Submitted by: Kenneth Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director

To: ABAG Executive Board

Subject: PDA Applications Received and Staff Recommendations

Date: March 5, 2012

Executive Summary

Staff has reviewed applications for Priority Development Area (PDA) Designation. The attached staff report outlines the applications received and staff recommendations for adoption.

Recommended Action

Approve adoption of recommended PDAs.

Next Steps

Staff will present this report to the ABAG Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on March 12, 2012. RPC comments will be presented to the ABAG Executive Board at their March 15th meeting along with this report for final approval of PDA recommendations.

Attachments

- Staff report
- PDA Recommendations
- Comment letters received

ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area

ABAG

MEMO

Date: March 5, 2012

To: ABAG Regional Planning Committee

From: Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director

Subject: **PDA Applications Received and Staff Recommendations**

Summary

Staff is seeking approval of the recommendations for PDA designation.

Background

ABAG and MTC have established a process related to the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and the umbrella plan, Plan Bay Area, for local governments to identify and nominate Priority Development Areas (PDAs). PDAs are neighborhoods in existing communities that are being planned in a manner that will foster complete communities based upon local community development aspirations and regional goals related to transit connectivity, housing needs and economic vitality.

ABAG has worked with MTC to support PDAs by tailoring funding programs to support PDAs. To date, the Station Area Planning Grant program has funded more than 25 neighborhood or specific plans in PDAs providing for extensive neighborhood level land-use and transportation planning. Infrastructure grants have been made available to PDAs through the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program to implement projects that advance plans. Expanded infrastructure funding and a new PDA Planning Grant program will be encompassed in the proposed One Bay Area Grant program. The PDA Technical Assistance program supports PDA jurisdictions with discrete planning projects that will advance implementation of their area plans. This program will continue along with the Bay Area Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) Fund, a $50 million revolving loan fund established through a $10 million investment by MTC and augmented by foundations and financial institutions in 2011. The TOAH Fund was established to advance affordable housing production in Priority Development Areas.

The first set of PDAs was adopted in November 2007 with the launch of the FOCUS program and others were subsequently approved through formal calls for applications. The initial PDA criteria required that nominated areas be in an existing community (not greenfield development), that the areas were being planned for more housing or that the local community had a vision to plan for more housing, and that the area had existing or

planned transit service. All of the areas were required to be locally nominated and were generally structured as mixed-use neighborhoods. In most PDAs, housing was being added to an existing primarily commercial neighborhood or thoroughfare. The scale of PDAs varied widely from the inception of the FOCUS program, varying from small centers such as Cloverdale in Sonoma County along the proposed SMART rail corridor to Downtown San Francisco.

Beginning in 2010, PDA applications began to be accepted on a rolling basis. Staff has continued to refine the program to ensure that new areas advance the goals of creating complete communities. In 2009, the transit criteria for PDA designation was refined to specify that areas need to have an existing rail station or ferry terminal, a planned transit station identified in MTC's Resolution 3434, or bus service with headways of at least 20 minutes during peak weekday commute periods.

In September 2011, two place types were added for PDA designation: Rural Town Center/Rural Corridor and Employment Center. The rural designation was established to recognize jurisdictions that are seeking to advance existing rural centers as appropriately scaled complete communities. For this new Place Type, the emphasis is on improved connectivity through walking, biking and amenities that reduce the need to drive, rather than transit service which is not required. The Employment Center place type was established to address the large number of office parks in the region that are currently disconnected from transit, and other community amenities. The criteria established for the employment centers is intended to strengthen major employment centers connectivity to transit, and intensify a mix of uses and services for employees on site. For this place type, jurisdictions that are not planning housing on site are required to demonstrate that a significant level of new housing is being planned within the community in close proximity to the proposed PDA.

As part of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) development process, ABAG requested that local jurisdictions identify areas they would like to see considered in the SCS development process. These areas were referred to as Growth Opportunity Areas. . In fall 2011, jurisdictions were encouraged to submit applications for those areas or other areas deemed appropriate for nomination as Priority Development Areas. The PDA application deadline was December 15, 2011 for those areas to be considered PDAs in the SCS and be eligible for One Bay Area Grant funds specified for PDA jurisdictions. Applicants have also submitted resolutions of support for their applications adopted by their City Councils or Board of Supervisors.

A total of 58 applications were received for consideration as PDAs. Fifty-one are being recommended for adoption. Two and a portion of a proposed PDA are being recommended as PDAs once the transit service improvements are made. These areas will not be considered PDAs until a letter from the transit provider is submitted to ABAG confirming that sufficient transit service is in place to meet the PDA transit criteria. One proposed PDA is not being recommended. Four were removed from consideration either

at the request of the applicant or were incorporated into the city's existing or proposed PDA. The staff recommendations are included in the attached list.

Several comment letters have been submitted in regards to PDA applications received. These letters are attached. Some of the comments received regard PDA designation of rural places. Rural place types do not need to meet the transit criteria and are not intended to be defined in the same manner as the other more urban or suburban PDA place types. Rural PDAs are intended to support local efforts to improve the services, infrastructure, and connectivity of these areas to encourage a reduction in driving locally. Local jurisdictions have submitted resolutions of support for their PDA applications, and ABAG staff accepts this as overall support for the area to be designated.

Staff has also been working with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) staff regarding local jurisdictions in VTA's Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas Program. VTA submitted this large PDA in 2007. Communities in Santa Clara County had provided resolutions related to inclusion of specific areas of their communities within the Cores, Corridors, and Station Area framework. Most of the jurisdictions have subsequently submitted resolutions related to PDA designation of the same areas. Staff is working to ensure local support for every PDA in every community and is waiting on council action to demonstrate local support for PDA designation in addition to the support that local jurisdictions have provided to VTA for well-regarded county-level program.

Recommendation

Approve the list of Planned and Potential Priority Development Areas.

