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2005 Report Card on Our County’s Quality of Life
Ninth annual edition

Sustainability: A healthy environment, society, and economy for the long term
About This Report

The ninth edition of *Indicators for a Sustainable San Mateo County* strives to stimulate a community-wide dialogue about bettering this special place where we work, play, and live. It challenges each of us to ask, “How do we simultaneously achieve the triple goals of a healthy economy, society, and environment in San Mateo County, while using only our fair share of the planet’s resources?” Propelled by the philosophy that “what gets measured gets managed,” this annual report card holds us collectively accountable for improvement in all areas.

This report aims to weave the concept of sustainability into the vocabulary of our leaders, residents, and workers, and ultimately into the fabric of our entire community. By providing fact-based information about local trends over time, it improves our ability to make sound decisions for the benefit of current and future generations. It is distributed to government policy makers, Chambers of Commerce, environmental organizations, human services agencies, civic groups, businesses, individuals, and more.

This report is a reflection of our community in more ways than one. It would not be possible without the help of dozens of local volunteers representing various walks of life in our county. These volunteers selflessly contributed their talents in research and the graphic arts. We are grateful for their assistance and the financial contributions of our sponsors.

About Sustainable San Mateo County

Sustainable San Mateo County (SSMC) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to the long-term improvement of our region’s environment, society, and economy through the promotion of sustainability.

Inspired by the 1992 Earth Summit, SSMC has been educating the community about sustainability for 12 years. In addition to publishing the *Indicators* report, SSMC hosts an annual Sustainability Awards program to recognize San Mateo County businesses, community groups, and individuals that have demonstrated an outstanding commitment to bringing sustainable practices to their work. SSMC also organizes community events that support a wider understanding of issues affecting sustainability in the county and collaborates with community groups to develop programs that address specific community issues and needs.

Our Mission

Sustainable San Mateo County exists to change the present and shape the future of our region’s environmental health, economic vitality, and social equity so that each generation meets its needs in a sustainable way. Sustainability means that we meet today’s needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

Cover Photos

The County of San Mateo Forensic Lab and Coroner’s Office: Built in 2002, the Crime Lab is a green building with a variety of sustainable practices and materials including a vast solar array on the roof, a design that provides for extensive natural lighting, and water efficient landscaping.

The Peninsula Family YMCA Gateway Child Care Center: This child care facility in South San Francisco, newly opened in August 2004, was built in partnership with the Peninsula Family YMCA and the City of South San Francisco and has a capacity for 100 children.

Caltrain Baby Bullet: Caltrain began operating Baby Bullet express train service in June 2004 allowing faster trains to pass slower ones at select locations. The Baby Bullet, together with the return of weekend service, resulted in a Caltrain ridership increase of nearly 17 percent in 2004.
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An indicator on Land Use was not included this year because of lack of updated information. We also sought to include an indicator on Bay & Ocean Water Quality but lacked sufficient volunteer assistance to thoroughly research and prepare the indicator. We hope to include these indicators next year.
What Is Sustainability?

Living sustainably means we meet today’s needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. A sustainable community maintains a healthy environment, society, and economy, thereby providing a productive and meaningful life for all community residents, present and future.

The environment, society, and economy are interconnected. A healthy economy is dependent on a healthy society, and both are dependent on a healthy environment. A disruption in any one area affects the health of the other two. Sustainable planning recognizes this interconnection.

Sustainability requires that we manage our affairs so our economy and society can continue to exist without destroying the natural environment on which we all depend. Sustainable communities acknowledge that there are limits to the natural, social, and built systems upon which we depend. Key questions asked in a sustainable community include: “Are we using this resource faster than it can be renewed” and “Are we enhancing the social and human capital upon which our community depends?”

What Is an Indicator?

“Indicators” are statistics and trends that display the direction in which a particular condition is heading. Indicators measure whether a community is getting better or worse at providing all its members with a productive, enjoyable life, both now and prospectively in the future. Communities are increasingly using indicators to gauge whether or not they are moving toward sustainability.

What Would a Sustainable San Mateo County Be Like?

A sustainable San Mateo County would …

... have clean air and water and would be free from pollution. Its natural resources would be replaced, not depleted. Its healthy environment would have natural spaces where animals and plants can thrive.

... meet the needs of all its community members. It would provide good schools, affordable housing, and the basic services that enable everyone to live comfortably. Its healthy society would foster a wide sense of individual responsibility for the community.

... have a strong economy that fosters sound businesses, government, and nonprofit entities. It would provide jobs, meet basic community needs, and offer a ground for innovation. Its strong economy would create a solid foundation for society.

“A sustainable community is designed in such a way that its ways of life, its businesses, its technologies, its social institutions do not interfere with nature’s inherent ability to sustain life.”

Fritjof Capra, Timeline
The central sustainability challenge facing San Mateo County is this:

How do we maintain and improve our collective standard of living so even the least affluent can meet basic needs, while drastically reducing our impact on the environment?

Achieving this goal will entail addressing the following problems.

A persistent and growing gap exists between the “have”s and “have-nots.” Only 15 percent of county households can afford a median-priced home, and the gap in per capita income between the richest city and the least wealthy region is almost seven to one. Twenty-two percent of county residents earn less than the self-sufficiency level, and fourteen percent of children lacked continuous health insurance in 2002. Low income residents are more likely to lack health insurance and employment, attend schools with lower academic achievement, and live in higher crime areas, and are less likely to vote. More affluent jurisdictions use up to seven times more water per capita and almost two to four times more natural gas and electricity per household than less affluent cities.

The county’s population is growing at an unsustainable rate mainly because of a birth rate that is greater than the replacement rate of 2.0 per female. Population is up 23 percent since 1980, with 91 percent of growth from births. The growing population places more pressure on scarce resources, such as affordable housing, water, and roads.

The county faces potentially catastrophic consequences from global climate change because of high fossil fuel use. Heat-trapping carbon emissions increased 20 percent since 1993, with vehicles the largest contributor. Gasoline use is up 11 percent since 1993, and electricity use is up 19 percent since 1990. The good news is that solar installations more than doubled in 2004, but they still represent a tiny fraction of the county’s energy supply. Cities are employing smarter planning techniques to reduce reliance on vehicles and are slowly but increasingly exploring energy-conserving green building opportunities. Residents also have more transit options and are carpooling in greater numbers. Yet the county is far from achieving its share of the up to 80 percent reduction in global fossil fuel use necessary to stave off climate change.

Our economic accounting systems fail to take into account unpaid voluntary social contributions and the social and environmental costs of economic activity. For example, the positive value of child-rearing is excluded from economic measures, while health costs from pollution are counted as positive additions to economic well-being. As a result, the actual economic well-being of county residents was about 44 percent less in 2000 than that reported by the conventional “Gross Regional Product” measure. A true measure of the county’s well-being would factor in everything of value whether or not its value is currently reflected in market pricing, and subtract undesirable social and environmental costs.

The average county resident consumes more than 4.5 times his “fair share” of global resources. If everyone on earth lived like a resident of San Mateo County, we would need the productive area of almost five planets. The biggest contributor to the county’s “ecological overshoot” is the burning of fossil fuels for energy.

Improvements in economic conditions seem to bring both positive and negative consequences. For example, crime, health insurance coverage, and the rate of child abuse referrals tend to improve during times of low unemployment while traffic congestion and solid waste disposal tend to worsen. Further, as incomes rise so does consumption of energy and water per capita. Such tradeoffs in income and the environment are not necessary since, according to Hawken and Lovins in Natural Capitalism, our energy using systems—motor vehicles, buildings, electrical motors, appliances, and so forth—can be designed to be 60 to 90 percent more efficient. Further, many of the county’s water suppliers offer conservation incentives such as in-home water audits and ultra low-flow toilet and efficient clothes washer rebates. In a sustainable society, improvement in one area—the economy, environment, or society—does not come at the expense of another area, but rather all three are simultaneously healthy.

“What the people want is very simple—they want an America as good as its promise.”

Barbara Jordan
Actual economic well-being was about 44 percent less in 2000 than that reported by conventional measure

Why Is This Important?

The conventional measure of economic output is the Gross National Product (GNP). This measure is an inaccurate measure of economic well-being, however, because it excludes unpaid voluntary social contributions, such as child rearing and household work, and does not subtract the social and environmental costs of economic activity, such as health costs from pollution and cleanup costs from oil spills. For example, if you get cancer from pesticide exposure, that actually counts as an addition to the GNP. The Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) was developed as an alternative and more accurate measure of economic well-being. GPI is calculated by starting with the personal consumption total from GNP accounts, then adding unpaid voluntary social contributions and subtracting social and environmental costs.

The biggest unpaid voluntary social contribution in the United States not counted in the GNP is child rearing and household work, mostly done by women. Some economists believe that including these non-market contributions would add 25 to 30 percent to the value of the society’s output. On the negative side, the social and environmental costs of economic activity—such as the loss of natural capital from overuse or degradation—are usually not counted within the market and are called “negative externalities” by economists. That is, they are external to the market pricing system. For example, the market doesn’t charge a firm for its toxic discharges into the waterways, soil, or air. Misusing nature in this fashion is considered “free” by the market.

Economist David Korten contends that 70 percent of GNP growth in recent years has come from the most polluting industries that rely extensively on non-renewable resources. He concludes that GNP is best understood “as a measure of the rate at which we are turning resources into garbage.”

Probably the best known comprehensive effort to develop an alternative measure to the GNP is the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW). Besides the benefit and cost categories mentioned above, the ISEW also accounts for social costs such as degree of income inequality, automobile accidents, and increasing reliance on foreign financing. The first calculation of the ISEW for the United States covered the period 1951 to 1990. The conclusion was that the per capita ISEW had only increased 14 percent during these years while per capita GNP had increased 52 percent. Recently the ISEW has been renamed the GPI, and it is being calculated not only for the United States but also for other countries as well as regions within countries.

Redefining Progress, a nonprofit organization based in Oakland, California, has taken the lead in calculating the GPI. Within the last year, at the request of the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, Redefining Progress calculated the GPI for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay region for the year 2000.

How Are We Doing?

The per capita GPI for San Mateo County in 2000 was $20,040, 44 percent less than the countywide per capita Gross Regional Product (GRP) of $36,045. San Mateo County’s per capita GPI was second highest in the San Francisco Bay Area, and 18 percent greater than the Bay Area average in 2000. In its GPI calculation for the San Francisco Bay Area, Redefining Progress added $64 billion of non-market social contributions and subtracted $73 billion of social costs and $31 billion of environmental costs. The result was a Bay Area regional GPI about 45 percent less than the GRP.

U.S. per capita GPI declined from 2000 to 2003. In 2002 U.S. per capita GPI was $10,083 compared with per capita GNP of $34,938, an almost 250 percent overstatement of economic activity. The biggest factor in this overvaluation is the U.S. dependency on fossil fuels for energy.

See appendix page 46. Researcher: Raymond C. Miller

Data source: © Redefining Progress
INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Per capita income in wealthiest city almost seven times higher than in least wealthy region

Why Is This Important?

San Mateo County is a very expensive place to live. Wide gaps in income levels create a small class of residents who can afford to live in the county while middle- and lower-income residents, who often work in vital service occupations, have difficulty remaining here. Further, income levels are correlated with a wide array of quality of life measures in the county, including academic performance, voter participation, and health. In a sustainable society, community members of all income levels meet basic needs and enjoy a high quality of life.

How Are We Doing?

A great deal of disparity exists in the incomes of San Mateo County’s households. In 2003 about 35 percent of households earned less than $50,000 per year while 34 percent earned $100,000 or more. A family of three needed an estimated $58,920 in 2003 to remain self-sufficient, which means more than one-third of households in the county earned less than the self-sufficiency level. At the very lower and upper-end brackets, about 14 percent of households earned less than $25,000 per year while a comparable proportion (17 percent) earned more than $150,000. The wide disparity in household income distribution is not improving, as the distribution of incomes has remained fairly constant since at least 1999.

