this information and agrees that it is likely that many of these property owners operate their properties with thin margins. Moreover, if AB 1482 passes, it will address relocation assistance associated with certain types of evictions.

**Outreach:** Based on feedback at the January 2019 study session, the community appears supportive of the City providing resources for mediation. Thus, outreach will need to focus on minimum lease terms and enhanced notice. Our intent is to ensure that these terms are well-understood and incorporate input received to the extent that it is aligned with City Council direction and best practices.

**Ordinance adoption:** Following outreach, City Council will consider a revised draft ordinance and provide direction for proceeding with a final ordinance.

**Implementation:** Success of any future ordinance will require significant implementation efforts. Outreach and education will need to be offered to both tenants and landlords over time. The City will also need to contract with service providers to help monitor and maintain the terms of the ordinance.

**Strategies for Housing Policy:**
Significant progress was made on the Land Use Plan update in FY 18-19. The Land Use Plan is the policy component of the City’s Local Coastal Program (LCP). Supported by an ad hoc Planning Commission committee, staff completed drafting the Development Chapter in December and released it for public comment. In January, the Community Development Director provided an overview of the draft chapter to the Planning Commission with a presentation focused on the numerous housing opportunities layered into the plan.

**Town Center:** The Town Center (previously referred to as the “Downtown Core” area), includes several new approaches that encourage infill multi-family and mixed-use development, a few of which are highlighted below:

- **Residential Densities:** The City’s highest density development (25 dwelling units/acre) is found throughout the mixed-use districts and other locations in the Town Center. Up to 35 dwelling units/acre could be accommodated on some sites with use of the Density Bonus ordinance, which requires the provision of affordable housing units. The draft Land Use Plan also proposes a transfer of development right (TDR) approach to convey development rights from sites outside the Town Center (as donor sites) into the Town Center (receiver sites). If this part of the plan is approved, a more detailed TDR plan will
be created for City Council approval, wherein Council can establish density limits within Town Center.

- **Planned Developments (PD):** Town Center PDs feature higher densities than PDs outside of the Town Center, and emphasize various forms of smaller, more affordable housing types. The housing is proposed to be combined with other uses that are compatible, serve community needs, and tend have low automobile trip generation rates out of sensitivity to concerns about local traffic congestion (e.g. assisted living).

- **Shopping Center Retrofits:** The City’s primary shopping centers are all located within the Town Center. The draft Land Use Plan acknowledges the potential for these to be retrofitted, either over time, or all at once, with mixed-use development. Residential development of these areas is included in the buildout analysis of the plan.

**Priority Housing Overlay:** The proposed Priority Housing Overlay would establish a new land use category. The overlay allows up to 25 units per acre for sites in the Town Center and 10 units per acre for sites outside the Town Center. As currently proposed in the draft Land Use Plan, approximately 200 dwelling units could be allowed through this new provision.

Staff considers this new strategy to be one of the most important housing policies in the Land Use Plan update. The intent of this land use designation is to allow housing specifically for the local workforce. As envisioned, housing development pursuant to this designation must be affordable to extremely low, very low, or low income households. In some cases, the housing would be located specifically on or adjacent to job-generating uses. For the most part, the intent is that at least one member of the household would be employed by on-site or nearby use. This includes field agriculture, greenhouses, and public park land (State and San Mateo County Parks), which are all Coastal Act priority land uses. For teachers and other public employees, the housing could be located on public school sites or within certain portions of the City’s public facilities property in the Downtown area. Two churches with public facilities designations are also included in this category.

There are many possible configurations and relationships between Priority Overlay Housing sites and how they could provide housing for the local workforce. For example, there is a site in the Open Space Reserve zoning district, which is not currently in active agricultural use, that some community members have suggested would be an ideal location to provide housing for employees of local visitor-serving industries such as hotels and restaurants. This would result in residents who work near, but not on, the housing site. Also, for the church sites, staff has heard concern about allowing housing on the two church properties proposed for this overlay. Staff’s perspective is that this should be as flexible as possible allowing churches to provide housing for their staff as well as for individuals and families that they serve.

Assuring that this potential new provision provides housing for the local workforce is of primary interest among community members and Planning Commissioners. Staff considers this concept to be well-developed; however, feedback from City Council would be helpful at this stage. If
Council is interested in retaining this provision in the draft Land Use Plan, staff will do further work on the policy language. There is capacity for the designation to allow more than 200 units; while it could also be revised to allow fewer units.

**Planned Developments:** Single-family PD areas have tended to be developed with some of the larger and more expensive homes in Half Moon Bay. Phase 1 of Pacific Ridge is a recent example. The result is a mismatch between local housing production and local housing needs. The proposed Land Use Plan update squarely addresses this issue for the remaining undeveloped PDs through a proposed “Provisions for Housing Affordability” policy. The policy requires new housing to be more “affordable by design,” by requiring lower-cost development forms with smaller and sustainably designed units such as cottages, attached townhomes, live-work units, duplexes, triplexes, and garden apartments. The draft Land Use Plan also includes policies that require PDs to be developed as neighborhoods with their own public parks, green infrastructure provisions, and other sustainability measures, including the provision of below market rate units in any PD with 10 or more homes.

**Water Allocations:** Staff has been working on the final chapter of the draft Land Use Plan, Chapter 3, Public Works. This chapter will cover the sewer system, automobile circulation (primarily for Highways 1 and 92), stormwater management, and water supply and allocations. Of these, water connection allocations have the biggest impact on the City's ability to develop affordable housing. Residential development, including affordable housing, is not a priority use under the Coastal Act at this time. As such, nonpriority water allocations, which are only available through a secondary market held by several private property owners, are required for all residential development. These connections are very expensive (current reports indicate $80K per connection) and thereby pose a significant financial burden on housing development.

City Council directed that the Land Use Plan update address this by establishing affordable housing as a priority use. As a start, affordable housing has been acknowledged in the draft Development chapter of Land Use Plan as a priority use of local significance for the City of Half Moon Bay in addition to the priority uses that must be accommodated pursuant to the Coastal Act. To ensure that this shift in policy can be found consistent with the Coastal Act and the requirements of past water district permits, the pending Public Works chapter also establishes that there is adequate water supply for both Coastal Act priority uses and affordable housing.