Attachment(s):

- PDA Recommendations
- Comment Letters Received

Areas recommended for PDA Designation

County	Jurisdiction	PDA Name	Place Type	Status Recommendation (Planned/Potential)	Notes On PDA Designation
Alameda	Alameda County	Castro Valley BART	Transit Neighborhood	Potential	
Alameda	Alameda County	E14th and Mission Street	Transit Neighborhood / Mixed Use Corridor	Planned	
Alameda	Alameda County	Hesperian Boulevard	Transit Neighborhood	Planned	
Alameda	Alameda County	Meekland Avenue Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	Planned	
Alameda	Albany	San Pablo/Solano Mixed Use Neighborhood	Mixed Use Corridor / Neighborhood	Potential	
Alameda	Livermore	Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area	Suburban Center	Potential	
Alameda	Hayward	Mission Boulevard Corridor	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Alameda	Alameda	Northern Waterfront	Transit Neighborhood	Potential	
Contra Costa	San Pablo	San Pablo Avenue	Mixed Use Corridor	Planned	Combine with proposed 23rd Street PDA
Contra Costa	San Pablo	Rumrill Road	Employment Center: - current job/hh ratio = .67 < 1.25 - don't have current job/acre info	Potential	

County	Jurisdiction	PDA Name	Place Type	Status Recommendation (Planned/Potential)	Notes On PDA Designation
Contra Costa	Concord	Downtown Concord	City Center	Potential	
Napa	Napa	Downtown Napa	Rural Town Center	Potential	
Napa	Napa	Soscol Gateway Corridor	Rural Corridor	Potential	
San Mateo	Redwood City	Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor	Mixed Use Corridor	Planned: DESIGNATION PENDING RECEIPT OF RESOLUTION	Taking resolution to Council March 5th
San Mateo	Belmont	Villages of Belmont	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
San Mateo	San Mateo County	Midcoast	Rural Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	Mountain View	Downtown	Transit Town Center	Planned	
Santa Clara	Mountain View	San Antonio	Transit Town Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	Mountain View	El Camino Real	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	Mountain View	East Whisman	Employment Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	Mountain View	North Bayshore	Suburban Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Stevens Creek TOD Corridor	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village	Suburban Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Capitol/Tully/King Urban Villages	Suburban Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Saratoga TOD Corridor	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	

County	Jurisdiction	PDA Name	Place Type	Status Recommendation (Planned/Potential)	Notes On PDA Designation
Santa Clara	San Jose	Bascom TOD Corridor	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Bascom Urban Village	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Camden Urban Village	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Capitol Corridor Urban Villages	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village	Suburban Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	Old Edenvale Employment Area	Employment Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	San Jose	International Business Park Area	Employment Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	Moffett Park	Employment Center	Planned	

County	Jurisdiction	PDA Name	Place Type	Status Recommendation (Planned/Potential)	Notes On PDA Designation
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	Peery Park	Employment Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	East Sunnyvale	Urban Neighborhood	Potential	
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	Reamwood	Employment Center	Potential	
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	Tasman Crossing	Transit Neighborhood	Potential	
Solano	Dixon	Downtown Dixon	Rural Town Center/Rural Corridor	Potential	
Solano	Rio Vista	Downtown Rio Vista	Rural Town Center/Rural Corridor	Planned/Potential	A portion of the PDA is covered by the Waterfront Specific Plan.
Solano	Benicia	Northern Gateway - Benicia's Industrial Park	Employment Center	Potential	
Sonoma	Santa Rosa	North Santa Rosa Station Area	Suburban Center	Potential	

County	Jurisdiction	PDA Name	Place Type	Status Recommendation (Planned/Potential)	Notes On PDA Designation
Sonoma	Santa Rosa	Roseland Area	Transit Neighborhood	Potential	
Sonoma	Rohnert Park	Central Rohnert Park	Transit Town Center	Potential	
Sonoma	Sonoma County	Airport/Larkfield	Airport: Employment Center; Larkfield: Rural Town Center	Potential: ONLY FOR LARKFIELD AREA; AIRPORT POTENTIAL DESIGNATION PENDING TRANSIT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS	Airport area does not meet transit criteria
Sonoma	Sonoma County	Forestville	Rural Town Center	Potential	
Sonoma	Sonoma County	Graton	Rural Town Center	Potential	
Sonoma	Sonoma County	Guerneville	Rural Corridor	Potential	

County	Jurisdiction	PDA Name	Place Type	Status Recommendation (Planned/Potential)	Notes On PDA Designation
Sonoma	Sonoma County	Penngrove	Rural Corridor	Potential	
Sonoma	Sonoma County	The Springs	Rural Corridor	Potential	
Areas recommended for PDA designation once transit service is in place					
Contra Costa	Moraga	Rheem Valley	Mixed Use Corridor	Potential: DESIGNATION PENDING TRANSIT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS (and Place Type change)	
Contra Costa	Danville	Downtown Danville	Transit Town Center	Potential: DESIGNATION PENDING TRANSIT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS	
Sonoma	Sonoma County	Airport/Larkfield	Airport: Employment Center; Larkfield: Rural Town Center	Potential: ONLY FOR LARKFIELD AREA; AIRPORT POTENTIAL DESIGNATION PENDING TRANSIT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS	Airport area does not meet transit criteria
Areas NOT recommended for PDA designation					
Sonoma	Sonoma County	Eighth Street East Industrial Park	Employment Center	Do not designate	Does not meet transit criteria and no plans exist to provide a mix of uses to serve employees
Areas removed from consideration					
Marin	Marin County	San Quentin Peninsula	Transit Neighborhood	Removed from consideration at County's request	Board of Supervisors did not approve resolution for PDA application
Santa Clara	Mountain View	Moffett Field and NASA Ames		Application deferred	Deferred until the federal agency that has land use authority can show support for application
Contra Costa	San Pablo	23rd Street	Mixed Use Corridor	Combined with proposed San Pablo Avenue PDA	
Contra Costa	Richmond	Central Richmond & 23rd Street Corridor	City Center and Mixed Use Corridor	Add to existing Central Richmond PDA	

DON HORSLEY

Board of Supervisors
County of San Mateo

February 29, 2012

Kenneth Kirkey, Director of Planning
Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG)
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94604-2050

Re: San Mateo County's application to designate the unincorporated Midcoast a Priority Development Area

Dear Mr. Kirkey,

Recently, concerns have been raised about the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors' unanimous decision to submit an application seeking a Priority Development Area in a Rural Corridor (PDA) designation for the unincorporated Midcoast. Although I can appreciate these concerns, I continue to support the position that designating the Midcoast a PDA is essential for the future sustainability of this unique region.