Per capita income in 2004 ranged from a low of $20,040 in the portion of Redwood City within zip code 94063 to almost seven times as much - $137,138 – in Atherton.

See appendix page 46. Researchers: Nick Hoffman and Akira Kobayashi

---

*The richest one percent of Americans own more of the nation’s overall wealth than the bottom 90 percent combined.*

Campaign for America’s Future

---

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau

Data source: Association of Bay Area Governments
JOBS

**Jobs down 4.3 percent in 2003, continuing 3-year decline**

**Why Is This Important?**

A diversified job base helps communities to be resilient during economic downturns. When employment is concentrated in a few large industries, workers risk losing their jobs if those industries decline. Rapid growth in high risk or emerging industries, such as biotechnology, does not necessarily create long-term, sustainable employment. Instead, planning for economic vitality entails examining job growth in all industries. A substantial distribution of jobs among various industries and small and medium-sized companies creates a platform for economic sustainability.

**How Are We Doing?**

The trend of job losses that began in 2000 in San Mateo County continued through 2003. The county lost 14,800 jobs—a 4.3 percent decline—between 2002 and 2003, with the following industries hardest hit: manufacturing of durable goods (2,300 jobs lost); computer systems design and related services (2,000); air transportation (1,700); wholesale trade (1,400); activities related to credit intermediation (1,300); and construction (1,200). A total of 46,700 jobs have been lost in the county from 2000 to 2003, a 12.4 percent drop in three years.

Jobs are expected to increase eight percent, or 30,300 jobs, from 2001 to 2008. More than half of this job growth is projected to come from four occupations: computer and mathematical sciences (24 percent of job growth), sales and related occupations (13 percent), management (8 percent), and life, physical, and social sciences (7 percent).

The county’s job base is well diversified among several industries and company sizes, which might partly explain why its unemployment rate is consistently less than the state and national rates. The two largest industries, professional and business services and trade, combined account for one-third of total employment. As of third quarter 2003, more than half (53 percent) of the work force was employed by an organization with fewer than 100 employees while approximately 14 percent was employed by a large company with more than 1,000 employees.

See appendix page 46. Researcher: Lambert Ma

“There are people in the world so hungry, that God cannot appear to them except in the form of bread.”

*Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948)*
Twenty-two percent of county residents earn less than the self-sufficiency level

Why Is This Important?

Poverty trends are indicators of economic health. High rates of poverty dampen investment and drain government revenues toward entitlements and away from parks, libraries, and other civic enrichments.

In a sustainable society, everyone has the opportunity to develop and utilize his or her unique gifts. People living in poverty are often unable to fulfill their potential because their nutritional, health care, and educational needs are inadequately met. Children are especially vulnerable, as deprivation can stunt physical growth and cognitive development.

How Are We Doing?

In 2003, 6.9 percent of San Mateo County residents lived below the federal poverty threshold, which was $14,680 for a family of three. The countywide poverty rate was far lower than the rate in California, 13.4 percent, and the nation, 12.7 percent. In 2003, 9.1 percent (14,249) of children in San Mateo County age 17 and under lived below the federal poverty threshold, compared with 6.3 percent (27,764) of adults age 18-64 years and 6.3 percent (5,357) of seniors age 65 and over. While updated data are not available at the city level, in 1999 poverty rates were especially high in East Palo Alto and North Fair Oaks, at 16.2 and 15.4 percent, respectively.

Comparisons to the federal poverty threshold are misleading, however, since the level is not adjusted for local variations in the cost of living. Because San Mateo County has a very high cost of living, a family of three needed an estimated $58,920 in 2003 to remain self-sufficient, four times more than the federal poverty threshold. About 22 percent of San Mateo County residents—or approximately 44,000 households—live below the self-sufficiency level needed to afford basic necessities. South San Francisco, San Bruno, Brisbane, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and unincorporated North Fair Oaks had the most pockets of poverty, with 26 percent of residents living below the self-sufficiency level. Another study found the county is home to four neighborhoods with high concentrations of poverty: North Fair Oaks, East Palo Alto, northeastern Redwood City, and the eastern portion of the City of San Mateo. Between 40 to 51 percent of residents (13,490 total) in these neighborhoods earn below 185 percent of the federal poverty line, which is the income threshold to qualify children for the federal reduced price lunch program.

Data sources: Association of Bay Area Governments and Northern California Council for the Communities. Note: Median household income for Woodside is data for zip code 94062, which also includes portions of Redwood City. Data for East Palo Alto is for zip code 94303, which also includes adjacent parts of Palo Alto.

Researchers: Christine Chang and Nicole Dungca
Economy recovering as unemployment dropped to 3.9 percent in 2004

Why Is This Important?
The unemployment rate is a basic indicator of economic vitality. The lower the level of unemployment, the more people who have jobs and an opportunity to participate in economic prosperity. High rates of unemployment place a strain on communities as people have difficulty making ends meet, which can contribute to poverty, social decay, and instability.

How Are We Doing?

While San Mateo County has enjoyed relatively low rates of unemployment for the past 15 years, unemployment rates fluctuate with economic cycles, and some cities suffer from relatively high unemployment.

Signs of economic recovery appeared in 2004 as the unemployment rate dropped. The average annual unemployment rate in the county was 3.9 percent in 2004, down from 5.1 percent in 2003. This translates into about 14,467 county residents unemployed in 2004. The unemployment rate in San Mateo County remains below state and national averages, 6.1 percent and 5.5 percent respectively.

Countywide unemployment generally trended downward throughout 2004, from 4.5 percent in January to 3.0 percent as of December. The December 2004 unemployment rate was highest in East Palo Alto at 7.7 percent, followed by the North Fair Oaks Census Designated Place at 6.7 percent. (North Fair Oaks is located partly in the southernmost portion of Redwood City and partly in an unincorporated portion of the county.) Daly City and South San Francisco December 2004 unemployment rates, at 3.9 percent and 3.8 percent respectively, were also higher than the countywide average for that month. Nonetheless, the December 2004 unemployment rate was down about 28 percent in each city within the county and North Fair Oaks compared with the same month one year earlier.

See appendix page 46. Researcher: Cissie Lam
A lack of affordable housing limits the ability of people to live here and employers to recruit qualified workers. The jobs/housing imbalance contributes to traffic congestion as people commute to work from outside the county where housing is more affordable. The high cost of housing can also lead to overcrowding of housing units, an exodus of essential service workers, increased poverty, and homelessness.

Despite a continuing low-interest-rate climate in 2004, housing remains very unaffordable in San Mateo County. Only 15 percent of San Mateo County households could afford to purchase a median-priced home in November 2004, compared with 19 percent for California as a whole and 55 percent nationwide. The cost of a median-priced single family home in San Mateo County increased from $650,000 in 2003 to $755,000 in 2004. To afford this, a home buyer needed to earn an annual income of $154,538—a 16 percent increase from 2003 and an incredible 125% increase since 1993. Homes are least affordable in Atherton, Hillsborough, Portola Valley, Woodside, and Burlingame and most affordable in East Palo Alto, Brisbane, Daly City, South San Francisco, Pacifica, and San Bruno.

While a family earning the 2004 countywide median income of $95,000 could not afford a home, it could almost afford a condominium. To afford the $465,000 median-priced condominium in 2004, buyers needed an annual income of $95,179—also a 16 percent increase from 2003. Moving in a different direction was the affordability of rents in San Mateo County. Income needed to afford the county's 2004 average monthly rent of $1,230 for a one-bedroom apartment and $1,434 for a two-bedroom apartment was $42,171 and $49,166 respectively—a two percent decline from 2003 and continuing a decline that began in 2000.

Rising housing costs are partly driven by an underproduction of housing in San Mateo County. Between 1999 and 2003, San Mateo County produced only 84 percent of the county's Fair Share housing allocation as determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments and only 37 percent of the affordable housing needed.

Another measure of housing affordability is the degree of overcrowding. Overcrowding is more frequent in rental units and also within lower income communities. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 21 percent of rental units in San Mateo County and 7 percent of owner-occupied homes were overcrowded. Overcrowding was greatest in East Palo Alto and North Fair Oaks. In East Palo Alto, half of rental units...
and 36 percent of owner-occupied homes were overcrowded. In North Fair Oaks, overcrowding was found in 54 percent of rental units and 22 percent of owner-occupied homes.

In 2004, one in 499 county residents was homeless. Nearly a quarter of the homeless were individuals in families with children. Among those families, the vast majority were headed by individuals with jobs. This has led some homeless shelters to provide on-site day care facilities for children of the working poor who are without homes.

See appendix page 47. Researcher: Joe Rois

### Percent of 1999-2003 Projected Housing Need Produced by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Market-Rate Housing</th>
<th>Affordable Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>171%</td>
<td>235%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>159%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>172%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>137%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>265%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>319%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Total</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Bay Area Council

---

**Data sources:** U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Freddie Mac, San Mateo County Association of Realtors, and San Mateo County Human Services Agency
Population growth increases human demands on land and other resources. To accommodate the needs of a growing population while protecting the environment and quality of life, resources must be used more efficiently and/or each person must consume less. Long-term sustainability of a region requires population stabilization, which results when the average number of children born per female remains close to the replacement rate of 2.0 for an extended period of time, and immigration and emigration are in balance.

**Why Is This Important?**

San Mateo County’s population grew by 0.4 percent, or 3,000 residents, from 2003 to 2004. Overall, the county’s population has increased 23 percent since 1980, adding 132,600 new residents in 24 years. The vast majority—91 percent—of the growth has been from births rather than new residents. While the county’s annual growth rate from births (minus deaths) remains less than one percent, this growth rate is unsustainable over the long term.

Many new residents (11,959) moved to the county from 1996-2001 as the economy picked up steam, only to depart in large numbers (13,596) over the following three years as the bubble burst. In general, more affordable cities—such as Daly City—tend to have more residents than affluent cities.

The county’s population continues to be ethnically diverse. In 2003, 38 percent were white (non-Hispanic), 22 percent were Hispanic, 23 percent were Asian, 3 percent were African-American, 1 percent was Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, less than 1 percent was American Indian and Alaska Native, 11 percent were some other race, and about 3 percent were 2 or more races. Projections to 2050 show a higher percentage of Hispanic, Asian, and multi-racial people, and a decrease in the percent who are white.

Of the 32 percent of county residents who were foreign-born, 53 percent were born in Asia, 30 percent in Latin America, 12 percent in Europe, and 5 percent in other regions. Forty-eight percent of the foreign-born population came after 1990, and 52 percent are not yet citizens. Forty-three percent of county residents speak a language other than English at home.

In 2003, San Mateo County had 4,296 legal immigrants, 2.4 percent of the state total. Since 1984, the county has had 112,780 legal immigrants, an average of 5,639 per year. Almost half of our legal immigrants come from the Philippines, China, India, Iran, Korea, and Taiwan. The remainder are primarily from Latin American nations.

About 20 percent of county residents are children age 0 to 14, 11 percent are teens and young adults age 15 to 24, 57 percent are working-age adults age 25 to 65, and 12 percent are seniors age 65 and over. The median age in 2003 was 38.7 years. Projections to 2050 show significant increases in the numbers of people over 65 with many more over the age of 85.

See appendix page 47. Researcher: Carol Mink
Carbon emissions increase 20 percent since 1993; vehicles the largest contributor

**Why Is This Important?**

The main source of manmade carbon emissions is the combustion of fossil fuels. These emissions are changing the chemistry of the atmosphere and leading to global climate change. Most scientists tell us that climate change, including global warming, will be detrimental to human health, ecosystems, food security, and water resources in many regions of the world, including the United States.