**California Coastal Commission Environmental Justice Policy:** The California Coastal Commission unanimously adopted a sweeping environmental justice policy in March 2019. Staff is considering the impact of this statement on the draft Land Use Plan and notes that this policy may support the effort to establish affordable housing as a priority use for Half Moon Bay. The policy states:

---

6 The Coastal Act originally included affordable housing as a priority use when it was first adopted; however, affordable housing was later removed from the Act in a subsequent amendment in 1981.
“Although the Legislature removed the Coastal Act mandate to protect and provide for affordable housing in 1981, the Commission retained the authority to encourage affordable housing. The Commission will increase these efforts with project applicants, appellants and local governments, by analyzing the cumulative impacts of incremental housing stock loss, and by working with local government to adopt local coastal program policies that protect affordable housing and promote a range of affordable new residential development types. The Commission will continue to seek legislative action to regain its previous authority with respect to affordable housing.”8 (Emphasis added.)

Strategies for Zoning Regulations:
Staff has identified the following as high priorities for zoning code amendments. The City Attorney’s office and Community Development Department staff have begun working on these amendments with the Planning Commission. City Council’s initial feedback is welcome at this time as we prepare for a Planning Commission study session on July 23, 2019.

Below Market Rate: The City’s Below Market Rate (BMR) ordinance requires that 20 percent of the dwelling units in ownership projects with 10 or more units (e.g. subdivisions) be restricted for lower income households; and/or the developer pay an in-lieu fee. Previous case law (Palmer/Sixth Street Properties, L.P., et al. v. City of Los Angeles) prohibited jurisdictions from requiring inclusionary units in rental development projects. The Palmer decision was overturned by recent State legislation. The primary intent for this update is to add rental housing into the City’s Below Market Rate Ordinance and to lower the threshold to projects with 5 or more units.

Density Bonus: In parallel with the BMR ordinance, the City Attorney and staff will review and provide draft amendments to ensure the City’s Density Bonus ordinance is in compliance with State law, including the Coastal Act. These amendments will provide greater clarity and enforceability of the ordinance.

Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Zoning Regulations: Numerous regulations in the mixed zoning designations, as well as the associated parking provisions, make it difficult for developers to design residential projects that meet City code, which is hinders and adds uncertainty to the development entitlement process. The zoning code update is intended to address the following topics:

• Parking: Staff is proposing to establish new multi-family and mixed-use parking requirements. Currently, the City’s parking code requires two garage spaces per residential unit, regardless of where the project site is located, or the type of housing proposed. This is a burdensome requirement on small infill sites in Downtown and for most multi-family and mixed-use development forms. The Planning Commission has been repeatedly asked to consider parking exceptions for these types of projects.

---

Implementation of a “right-sized” parking code would likely eliminate the need for future parking exceptions and allow more streamlined review.

- Permitted Uses:
  - Residential Use as a Permitted Use: Although residential use is principally permitted in the mixed-use zoning designations, a Use Permit is required for residential development in some areas, including downtown. A Use Permit is redundant to other review that may be required for a project.
  - Ground Floor Retail Requirement: Currently, the City’s mixed-use downtown zoning regulations permit office and other types of uses that are not visitor-serving in nature on the ground floor, even on Main Street in the heart of old Downtown. Staff will propose to disallow such uses, including residential, on the ground floor of Main Street between the Main Street Bridge and Correas Street. This type of restriction is common in other cities.

Residential Zoning – R-1, R-2, R-3: The R-1 zoning district is specifically reserved for single-family development, which may also include ADUs and other uses such as childcare homes and home occupations. The R-2 and R-3 districts are meant for duplex and or multi-family development. Because single-family development tends to be more economically lucrative, developers often prefer to pursue single-family development of smaller R-2 and R-3 properties. Staff will propose code amendments to preserve those residential zones for multi-family development as well as other amendments to maintain neighborhood character standards.

Additional Considerations: City Council, the Planning Commission, community members and staff have identified additional policy matters that concern the community with respect to the production and preservation of affordable housing in Half Moon Bay. Some that staff considers to be especially timely are summarized below:

Affordable Housing Residency Preferences: The City Council has expressed interest in developing policies that favor affordable housing applicants with existing ties to the community. Such policies are permissible, so long as they are structured appropriately. In particular, the City should (a) express such policies as preferences rather than inflexible requirements, (b) focus on whether individuals are bona fide residents or employees, rather than imposing any durational standard, and (c) consider potential disparate impacts of the policy on protected classes. Similar policies have been implemented by other local governments, including Mountain View and Calistoga.

Measure D: Measure D is the City’s annual residential growth measure. It allows for annual population growth of 1 percent with an additional 0.5 percent additional growth allowed within a defined downtown area. This is managed through an allocation system of certificates: 0.5 percent allocated to project sites the downtown; 0.5 percent allocated to downtown; and an additional 0.5 percent allocated as a bonus allocation to downtown. City Council approves the annual Measure D allocations each December for the next calendar year. In 2019, there are 71 allocations. Thus far, all of the allocations for outside the downtown area (24) have been issued. The 47 allocations reserved for the downtown area remain available. In September of
each year, the base downtown allocations (not the bonus allocations) become available to be transferred to outside downtown. This September, up to 23 more allocations will be available outside downtown. The City’s allocation regulations do not specify the process for this transfer. This, and other concerns about Measure D have been brought up by City Council in the past. Staff suggests revisiting the Measure D allocation process next year. The new Land Use plan policies will then provide guidance for such an update.

**Short Term Rentals:** The Planning Commission considered policy options for a short-term rental (STR) ordinance in spring 2018. Staff had to set this aside to work on other priorities. STR policy and regulations are very important considerations for the preservation of existing housing stock. STRs have also been an important policy area for the Coastal Commission, which considers STRs to be a strategy for providing low-cost visitor serving accommodation. Staff has been tracking the development of STR ordinances in the Coastal Zone and hopes to pick this back up in the next fiscal year.

**Empty Houses:** City Council has indicated that they may be interested in pursuing regulations about empty housing.

**Other State Legislation:** The City’s Communication Director, the City Attorney’s office, and the Community Development Director continue to track State housing legislation. We anticipate that updates will be available at the time of the City Council meeting on July 16.

**Conclusion:**
This report provided an overview of numerous approaches that can help facilitate the development of affordable housing. Establishing the affordable housing fund allocation process and completing the proposed zoning amendments will be especially supportive to achieving the stated desire to bring forward a new multi-family rental development affordable to extremely low, very low and low income households in the near future. Completing the Land Use Plan update and addressing water allocations will support the provision of affordable housing for years to come.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Home for All, San Mateo County, Glossary of Terms, April 2019
2. Affordable Housing Fund Examples
3. San Mateo County NOFA
4. Community Land Trust Wikipedia Summary
Affordable housing: The federal government defines affordable housing as housing that costs no more than 30% of household income (before taxes). In general, it is the price that a household can afford to pay for housing and still have enough income to pay for other essentials such as food and transportation. It also refers to housing that is subsidized by the government, and is rented or sold at prices Below Market Rate (BMR).