There has been, and will continue to be, concerns over transportation and mobility on the Midcoast until the proper actions have taken place. With limited safe crossings on Highway 1 and a need for better roads and traffic mitigation, this designation will allow San Mateo County to pursue much needed funding to assist in creating more sustainable communities on the Midcoast. One important funding opportunity that the Midcoast would benefit from is the PDA Planning Program through One Bay Area's FOCUS program. In accordance with the Local Coastal Program resubmittal, San Mateo County has committed to conducting a Transportation Management Plan. This plan would address how to alleviate traffic and improve transit, trails, and residential transportation, all essential for a sustainable community. Without this designation, the county's ability to submit a competitive application and receive grant funding is diminished.

Another priority for the Midcoast is a community plan for Princeton by the Sea. This plan will utilize the unique characteristics of Princeton's zoned working waterfront to improve economic development, infrastructure, and capital improvements. A PDA designation would allow San Mateo County to submit a competitive application to secure needed funding to complete the planning portion of this project, the first step in creating a more sustainable community.

The concern that the Midcoast does not meet the PDA criteria has been noted. The FOCUS Application Guidelines state that the criteria to be designated a PDA is as follows: (a) the area is within an existing

County Government Center
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063

Direct (650) 363-4569
Coastside (650) 573-2222
Fax (650) 363-1856

community, (b) the area is near existing or planned fixed transit (or is served by comparable bus services), and (c) the area is planned or is planning for more housing. The Midcoast does not meet the transit requirements laid out in requirement (b). However, we are currently assessing transit on the Midcoast in the hopes of working with SAMTRANS to improve Midcoast transit services. Regarding requirement (c), development on the Midcoast is limited by the Local Coastal Program and California Coastal Commission to infill in existing coastal communities.

Access to water connections and improvements to roadways also play an role in creating more sustainable communities. Currently, Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD), the water provider for a large portion of the Midcoast, is working with the California Coastal Commission to establish the terms of permitting future water connections within the Local Coastal Program. Once the moratorium is lifted, MWSD will be able to permit new water hook-ups to new developments. If granted the PDA designation, San Mateo County will be able to seek funding to begin improving roadways and traffic congestion. This continues to remain a priority for the county.

The effort to designate the Midcoast a PDA derives from our desire to improve the region and make it more sustainable. It is our priority to improve roads, trails, transit, and the region as a whole. I urge you to approve the PDA designation for the San Mateo County Midcoast. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Don Horsley, Member
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

Sabrina Brennan
165 La Grande Ave.
Moss Beach, CA 94038

February 14, 2012

Kenneth Kirkey, Director of Planning
Association of Bay Area Governments
PO Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94604-2050

Re: **Application by San Mateo County for Priority Development Area (PDA) for the unincorporated Midcoast**

Dear Mr. Kirkey,

For the reasons given below, I request that ABAG not approve the request to designate the semi-rural San Mateo County Midcoast as a PDA.

I appreciate regional development and conservation strategies that limit urban sprawl and promote urban open space, green street programs, farmers markets, wetland restoration, parks, community colleges, school bus service, food-hubs that provide professional food buyers with fresh produce grown by local farmers, and bicycle/pedestrian safety and mobility improvements near Bay Area transit and jobs.

I live in Moss Beach, one of five small unincorporated farming, fishing, and eco-tourism communities located along the semi-rural San Mateo County Midcoast. The unincorporated Midcoast communities of El Granada, Miramar, Princeton, Montara, and Moss Beach are not located near Bay Area transit or jobs. Infrastructure is extremely limited in all five communities — they lack sidewalks, street lights, curbs, and storm drainage. The lack of storm drainage in the unincorporated urban Midcoast results in significant flooding, runoff, and erosion during the rainy season. The Midcoast has woefully inadequate transit service and no school bus service. Chronic backups on 10 scenic miles of Highway 1, the only transportation corridor, bring traffic to a crawl on a daily basis. The Midcoast does not have a supermarket, library, or community center. The Midcoast lacks public and private school capacity. We do have one small hospital. Most voting age citizens commute daily over the Santa Cruz Mountains to jobs on the Bayside of San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties.

I am concerned about a number of issues that impact ABAG designation of the San Mateo County Midcoast as a Priority Development Area (PDA).

The Midcoast is located entirely within the Coastal Zone. I am concerned about the inherent policy conflicts between PDA designations, the California Coastal Act and San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP) policies for the Midcoast. I have not been able to find any information on ABAG, FOCUS, and OneBayArea websites as to how Coastal Act and LCP policy conflicts would be resolved. If the ABAG Executive Board designates the unincorporated Midcoast as a PDA, the Midcoast could become a target for state mandated, higher density development than allowed by the LCP. Any proposed Coastside development could be subject

to appeal to the California Coastal Commission, which is likely to deny it.

A PDA designation is not appropriate for areas with significant constraints on new development. The Midcoast has inadequate infrastructure, including water, sewer, schools, and highway capacity, to accommodate planned buildout. All new development must be consistent with the County's LCP, which was certified in 1980. An update to the Midcoast LCP has been in limbo for more than a decade, and is still under review by the California Coastal Commission.

The low-lying portions of the Midcoast are located within a tsunami inundation zone, flood zone, and sea level rise zone. Specifically all of Princeton, areas along Airport Street including the proposed Big Wave project, and the Manufactured Home Park, nearly all of Miramar, and a small part of El Granada are within the mapped flood zone. Strategies for coping with coastal erosion, landslides, and sea level rise include Planned Retreat. Designating a PDA in a semi-rural unincorporated area that must plan for sea level rise impacts and is far from transit and jobs is not a sustainable growth strategy.

Designating PDAs in unincorporated areas located in the Coastal Zone that are far from transit/jobs would force counties plagued by budget problems and aggressive housing allocation numbers to change zoning regulations to maximize infill development. Rezoning the Coastal Zone for high density development in an area that is projected to experience sea level rise is not smart planning. PDAs are envisioned to "support focused growth by accommodating growth as mixed use, infill development near transit and job centers, with an emphasis on housing." That's an urban Bayside strategy, and has the potential to conflict with the Coastal Act and LCP.

The FOCUS Application Guidelines require that a PDA must meet all of the following criteria: (a) the area is within an existing community, (b) the area is near existing or planned fixed transit (or is served by comparable bus service), and (c) the area is planned or is planning for more housing.