With only five percent of the world’s population, the United States accounts for a quarter of all manmade carbon emissions worldwide. Atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations are significantly higher now than at any time during the last 400,000 years and continue to rise. Atmospheric models predict that increasing carbon dioxide concentrations will result in increasing global temperatures. Average temperature variations are highly correlated with carbon dioxide concentrations.

In 1991 the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued a report that said human-caused global warming had already begun, and much sooner than expected. What’s more, the problem is bound to get worse—perhaps a lot worse—before it gets better. In January 2005 the panel’s chairman said the world has already reached the level of dangerous concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and called for immediate and very deep cuts in the pollution if humanity is to survive.

Most other industrial countries have committed themselves under the Kyoto Protocol to reduce their carbon emissions below the 1990 level by 2012. The United States has unilaterally withdrawn from the Kyoto Protocol of the Climate Change Treaty.

**How Are We Doing?**

The total estimated carbon emissions from gasoline, electricity, and natural gas use in San Mateo County were more than 1.7 million tons in 2003, or 4,851 pounds per person. Since 1993, total carbon emissions from these sources have increased 20 percent (12 percent per capita). The transportation sector accounts for more than half (57 percent) of the total carbon emissions in the county. Estimated carbon emissions decreased eight percent from 2001 to 2003 mainly because of a reduction in the proportion of electricity derived from coal and a decrease in gasoline use. To calculate your personal carbon emissions, see http://www.humboldt1.com/~ceed/cgi-bin/cpr/worksheet.html.

Carbon emissions from electricity fluctuate based on the sources of electricity. In years when deep snow pack fills the reservoirs, more hydroelectric power, which has no carbon emissions, is available. In other years, the deficit in hydroelectric power is replaced with electricity from carbon-heavy fossil fuels.

A February 2005 study found that major global warming legislation would add more than 800,000 new jobs in America by 2025. A bipartisan bill, the Climate Stewardship Act, would trigger new development and investment in clean energy technologies, bringing much-needed employment to states and diverse job sectors across the country.

To allow Earth’s climate to return to equilibrium over the next few centuries, manmade carbon emissions must be reduced to the rate at which the oceans and forests can absorb them—as much as 80 percent below today’s rate. San Mateo County has a long way to go.

See appendix page 47. Researcher: Tom Rounds

“We are risking the ability of the human race to survive.”

Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ELECTRICITY & NATURAL GAS USE

Electricity use up 19 percent since 1990; solar installations more than double in 2004

Why Is This Important?

In the twentieth century humans used more energy than all previous human societies combined. That energy use has come mostly from the burning of non-renewable fossil fuels—coal, petroleum, and natural gas. Non-renewable fuels take millions of years to form, and burning them releases unprecedented amounts of carbon dioxide and other gases into the atmosphere, creating global climate change, air pollution, and acid rain. From a resource and health perspective, this pattern is unsustainable.

How Are We Doing?

Energy use in San Mateo County, including electricity and natural gas use, continues a general upward trend, increasing one percent from 2002 to 2003 and eight percent since 1990. In 2003, 59 percent of the county’s energy use was natural gas and 41 percent was electricity. Residents used a little more than half (53 percent) of the county’s total energy in 2003.

Most of the increase in the county’s energy use since 1990 has been because of a 19 percent rise in electricity use. From 2002 to 2003 electricity use increased three percent, driven by an eight percent increase by residents. Despite this recent rise however, the county is still below the highs reached in 2000 before the 2001 rolling blackouts motivated consumers to conserve. Residents used about one-third of the county’s electricity in 2003, while non-residential users accounted for the remaining two-thirds.

The county’s natural gas use actually fell one percent from 2002 to 2003, and is up only one percent compared with 1990 levels. In 2003 two-thirds of the county’s natural gas was delivered to residents while one-third was for non-residential uses.

Over one-third of California’s electricity comes from natural gas. The state’s heavy reliance on natural gas, a cleaner-burning fuel, helps to avoid acid rain problems but makes it vulnerable to wide fluctuations in price as occurred during the state’s 2001 energy crisis.

Average household use of natural gas and electricity in San Mateo County generally correlates with affluence and varies widely by city. As in past years, the four most affluent cities—Atherton, Woodside, Hillsborough, and Portola Valley—consumed almost two to four times more natural gas and electricity per household than other cities in 2003. Cities with the least average household energy use (natural gas or electricity) in 2003 were Brisbane, Colma, Daly City, and South San Francisco. The average household in San Mateo County used 5,734 kilowatts of electricity in 2003, up slightly from 5,723 kilowatts in 2002.

California’s Clean Energy Act of 2002 requires the state’s investor-owned utilities to procure at least 20 percent of their electricity from clean, renewable sources such as wind, solar, and small-scale hydroelectric by 2017. The state’s Energy Action Plan recommends that the deadline be accelerated to...
2010. Governor Schwarzenegger endorsed that recommendation as well as proposing an additional goal of 33 percent by 2020. In August 2004, however, the Governor vetoed SB 1478 which would have codified the Energy Action Plan’s recommendation, saying that while he appreciated the bill’s intent, it had several onerous provisions that would impede achievement of the goal. In 2003 the statewide proportion from these renewables was nearly 10.5 percent.

Solar and Wind Energy

Use of solar energy, a renewable energy source, is growing in San Mateo County although it still represents only a tiny fraction of the county’s total energy use. Annual installation of solar photovoltaics (PV) in the county has surged 59-fold since 1998. The kilowatts installed reached a record 581,316 in 2004 from 159 projects, more than double the kilowatts installed the previous year. The increase has been prompted by several factors including: state rebates and state and federal tax credits that make solar PVs more affordable; the continuing decrease in the cost of solar PV installations; stepped up marketing efforts by solar manufacturers and installers; and the increased awareness generated by more people installing PV systems.

To date, the state’s Emerging Renewables Program, which provides incentive rebates, has funded 386 projects in San Mateo County representing 1.3 megawatts of solar energy.

Wind installations did not experience the same level of success as solar and stand at three installations for a total of two kilowatts of energy. San Mateo County is not highly conducive to wind installation given its geographic setting (not very high wind speeds) and the fact that most wind installations tend to be large scale, centralized deployments, rather than small residential or commercial projects.

See appendix page 48. Researchers: Joe Rois and Isabelle Gecils
GASOLINE USE & VEHICLE FUEL EFFICIENCY

Gasoline use up 11 percent since 1993 despite 7 percent drop from 2001 to 2003

Why Is This Important?

The single largest source of pollution in the Bay Area is the motor vehicle. In San Mateo County the transportation sector accounts for more than half (57 percent in 2003) of estimated total carbon emissions, a greenhouse gas linked to global climate change (see “carbon emissions” indicator on page 13). An October 2003 Pentagon study raised the possibility that global warming could prove a greater risk to the world than terrorism. Among the potential consequences, if climate change occurs abruptly or at the high end of scenario projections, would be catastrophic droughts and famines, increased severity and frequency of storms, rising sea levels, and conflicts over resources. It is quite plausible that within a decade the evidence of an imminent abrupt climate shift may become clear and reliable. The report suggests that, because of the potentially dire consequences, the risk of abrupt climate change, although uncertain and quite possibly small, should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern.

In addition to greenhouse gas emissions, gasoline-powered vehicles spew chemicals that produce smog and contribute to water pollution from the wearing of brake pads, engine emissions, and runoff from roads and parking lots. Americans’ high consumption of gasoline also contributes to dependence on foreign oil from unstable and undemocratic countries and makes us vulnerable to price shocks.

How Are We Doing?

Estimated highway gasoline use in San Mateo County was up 11 percent (4 percent per capita) in 2003 compared with a decade ago to more than 371 million gallons, or 521 gallons per person. From 1993 to 2001 estimated highway gasoline use increased 19 percent (11 percent per capita), but as the economy cooled and residents left from 2001 to 2003 usage dropped seven percent (six percent per capita.)

On a per capita basis, gasoline use in San Mateo County was 557 gallons in 2001, 30 percent greater than the national average and almost 5 to 62 times greater than usage in other countries such as Japan, Germany, and China. Higher gas prices can be an incentive to conserve. In December 2002 the average Bay Area price of gas was $1.67. In contrast, December 2002 gas prices in Japan and Germany were more than twice as high as the Bay Area average and their 2001 per capita gasoline use was almost five times less than in San Mateo County.

In September 2004 the California Air Resources Board adopted landmark regulations that will reduce tailpipe carbon dioxide emissions. Under the new rules, car makers must reduce carbon emissions from cars and light trucks by 1.3 percent in 2009, increasing gradually to 33.9 percent in 2016. California estimates the law will reduce greenhouse gas emissions 22 percent by 2012. More than a dozen major car makers have filed a lawsuit to block the rule. Several other states intend to copy California’s regulations if they withstand the legal threat.

A record 55 percent of new U.S. vehicles purchased last year were light trucks, such as pickups, SUVs, and vans, which have lower gas mileage on average than passenger cars. Nevertheless, rising fuel prices, instability in the Middle East, and concerns about global warming have helped propel interest in fuel-efficient hybrid vehicles, and U.S. car buyers have turned away from the biggest SUVs in favor of smaller models. While there is a growing demand for “green” cars, the hybrid market share is still small. For example Toyota, the world leader in hybrid sales, has a goal to sell 300,000 hybrid vehicles this year worldwide, less than four percent of its projected worldwide sales.

See appendix page page 48. Researcher: Eva Dehlinger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Highway Gasoline Use in San Mateo County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: California Department of Transportation, Office of Transportation Economics

continued
Increasing Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards is the single most important step we can take to reduce our dependence on petroleum. By increasing CAFE standards in Sport Utility Vehicles and light trucks, we would save one million barrels of oil a day, decrease foreign oil imports by 10 percent, and prevent 240 million tons of carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, from entering the atmosphere each year. It would also save drivers hundreds of dollars each year in gasoline costs.

U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein

Twenty-five percent of San Mateo County’s new fleet is hybrids—a total of 48 hybrids so far averaging 44 miles per gallon each.
GREEN BUILDING POLICIES

Cities slowly but increasingly explore green building approach

Why Is This Important?

Although indispensable to humans, buildings take a toll on the environment. Buildings use 40 percent of the world’s material and energy flows, one-quarter of its wood harvest, and one-sixth of its fresh water withdrawals. Besides harming the environment, high energy and water use translate into higher costs for building owners and occupants. Further, many buildings and furnishings contain chemicals that pollute indoor air, which can harm human health.

In response to these challenges, architects, builders, developers, and municipalities are increasingly employing “green building” techniques. Green buildings are designed to use energy, water, and materials efficiently, improve indoor air quality, and use environmentally preferable products and processes. They also are sited so the sun’s rays generate warmth in the winter but stay out during summer (called “passive solar”), thereby reducing energy costs and enhancing building comfort. Green buildings located close to public transportation and amenities contribute to the overall well-being and vitality of the community. Green buildings save money as well as the environment by using fewer resources.

How Are We Doing?

A green building policy is a written ordinance, code, policy, or guideline that promotes the construction of green buildings. San Mateo County adopted a green building policy in 2001 which is already yielding results: in 2004 the solar panels on its forensics lab generated almost 320,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity and eliminated more than 200,000 pounds of carbon dioxide, 54 pounds of sulfur oxides, and 178 pounds of nitrogen oxides emissions. The county has two more green buildings in the works: a Youth Services Center and a future Interpretive Center at Edgewood Park.