Area Median Income (AMI): The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) calculates these incomes each year based on location and number of persons in a household. AMI is used to determine the eligibility of applicants for publically funded affordable housing programs.

Extremely Low-Income: Household income that is 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). This is $30,800 for one person and $44,000 for a household of four in San Mateo County.

Very Low-Income: Household income that is 50% of AMI. This is $51,350 for one person and $73,300 for a household of four in San Mateo County.

Low-Income: Household income that is 80% of AMI. This is $82,200 for one person and $117,400 for a household of four in San Mateo County.

Moderate Income: Household income that is 120% of AMI. This is $99,450 for one person and $142,100 for a household of four in San Mateo County.

Below Market Rate (BMR): Rental or ownership units, that are available for qualified very-low, low-, or moderate-income households.

Cost Burdened: When an individual or family spends more than 30% of their income on housing.

Home for All: Home for All is a county-led collaborative of local governments, businesses, schools, advocates and not-for-profit organizations working to increase local housing production and preservation so that persons of all ages, backgrounds and income levels have the opportunity to call San Mateo County home.
Impact Fee: Fees collected from new commercial or residential developers that are used to build affordable housing. The fee is designed to offset the effects of new development on housing needs in the community.

Inclusionary Zoning: A local planning requirement that a percentage of newly constructed housing units be affordable. If developers do not include affordable housing units in the project, they may be able to pay in-lieu fees that are dedicated to affordable housing.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA): California requires that all local governments plan enough housing for their expected number of future residents. This plan is called a Housing Element. Before this plan is developed, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) determines the housing needs for the region. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), our regional planning agency, is responsible for creating a process for the amount of housing needed to be built in each city. These numbers are divided into income categories for each city for an eight-year period. For the current 2015 to 2023 cycle\(^\text{i}\), San Mateo County is responsible for creating 16,418 housing units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHNA 2015-2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Units: Small living units that share a lot with a single family home. Known by many names—second units, junior second units, granny flats, in-law units, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs), second units can be attached to the main house, a second story on a garage, a converted garage, or a stand-alone building.

Section 8 / Housing Choice Voucher Program: Federal rent-subsidy program for eligible very low-income families, seniors, and the disabled. Section 8 participants can choose any housing in the private market that meets the program requirements. The voucher subsidizes the difference between the full rent and the tenant’s rental portion which is based on 30% of income.

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD): Housing that is located near public transit, usually \(\frac{1}{4}\) to \(\frac{1}{2}\) mile of a transit station or bus line. Bay Meadows, an 18-acre development in San Mateo near the Hillsdale Caltrain Station is an example of transit-oriented development.

Workforce Housing: Housing that is for local employees earning within income guidelines. An example of this concept is San Mateo Community College District’s faculty and staff housing complexes that were developed to attract and retain faculty and other staff.

CONNECT

http://homeforallsmc.org/

@HomeforALLSMC


\(^{\text{ii}}\) Regional Housing Need Plan, San Francisco Bay Area: 2015-2023.

https://abag.ca.gov/planning/housingneeds/pdfs/2015-2023_RHNA_Allocations.pdf
Affordable Housing Policy Examples from Other Jurisdictions

**Redwood City:** The City of Redwood City adopted affordable housing fund guidelines in June 2018. Redwood City City Council June 25, 2018 agenda, Item 7A begins on page 575. Redwood City kept a high-level strategic approach that prioritizes four uses for their Affordable Housing Fund:

- New multifamily affordable construction or site acquisition
- Acquisition with or without rehabilitation of existing multifamily to become deed restricted
- Rehabilitation of existing deed-restricted multifamily
- Refinance of existing deed-restricted to preserve affordability

**East Palo Alto:** East Palo Alto adopted their current Affordable Housing Strategy in October 2018. The East Palo Alto Zoning Code also addresses affordable housing impact fees. Municipal Code section 18.40.060.B “Affordable Housing Plan” specifies that all affordable housing impact fees or other funds collected under this chapter shall be deposited into the City Affordable Housing Fund. The monies in the Affordable Housing Fund and all earnings from investment of the moneys in the Fund shall be expended exclusively to provide housing affordable to extremely low income, very low income, lower income, and moderate income households in the City, consistent with the goals and policies contained in the City's Housing Element and the purposes for which the fees were collected, and for administration and compliance monitoring of the affordable housing program. The City Council may, from time to time, adopt guidelines for expenditure of monies in the affordable housing fund.

**Sonoma County:** The County of Sonoma’s Fund for Housing Policy explains requirements for projects to be considered and outlines eligible types of assistance. For example, Sonoma County requires a 55-year term of affordability and requires that at least 20 percent of units in an aided affordable housing development be for residents who earn less than 80 percent of adjusted median income (AMI), with the remainder for those earning less than 120 percent of AMI.

**West Hollywood:** The City of West Hollywood’s ordinance on establishing their affordable housing fund contains specific rules on how the funds can be spent. Noteworthy among the requirements is that 60 percent of units in any supported development must be for low- or moderate-income residents, and 20 percent must be for low-income residents. Only non-profit housing developers are eligible to receive financing from the fund.

**Sacramento:** The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency handles the City of Sacramento’s affordable housing funds. According to the agency’s Multifamily Lending Policies, applications for a variety of new affordable housing construction and rehabilitation projects are allowed. The policies lay out underwriting rules for projects, explain preferences (such as for projects near transit or in areas with a low proportion of poverty), and explain the details of
project requirements. The city funds can only go to support projects with a maximum of 80 percent AMI affordability, while Sacramento County funds will go to projects for tenants at 50 percent of AMI or below.

**Los Angeles:** The Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department publishes regulations for its affordable housing fund work. Its rules do such things as define eligible permanent supportive housing.

**San Jose:** The City of San Jose has adopted policies to govern its affordable housing expenditures. This policy is notable for including a hard cap of $140,000 per unit in subsidy. The staff report linked to in this memo also does a good job of explaining the available sources of affordable housing funds the city had available and how the city’s funds could be used to help the distinct groups in need of public assistance (retired very low-income seniors, low-income workers, etc.).

**Berkeley:** The City of Berkeley’s Housing Trust Fund Guidelines state requirements such as a 55-year term of affordability and a 20% set aside for very low-income populations in funded projects. It also illustrates internal funding priorities by, for example, capping the portion of the overall fund that can be used for pre-development assistance at any given time.