The Midcoast area does not meet all of these criteria:

1) There is no plan for fixed transit and SAMTRANS bus service is marginal.
    a. Route 17 (Montara to HMB) 90-min interval 8-6 daily (9-5 Sun); 60-min interval 6-8 AM weekdays.
    b. Route 294 (Pacifica to San Mateo) 90-min interval 8-6 weekdays only.
2) The coastside has a significant surplus of housing compared to jobs, and residents must commute "over the hill" to jobs on the Bayside of San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Francisco counties.
3) Housing is the lowest priority land use under the Coastal Act.

Another Midcoast issue which severly impacts PDA growth and development objectives is the inadequate water supply and delivery capacity. Coastside County Water District (CCWD) receives a limited supply of water from the Hetch Hetchy system, but by agreement with the City and County of San Francisco, cannot increase this supply. Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) must rely entirely upon wells for its drinking water supply, which are even less robust than CCWD's.

An additional consideration is that while MWSD issues permits based on safe yield, meaning how much water they can reliably expect to get in drought years, CCWD issues permits based on

average yield (across wet and dry years). This means that half the time, CCWD is over-committed on the water supply, and every new connection increases the probability of mandatory rationing in dry years. Many homes in the unincorporated urban Midcoast are on private wells; salt water intrusion has been a problem in the past and is an on-going concern for some property owners. There are hundreds of people who paid in the 1980s to have the right to hook up. All they have to do is go to San Mateo County, pull a building permit and go to CCWD and say "hook me up" and CCWD has to do it. If/when CCWD actually hooks up all of the pre-sold water connections, there would be mandatory rationing about half the time. The bottom line is that if the Midcoast is currently at 50% buildout as the San Mateo County Planning Department states, there is simply no water available to get to full buildout, and especially not for increasing the amount of development.

The ABAG memo dated 8/30/11 finds that building homes in the right places — near jobs and transit options — reduces the need to drive for everyday needs, with the associated benefits of improved air quality and reduced greenhouse gas emissions. SB 375 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets to be achieved from the automobile and light truck sectors for 2020 and 2035. San Mateo County has a jobs/housing imbalance, which leads to long commute distances from around the Bay Area to Bayside jobs. The county needs more housing near jobs and transit corridors to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions. The San Mateo County Coastside is one of the outlying areas providing housing for Bayside jobs, and thus has the opposite jobs/housing imbalance. There is no viable transit connection to Bayside jobs. Building more housing on the Coastside, far from the jobs center and transit corridor will not help reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions, but will actually contribute to the problem.

The Coastside's unique scenic and environmental resources are a treasure to be shared with all Californians. This area, without transit connections and isolated from the Bayside jobs centers, is best preserved as a small town farming, fishing, and visitor-serving destination, and the jobs it supports. Coastside VMT and greenhouse gas emissions can be reduced by improving local bus service and building the Hwy 1 multi-modal trail and safe highway crossings. Funding for these projects should come from Measure A. The new ABAG Priority Development Area guidelines ('Rural Mixed-Use Corridor' and the 'Rural Town Center') are too vague to ensure that grant funding incentives would go towards building pedestrian and bicycle friendly projects such as trails.

Over the past four years San Mateo County has missed two opportunities to apply for Measure A funding for Midcoast pedestrian and bicycle initiatives. This has been frustrating for residents who are concerned about the growing number of pedestrian and bicycle accidents and fatalities on Highway 1. The Route One pedestrian/bike trail from Montara through Half Moon Bay is specifically identified in the County Transportation Authority's Strategic Plan 2009-2013 as eligible for Pedestrian and Bicycle Funds from Measure A. Although Half Moon Bay has successfully applied for funds for a significant portion of the Trail within Half Moon Bay city limits, San Mateo County has not yet submitted an application for the unincorporated Midcoast segment, despite two calls for project submittals in the past four years.

The ABAG memo dated 8/30/11 states that Priority Development Areas are areas that are ripe for growth. "PDAs comprise a network of neighborhoods that are expected to accommodate the majority of the region's population and employment growth." Though ABAG and MTC can't

force cities to accept their projections, these agencies can withhold transportation grants from cites and counties that don't comply. Development of these areas would be bolstered by state grants, with 70% going to PDAs. ABAG & MTC propose regional funding program: OneBayArea Grant to support SCS (Sustainable Communities Strategy) implementation. $211 million for Bay Area counties, based on population, Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), and actual housing production.

I'm concerned about the alarming lack of local participation in the County's recent decision to apply for a PDA designation in the unincorporated Midcoast. I did not receive adequate notification about the County PDA application. I was informed of this application only four days before the Board of Supervisors meeting of January 31, 2012, when the agenda was published online. I receive both the County list-serve notifications regarding permit and planning and Midcoast Community Council meeting agendas and I do not recall any public discussion or public notice regarding a proposed PDA in my community. I'm very concerned that this item was put on the Board of Supervisors consent calendar without first vetting it through the public.

I respectfully request that ABAG not approve the proposed PDA for the San Mateo County unincorporated Midcoast.

Sincerely,
Sabrina Brennan

cc: Bill Kehoe, Chair, Midcoast Community Council
Laura Stein, Vice-Chair, Midcoast Community Council
Lisa Ketcham, Secretary, Midcoast Community Council
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Steve Monowitz, Deputy Director, San Mateo County Planning Division
Ruby Pap, California Coastal Commission
Madeleine Cavalieri, California Coastal Commission
Dan Carl, California Coastal Commission

COUNTY OF SONOMA
PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

February 29, 2012

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director
Association of Bay Area Governments
PO Box 2500
Oakland, CA 94604-2050

Re: Sonoma County Application for Airport/Larkfield Priority Development Area (PDA) Designation

Dear Mr. Kirkey,

Thank you and your staff for assisting with our applications for PDA designations in Sonoma County. We have truly appreciated ABAG's efforts to develop alternative place types in the Sustainable Communities Strategy which are more appropriate for the Bay Area's rural counties such as Sonoma.

This letter is written to provide additional context and clarification of the County of Sonoma's application for Priority Development Area designation for the Airport/Larkfield area. We hope that this entire PDA boundary can gain staff's recommendation to the Executive Board on March 15, to support the County's efforts in reducing VMT in this area and support efforts for more sustainable future development.