Although the 20 cities on the peninsula have not yet adopted a formal green building policy, many have taken positive steps to encourage green building in their communities. Most cities have a construction debris and waste management ordinance or policy, and are educating city staff and/or residents about the basic tenets of green building. East Palo Alto requires solar power and solar water heating installations as a condition of approval on residential projects. Brisbane recently hired a consultant to assist the city in developing a sustainable city program that will include a green building policy. Pacifica’s city council is interested in discussing the possibility of adopting a green building policy. Colma has a water efficiency ordinance, and its General Plan encourages solar energy where appropriate. Burlingame exempts solar panels from design review. Portola Valley has reduced its permit fees for solar panels, and Woodside has an ordinance that encourages solar panels and natural materials.

More than half the cities in San Mateo County are using, or considering, green practices for public buildings, usually in the area of energy efficiency. For example: Portola Valley is designing a new Town Center that will be built for LEED® rating; the city of San Mateo is building a LEED certified main library that is projected to cut energy costs by 20 percent, and is considering green aspects for the design of its new police stations; Millbrae’s new city library has some green features; Redwood City’s City Hall is based on passive solar design and includes high efficiency lighting and mechanical equipment; San Carlos is installing solar panels on existing corporation yard buildings; Daly City upgraded City Hall for energy efficiency a few years ago and has incorporated some green elements into a new fire station, community centers, and library; Foster City’s new City Hall


continued
incorporates daylighting and energy efficient lighting; Menlo Park’s Burgess Pool uses solar in the locker room; East Palo Alto will consider green options for its new City Hall in about two years; and Pacifica’s wastewater treatment plant will have solar panels, and the city is exploring a proposal to institute green construction when it remolds its former wastewater treatment plant to a new city hall.

In 2003, a countywide committee consisting of city, town,

and county staff, architects, builders, and Sustainable San Mateo County developed a set of guidelines and checklist that encourage green approaches to construction. These guidelines, the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide, were published in February 2004 by San Mateo County RecycleWorks Green Building Program. The full guide is incorporated into the new RecycleWorks.org website and is available as a download, or can be picked up at any city planning or permitting departments. Portola Valley requires that all architectural building applicants fill out and submit the checklist with their applications.

Barriers to greater adoption of green building policies in the county include perceptions that it costs more, fear of scaring away business, competing priorities, the need for a champion, and the complexity of the issue. Effective implementation of any green building policy or ordinance adopted in the county will require city staff, city council, and planning commission support, easy access to green materials and resources, and a critical mass of people willing to implement green building practices. An in-depth Report on Green Building Policies and Practices in San Mateo Cities and Towns, 2004 is available at RecycleWorks.org.

In December 2004 California's governor created the Green Building Initiative (Executive Order S-20-04) with the goal of reducing electricity purchased from the grid by existing government and private commercial buildings by 10 percent per square foot by 2010 and 20 percent by 2015. The Order also calls for involving state leadership in retrofitting, building, and operating the most energy- and resource-efficient public buildings in the country. The Order mandates that all new and renovated buildings paid for with state funds be certified as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standard or higher, and that office spaces and office equipment leased or purchased by the state be Energy Star-qualified where cost-effective. The measures outlined in the Order can save California taxpayers $100 million per year.

See appendix page page 48. Researchers: Regiane Alves Garcia and Michelle Lee

*LEED, or “Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design,” is a program of the U.S. Green Building Council. LEED consists of a checklist of elements that contribute to a “greener” building. Developers can use this checklist to help them design and construct sustainable buildings. For more information, see www.usgbc.org.

2005 GREEN BUILDING AWARD WINNER
The d’Souza / de la Torre home in Belmont was designed with sustainability as the guiding principal and is almost entirely self-sufficient. All electricity is provided by a solar photovoltaic system, and water and room temperature are regulated by a solar thermal system. The home incorporates salvaged building materials, less-toxic and recycled building materials, energy-efficient appliances, sustainably harvested wood, and lots of natural lighting.

2005 GREEN BUILDING AWARD HONORABLE MENTION
The Hogg home in Half Moon Bay is a green building that emphasizes reuse and energy efficiency. It was recently remodeled with a conscious effort to incorporate features and materials from the old home into the new one.
TRANSPORTATION

More carpooling and transit use, smart planning, and cooler economy ease congestion

Why Is This Important?

Transportation impacts the economy, environment, and our quality of life. Traffic congestion causes costly delays that translate into lost productivity, less time with families, wasted resources, and stress. Vehicles pollute the air and water and are a significant contributor of greenhouse gas emissions that lead to global climate change. Reliance on autos, SUVs, and trucks encourages low-density land use patterns and wastes precious land.

How Are We Doing?

About two-thirds (68 percent) of commuters who live in San Mateo County drove to work alone in 2003 and 2004. This represents a five to seven percentage point decrease since 1999 through 2002, with solo drivers shifting mainly to carpooling. In 2004, 18 percent commuted via carpool, 9 percent via transit (4 percent BART, 3 percent bus, and 2 percent Caltrain), and 6 percent used other modes (3 percent walked, and 1 percent each biked, telecommuted, rode a motorcycle, or used another mode.) San Mateo County has 13 miles of carpool lanes and 277.4 miles of bike lanes. Vehicle-hours of delay dropped to 7,300 per day in 2003, a 60 percent decrease since peaking in 2000. Nevertheless, the “cost” of congestion in 2003 was an estimated $22.3 million in wasted time and gas. After an all-time high in 2002, vehicle miles of travel decreased four percent in 2003 to 19.2 million miles a day or 27 miles per resident.

BART opened four new stations in the county in July 2003, driving an eight percent increase in local BART ridership in 2004. Caltrain began operating Baby Bullet express train service in June 2004 allowing faster trains to pass slower ones at select locations. The Baby Bullet, together with the return of weekend service, resulted in a Caltrain ridership increase of nearly 17 percent. In August 2004, SamTrans began operating Regional Express bus service between East Palo Alto, office and industrial campuses east of 101, and the Millbrae BART station, providing access to jobs and the regional transit system. In November 2004 county residents reauthorized Measure A, extending the county’s half-cent sales tax for transportation projects and operations through 2033.

San Mateo County cities are encouraging new “Transit Oriented Developments” (TOD) such as the new high-density residential developments by the Colma and South San Francisco BART stations. TOD is planned for areas adjacent to the Millbrae BART station, the Hayward Park and Bay Meadows Caltrain stations in the City of San Mateo, and the San Carlos and Redwood City Caltrain stations. Any housing within one-third mile of a Caltrain or BART station or SamTrans bus line encourages walking to and from that site. Many cities are collaborating with a national urban planning group to develop a sense of place and a more pedestrian-friendly connection to public transit. The El Camino Grand Boulevard Initiative strives to demonstrate how linking transit services with community planning can improve the livability of communities. Demonstration projects will be developed in Daly City, Colma, Belmont, San Carlos, and Redwood City.

See appendix page page 48. Researchers: Arthur Lloyd, Beth Thomas, Mark Duino
AGRICULTURE

Summit yields steps toward securing water supply, “right to farm” ordinance, and marketing program to stem agricultural decline

Why Is This Important?

Agriculture has historically played an important role in San Mateo County’s economy. While the amount of land dedicated to agriculture has declined considerably over the past 50 years, it still contributes more than $632 million to the county’s economy, including “multiplier” effects.

Farmland—or “working landscapes”—also provides significant environmental and quality of life benefits, such as open space and healthy microclimates. Controlled grazing helps to minimize soil erosion. Locally grown food contributes to the county’s food security, reduces transportation-related air pollution and costs, maintains food freshness and nutrition, and protects land from urban sprawl. Organic farms avoid the harmful effects of pesticides and protect soil quality.

How Are We Doing?

About three percent (9,225 acres) of the county’s land is agricultural land (non-grazing) while another 16 percent (45,829 acres) is suitable for grazing, whether or not it is actually used for grazing. In 2003, the vast majority of farmland—89 percent—was used for field crops (beans, grain, and hay) or pasture, 7 percent was used for vegetable, fruit, and nut crops, and 4 percent was used for floral and nursery crops.

The gross production value of all crops in 2003 was $180,621,000, down 1 percent from 2002 and down 14 percent since 1992. A major factor in the 2003 decline was an 18 percent decrease in mushroom production. Although relatively little farmland is used for floral and nursery crops, these crops generated 80 percent of the total crop production value. Vegetable crops generated 16 percent of the total production value, while livestock and livestock products, forest and apiary products, and fruit, nut, and field crops each generated 1.5 percent or less of total production value.

Less than four percent of the county’s 4,593 acres of cultivated agricultural land is organic. Organic farms consisted of 165 acres in 2003, more than twice as much as in 1998. The county’s agricultural agency and the local agriculture industry use many environmentally friendly pest control methods such as biological controls and insect traps. Less-toxic alternative pest control products and methods, however, are not always available for the types of specialty crops grown in San Mateo County. In 2003, 51,904 pounds of the most toxic pesticides were used in local agriculture (see “pesticide use” indicator on page 34). While most farmers are trying to reduce their use of high risk pesticides, they often are held to standards of product perfection that are out of their control because retail and wholesale buyers demand flowers and food without blemish. The county is home to two Community Supported Farms, a unique model of local agriculture whereby residents commit to supporting and buying food from a local farmer. Most growers have some local markets, including the county’s 10 farmers’ markets.

County supervisors hosted an Agricultural Summit in February 2003 to explore methods for invigorating and sustaining the county’s threatened agriculture industry. The summit placed special emphasis on securing a dependable water supply and keeping agricultural land in production. Since then much has been accomplished. To assist farmers in streamlining applications for construction of off-stream water storage for irrigation, the nonprofit Sustainable Conservation is planning to start a pilot project to determine the feasibility of using a watershed Environmental Impact Report (EIR) template, with components applicable to many individual

Data source: San Mateo County Department of Agriculture / Weights and Measures

“The average food item on your supermarket shelf has traveled at least 1,500 miles.”

Organic Consumers Association

continued
Sustainable agriculture integrates three main goals: “…environmental health, economic profitability, and social and economic equity. Farming systems that simultaneously pursue these three goals hold great potential for maintaining communities and stewardship of our natural resources.”

*The National Commission on Small Farms*

watershed EIRs. The county has drafted a “right-to-farm” ordinance that likely will be submitted in early 2005 to the Board of Supervisors for adoption. The ordinance helps to mitigate problems that arise where agricultural and residential areas abut. It would require that buyers of houses close to farms be notified of these pre-existing agricultural activities. The Farm Bureau and the Community Alliance with Family Farmers (CAFF) are seeking a grant to implement a marketing plan and labeling program, and local farmers are working with CAFF on label development. Still to be implemented is the summit recommendation to explore state legislation to extend tax credits to land trusts and open space organizations that agree to keep land in agricultural production.

To control agricultural runoff, the Farm Bureau has partnered with nonprofits and government agencies to design and implement two demonstration projects. Completed in 2003, the projects addressed sediment and siltation issues and protected local water quality and stream habitat by building riparian fencing and planting winter cover crops. Further, most farmers have participated in 15 hours of agronomy classes that include topics such as irrigation efficiency and protection of riparian corridors.

Issues of emerging concern include two limited locations of Sudden Oak Death—though progress has been made in negotiating with a handful of states and Canada that blockaded exports from the county—and a possible reduction in state funding to counteract pest introduction into the state.

See appendix page 49. Researcher: Marcia Pagels

---

**2005 SSMC AWARD WINNER**

Jacobs Farm / Del Cabo, Inc., an organic herb farm that originated in Pescadero, has partnered with Mexican farmers to form a co-op of more than 200 small family farmers growing organically and selling worldwide.
California Quail apparently under pressure from urban expansion and habitat changes

Why Is This Important?

The number and diversity of birds are good indicators of an ecosystem's health. Birds are a vital part of the food chain, acting as both predators and prey. A relatively stable bird population indicates an ecosystem in balance. A sustained increase or decrease in the populations of specific species can result from a variety of factors including habitat changes, a problem in the food chain, an environmental threat, disease, or—in the case of migratory birds—problems elsewhere in their migratory range.