**Napa County:** The County of Napa’s policy for its affordable housing trust fund outlines the application process and eligible uses.
San Mateo County’s seventh Affordable Housing Fund Notice of Funding Availability ("AHF 7.0 NOFA," or "NOFA") includes a combination of funding from the County and the Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo (HACSM), detailed in Section III (A). This funding will be targeted to projects that provide or help preserve affordable rental housing opportunities for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income San Mateo County residents, and projects that provide affordable homeownership opportunities for low-income San Mateo County residents, through the development of new affordable multifamily rental housing and homeownership units, and through the re-syndication and rehabilitation of existing deed-restricted affordable multifamily rental housing stock.

The San Mateo County Department of Housing’s (DOH) strategic priorities for this funding assistance include the following:

- Expand housing opportunities through construction of new affordable multifamily housing developments;
- Target affordable housing funds to very low- and extremely low-income affordable housing units;
- Maintain existing deed-restricted affordable rental housing in conjunction with re-syndication of Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), to support the Project, for health and safety reasons and/or to extend the useful life of the improvements when such repairs are beyond the Project’s capital improvement budget;
- Create more extremely low-income and/or supportive housing for homeless households and those at imminent risk of homelessness, including housing opportunities for at-risk former foster youth, persons with serious mental health challenges who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness, and other clients of County services in need of affordable housing;
- Encourage the creation of affordable multifamily projects containing larger units (2- and 3-bedroom);
- Create more housing within walking distance of services, amenities, and transit – particularly where doing so leverages Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities (AHSC) funding;
- Build system capacity among affordable housing providers and supportive services providers

DOH’s strategic priorities for the AHF 7.0 funding assistance serve to further San Mateo County’s ("County") Fair Housing Goals set forth in the San Mateo County Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, approved by HUD in November 2017. The 2017 Assessment of Fair Housing,
including its goals, metrics, and milestones, can be found at https://housing.smcgov.org/assessment-fair-housing.

Eligible project types include the following:

- **New Construction Multifamily Rental Projects** – Approximately $25M
- **Eligible Multifamily Re-syndication-Rehabilitation Projects** - Up to a total of $2M
- **Eligible Multifamily New Construction Affordable First-Time Homeownership Projects** - Up to a total of $1M

**Preference Criteria and Scoring:** Preference criteria emphasize support from the local jurisdiction. Scoring Factors and Points for Rental Projects are summarized below for Multifamily New Construction Affordable Rental Housing Projects and Multifamily Re-Syndication-Rehabilitation Projects. There is a maximum possible of 100 points. Considerations of particular note to Half Moon Bay are highlighted in grey.

1. The Project is ready for occupancy sooner than four (4) years for Multifamily New Construction Affordable Rental Projects, and three (3) years for Multifamily Re-Syndication-Rehabilitation Projects, from the due date for NOFA application submission. Projects that could otherwise close but for a small gap funding award provided under this NOFA will garner additional preference consideration. Readiness will be gauged by the status of planning and land use entitlements and permits, the degree to which other funding commitments have been secured, completion of architectural drawings, the anticipated date for 9% tax credit financing applications or 4% tax credit/tax-exempt bond applications (if applicable), and the anticipated development schedule submitted as part of the application. (15 points)

2. The City (if the Project is located in an incorporated city or town) or County (if the Project is located in the unincorporated County) has provided a commitment to: a. Provide City funds (if the Project is located in an incorporated city or town); b. Grant the Project one or more cost-saving incentives, such as fee reductions or waivers, by-right zoning, density bonus, parking requirement reduction, or other such cost-saving incentives. Note that the County seeks to leverage AHF funds to create affordable housing and is unlikely to fund applications that include large fees payable to local jurisdictions when the subsidy needed to pay such fees could otherwise be used to fund development of additional affordable housing. (10 points)

3. ** Provision of city-, County-, or other publicly- or privately-owned land for the Project at a below-market-rate or at zero cost to Developer. ** (10 points)

4. The Developer uses all reasonable efforts to partner with a local jurisdiction or transit agency and submit an application for Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) funds to support development of the Project, enhance walkability, increase access
for biking, and improve linkages to public transportation. Note that DOH staff are aware that some sites may not be competitive for AHSC funds. If an Applicant does not plan to apply for AHSC funding, the Applicant must provide a statement describing its reasoning for not submitting an application. Those that do plan to apply will have the opportunity to describe the current status of discussions with their local jurisdiction/transit agency partner(s), the amenities planned for inclusion in the application, and the timeline and status of the application. Projects that do not compete for AHSC funds but nonetheless seek to enhance area walkability, increase bicycle access or improve linkages to public transportation will also receive scoring preference for such amenities. (5 points)

5. The Project provides strong leverage for County funds and limits the amount of County subsidy required by attracting additional non-County funding sources, including donation or below-market-rate sale of land from other quasi- or nongovernmental entities, and by controlling costs. (15 points)

6. A larger proportion (percentage) of Project units described in Section VI(A)(1) is targeted to any of the following: households with incomes at or below 35% of AMI, residents who are homeless or at imminent risk of homelessness (as defined by DOH in this NOFA or by HUD or VA definitions in the case of homeless Veterans), frail elders leaving nursing or long-term care facilities or needing specialized services in order to remain in an independent living situation, or FFY households, or other clients of County service agencies. (10 points)

7. Project is within easy walking distance of services, amenities, and transit. (10 points)

8. The Project’s 30-year operating cash flow indicates a Services budget greater than $500 per unit per annum (PUPA), and the Project provides high-quality services appropriate for the needs of the tenant population served, in connection with the more robust budget; physical space for service amenities is available within the development; and service amenities will be of a regular and ongoing nature and provided to tenants free of charge (except for day care services or any charges required by law). (5 points)

9. The Project includes a greater proportion of units for larger families (two- and three-bedroom units, or larger). (5 points)

10. The Project will serve a greater number of households (i.e. larger unit count). (5 points)

11. Funding provided under this NOFA will allow Project to close within one year from the date of this NOFA close and Applicant has made best efforts to obtain all other sources of gap financing. (10 points)
Community Land Trust – Wikipedia Summary

Defining Community Land Trust features in the United States

Since 1992, the defining features of the CLT model in the United States have been enshrined in federal law (Section 213, Housing and Community Development Act of 1992). There is considerable variation among the hundreds of organizations that call themselves a community land trust, but ten key features are to be found in most of them.