The County has proposed a dual designation of Employment Center/Rural Town Center which appeared to be the best fit for this unique area split by Highway 101 with jobs to the west and housing with infill potential to the east. Preliminary feedback from ABAG staff indicates concern with meeting all of the criteria for the Employment Center half of this proposed PDA, so this letter will focus just on the portion of this PDA west of Highway 101.

Setting. The approximately 1,400 acre portion of the Airport/Larkfield PDA area west of Highway 101 contains a mixture of office, light industrial, warehouse, commercial and public facility uses. See attached Airport/Larkfield Area Overview and Land Use Graphics. This unincorporated area contained approximately 6,000 jobs in 2009. Development has been in accordance with the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan, originally adopted in 1987. The Sonoma County Airport occupies about 780 acres, the majority of which is restricted for runway approach protection, leaving a balance of 630 acres of land for private development to the east of the Airport. Approximately one third of the 630 acres of industrial designated land is vacant.

The Sonoma County Airport is the North Bay's only airport providing passenger service and is an important transportation component supporting the local economy. In January, the Board of Supervisors approved a new Airport Master Plan and a package of improvement projects including runway extensions. The Airport Master Plan and Airport Improvement project were heavily supported by the business community, including a petition of support from over 500 local businesses representing essentially all of the major local employers and businesses in the County. The business community hailed the existing and expanded use of the Sonoma County Airport as a vital economic component to growing and attracting new businesses to Sonoma County. Another unique feature of this area is the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) rail corridor running through the business park. The area is served by Sonoma County Transit with several stops throughout the park in the morning and evening commute hours at 30 – 40 minute headway intervals. The area has been developed with roadways to accommodate a Class II bike lane along the main roadway serving the area (Airport Boulevard).

Future Development Scenario. The area has a potential for another 12,000 jobs. Due to budget constraints, there are no immediate future plans to shorten the existing 30 – 40 minute bus transit headways during the commute hours. The site is well situated for the improvement of multi-modal transportation options for employees. The focus of SMART at this time is initiating service within two years between San Rafael and Santa Rosa, followed by extension to the Larkspur ferry and Cloverdale. Although a SMART station at the Airport Business Park is not currently part of the approved plan, we expect that passenger rail service for residents near any of the 14 rail stations along the 70 mile SMART corridor to the 6,000+ jobs within the Airport Industrial Area business park will become a high priority in the future, particularly as the economy recovers and additional jobs are created. As the attached Airport Business Park Distance/Direction Graphic shows, 61% of the 6,000 Airport Business Park workers reside only 10 miles away in the Windsor, Larkfield, and Santa Rosa communities. In conjunction with the improvement of the SMART rail corridor, there are plans to construct an adjacent Class I bike path which will provide a bike commuting option for Airport Business Park employees in the future.

Employment Center Criteria. The project meets all of the criteria for PDA designation except the 20 minute headway, as discussed below.

> ***Employment Center:*** *Acknowledging the importance of employment location in creating a robust, functional transit network and sustainable regional land use pattern, the Employment Center place type designation is intended for existing non-residential areas with transit service that are planning for more intensive development, including a greater mix of uses and more pedestrian-friendly, vibrant environments. These might include central business districts, redeveloping office parks, or retrofitting commercial corridors or shopping malls.*

1. *The areas currently contain a density of 25 jobs per gross acre or greater than 0.5 FAR or have the plan capacity for this intensity of jobs.*

   Response: This criterion is met. Buildout of the over 600 acres of private lands designated for industrial development in the General Plan at current allowed densities and at an FAR of 1.0 would result in over 18,000 jobs using a 50/50 mix of warehouse and industrial land uses and an average employee generation rate of 600 square feet of building area per employee. This calculation includes the existing 6,000 jobs added to development on 200 acres at the FAR and land use mix described above. This would result in nearly 30 jobs per gross acre in the Year 2040.

2. *The areas are currently served by transit or have planned transit service (existing or planned fixed rail, demonstrated high frequency bus with 20 min headways during peak weekday commute hours, or shuttle service to fixed rail) and support other modes of transportation (required Transportation Demand Management, improved walking and biking, and reduced parking requirements)*

   Response: This criterion is not met. There are 2 or 3 bus stops in the morning and evening during commute hours 30 to 40 minutes apart. See attached Sonoma County Routes 60 and 62 route schedules. As mentioned previously, over 60% of the business park employees currently live within 10 miles of their job. There is great potential to encourage more transit, bike and future rail trips to reduce single occupant vehicular trips to the work area. A class II bike lane exists along Airport Boulevard, which would connect with a future planned class II bike lane

along Old Redwood Highway and a future class I bike lane along the SMART rail corridor right of way directly linking the Airport Business Center to the communities of Larkfield, Windsor and Santa Rosa. Additionally the potential exists for a rail stop to serve all the residents within walking distance of the 14 future rail stations to the north and south in the future. Obtaining planned Priority Development Area status for this entire Airport/Larkfield PDA would support Sonoma County's efforts to reduce VMT's at this location and create more sustainable development in the future.

3. *The areas are planned for a mix of uses, services, and amenities for employees.*

   Response: This criterion is met. The Airport business park area has lodging, a health club, restaurants, service stations, and entertainment uses for employees and customers in accordance with development standards of the Airport Industrial Specific Plan.

4. *The jurisdiction is providing sufficient housing near the employment center to merit resources supporting an exclusively employment development area. The jurisdiction has lower existing jobs per household than the regional average of 1.25 or the jurisdiction has lower future jobs per household in its adopted General Plan than its existing ratio.*

   Response: This criterion is met. According to the jobs projections contained in ABAG's January 2012 Focused Growth scenario alternatives for 2040 the unincorporated County has a jobs/household ratio of 0.88 (57,233 jobs 2040/65,278 households), which is below the regional average of 1.25 jobs per household.

Thank you for your continued consideration of Sonoma County's application of the entire Airport/Larkfield proposed Priority Development Area. If I can provide any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me at 707-565-1925 or Denise Peter at 565-7385.