How Are We Doing?

Two bird counts occur annually during Christmastime in San Mateo County, the Crystal Springs count and the Año Nuevo count. The California Quail, Acorn Woodpecker, and Common Raven all nest in the county, each representing different dietary needs, nesting requirements, and breeding behavior. Evaluating long-term trends in counts of these species can reveal changes in the health of local ecosystems.

Counts of the California Quail and Acorn Woodpecker have fluctuated widely each year, often because of varying weather conditions on count days. Both species seek shelter and are very quiet during wet weather conditions and are therefore very difficult to locate. Steady rain throughout most of the 2004 Año Nuevo count day resulted in disappointing numbers for both species in comparison with the previous year. With few exceptions, California Quail counts continue a slow downward trend since 1988 which may be because of habitat problems. The removal of brush and cover along fence rows and urban expansion make this species more vulnerable to predators such as feral and domestic cats.

The Acorn Woodpecker number for the Crystal Springs count was unusually high and a hopeful improvement from 2003 which saw the population at a five-year low. The Año Nuevo count was impacted by weather conditions and must be viewed within this context. The 2004 acorn crop was much better than the poor 2003 crop, and the Acorn Woodpeckers were actively working on their granaries, storing and maintaining the harvested acorns.

The intelligent, social, and opportunistic Common Raven tends to thrive where humans have modified the natural environment. They are omnivorous and have adapted quickly to food sources created by urban development, such as scavenging food from dumpsters, trashcans, and landfills. They also eat young mammals and birds, some of which are endangered species. The local population has increased rapidly over the last few years, especially on the more urban Crystal Springs count, and reached a record high on the Año Nuevo count in 2003. The 2004 Crystal Springs count reverses an unexplained one-year decline in 2003.

The first confirmed avian case of West Nile virus in San Mateo County occurred in July 2004. Elsewhere, the Corvid Family, which includes crows, ravens and jays, has been particularly hard hit by this virus. How rapidly the virus spreads in San Mateo County and the impact on our local bird populations remain to be seen. Sudden Oak Death also exists in San Mateo County and may have a significant impact on local bird populations in the future, especially those that depend on oak woodlands.

Data source: National Audubon Society. Note: Caution must be applied in making year-to-year comparisons because of fluctuations in weather conditions on the count days, the number of observers in the field, familiarity with the count areas, and the total number of hours in the field, all of which can significantly impact the count results.

See appendix page 49. Researcher: Susan James
ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT

Average county resident consumes more than 4.5 times his “fair share” of global resources

Why Is This Important?

Everything humans do depends on the biological support of nature. Sustainability has become an issue in the last twenty years, since the question has been raised whether we are overusing the biological capacity of the earth. The “ecological footprint” recently emerged as a way to measure our impact on the available natural resources. Specifically, the ecological footprint measures how many acres of land and water are required to support the lifestyle of people within various regions. It enables us to determine whether or not we are exceeding the biological capacity of the earth to support us.

In the early 1990’s a team at the University of British Columbia led by Mathis Wackernagel created the concept of the ecological footprint and began the complicated process of measuring it for cities, regions, and countries. A team of scholars now measures and annually updates the ecological footprints of 148 countries. There are approximately 3,500 data points and 10,000 calculations per year and country. The work is done by the Global Footprint Network, based in Oakland, California, in conjunction with the World Wildlife Fund and the United Nations Environmental Program. For the first time Sustainable San Mateo County’s indicators report includes information on the ecological footprint, not only because of its importance as a sustainability measure but also because Redefining Progress of Oakland, in cooperation with the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, has just measured the footprints of the counties in the San Francisco Bay Area.

About one-fourth of the earth’s surface—27.9 billion acres—is potentially productive for human use, broken out into 20 percent water and 80 percent land. The land area consists of 35 percent forestland, 31 percent grazing land, 13 percent cropland and 2 percent built-up land. In 2001 human economic activity was using about 20 percent more than the available capacity. Exceeding the annually available capacity is only possible by depleting natural capital on an unsustainable basis, such as by overfishing, overuse of aquifers, and extracting and using non-renewable resources such as petroleum. This ecological “overshoot” started about 20 years ago, and continues to worsen.

The more economically developed a country, the greater the likelihood it uses more than its fair share of the earth’s biological capacity. Some developed countries, such as Canada and Russia, are able to consume more than their fair share because they are fortunate to have abundant natural capital within their borders. Other developed countries, such as the United States, Japan, and those in Western Europe, have deficits that they cover by importing some of the biological capacity of other countries through trade. In effect, these deficit countries are incurring an ecological debt, but currently there is no regularized system for paying back that debt. The burden will fall on future generations.

By dividing the biologically productive surface area of the earth by the over 6 billion human beings alive, the “fair share” allocation is about 4.5 acres per person. Actual global use in 2001 was an average of 5.4 acres per person. High income countries used 15.8 acres per capita, middle income 4.7, and low income countries 2.0. The United States had the highest per capita ecological footprint of any country: 23.5 acres. In contrast, Japan’s footprint was 10.6 acres, primarily because of its relative energy efficiency. San Mateo County’s ecological footprint was 20.9 acres per capita.

The county’s ecological footprint is about average for the San Francisco Bay Area, but 11 percent less than the United States average. The county’s footprint, however, is almost four times the global average and almost five times the avail-
able global biological capacity per person. If everyone on earth lived like a resident of San Mateo County, we would need the productive area of almost five planets.

By the ecological footprint measure, the current behavior of San Mateo County residents is clearly unsustainable. The biggest contributor to the county’s “ecological overshoot” is the burning of fossil fuels for energy. The energy component accounts for 63 percent of the county’s footprint. While recycling has reduced the county’s footprint by a small amount (almost 0.4 acres), a major reduction will not occur until there is a shift away from fossil fuels for energy production.

To calculate your individual ecological footprint, see www.earthday.net/footprint/index.asp.

See appendix pages 49 and 50. Researcher: Raymond C. Miller

“There is one measure and one measure only describing the capacity and relationship between human society and living systems: The Ecological Footprint. It is the only standard by which we may calibrate our collective impact upon the planet, and assess the viability of our future. It is “true north” when it comes to sustainability; no report about the environment is complete without it.”

Paul Hawken, co-author of Natural Capitalism

“With the coming of Peak Oil and the beginning of long-term, irreversible declines in the availability of fossil fuels (along with many other resources), modern industrial civilization faces a wrenching series of unwelcome transitions. This comes as a surprise only for those who haven’t been paying attention.”

John Michael Greer, The Coming of Deindustrial Society: A Practical Response, October 5, 2004

Average Acres of Land to Support Each San Mateo County Resident, 2001

Data source: ©Redefining Progress. Note: “Energy land” is each resident’s “energy footprint,” or the acres of land and water required to sequester the carbon dioxide emissions from each person’s energy use (mostly fossil fuels).
HABITAT PROTECTION

Invasive species and fragmentation threaten open space habitats

Why Is This Important?

Biodiversity is the variety and number of native plant and animal species in a particular region. Robust native ecosystems are the best defense against pests and disease. They also help maintain genetic diversity and support insects and birds vital to pollination. Natural areas provide more than habitat. They also are part of the water cycle, capturing rain and releasing it as fresh water and reducing flooding during heavy rains. Healthy plant communities provide climate moderation, absorb carbon, and produce oxygen. Plants are often the source of new medicines.

How Are We Doing?

The county’s open space lands, both public and private, include numerous habitats supporting a variety of native species and are particularly rich in birds, waterfowl, amphibians, vegetation, and rare plants. Preserving open space alone, however, will not preserve local biodiversity. Protecting and restoring habitats in our open space lands is essential to preserving the county’s biodiversity. Although difficult to detect with the untrained eye, habitats in the county’s open spaces have been compromised from a variety of factors.

Sustainable San Mateo County’s (SSMC’s) 2003 survey found that managers of public and privately held open space lands spent more than $373,700 and 27,600 hours, many of them by volunteers, restoring at least 6,736 acres of habitat. The 2004 indicators report highlighted a few of their numerous efforts.

Data for 2004 currently are being collected and will be reported in SSMC’s 2006 indicators report. According to preliminary 2004 data, invasive species and the habitat fragmentation that occurred in the past continue to be major problems undermining the integrity of habitats in the county’s open spaces. The agencies that manage the county’s open space lands also cited the complexity and timeline associated with permitting and insufficient funds as challenges. Some agencies noted the need to create planning timelines for restoration projects, and many are working on or have completed such plans during 2004. The agencies continue to rely heavily on volunteers and hand labor to remove invasive species, although contractors, heavy equipment, and limited, targeted applications of herbicides are also used.

See appendix page 49. Researcher: Julia Bott

A local success story

In 1996 volunteers with the California Native Plant Society -Santa Clara County and Friends of Edgewood targeted a site at Edgewood County Park and Natural Preserve choked with invasive, non-native yellow star thistle. The methodical approach and dedication of the volunteers has paid off.

1996: 4 people worked 3 hours each, 12 hours, to remove all plants in a 15 by 30 foot colony
1997: 6 people worked 1 1/2 hours each, 9 hours
1998: 2 people worked 2 hours each, 4 hours
1999: 1 person worked 1 1/2 hours
2000: 1 person worked 3/4 hour
2001: A sweep of the area removed 118 plants
2002: A sweep of the area removed 42 plants
2003: A sweep of the area removed 9 plants
2004: A sweep of the area by 3 people found no plants present

2005 SSMC AWARD WINNER

Cargill Salt, Inc. is re-engineering 16,000 acres of salt ponds in the South Bay as an initial step in the largest tidal wetland restoration project on the West Coast. The Project introduces tidal action and the circulation of bay water to selected ponds under strict wildlife monitoring.
To reach a sustainable equilibrium, the consumption of natural resources needs to reach a balance where we are not consuming more than is being renewed. Petroleum and metals are limited and not renewable. Trees are renewable but harvested at rates that outpace our ability to replenish. Waste reduction and green building efforts both focus on ways in which to achieve a balance in resource consumption.

In spite of the fact that San Mateo County has over two decades of landfill space available, this still represents a finite amount. Preserving the last of this space should be a priority in our waste management planning as alternatives will all have higher environmental impacts.

In 1989 California passed the Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) that required municipalities to cut waste in half—that is, to “divert” 50 percent of waste from the landfill—by the year 2000. Reducing consumption, reusing materials, recycling, composting, and buying products made from recycled materials are ways to achieve this goal.

The amount of solid waste generated in San Mateo County and disposed into landfills continues a steady decline, decreasing 18 percent from 2000 to 2003. From 2002 to 2003 alone, solid waste disposal decreased eight percent to 747,000 tons. In contrast to this positive countywide trend, waste disposal increased statewide by 2.3 million tons in 2003, and statewide waste diversion dropped from 48 percent in 2002 to 47 percent in 2003.

The county’s success in reducing waste since 2000 is somewhat attributable to the slower economy, which is reflected in a decreased population and lower sales tax revenues. The percentage of waste diverted in 2003 ranged from a high of 75 percent in East Palo Alto to 27 percent in Daly City.

Construction and demolition debris continues to be a major factor of disposal in the county. Many cities and the county have ordinances in place requiring specific levels of recycling of this debris. In addition, the emerging interest in green building naturally enfolds the concept of using fewer materials with alternative practices, construction debris recycling, and incorporating materials made from recycled content.

During 2004 food waste composting pilot programs began in different parts of the county. More than 14 percent of California’s waste stream is food waste, a product that is easily composted. As the new food waste programs expand, we should see further reduction in disposed tonnage and increased diversion rates for the participating cities.