Nonprofit, tax-exempt corporations

A community land trust is an independent, nonprofit corporation that is legally chartered in the state in which it is located. Most CLTs are started from scratch, but some are grafted onto existing nonprofit corporations such as community development corporations. Most CLTs target their activities and resources toward charitable activities like providing housing for low-income people and redeveloping blighted neighborhoods, making them eligible to receive 501(c)(3) designation from the IRS.

Dual ownership

A nonprofit corporation, the CLT, acquires multiple parcels of land throughout a targeted geographic area with the intention of retaining ownership of the parcels forever. Any building already located on the land or later constructed on the land can be held by the CLT or sold off to an individual homeowner, a cooperative housing corporation, a nonprofit developer of rental housing, or some other nonprofit, governmental, or for-profit entity.[3]

Leased land

Although CLTs intend never to resell their land, they can provide for the exclusive use of their land by the owners of any buildings located thereon. Exclusive use of parcels of land can be conveyed to individual homeowners or to the owners of other types of residential or commercial structures by long-term ground leases. The two-party contract between the landowner (the CLT) and a building's owner protects the owner's interests in security, privacy, legacy, and equity and enforces the CLT's interests in preserving the appropriate use, the structural integrity and the continuing affordability of any buildings on its land.

Perpetual affordability

The CLT retains an option to repurchase any residential (or commercial) structures on its land if their owners ever choose to sell. The resale price is set by a formula contained in the ground lease that is designed to give present homeowners a fair return on their investment but giving future homebuyers fair access to housing at an affordable price. By design and by intent, the CLT is committed to preserving the affordability of housing (and other structures), one owner after another, one generation after another, in perpetuity.
Perpetual responsibility

The CLT does not disappear once a building is sold. As owner of the underlying land and as owner of an option to repurchase any buildings located on its land, the CLT has an abiding interest in what happens to the structures and to the people who occupy them. The ground lease requires owner-occupancy and responsible use of the premises. Should buildings become a hazard, the ground lease gives the CLT the right to step in and force repairs. Should property owners default on their mortgages, the ground lease gives the CLT the right to step in and cure the default, forestalling foreclosure. The CLT remains a party to the deal, safeguarding the structural integrity of the buildings and the residential security of the occupants.

Community base

The CLT operates within the physical boundaries of a targeted locality. It is guided by and accountable to the people who call the locale their home. Most commonly, any adult who resides on the CLT’s land and any adult who resides within the area deemed by the CLT to be its community can become a voting member of the CLT. The community may encompass a single neighborhood, multiple neighborhoods, or, in some cases, an entire town, city, or county.

Governance

Typically, CLTs are run by a board of directors whose members include three groups of stakeholders: residents or leaseholders, people who reside within its targeted community but do not live on its land, and lastly the broader public interest. This third group is frequently represented by government officials, funders, housing agencies, and social service providers. Organization bylaws may designate each of these groups a specific and equal number of seats, and they may be elected separately by their constituent groups. Control of the CLT’s board is diffused and balanced to ensure that all interests are heard but that no interest predominates.

Expansionist acquisition

CLTs are not focused on a single project located on a single parcel of land. They are committed to an active acquisition and development program aimed at expanding the CLT’s holdings of land and increasing the supply of affordable housing (and other types of buildings) under the CLT’s stewardship. A CLT’s holdings are seldom concentrated in one corner of a community but tend to be scattered throughout its service area, indistinguishable from other owner-occupied housing in the same neighborhood.
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AGENDA REPORT

For meeting of:  
July 16, 2019

TO:  
Honorable Mayor and City Council

VIA:  
Bob Nisbet, City Manager

FROM:  
Jessica Blair, Communications Director / City Clerk

TITLE:  
LEGISLATION / GRANTS UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive an update on legislation and grants.

FISCAL IMPACT:
There is no fiscal impact associated with this discussion.

STRATEGIC ELEMENT:
This action supports all elements of the Strategic Plan.

DISCUSSION:
Townsend Public Affairs will provide the City Council with an update on legislation, including housing legislation, as well as grants at the mid-session mark for the Legislature.
RECOMMENDATION:
Receive report and by motion, accept the recommendation of the Main Street Bridge Advisory Committee on the barrier design for the Main Street Bridge Rehabilitation Project.

FISCAL IMPACT:
The FY 2019-20 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget has sufficient funds for the design of the project. Caltrans has provided authorization (E-76) for Preliminary Engineering and Environmental phases allowing reimbursement of project costs of up to $1,291,000 at 88.53 percent with a local match of 11.43 percent.

STRATEGIC ELEMENT:
This recommendation supports the following Elements of the Strategic Plan: Infrastructure and Environment, Healthy Communities and Public Safety, and Inclusive Governance.

BACKGROUND:
The Main Street Bridge, constructed in the year 1900, is the primary access point to downtown Half Moon Bay from State Route 92. The Main Street Bridge is an integral element of the City’s downtown and environmental setting. The bridge is a nationally registered historic structure which also has an important relationship with the Pilarcitos Creek and the adjoining riparian habitat resources.

The bridge structure is a concrete arch that is supported on concrete abutments and timber piles. Spandrel walls project out from the arch soffit and support the earthen fill used to create the roadbed. Concrete wingwalls extend back from the abutments to support the roadway approaches. These principal components of the structural elements have remained relatively unchanged since original construction.
The existing historic bridge is narrow and has no shoulders or space for bicycle lanes. There are two wooden deck walkways attached to the bridge on each side. The walkways are not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and are difficult to traverse by both pedestrian and bicyclists. The structure is functionally obsolete (a Caltrans and FHWA categorization) due to a lack of adequate shoulders and accessible walkway. The structure was built prior to the development of modern earthquake standards. As such, the primary challenge of this rehabilitation project is the seismic retrofit of the structure while maintaining its historical integrity.

In 2014, the Main Street Bridge (also known as the Pilarcitos Creek Bridge) was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Also, in 2014, Half Moon Bay voters passed Measure F, the “Main Street Bridge Preservation Act,” which prohibits demolition of or substantial changes to the bridge without voter approval.

In 2016, the City applied for federal grant funding as part of the Highway Bridge Program (HBP) and was approved for the rehabilitation of the historic Main Street Bridge per the Federal and State Transportation Improvements Program (FTIP/STIP). The total project cost is $8.527M with a federal share of $7.549M (88.53 percent) and local match of $978K (11.47 percent). The total project cost includes hard costs (construction) and soft costs (engineering, environmental, and project management).