Sincerely,

Pete Parkinson, AICP
Director, Permit and Resource Management Department

Attachments:

1. Airport/Larkfield Area Overview Map
2. Airport/Larkfield Land Use Map
3. Airport Business Park Distance/Direction Graphic, US Census LEHD 2009
4. Sonoma County Transit Schedules Routes 60, 62

cc: Board of Supervisors
Denise Peter, Planner III
Jennifer Barrett, Deputy Director, Planning

City of
Santa Rosa

February 27, 2012

Kenneth Kirkey, Planning Director
Association of Bay Area Governments
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Mr. Kirkey:

We are writing in regard to the joint application submitted by the City of Santa Rosa and Sonoma County for designation of a Priority Development Area (PDA) in the Roseland area under the FOCUS initiative. We understand that PDA designation has been postponed because transit service within the Roseland area does not meet the FOCUS criterion for 20 minute weekday peak commute headways at the present time. We respectfully ask that ABAG reconsider this decision, based on our view that the 20 minute headway criterion is not the best measure of transit density or transit orientation in the Santa Rosa CityBus system, and in the Roseland community in particular.

We are providing this letter in order to give a fuller picture of the current level of transit investment in the proposed Roseland PDA, to highlight important service design goals and constraints that limit the utility of the 20 minute headway criterion as a measure of overall transit density in the Roseland area, as well as to note what we view as a unique "chicken or egg" dilemma in relation to PDA designation for Roseland.

Transit Service Levels in the Proposed Roseland Area PDA

The proposed Roseland Area PDA encompasses the community of Roseland, an economically-disadvantaged area with high levels of transit ridership. The proposed PDA is centered on the Santa Rosa CityBus Southside Transfer Center. Every weekday, 112 CityBus trips—8 buses each hour—serve the Roseland area via four routes that provide direct service to downtown Santa Rosa as well as across Highway 101 and Highway 12 to key employment, social services, and shopping destinations on the north and east sides of Santa Rosa. These routes account for 30% of total service hours in the CityBus system. Three CityBus routes directly serve the Southside Transfer Center, pulsing at the Transfer Center every 30 minutes. This equates to six buses serving the Transfer Center each hour—one bus every 10 minutes if these trips were

100 Santa Rosa Avenue • Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 543-3333 • Fax: (707) 543-3326
www.srcity.org

distributed throughout the hour rather than being scheduled on a pulse model to facilitate transfers—an important feature of the CityBus service model. From the Southside Transfer Center, passengers can reach the downtown Transit Mall (the central hub of the CityBus system) four times each hour (on the :00, :10, :30, and :50), or travel directly across town to the Northside Transfer Center at the Coddingtown Mall—the second busiest transfer center in the CityBus system, after the Transit Mall.

Given the relatively low level of street connectivity in the Roseland area, providing adequate levels of service coverage is a key challenge and major area of investment in the CityBus system. Despite the lack of connectivity in some areas, many residents of the proposed PDA (such as those living near the Southside Transfer Center, Stony Point Road, Hearn Avenue, and West Avenue) have access to more than one CityBus route within a short walking distance. This reflects a decision made by the Santa Rosa City Council to ensure the widest access to transit within an area where a great many residents use transit as their primary mode of transportation. The City provides this coverage at the expense of frequency of service (due to the limits on available operating funds), but strives to mitigate the effects of lower frequencies by providing excellent connectivity via direct service to other parts of the City, as well as regular timed transfer opportunities.

We believe these other dimensions of transit service level should be considered in the case of the Roseland PDA. We additionally argue that the 20 minute headway criterion fails to take into consideration the central quandary of transit service provision in the Roseland area, which we believe makes this case unique, as discussed below.

"Which comes first?"

Roseland is a highly transit-oriented community, and in our view has demonstrated mobility needs and transit ridership levels that mark the area as a potential focal point for future transit operations investments, such as increased frequencies and longer span of service. (Indeed, the Roseland service model is one focus of the City of Santa Rosa's current Short Range Transit Plan development process, in which a key proposal under consideration is introducing 15 minute headways on Roseland's Route 9, which carries an average of over 40 passengers per hour.)

However, for CityBus to sustain the higher levels of transit service that we believe Roseland deserves, we must pursue all available measures to support three key outcomes for the area: 1) continued development, 2) increasing density in the urban fabric, and 3) vastly improved pedestrian infrastructure and connectivity to promote safe and convenient access to transit stops. We view designation of a PDA as a critical step in the process of supporting local planning, development, and infrastructure improvement projects that will enhance the already

notable transit orientation of the Roseland area. The quandary is this: which comes first—the investments that will qualify this area for PDA designation, or the PDA designation that supports these investments in the short term, and helps us to sustain them over the long-term? Santa Rosa's transit system may not have 20 minute headways in place at the present time, but PDA designation can only help us to achieve, maintain, and build upon these higher service levels to improve quality of life and economic opportunity for Roseland residents, and support the development of the Roseland area as an example of smart growth in the Bay Area.

We hope that this information will provide ABAG with a fuller understanding of the unique conditions in the Roseland area, and our rationale for considering this area to be an excellent candidate for PDA designation in keeping with the goals of the FOCUS program, and the City of Santa Rosa and Sonoma County's shared vision.

Please do not hesitate to contact Rachel Ede, Transit Planner, at 707-543-3337 or Lisa Kranz, Supervising Planner, at 707-543-3259, with any questions or needs for clarification. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Moshier
Director of Transportation and Public Works, City of Santa Rosa

Charles J. Regalia
Director of Community Development, City of Santa Rosa

Pete Parkinson, AICP
Director, Sonoma County Permit & Resource Management Department

Cc: Kathleen Millison, City Manager, City of Santa Rosa
Santa Rosa City Council
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors
Jackie Reinhart, Regional Planner, ABAG

MAYOR JACK BATCHELOR, JR.
VICE MAYOR MICHAEL CEREMELLO, JR.
COUNCILMEMBER DANE BESNEATTE

COUNCILMEMBER THOM BOGUE
COUNCILMEMBER RICK FULLER
CITY TREASURER JAMES SLAUGHTER

March 5, 2012

Mr. Kenneth Kirkey
Association of Bay Area Governments
Regional Planning Committee
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Response to letters in opposition to designating Old Town Dixon as a PDA

Mr. Kirkey:

Recently you have received two letters, one from the Solano County Taxpayers Association and the other from the Old Town Neighbors, in opposition to the City of Dixon's application to have Old Town designated as a PDA. I wish to respond to some of the items mentioned in these letters which are inaccurate and do not represent the majority opinion of the City Council.