Increased attention on keeping electronics out of the landfill and a new bill, SB 20, which requires disposal fees at the time of purchase, have inspired a new countywide campaign to educate people on the correct procedure for getting rid of their old electronics. Additionally, the County of San Mateo has received a CIWMB grant to work with Goodwill in starting a computer reuse program.

See appendix page 50. Researchers: Tony Cassanego and Jill Boone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversion Rates of San Mateo County Jurisdictions</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SF</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2003 rates have been submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board and will be reviewed in 2006 during the 2003/2004 biennial review process. N/A means diversion surveys are currently being reviewed for 2003. A final diversion value will be reported shortly.

Data source for both: County of San Mateo, RecycleWorks
WATER USE

Water use up seven percent in 2003-04; largest usage is residential indoors

Why Is This Important?

Water is a basic necessity for survival and many everyday activities. Water conservation is essential in San Mateo County because existing usage levels overdraw local sources and rely heavily on distant sources. Projected population growth will place further strain on our finite water supply. Ninety-three percent of the county’s water comes from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir in Yosemite National Park, which is fed by snowmelt from the Sierra Nevada mountains. Six percent comes from groundwater created by rain percolating through the soil. Increased urbanization such as pavement and buildings typically diverts rainfall into storm drains, preventing natural recharging of the groundwater. The reduced inflow and the overdrawing of water can collapse the surrounding earth, decreasing the capacity for future water storage.

How Are We Doing?

Water use in San Mateo County increased sharply in fiscal year 2003-04, up seven percent to about 99 million gallons per day. Fiscal year 2003-04 experienced substantially less precipitation than the previous two years, which typically increases the demand for water. The increase might also be because of the rebounding of the economy as well as the system upgrades, cleaning, and flushing that took place during the transition to chloramines disinfectant in February 2004. Excluding the impact of mandatory rationing during the 1987-92 drought, water use has increased in San Mateo County by an average of 1.1 percent per year from FY 1993-94 through FY 2002-03. Water use is expected to continue increasing at 1.1 percent per year through 2030. As of fiscal year 2002-03, only a tiny fraction, .02 percent, of the county’s water use is recycled water, compared with 3.8 percent in Santa Clara County and 1.4 percent in Alameda County.

Residential use is more than two-thirds of the county’s total water use. Less affluent jurisdictions tend to use far less residential water per capita than more affluent areas. Per capita residential water use in fiscal year 2001-2002 ranged from a low of 44 gallons per person per day in East Palo Alto to more than seven times as much—320 gallons per person per day—in Hillsborough. Single-family residents in more affluent areas used a far greater proportion of water outdoors (58 to 61 percent) than in less affluent areas (8 to 17 percent) in 2001, suggesting affluent homeowners use more water on landscaping.

On average, more than two-thirds of residential water is used indoors. Toilets are the number one water user inside the home, followed by clothes washers. Installing 1.6 gallon ultra low-flow toilets and water efficient “Energy Star” clothes washers are just two ways that residents can help move the county toward a more sustainable water future. Many water suppliers offer incentives for conservation, including in-home water audits, bathroom retrofit kits, ultra low-flow toilet and efficient clothes washer rebates, and large landscape audits.

For more information about drinking water quality, see the Drinking Water Quality indicator on page 32.

See appendix page 50. Researchers: Linda Bagneschi Dorrance, Jesse Bellister, and Alexandra Schwab
Particulate air pollution up slightly in 2004; 11 percent of kids have asthma

Why Is This Important?

Clean air is essential to human health and the environment. Yet many of our daily activities contaminate the air, including driving cars and constructing buildings and roads.

The number of days that San Mateo County exceeds particulate matter and ozone standards is an indicator of air quality. Suspended particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM10)—dust, smoke, and soot—is associated with serious health effects, such as aggravated asthma and premature death, contributes to haze, and harms the environment. Low-level ozone increases the risk of death, triggers a variety of health problems including asthma even at very low levels, may cause permanent lung damage after long-term exposure, damages plants and ecosystems, and is the main component of smog. PM10 is generated from vehicles, construction sites, unpaved roads, factories, wood burning, fuel combustion at power plants and in other industrial processes, and other sources. Vehicles are the primary source of the pollutants that create ozone.

Outdoor air pollution from diesel trucks, refineries, industrial equipment, and cars are associated with more asthma attacks and increased visits to health clinics, emergency rooms, and hospitals. Poor indoor air quality in homes and schools also contributes to asthma.

How Are We Doing?

San Mateo County enjoys relatively clean air, thanks in part to regulations for cleaner burning gasoline and public education efforts aimed at reducing polluting activities. The county’s clean air may also be because of prevailing winds that carry pollution elsewhere. The county’s proximity to the ocean helps to generate breezy weather in the warm season, with the prevailing wind transporting air from the ocean, which is generally a clean source.

Exceedances of the PM10 standard in San Mateo County increased in 2004 after a two-year decline. Just under two percent of monitored days exceeded the PM standard in 2004, up from no exceedances in 2003. The state ozone standard was exceeded one day in 2004—the same as in 2003—and has not exceeded more than one day per year since 1996.

Carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide levels continue to remain below state standards.

Almost seven percent of county residents have asthma, including 14,600 children and 33,300 adults. In 2001, about 11 percent of San Mateo County children ages one to 17 were diagnosed with asthma, less than the statewide average of almost 14 percent.

While automobiles and light trucks account for more than half of the Bay Area’s air pollution, major industrial facilities that violate air quality standards also contribute to the problem. A 2004 report by the nonprofit Environmental Working Group found that fines levied to polluting companies were too small to deter further violations.

See appendix page 50. Researcher: Lambert Ma
CONTAMINATED SITES

Leaking underground storage tanks decline by half in 10 years

Why Is This Important?

Contaminated sites can compromise human health, water quality, and economic development. Commercial or residential property is contaminated when its soil contains unacceptable levels of chemicals or other materials. Leaking underground storage tanks and other hazardous chemical leaks are two sources of site contamination in San Mateo County.

Underground storage tanks were used to store petroleum products including gasoline, heating oil, and other hazardous chemicals. Over time the tanks developed leaks and the petroleum and chemicals drained into the soil. Contaminated sites include abandoned filling stations, dry cleaners, corporation transportation yards, and industrial facilities.

Other hazardous chemical leaks consist of intentional or accidental dumping or burying of hazardous chemicals and materials, sludge ponds, seepage from offsite contamination, and manufacturing waste. Included in other hazardous chemical leaks are superfund sites, such as the old Southern Pacific switching yards in Daly City and an area with large chlorinated solvent contamination in Redwood City.

Hazardous chemical leaks, which largely consist of solvents, pose a greater threat to groundwater than do motor fuel leaks because solvents are highly soluble (capable of being dissolved), mobile, and long-lasting. Leaked hazardous substances can enter the drinking water supply. Certain areas of the county, such as Daly City, East Palo Alto, and the Coastside, have a significant number of homes using well water. Regulators are increasingly concerned about vaporization of underground petrochemicals; these fumes can enter nearby housing and become a cancer risk. Residential and business real estate developers are reluctant to buy or build on contaminated property for fear of incurring the cleaning cost. Instead, developers seek parcels farther away from already built-up commercial or residential areas.

How Are We Doing?

The number of leaking underground storage tank cases in San Mateo County discovered and undergoing investigation, monitoring, and/or cleanup (i.e., “open” cases) has dropped in half over the past decade. At year-end 1995, 719 cases were open, compared with 367 open cases at the end of 2004. A total of 923 cases have been open in the county at some point over the past 10 years, 556 of which have since been closed.

In addition to the 367 open cases of leaking underground storage tanks, 73 cases of other hazardous chemical leaks were open in the county as of year-end 2004. Open cases contain unacceptable levels of petroleum or chemical contamination.

South San Francisco, Redwood City, San Mateo, and San Carlos had the highest combined number of open cases of leaking underground storage tanks and other hazardous chemical leaks at the end of 2004. Leaking underground storage tanks are more common in larger cities with abandoned gas stations and significant industrial and commercial activity.

The number of newly identified leaking underground storage tanks has been decreasing each year. Some cases have been open for a long time. These long term cases may be service stations where new leaks occurred before old ones were cleaned up, low risk cases that are self-remediating, and difficult cases where the owner has disappeared or is being evasive.

See appendix page 50. Researcher: Tom Rounds
Major crime rate up six percent in 2003 to a five-year high

Why Is This Important?

A sustainable community ensures that people can pursue their lives without the fear of crime. High crime levels indicate social disintegration and harm the economy by inhibiting investment and the inflow of new residents. High crime rates compel a community to channel its resources to law enforcement and detention programs, away from more productive uses.

High juvenile crime rates are especially disturbing, as youths who continue criminal behavior do not develop into emotionally stable and productive adults. This can harm the long-term well-being and stability of a community.

How Are We Doing?

The California Crime Index Rate measures the number of major crimes per 100,000 of the general population. It includes homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, and motor vehicle theft.1

The rate of major crime in San Mateo County increased about six percent in 2003 to 1,030 major crimes per 100,000 residents, the highest in five years. Despite this increase, the major crime rate in the county is 40 percent fewer than in 1993. The county posted a one percent increase in the violent crime rate in 2003, compared with a statewide decrease of about three percent, a record low for California since 1973.

Juvenile arrests, which had decreased an impressive 43 percent from 1996 to 2002 reversed course and increased 6 percent in 2003. In contrast, juvenile arrests in 2003 decreased statewide by almost two percent. The county experienced an increase of more than 20 percent in arrests for violent juvenile offenses in 2003.

Along with the rise in major crime, domestic violence related calls for assistance increased six percent in the county during 2003, from 2,879 in 2002 to 3,061 in 2003.

The decrease in the county’s crime rate from 1993 to 2000 is largely because of the significant drop in the number of misdemeanor arrests, primarily arrests for Driving Under the Influence (DUI) and petty theft. The decrease in DUI arrests might be attributable to proactive outreach programs like Avoid the 23. The lack of resources and staff because of budget cuts in the county also affects reported crime statistics by forcing law enforcement agencies to reduce proactive work.

The general decline in the county’s juvenile crime rate from 1993 to 2002 might be correlated with the steady decline in the high school dropout rate. Education, job skill training, organized sports, arts programs, and early intervention remain valuable in combating juvenile crime.

See appendix page 50. Researcher: Sapna Singh

1 The Criminal Justice Statistics Center suspended the calculation of the California Crime Index and the FBI Crime Index this year and is currently reevaluating the Index. For purposes of this report, our researcher calculated the 2003 California Crime Index for San Mateo County, its component cities, and California by summing the 2003 crimes reported in the categories within the California Crime Index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Major Crimes by City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Crimes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources: California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center and California Department of Finance.
DRINKING WATER QUALITY

2004 switch to chloramines drastically reduces TTHMs, a potential carcinogen

Why Is This Important?

High quality drinking water is essential to human health. Contaminated water can cause disease, birth defects, infant mortality, and increased cancer rates.

Federal and state safe drinking water laws aim to assure the high quality of public water supplies. Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs), or drinking water standards, are limits of contaminants that are allowed in drinking water. More stringent than MCLs, Action Levels are levels at which water managers must cut off any source of water leading to a drinking water use until remedial steps have been taken.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency places special emphasis on trihalomethanes (TTHMs) and lead because of risks associated with these contaminants. TTHMs, chemicals that form from chlorinating water, are suspected to be human carcinogens and mutagens and may cause damage to human DNA. Lead can cause severe learning disabilities in children, elevated blood pressure and neurological ailments in adults, and complications in pregnancy.

How Are We Doing?