On July 27, 2017, the Main Street Bridge Advisory Committee (MSBAC) convened to receive a presentation on project background and status. The Committee concurred with the project plan and recommended the City move forward with the project. The MSBAC convened two additional meetings on February 22, 2018 and June 27, 2018 to discuss the project status and to recommend the project proceed forward. The Committee met on June 28, 2019 to consider barrier design options.

In 2017, staff made a request to Caltrans Local Assistance, who manages the federally funded transportation projects, to advance the Preliminary Engineering (PE) funding for the Main Street Bridge to Federal FY 2017-2018. Subsequently, in 2018 Caltrans issued the authorization (Form E-76) to proceed with the Preliminary Engineering Phase for the project. The PE phase includes design, environmental clearance, permits and project management. On August 21, 2018, the City Council awarded the professional services agreement for the design and environmental clearance of the project.

**DISCUSSION:**
The objective of the Main Street Bridge Rehabilitation Project is to preserve the historic bridge for future residents and visitors of/to Half Moon Bay. Rehabilitation includes repair of concrete wingwalls, repair of spandrel walls, reinforcement of the foundation and ensuring reconstruction of ADA compliant walkways all while preserving historic integrity. The width of the bridge, travel lanes, etc. will be consistent with the existing structure and roadway.
The first level of design is the 35-percent design which is also referred to as conceptual design. 35-percent design provides schematic design in sufficient detail to clearly establish a “Project Description” and initiate environmental review. As this project involves federal funding, environmental review will include NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) as well as CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act compliance). The City and its consultants have been actively working on 35-percent design. Since award of the professional services agreement for the design and environmental clearance of the project, the following activities have been completed:

- Topographic survey and channel survey
- Geotechnical Engineering - investigation and preliminary reporting
- Preliminary Design: Seismic analysis and design, preliminary alignment design, preliminary design of park entrance, preliminary design of crosswalk completed, design of replacement bridge barriers ongoing.
- Hydraulics – preliminary hydrology and hydraulic analysis, preliminary scour mitigation (RSP) design.

In addition to those items completed, activities have commenced and are currently in progress as follows:

- Environmental Compliance – pending 35% design
- Utility Coordination – AT&T Vault Relocation
- Design of Bridge Barriers (see below for additional details)

The City’s design team includes an historic architecture firm whose duties include assisting the City through the historic rehabilitation process with Caltrans, NEPA and CEQA. As noted earlier, design of the rehabilitation is being completed with historic preservation in mind. There are a variety of historic components to the bridge, some of which are more significant than others. The concrete arch and spandrel walls are historically significant; no major changes are proposed in the rehabilitation. The project includes limited surface repairs of cracks and spalls and surface coatings are proposed and will be specified by the project historic architect to ensure the repair work is appropriate. The existing timber sidewalks and railings are of less or no historic significance and are proposed to be replaced with a new structure type. This change will facilitate ADA compliance and general access improvements while also reducing structural loading on the historic bridge.

The Main Street Bridge includes a concrete barrier that currently separates pedestrians from the automobile travel lanes. The barriers are an element of the historic aesthetic of the bridge. Per Measure F, the City must preserve the historic aesthetic even if the barriers are required to be removed and replaced with modern safety barriers. Originally the barriers (east and west) served to protect carriages, horses, automobiles and pedestrians from tumbling over the bridge into the Pilarcitos Creek. In the early 1940’s, with the addition of the pedestrian walkway on the east side, the wall served to separate vehicles and pedestrians. The westerly wall
subsequently served the same purpose with the addition of a walkway in the 1970’s. While the existing concrete bridge barriers contribute significantly to the appearance of the bridge, major modifications are required to meet current mandated safety requirements.

Caltrans recently adopted new barrier requirements. These standards apply to all State and federally funded bridge construction and rehabilitation projects advertised for construction on or after September 1, 2019. Under the provisions, all barriers must now comply with the Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH) criteria and must be crash-tested. The City has three options in regard to the barriers:

1) Crash-test the existing barriers at one of the 11 approved nationwide test sites. This requirement would result in the City having to test the existing barriers at a cost of up to $1M and up to 3 years of certification process. If the barriers withstand crash testing for 45MPH (impact by a truck), then we can use the existing barrier design and strengthen them internally. This would result in no adverse effect.

2) Use an existing approved barrier form the MASH tested list of barriers. This approach would result in a “Significant Adverse Effect” under NEPA since the design will be somewhat different, and the end tall concrete columns will be eliminated. It would necessitate an EIR as well as a public vote per Measure F requirements.

3) Use a modified barrier design which meets MASH standards to emulate the original 1900 bridge design along the vehicle travel way. City staff has evaluated this option with Caltrans barrier specialist who agree with this design and that it meets the requirements. However, in order to obtain a “No- Adverse Effect” concurrence from, Caltrans Environmental Division staff, further data analysis and discussions are required.

On June 27, 2019, staff presented alternative barrier designs to the Main Street Bridge Advisory Committee (MSBAC) for their consideration. The MSBAC discussed the barrier alternatives and unanimously voted to recommend the Option No. 3 (Attachment 1) to the City Council for consideration. This preferred barrier alternative resembles the earlier condition of the bridge as it was originally constructed in the early 1900s.

The proposed concrete barrier design would provide a crash tested Caltrans barrier between the travel way and the sidewalk on the 60-foot length of the bridge with the required 13-foot-long crash cushions on either end. This concrete barrier can be painted white to resemble the existing historic barrier. Since there are no vertical projections allowed in line with the barriers, the four pilasters at the ends of the barriers would need to be either eliminated in their entirety or relocated elsewhere on the bridge as deemed appropriate by Caltrans.

In addition, an approved steel barrier with horizontal steel railing is proposed in the place of the existing wood railing barrier for pedestrians to extend the entire length of the bridge and approaches. This barrier can also be painted white to resemble the existing horizontal white
barrier. This barrier is required both for pedestrian safety as well as for vehicles on the approaches to the bridge.

The City is coordinating with Caltrans Office of the Environmental Compliance and Office of Local Assistance in Oakland as well as Caltrans Office of Structures in Sacramento to assure compliance with the barrier requirement as necessary for the federal funding as well as to obtain a finding of no adverse effect for the environmental analysis.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Proposed Barrier Rendering
2. Historic & Existing Bridge Photos
ATTACHMENT 2

Historic Photo Main Street Bridge 1900-1910 (Original Barrier)

Historic Photo Main Street Bridge 1920-1930 (Cap and Bollards Added to Barrier)
Historic Photo Main Street Bridge 1942 (western sidewalk added)

Existing Condition Main Street Bridge
BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HALF MOON BAY

AGENDA REPORT

For meeting of: July 16, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

VIA: Bob Nisbet, City Manager

FROM: Matthew Chidester, Deputy City Manager
Karen Decker, Senior Management Analyst

TITLE: CARTER PARK RENOVATION PROJECT UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive an update on the Carter Park Renovation Project (design phase) and provide comments for staff and consultant consideration.