In the letter from the SCTA they mention that the City may need to sell the train station, because it is an asset of the now disbanded redevelopment agency. They reference a comment made by our City Attorney stating this certainty. The train station is owned by the City and not the redevelopment agency. Some redevelopment funds were used in the construction of the station, but there is no requirement they be repaid. Most of the funding for the station came from a Solano Transportation Authority (STA) grant. The comment made by our City Attorney was in response to a general question about what was going to happen to redevelopment assets. The council member asking the question wrongly assumed that the redevelopment agency owned the train station, because some redevelopment funds were used in its construction.

STA and the City are well aware that it will be expensive to ultimately make the train station meet the standards needed for a Capitol Corridor Train stop. Part of the reason for why we applied for a PDA designation of Old Town was to help further that objective by giving us a greater opportunity to apply for the needed funds to complete this work. It is true there are some people opposed to the train station ever being a stop, but they are in the minority. It has been a goal of this and many previous Dixon City Councils

City of Dixon
600 East A Street • Dixon, California • 95620-3697
(707) 678-7000 • FAX (707) 678-0960 • TTY (707) 678-1489

since 1996, when the City commissioned the Downtown Revitalization Plan, to once again have a train stop in Old Town. Completion of the Transit Center (train station) was also in the 2001-2006 Redevelopment Agency Implementation Plan.

In the letter from the Old Town Dixon Neighbors they mention their neighborhood should have been notified by senior staff of the PDA application, because of the potential adverse impacts the designation will have on the neighborhood. They mention a number of traffic concerns they believe will be exacerbated by higher densities that would be allowed in Old Town as a result of receiving a PDA designation. The City was under no legal obligation to notify Old Town Neighbors of the PDA application. The City has notified the neighborhood whenever a new development project has been proposed, as a courtesy. Obtaining a PDA designation in of itself is not approval of any development. Furthermore, their concerns about traffic as a result of increasing densities within the PDA is premature in that it is not certain what effects a project will have on existing traffic until the specific project is analyzed.

The City strongly believes the Old Town Neighborhood should be designated as a PDA. We believe having the train stop in Old Town is a key component to its revitalization and without the PDA designation it will be very difficult to obtain the necessary funding. We acknowledge there are a number of hurdles that must be overcome to achieve this goal.

Please feel free to contact me at 707 678-7004 x114 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

David Dowswell
Community Development Director

cc: Jack Batchelor, Mayor
Jon Cox, Acting City Manager

Solano County Taxpayers Association
Earl Heal, President
P.O Box 31
Dixon, CA 95620
<solanotaxpayers@sbcglobal.net>

February 29, 2012

Association of Bay Area Governments
Regional Planning Committee
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, California 94607

Attention: Kenneth Kirkey, Planning Director

Subject: Dixon Application for Priority Development Area (PDA) Adopted by Council January 24, 2012

At its February 22, 2012, meeting, Solano County Taxpayers Association (SCTA) approved a resolution to present SCTA concerns to Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) about the large commitments of tax money, both past and future, required to bring a Capital Corridor train stop to Dixon. In addition we believe that the Dixon City Council January 24, 2012, staff report and resolution to approve the pending Dixon Priority Development Area (PDA) application failed to include recent, relevant information to the Council and to the public regarding future ownership of the train station. The train station was completed in 2007 using State redevelopment money and is central to the intent of the PDA.

The State dissolution of redevelopment agencies late last year did more than just stop the flow of money from Sacramento; it also allows the State to appropriate redevelopment assets (buildings, parking lots and leases). As the city attorney informed the Council on February 14, 2012, ". . . the City's obligation is to sell (the train station)." Although SCTA would argue that the City knew or should have known of the potential sale of the train station at the time the PDA application was approved by the Council in January, it is but one additional reason that the Dixon PDA application is premature and should not be approved at this time.

Contrary to the Council's official position, the actions of the Council in these matters have been neither unanimous nor without significant public disagreement since before the construction of the train station. The unfortunate location chosen for the train station will force the City to make a number of very costly and disruptive changes to the historic section of downtown (Old Town). The most costly and disruptive of these is the West A Street grade separation tunnel that is required to provide space to construct some future rail passenger platform. The City's application for the PDA acknowledges that a funding source for this project has <u>not</u> been identified. This project is expected to cost several tens of millions of tax dollars.

In addition to the high cost, the construction of a grade separation tunnel of a major cross-town street, West A Street, the only east-west crossing now in the city limits, would disrupt traffic and Old Town businesses for a very long time. Many businesses in Old Town are already struggling economically and the effect of this kind of disruption on these businesses is not expected to be positive. The existing post office seems sure to suffer major, if not permanent, disruption of public access.

What will be the effect of ***selling*** the train station? Shouldn't the PDA application at least be tabled until this question is resolved?

The PDA application also states ". . . the City **hopes** that many of the existing buildings in Old Town . . . will be renovated and reused. The City **hopes** that the upper floors . . . will again be used for residential." The SCTA is concerned that many historic buildings in Old Town were constructed before modern earthquake and other building standards were in effect and that "renovation" may be extremely costly. Instead of renovating the former Veterans Hall in Old Town, for example, the County recently elected to purchase a new facility in another location at a lower cost. The "hopes" of the City in the PDA application may prove illusory and may become the taxpayer's most costly approach to the stated goals of the PDA.

Again, what will be the effect on the proposed PDA of ***selling*** the train station?

Another smaller, but costly related project for which money has been approved by the Council is the construction of a pedestrian tunnel to replace the West B Street pedestrian grade crossing near the train station. In addition to the high cost (over $6 million), SCTA is concerned about this project because the City's portion of money required for its construction has been diverted from a development impact fund (intended to mitigate growth related issues) to a transit capital fund that contained less than half the money required for the City's portion of this project. In addition to not clearly identifying the method of repayment of the money loaned (diverted) from the development impact fund, the Council majority focused mostly on a purported pedestrian safety issue at the site. A significant number of citizens and a minority of the Council have suggested a lower-cost alternative to address the supposed safety issue (the addition of crossing arms) and repeatedly questioned the cost, need and wisdom for this project at all. Opposition to this project includes significant safety issues (lack of visibility, potential for loitering and crime and the attendant risk particularly to students), aesthetics (odors, potentially poorly maintained lighting, dampness, vandalism) and taxpayer costs.