The water districts serving San Mateo County publish annual water quality reports, called Consumer Confidence Reports, presenting the results of monitoring for various contaminants. Monitoring is done by sampling water at various locations in each district’s distribution system over time. Sustainable San Mateo County examined the 2003 water quality reports of the 21 water districts in San Mateo County that are members of the Bay Area Water Supply & Conservation Agency (BAWSCA). The reports indicate that the water delivered by all 21 water districts met state and federal drinking water regulations.

Most of the water delivered to the county’s 21 BAWSCA-member water districts comes from the San Francisco Water District (SFWD), also called the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. During 2003 the state standard for TTHMs was 100 parts per billion (ppb) based upon a running annual average of results. (The water districts purchasing water from SFWD secured an exemption from the federal standard of 80 ppb for 2003 but were required to comply with the federal standard starting in 2004.) While no district exceeded 100 ppb, average TTHM concentrations ranged from a low of 50 ppb from Coastside County Water District to a high of 87.5 ppb from City of Brisbane Water District. The average of all 21 water districts was 66.9.

In February 2004, SFWD and the San Mateo County water agencies purchasing SFWD water switched from chlorine to chloramines to disinfect the water since chloramine produces far fewer TTHMs as a byproduct. As a result, testing as of early 2004 indicates the TTHM levels in the county have dropped dramatically.

The water districts also test for lead. Lead test results at the 90th percentile level must be less than the Action Level in order to meet water quality standards. All water districts reported that the 90th percentile concentrations of lead were below the Action Levels.

Please refer to the appendix for information about which cities are served by each water district. For more information about water use, see the Water Use indicator on page 28.

See appendix page 50. Researcher: Swati Dubey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Trihalomethanes (TTHMs) in 2003 by Water District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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Data sources: 2003 Consumer Confidence Reports (Water Quality Reports) from each water district. Note: The water districts purchasing water from the San Francisco Water District secured an exemption from the federal standard of 80 ppb for 2003 but were required to comply with the federal standard starting in 2004.
An estimated 10.4 percent lacked health insurance in 2003, up from 7.1 percent in 2001.

Why Is This Important?
A sustainable community ensures that everyone has access to adequate and affordable health care, a key foundation for a healthy and productive life. This indicator tracks health insurance coverage, cost of medical care, prenatal health care, infant mortality, treatment for substance abuse and mental health, and obesity. Preventive care and treatment for illness reduce a community’s long-term social, financial, and medical burdens. Health insurance provides access to health care and spreads the cost of care across the community. High costs for health insurance, treatment, and medications are a deterrent to obtaining proper care and leave less money for other basic needs. Early prenatal care is essential for preventing infant mortality, low birth weights, and illness. Treatment for substance abuse promotes individual stability and independence and reduces family violence, crime, accidents, and disease.

How Are We Doing?
The estimated percentage of San Mateo County residents lacking health insurance increased from 7.1 percent in 2001 to 10.4 percent—or 73,000 people—in 2003. Despite the increase, the county’s rate remained below the estimated statewide rate of 14.6 percent in 2001 and 14.0 percent in 2003. County residents of Latino and Asian descent had the highest estimated rates of lack of health care coverage at 28.2 percent and 15.1 percent, respectively, while Whites had the lowest at 2.8 percent. Health insurance coverage was also correlated with income, with an estimated 37.3 percent of residents below the federal poverty line (FPL) and 21.6 percent of residents at 100 to 199 percent FPL lacking health coverage, compared with just 5.9 percent of residents at 300 percent FPL and above. In 2003 the FPL was $18,400 for a family of four.

The cost of health care, as measured by increases in the medical care category of the Bay Area Consumer Price Index, has grown rapidly since 1999. According to this index, the cost of medical care grew an average of 2.6 percent per year from 1993 to 1999, but then the average growth rate almost doubled to 4.7 percent per year from 1999 to 2004. The increase from 2003 to 2004 alone was 6.8 percent, an 11-year high.

In 2001, 21.7 percent of births in San Mateo County (2,231 births) were to women with inadequate or intermediate prenatal care utilization, compared with 26.7 percent statewide. Native Americans (45.8 percent), Hispanics (29.3 percent), African Americans (26.8 percent), and South East Asians (23.2 percent) had higher than average rates, while Other Asians (13.2 percent) and Non-Hispanic Whites (15.5 percent) had lower than average rates. While 2000 countywide infant mortality—at 3.5 deaths per 1,000 births—satisfied the Healthy People 2010 target of 4.5 deaths per 1,000 births, the rate among Hispanics (5.2) did not meet the target.

In fiscal year 1999-2000 alcohol and drug treatment capacity increased in San Mateo County. This might be a factor in the 19 percent increase in the number of clients in alcohol or drug treatment in fiscal year 2001-02 compared with fiscal year 1997-98. About 13.9 percent (75,000) of county residents reported needing help for emotional or mental health problems in 2001. Only 7.1 percent of these people had difficulties or delays getting mental health care. About 1.4 percent of county residents (9,839) received mental health treatment in fiscal year 1999-2000 from local county mental health programs.
Widespread use of toxic pesticides can damage human health and the environment. The most toxic pesticides can cause cancer, pose reproductive hazards, disrupt hormone function, are nerve toxins, and/or pollute the air and water. Pesticides applied to homes, gardens, buildings, agriculture, rights-of-way, and other places run off into our waterways, polluting water and threatening the health of wildlife. Organic food production (a $15 billion industry growing nationally at nearly 20 percent per year) and non-toxic pest management are emerging as alternatives to toxic pesticide use.

Of the 273,273 pounds of pesticides applied in San Mateo County during 2003—excluding residential use—45 percent, or 123,805 pounds, were classified as most toxic. Use of the most toxic pesticides, however, was down 40 percent compared with 1997 levels.

The overwhelming majority of the most toxic pesticides used in the county during 2003—excluding residential use—were for structural pest control (46 percent) and agriculture (42 percent). Structural pest control includes measures such as termite, ant, and roach control. Three-quarters (76 percent) of the most toxic pesticides used in agriculture were for Brussels sprouts. Less than four percent of the county’s 4,593 acres of cultivated agricultural land are organic.

Sulfuryl fluoride was by far the top used most toxic pesticide in the county. Used extensively as a fumigant for termite pest control by structural pest control companies, this acutely toxic chemical accounted for 44 percent of the most toxic pesticides countywide. Applications of this material increased when structural use of methyl bromide was cancelled because of concerns about ozone depletion. As with all fumigants, significant pounds of material are used because a space is being treated as opposed to a targeted surface. The amount of structural fumigants in San Mateo County is directly correlated with the real estate market, with more applications taking place when more houses are sold and inspected for termites before sale.

Ranking second in use at 29 percent of the most toxic pesticides was potassium N-methyldithio carbamate, used primarily as a pre-plant soil fumigant on Brussels sprouts. Potassium N-methyldithio carbamate is a developmental or reproductive toxin and acutely toxic.

The 40 percent decline in the use of the most toxic pesticides since 1997 was driven mostly by sharp decreases in metam-sodium and methyl bromide and smaller decreases...
ten percent of pesticide use in the U.S. (and 25 percent worldwide) is used on conventionally grown cotton."

Consumer use of home and garden pesticides is not reported, nor are most industrial or institutional uses, unless applications are performed by a licensed pest control applicator. Unreported pesticide use in California is estimated to be approximately 30 percent of total pesticide use.

See appendix page 52. Researchers: Stephen Ensley and Joe Rois
CHILD ABUSE

Child abuse referrals up 8 percent over 5 years to 2.7 percent of children

Why Is This Important?

Healthy children in stable families are a foundation of a sustainable community. Unable to protect themselves, children depend on adults to provide a safe and nurturing environment. When a child is abused, particularly by an adult with whom that child has a significant relationship, that child’s development is profoundly impacted.

The trauma of child abuse often results in lifelong impairment in social, academic, and occupational functioning. Many incarcerated adults were victims of child abuse, and most perpetrators of child abuse experienced abuse during their childhood. Early intervention in the lives of abused children leads to fewer physical, psychological, and emotional problems and helps reduce the continuation of abuse in future generations.

How Are We Doing?

Almost three percent of children—or 4,388 kids—in San Mateo County were referred to Child Protective Services as victims of child abuse in 2003. Specifically, the rate of child abuse referrals per 1,000 children in San Mateo County was 26.7 in 2003, up eight percent from 1998. Despite the increase, the county’s rate was almost half the state rate of 51.7 per 1,000 children in 2003. The state rate increased almost 10 percent since 1998.

Child abuse referrals in San Mateo County are far more prevalent among Blacks than other ethnic groups. In 2003 the rate of child abuse referrals per 1,000 Black children in the county was 113.7, more than three to seven times the rate of other ethnic groups, and more than four times the county average. The rate among Hispanics was also greater than average, at 34.5 referrals per 1,000 Hispanic children. Asians had the lowest referral rate (15.8), followed by Whites (19.3).

The most common type of allegation among child abuse referrals in fiscal year 2003-04 was general neglect (37 percent), followed by physical abuse (17 percent), substan-

---

Child Abuse Referrals in San Mateo County by Allegation Type, FY 2003-04

Data source for all graphs: U.C. Berkeley Center for Social Services Research
Child care supply up 10 percent, demand up 19 percent as economy improves

Why Is This Important?

The availability of quality child care impacts employers’ ability to utilize the county’s highly skilled workforce and maintain economic competitiveness. Further, child care is indispensable to the many families who need two incomes to afford San Mateo County’s high cost of living.

In addition to economic impacts, quality of care during the early years affects children’s socio-emotional and cognitive development including language learning, problem-solving, self-control, social skills, and school readiness. Consistent, quality child care can be a stabilizing force for children and their families during changing times.

How Are We Doing?

![Chart of Child Care Demand Versus Supply in San Mateo County]

Data sources: California Child Care Resource & Referral Network, California Department of Finance, and U.S. Census Bureau

In 2004, the supply of licensed child care facilities in San Mateo County was sufficient to meet the needs of only 32 percent of children under age 14 needing non-parental care. Despite the huge gap, this is an improvement over 2001 when the county’s licensed supply met the needs of just 27 percent of such children.

As the economy has improved over the last year both demand for, and supply of, child care has risen. While the total number of children in San Mateo County increased by just one percent over the last year, the number of children with both or a single parent in the workforce has increased by a dramatic 19 percent. This increased demand has been somewhat offset by a 10 percent increase in licensed child care spaces in the last year, primarily in family child care homes. This increase in child care spaces represents a departure from the trend toward decreasing space between 1999 and 2003.

Despite the high demand for child care in the county, child care providers surveyed as part of the Preschool for All, Supply and Demand Study in June 2004 reported vacancies. Forty-seven percent of child care centers cited a family’s inability to afford child care as the reason for vacancies. Child care costs in San Mateo County remain higher than in most parts of the state and continue to increase. The average monthly cost for infant care in 2004 was $813 (family child care home) to $1,126 (center-based care), up 25 percent and 48 percent respectively from 1998. Preschooler care averaged $761 per month (family child care home) to $775 (center-based care), up 24 percent and 42 percent respectively in the last six years. The cost of part-time care for school age children averaged $5.94 per hour (family child care home) to $344 per month (center-based care), up 42 percent and 5 percent respectively in the last six years.

Middle- and low-income families face a particularly difficult time affording child care. To qualify for child care subsidies, a family’s income must fall below state or federal guidelines that are not in alignment with the county’s high cost of living. Families with incomes above the guideline level, with annual incomes between $35,000 and $75,000, are not using licensed child care programs as much as families with lower and higher incomes. This lower usage could be attributed to the fact that these families neither receive subsidies nor have income sufficient to pay for licensed care. Even families who meet very low income guidelines for subsidized care are not assured of assistance, often remaining unserved for years on the county’s Centralized Eligibility List. As the amount of subsidy funding has decreased, the number of children on the list climbed to 3,360 in 2004, up 74 percent from one year ago.