FISCAL IMPACT:
There is no Fiscal Impact related to this update. The City has a professional services agreement with ELS Architecture and Urban Design, Inc. (ELS+) in the amount of $170,000 for architectural design services under the Carter Park Renovation Project Budget. Including the previously completed conceptual design and geotechnical investigation work, the total cost of the initial design and exploration work through 40-percent drawings is approximately $213,000. An additional $400,000 will be required to complete the full construction drawings and permitting process.

The total cost of the renovation is unknown; 40-percent design will allow for construction cost estimates to be developed and analyzed.

STRATEGIC ELEMENT:
This action supports the Infrastructure and Environment and Healthy Communities and Public Safety Elements of the Strategic Plan.

BACKGROUND:
The Parks Master Plan adopted by the City Council on February 5, 2019 identified John L. Carter Memorial Park (Carter Park) as an opportunity to increase community recreation at an underutilized, natural open space tucked away beneath the entrance to historic downtown Main Street. Additionally, the FY 2018-19 budget City Council priority setting process revealed residents’ desire for City Council to consider Carter Park improvements. The city hired ELS+ to create conceptual drawings for initial discussion and comment. In 2018, this plan was presented at the Parks and Recreation Commission on two occasions and presented to the
community at the Summer’s End Music Festival on September 22. The concept plan was well received, and comments from the Commission and community were collected.

Since the City Council’s authorization of architectural design services in March 2019, the concept plan has evolved based upon extensive community and stakeholder feedback. Staff kicked off an outreach campaign with a community-wide survey that resulted in over 100 responses. ELS+ and staff held focus group meetings with key stakeholders including residents from Cypress Cove, Mariner’s Church, commercial property owners and businesses at the Stone Pine Business Park and Stone Pine Shopping Center, and local theater and performing arts groups.

Design concepts were presented to the Parks and Recreation Commission in February and June of 2019, and there is a study session scheduled for the Planning Commission which will take place on July 23rd. The purpose of the session is to give the Planning Commission an early opportunity to provide input on the design relevant to their in future review of the Coastal Development Permit and environmental review which will ensure conformance with the City’s Local Coastal Program.

Staff was also able to solicit input when two Parks and Recreation Commissioners joined city staff and ELS+ for a field trip to Stern Grove, a natural amphitheater in San Francisco known as a thriving recreation venue. Walking the grounds afforded our group the opportunity to visualize and inform the process. An on-site parks manager addressed several questions and concerns derived from the survey and community forums.

Other key elements informing this process are the completion of soils and geotechnical investigation and civil survey work. Staff is finalizing an agreement for completion of a Biological Resource Evaluation (BRE) and environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**DISCUSSION:**
Following initial analysis of the outreach campaign and technical engineering studies, ELS+ has updated the design plan to include the following elements:

- A new permanent stage structure
- Ample open lawn seating and dance area
- A natural amphitheater
- Children’s play area
- Picnic areas
- Solidarity Trail through the Redwoods, as gifted to the Latino and immigrant communities at the Posada event in December 2017

The first three elements above speak to the overwhelming feedback by survey responders (78-percent who would like to see more music performances at Carter Park. Other high rates of
response spoke to the desire for theatrical performances, Citywide social gatherings, relaxation, lunch on the lawn, and picnic gatherings.

The survey provided additional insight. The most popular form of transportation to Carter Park was walking (54-percent), followed by driving and cycling. Although 40-percent of responders had no concerns about Carter Park renovations, 32-percent of survey participants as well as residential stakeholders from the focus group cited parking concerns.

Some possibilities to address parking include a simple parking study examining the number of available spaces within a 5-minute walking radius, potential leasing of private lots for specific events, and shuttle services from designated pick-up locations. Safety, traffic, light, and noise were also factors that came up during our outreach effort and will be addressed in more detail during the final design presentation. A special noise study is also being prepared to ensure this potential impact is well understood for the environmental review.

The updated concept plan is part of the 40-percent design which allows for first-level cost estimates and permitting. The initial cost estimate will provide a better understanding of the full project cost and will inform options for a phased approach to renovation.

The presentation will include additional detail with regard to anticipated timelines for completion of 40-percent design, preparation of cost estimates, and related permitting and environmental review processes.

**ATTACHMENT:**
Carter Park Concept Plan Dated June 26, 2019
CONCEPT PLAN
JOHN L. CARTER MEMORIAL PARK IMPROVEMENTS
JUNE 26, 2019
Concept: Natural Amphitheater
For meeting of:  July 16, 2019

TO:  Honorable Mayor and City Council

VIA:  Bob Nisbet, City Manager

FROM:  John Doughty, Public Works Director

TITLE:  FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 SEWER SERVICE CHARGES

RECOMMENDATION:
Conduct a public hearing and adopt a resolution approving the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 Sewer Service Charges, direct staff to file the assessment roll, and authorize the County Controller to place the assessment charges on the County of San Mateo Property Tax Roll and direct staff to bill assessments directly that are not on the tax roll.

FISCAL IMPACT:
The sewer service rate of $33.58 (per hundred cubic feet of water) has remained the same for six years and will not increase in FY 2019-20. This rate is applied to the water use data for parcels using the Half Moon Bay sewer system. The total FY 2019-20 revenues are projected to be $4,437,499.

STRATEGIC ELEMENT:
This recommendation supports the Fiscal Sustainability and Inclusive Governance Elements.

BACKGROUND:
The City owns and operates a sewer collection system comprised of 35 miles of gravity mains and three (3) sewer pump stations and force mains. Treatment is provided by the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM), a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) comprised of the City of Half Moon Bay, Granada Community Service District (Granada) and Montara Water and Sanitary District (Montara).

On July 27, 1988, the Half Moon Bay City Council adopted Ordinance No. 12-88 establishing a methodology for the collection of sewer service charges. The total dollar amount of the sewer service charges equals the projected annual cost of operation and maintenance, repairs, and capital improvements of the sewage treatment plant and sewer collection system (sewer mains and lift stations), including administrative overhead costs.
The last increase to the sewer service rates was on June 5, 2012 when the City Council approved a 9% increase for FY 2013-14. The cost of services and maintenance has grown substantially since this last rate adjustment (see below).