Citizens and some on the Council have repeatedly urged the Council to consider other, more suitable sites for a future train stop that would not be burdened by most of the mitigation measures, and costs, that the train station at its current location requires before any passenger train can stop. One of these proposed sites is within the city limits to the northeast of the subject location (East H Street) and has been offered by the owner for this purpose. This site is relatively free of development at this time and would offer a clean slate for future central transit development.

SCTA believes that ABAG and the Council should step back from their headlong rush to spend large amounts of tax money on a poorly-located train station and the pending approval of the PDA application until effects of the likely sale of the train station are made clear. SCTA also believes that alternative nearby passenger train sites exist that do not come burdened with the large costs and undesirable consequences for Old Town associated with the current location.

The Dixon Chapter of SCTA is currently circulating a petition stating the foregoing objections to further expenditures of tax money at the current train station site, and asking that the PDA application be halted at this time. Copies of these petitions will be available for review after March 14, 2012.

Sincerely,

Earl Heal, President
Solano County Taxpayers Association
(707) 446-1353

OLD TOWN DIXON NEIGHBORS

Dixon, California 95620

February 29, 2012

Mr. Kenneth Kirkey, Planning Director
Regional Planning Committee
Association of Bay Area Governments
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94604-2050

Dear Mr. Kirkey:

We are writing as representatives of a group of Dixon residents known as the ***Old Town Neighbors***. Our group opposes the application by the City of Dixon to designate our downtown, core neighborhood as part of a Priority Development Area (PDA) through the FOCUS program. We have summarized our objections for your review and consideration.

The community did not learn of the City's plan to apply for the PDA designation until well after the fact. Even though members of the ***Old Town Neighbors*** have been meeting with David Dowswell, Dixon's Community Development Director, since early 2009, we were never made aware of the City's intent to turn our downtown commercial district and the adjacent neighborhoods into a Rural Town Center/Rural Corridor. We only found out on January 24, 2012 when the Dixon City Council adopted a resolution, by a three-to-two vote, in support of an application that apparently had already been submitted. When we questioned Mr. Dowswell at our meeting with him on February 8, 2012, he indicated that at one of their weekly meetings, City staff had discussed whether to inform us ahead of time. According to him, senior staff did not "believe" they were obligated to let us know of the intent to designate our neighborhood as part of a PDA.

We would point out that in 2009 we submitted a neighborhood letter/petition to the local Planning Commission that was their incentive to direct Mr. Dowswell to begin meeting with us. In that letter we stated:

> "Citizens should be actively involved in decision making that affects them and their families. Whenever a neighborhood policy, a zoning change, a strategic plan, or any other planning is undertaken, there must be continuous and maximum participation by those who will be affected by the change, especially by the residents who live in the area."

We have no doubt that you will agree that designating Old Town as a PDA has relevance to those residents who live within its boundaries.

Our City officials are well aware that the very neighborhood that they have chosen for a Priority Development Area has been over-developed for upwards of 30 years. In a report presented to the Planning Commission in September of 2011, Mr. Dowswell stated: "Staff acknowledges over the past 30 years the City has wrongly approved a number of projects in old town that violated the General Plan by exceeding their allowable density. The net effect is that many more units have been created in old town than should have been." Furthermore, in a July, 2009 response by City staff to a letter from the State Department of Transportation it was pointed out that "congestion and limited parking availability in the RM-2 are factors making it desirable to encourage multi-family housing in other neighborhoods."

Designating the Old Town area as a PDA will NOT help to implement the Downtown Revitalization Plan. Fostering home ownership in the adjacent neighborhood is a key element in the plan to revitalize the downtown. Mr. Dowswell is well aware from his meetings with the neighborhood at large, that many homeowners question the incentive to maintain property in an area that has for years suffered the impacts of overdevelopment. Adding more compact housing to the area will only exacerbate the unmitigated impacts that already exist.

In regard to the underutilized, existing buildings in the downtown commercial area, a determination should be made as to the cost of renovating and reusing the upper floors for residential use. Retrofitting brick buildings to make them safe for housing may very well be cost prohibitive for the property owners.

In terms of the goal to make Dixon a more pedestrian-friendly environment, many residents of our neighborhood and well beyond consider the undercrossing at B Street to be a giant step in the wrong direction. We do not believe that the passage will be safe for our children and seniors. In order to accommodate ADA requirements in terms of slope and platforms, access at either end of the tunnel does not provide for a clear line of sight. Residents are of the opinion that the undercrossing will discourage walking from one side of the tracks to the other, rather than promote it.

And, there is widespread concern that in regard to public safety and traffic mitigation, the overcrossing at Parkway Boulevard should be a higher priority. Depending on the time of day, traffic congestion through the bottleneck of downtown Dixon necessitates the fire department taking a very time consuming and convoluted route to respond to emergencies in the southeastern area of Dixon. Neither the pedestrian undercrossing at B Street nor the proposed vehicular undercrossing at West A Street will improve emergency response time to certain parts of town.

And, last but not least, the fate of the train station in downtown Dixon is uncertain. At the Council meeting on February 14, 2012, there was discussion about the very real possibility that, as a redevelopment asset, the property may have to be sold. Many residents of Dixon and some members of the Council consider that to be a blessing in disguise. The current location has many more drawbacks than benefits; and, other options should be reexamined. One possibility is a site off of East H Street which at the present time and certainly in the long-term will be more accessible to the goods and services that our community has to offer.

It has been many years since our now historic downtown has been the job center for our community. Development in the Northeast Quadrant is planned as the future center for employment opportunities not only for Dixon but for the surrounding area as well.

We trust that you agree with us that before an area is designated for Priority Development, more community input should take place. The public must be fully engaged in participatory planning in order to truly determine local aspirations for the development of a complete community.

As representatives of the ***Old Town Neighbors***, we fully support the efforts of the local chapter of the Solano County Taxpayers Association to circulate a petition in order to gauge community sentiment about the proposed location of Old Town Dixon as a Priority Development Area.

It is our understanding that you will include our letter with the report you present to the Regional Planning Committee on March 12, 2012 and to the ABAG Executive Board for their meeting on March 15, 2012. Thank you.

Ginger Emerson

Patricia Graves

Martha Pearson

Sandy Block

David Werrin

Susan Werrin