DISCUSSION:
Sewer service charges are utilized to maintain and operate the City’s sewer collection system and to fund the City’s portion of the SAM operations. As noted earlier, the City is directly responsible for maintaining the system which collects and conveys effluent while SAM provides treatment services. The sewer service charges include funding of capital repairs, replacements and improvements both within the City system and the SAM treatment plant. Over the last four years the cost of SAM JPA services has increased substantially (more than 20-percent each of the last two fiscal years). Additionally, the City has programmed necessary capital projects that have grown increasingly more expensive (due to increased material costs, size of the projects and limited capacity of contractors in Bay Area).

In both FY 2018-19 and the upcoming FY 2019-20, the costs of providing services has exceeded the revenues derived from sewer service charges. As such, the City has been required to utilize sewer capital reserves to balance the operations costs. Compounding this situation is ongoing litigation with Granada and Montara based upon a disagreement regarding the City’s contribution of funds to non-treatment related capital repairs, replacements and improvements; often referred to as the Intertie Pipeline System or simply IPS.

The City is currently in settlement discussions with both parties and is hopeful for an amicable and timely resolution of this issue. The City initiated work on a revised sewer rate service study, but tabled the study pending the outcome of the litigation given the IPS replacement project represents an $18-20 million project over the next 10-years. Regardless of the litigation outcome, the City will need to move forward with a rate study to ensure there are adequate funds for ongoing operations, maintenance and capital repair/replacement of the City’s collection system and the SAM treatment plant. It is critical that FY 2019-20 assessments be established for the sewer service charges to be collected by the City to cover budgeted costs.

Current Methodology
Sewer service charges are assessed based upon the volume and strength of the wastewater discharged by individual premises. To arrive at the amount of the sewer service charge, Staff multiplied water consumption data provided by the Coastside County Water District, times the assessment rate and a classification strength factor, based on the class of residential and non-residential premises as further described in chapter 13.36.075 of the City’s Municipal Code.

The total FY 2019-20 collections are projected to be $4,437,499. This is an increase of $63,400 from the prior year’s sewer revenues of $4,374,099.

The City of Half Moon Bay collects sewer service revenues in two ways:

1. Property owners' sewer assessments are added to the tax roll by the San Mateo County
Tax Collector (pursuant to Section 5473 of the Health and Safety Code of the State of California). This year, individual assessments of 3,276 properties are projected to generate $4,221,948.30 in revenues which will be forwarded to the City of Half Moon Bay as part of the San Mateo County tax roll collection.

2. The City also directly bills property owners who are connected to the City sewer system but are not included in the City of Half Moon Bay’s assessments which are collected through the San Mateo County Property Tax Roll. This applies to unassessed government properties and to properties outside of Half Moon Bay city limits that use the City’s sewer system. Another $215,550.42 in revenue is projected by billing 172 properties directly.

Staff recommends that the City Council hold a public hearing and direct staff to file the assessment roll; authorize the County Controller to place the assessment charges on the San Mateo County Property Tax Roll this year; and direct staff to bill sewer users directly if they are not assessed on the tax roll.

ATTACHMENT:
Resolution adopting FY 2019-20 Sewer Service Charges
RESOLUTION NO. C-2019-__

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HALF MOON BAY ADOPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 SEWER SERVICE CHARGES FOR PROPERTIES SERVED BY THE HALF MOON BAY SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM

WHEREAS, on June 5, 2012, the City Council approved Resolution No. C-29-12 authorizing a 9% sewer service rate increase for FY 2013-14, which resulted in a rate of $33.58; and

WHEREAS, the sewer service rate did not increase in FY 2014-15, FY 2015-16, FY 2016-17 or FY 2017-18, FY 2018-19 and will not increase in FY 2019-20; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2019-20 sewer service charges have been compiled and calculated for properties using the Half Moon Bay sanitary sewer system using the aforementioned rate; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a noticed public hearing on July 16, 2019 adopting the FY 2019-20 sewer service charges.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Council of Half Moon Bay hereby adopts the sanitary sewer service summary entitled, "City of Half Moon Bay – FY 2019-20 Sanitary Sewer Assessments Summary" totaling $4,437,498.72 included as Exhibit A and that the City Council hereby directs staff to: 1) file the FY 2019-20 assessment roll for the City of Half Moon in the amount of $4,221,948.30; and 2) authorizes the County Controller to place these assessment charges on the County of San Mateo Property Tax Roll; and 3) bill $215,550.42 for the 172 directly billed properties for assessments not included on the tax roll.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly passed and adopted on the 16th of July 2019 by the City Council of Half Moon Bay by the following vote:

AYES, Councilmembers:
NOES, Councilmembers:
ABSENT, Councilmembers:
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers:

ATTEST:

______________________________
Jessica Blair, City Clerk

APPROVED:

______________________________
Harvey Rarback, Mayor
San Mateo County Property Tax Roll Sanitary Sewer Assessments for City of Half Moon Bay

Half Moon Bay Sanitary Sewer Service Charges

Assessment/Charge Code: 721S

Total Number of Parcels Assessed: 3,276

Total Dollar Assessment: $4,221,948.30

Lowest Parcel Assessment: $322.36

Highest Parcel Assessment: $222,853.26

Person Responsible for Submitting the Data: Paula Krogh
City of Half Moon Bay
507B Purissima Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Phone: 650-726-8779
Fax: 650-726-4550
Email: pkrogh@hmbcity.com

Tax Payer Contact: Paula Krogh
650-726-8779

Person Responsible for Review and Sign Off the Proof List: Bob Nisbet
Email: bnisbet@hmbcity.com

Sanitary Sewer Assessments Manual Billing Summary for the City of Half Moon Bay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Type</th>
<th>Total (Grouped by Class)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (6 parcels)</td>
<td>$26,795.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational (4 parcels)</td>
<td>$22,566.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident-Multiple (1 parcel)</td>
<td>$638.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident-Single (159 parcels)</td>
<td>$164,844.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (2 parcels)</td>
<td>$706.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Manual Billing Assessments (172 Parcels)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$215,550.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2019-20 Sanitary Sewer Assessments for City of Half Moon Bay

Total Sewer Assessments on SM County Property Tax Roll: $4,221,948.30
Total Sewer Assessments Manual Billings: $215,550.42

Total FY 2019-20 Half Moon Bay Sanitary Sewer Assessments: $4,437,498.72