Several initiatives in the county aim to address the child care shortage through facilities development, capacity-building efforts, and professional training and retention programs. The Peninsula Quality Fund for Early Childhood Facilities provides facility improvement grants to licensed, nonprofit child care centers serving low-income children. SmartKids, the county’s Child Care Facilities Expansion Fund, issues grants to help with start-up costs, training, facility improvements, and equipment purchases. The San Mateo CARES (SaMCARES) incentive program strives to improve the quality of care by encouraging child care professionals to pursue child development training and by promoting the retention of qualified providers.

See appendix page 52. Researcher: Sarah Johnson
CHILDREN’S HEALTH

Fourteen percent of children lacked continuous health insurance in 2002

Why Is This Important?

This indicator tracks a variety of children’s health measures including rates of childhood poverty, health insurance coverage, immunizations, obesity, mental health referrals, and attention deficit disorder.

Children in poverty frequently live in stressful environments without the necessities most children have, including adequate nutrition to enable physical and cognitive development. Children from low-income families are more likely to go hungry, reside in overcrowded and unstable housing, live in unsafe neighborhoods, and receive a poorer education. They also tend to have less access to health care, child care, and other community resources such as quality after-school programs, sports, and extracurricular opportunities.

Immunizations protect children against serious and potentially fatal diseases and can prevent the spread of contagious diseases to the public. Children who are overweight or obese are at risk of developing high blood pressure, high cholesterol, asthma, and Type 2 diabetes, among other serious physical problems. Overweight and obese children also are more likely to have weight problems in adulthood. Children with serious emotional disturbances can have difficulty leading healthy and productive lives as adults.

How Are We Doing?

The percentage of children in the county living below the federal poverty level steadily declined from 9.5 percent in 1997 to 5.8 percent in 2001, but rose to 6.9 percent in 2003. These relatively low rates, however, mask the true rate of poverty given the high cost of living in San Mateo County. About 22 percent of San Mateo County residents live below the “self-sufficiency level,” or the $57,501 per year needed by a family of three to afford basic necessities in 2003.

As of May 2002, nearly 14 percent of children in the county (about 24,000 between the ages of 0 and 18) lacked access to continuous health insurance. Nine out of ten uninsured children come from hard-working families trying to provide for their children but whose jobs lack health benefits. These working families cannot pay for privately purchased insurance since close to 90 percent earned less than 400 percent of the federal poverty level (or $61,000 for a family of three in 2002), which is below the county’s estimated cost to raise a family.

The percentage of children who have received the recommended immunizations by age 2 remained relatively steady from 1996 to 2000 in the county overall. Although San Mateo County children are more likely to be immunized than children statewide (73 percent vs. 67 percent in 2000), all regions in the county remain well below the Healthy People 2010 Objective of 90 percent. In 2000 South County had the lowest immunization rate at 66.2 percent, while Mid-County had the highest at 80.6 percent. Coastside was 74.7 percent, and North County was 74.4 percent. By the time children reach kindergarten, a greater proportion has received all required immunizations mandated by California law. In 2003, the figure was 92.5 percent, up from 89.6 percent in 1999.

Among San Mateo County children 10-12 years old receiving San Mateo County Health Department health exams in 1996, 24.4 percent were overweight. This rate was higher than both the state average (20.3 percent) and the national average (20.4 percent). In a 2001 survey of San Mateo County adolescents 27.3 percent reported feeling overweight.

The number of children age 17 and younger who received mental health treatment rose 74 percent from fiscal year 1990-91 to 2,358 in fiscal year 1999-2000. In 2001 approximately 3.1 percent of children age 1 to 11—or 3,000 children—were diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder.

See appendix page 52. Researcher: Aalap Narichania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of San Mateo County Children Immunized by Age Two Compared to Healthy People 2010 Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: San Mateo County Children’s Report Initiative, Peninsula Partnership Council
Countywide Academic Performance Index (API) is up nine percent in five years

Why Is This Important?

A good education sets a foundation for people to become productive members of society and obtain quality, high-paying jobs. Many local businesses need a highly skilled and educated work force to remain competitive. Funding for education is an investment in a community’s future. Insufficient funding means schools have difficulty attracting and retaining qualified teachers and providing updated curricula. An inadequate education can make students more vulnerable to poverty, homelessness, crime, and substance abuse.

How Are We Doing?

During 2003-04, 23.4% of enrolled students were English second language learners in San Mateo County, compared with 25.4% statewide. The vast majority of the county’s English learners speak Spanish as their primary language. In 2004, only 36 percent of English learners passed the English Language Arts portion of the California High School Exit Exam, compared with 88 percent of non-English learners. On the Math portion of the exam, 52 percent of English learners passed compared with 87 percent of non-English learners.

In 2003-04 countywide average class size was 26.5, compared with 27.4 for the state. Almost 44 percent of the county’s high school graduates in 2002-03 had taken a curriculum meeting University of California or California State University admission requirements, far higher than the 34 percent state average.

In 2002-03, the county’s high school dropout rate was 1.4 percent, about half the state level of 3.2 percent and down 53 percent from 1991-92. Students of Hispanic, Pacific Islander, and African-American descent have relatively higher dropout rates, at 2.6, 2.4, and 2.1 percent, respectively, while Asians have the lowest dropout rate at 0.4 percent.

Information about per pupil spending in 2002-03 was not available in time for this report.

See appendix page 53. Researcher: Rinku Bhaswati Bhadra

2005 SSMC AWARD WINNER

“Getting Green at Central” is a grassroots effort at Central Elementary School in Belmont which has inspired the whole school to recycle everything from aluminum to tennis shoes—and in the process saved enough money to build a new play structure and install an “outdoor classroom” to teach lessons outdoors.
San Mateo County Elementary School Districts 2004 API Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hillsborough City</th>
<th>Portola Valley</th>
<th>Las Lomitas</th>
<th>Menlo Park City</th>
<th>Burlingame</th>
<th>San Carlos</th>
<th>Belmont-Redwood Shores</th>
<th>Pacifica</th>
<th>San Mateo-Foster City</th>
<th>Brisbane</th>
<th>San Bruno Park</th>
<th>Jefferson Elementary</th>
<th>Bayshore</th>
<th>Redwood City</th>
<th>Ravenswood City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Hillsborough</td>
<td>S. Hillsborough</td>
<td>Corte Madera</td>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>Redwood Shores</td>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>San Mateo-Foster</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>San Bruno Park</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>Bayshore</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Ravenswood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hillsborough</td>
<td>Corte Madera</td>
<td>La Lomitas</td>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>Belmont-Redwood Shores</td>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>San Mateo-Foster</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>San Bruno Park</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>Bayshore</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Ravenswood City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- W. Hillsborough
- S. Hillsborough
- E. Hillsborough
- Corte Madera
- La Lomitas
- Woodside
- Menlo Park
- Burlingame
- Belmont-Redwood Shores
- Pacifica
- San Mateo-Foster City
- Brisbane
- San Bruno Park
- Jefferson Elementary
- Bayshore
- Redwood City
- Ravenswood City
San Mateo County Unified and High School Districts
2004 API Scores

Data source for both tables:
California Department of Education
ARTS PARTICIPATION

Arts funding suffers from economic downturn and government budget cuts

Why Is This Important?

Art is an essential component of a good education. In addition to studying the arts for their own sake, experiencing and making works of art benefits students in their intellectual, personal, and social development, and can be particularly beneficial for students from economically disadvantaged circumstances and those who are at risk of not succeeding in school. Research studies point to strong relationships between learning in the arts and fundamental cognitive skills and capacities used to master other core subjects, including reading, writing, and mathematics.

Participation in the arts also fosters creativity and expression. Creativity enables one to imagine what is possible, not just what already exists—a critical skill for success in an innovation economy. Artists make possible the music and entertainment industries, and design our clothes, living spaces, and advertisements. A thriving artistic sector can draw tourists to a community, bringing revenue from spending on transportation, hotels, restaurants, and shopping.

Perhaps the more important benefits are intangible. Artistic expression brings intrinsic rewards to both the artist and the audience, and can thus make life more fulfilling. Arts are a medium for an artist to reveal his or her passion, and for the audience to experience that passion in ways that lift their spirits, make them laugh, challenge their perceptions, experience new emotions, or learn about life.

How Are We Doing?

School Art Courses

Each school district in San Mateo County varies greatly in its assortment and nature of art courses. Woodside Elementary, Brisbane Elementary, Hillsborough City, and Portola Valley Elementary school districts have the greatest number of fine art courses relative to their student populations (thus, the fewest number of students per art course), while Bayshore School District, Ravenswood, Pacifica, Redwood City Elementary, and San Bruno Park Elementary school districts have the fewest fine art courses.

Teachers in elementary schools tend to teach and perform art without necessarily having specific “art courses.” Thirty-seven schools have implemented “Art in Action,” a curriculum-based visual arts program for kindergarten through eighth grade. The main purpose is to ensure that each student has some art exposure, with the students receiving one to two hours of art every two to three weeks on average. Further, many schools have an appointed teacher who teaches either basic art or music.

Despite the attempts of programs such as Art in Action to increase art education in schools, many improvements are still necessary. State budget cuts have forced organizations such as the California Arts Council to withdraw funding of arts programs in schools. The government is attempting to reinstate art programs in the schools under the No Child Left Behind Act, but simultaneously is cutting funding that would enable schools to do so.

Arts Organization Funding

San Mateo County has a rich and diverse range of art and cultural organizations ranging from dance and theater to music and visual arts. The arts community is inadequately funded partially because of the recent economic downturn. The most drastic funding reductions have come from foundations. In some cases, foundations have restructured and are withdrawing their support for the arts to fund areas the government no longer does, such as health care and education. Many organizations have endured a decrease in individual donations and income from fundraising. Several organizations, however, report signs of rebounding from the economic slump.

Sustainable San Mateo County surveyed 45 arts organizations to inquire about trends in funding levels and sources. Of the 10 organizations that responded, 6 received a majority of their income from individuals, 2 from foundations, and 2 through earnings. All respondents received little to no funding from corporations or government sources.

See appendix page 53. Researchers: Chris Walker and Lauren Hay
City parks acres up 31 percent per capita but still about half the recommended level

Why Is This Important?

The presence of nearby areas for recreation enriches quality of life. By providing opportunities for outdoor activity and socialization, parks contribute to physical and psychological health. Community events such as art fairs, Halloween parades, and concerts in the park foster social and cultural enrichment and bring people together to build a sense of local community.

How Are We Doing?

In 2004 San Mateo County had an average of only 2.2 acres of developed city parks per 1,000 residents, far short of the 4 to 5 acres recommended by the National Recreation and Park Association. The countywide average has remained about half the recommended level for at least the past five years. Nonetheless, acres of developed city parks per 1,000 residents increased 31 percent from the 2003 level of 1.7 acres.

Only Brisbane, San Carlos, and Foster City, at 17.2, 4.7, and 4.1 acres per 1,000 residents, respectively, met or exceeded the recommended level of developed city parks. Pacifica and San Mateo were close to the recommended level, at 3.7 and 3.6 acres respectively. Many cities, however, had high capital improvement budgets per capita for developed city parks in 2004—including Colma, Foster City, Daly City, Pacifica, San Carlos, Brisbane, Atherton, and others—suggesting that the trend might improve in the future.

More than 275 community events took place in San Mateo County during 2004, with almost every city home to at least one. More than 20 community events took place in Pacifica, Burlingame, Redwood City, Foster City, South San Francisco, San Bruno, and Menlo Park during 2004. In contrast, Hillsborough, Woodside, Millbrae, East Palo Alto, and Colma had fewer than 10 community events during that timeframe, although some of these cities have small populations.

See appendix page 53. Researchers: Leora Tanjuatco, Esther Wong, and Marcia Pagels

Data sources for all three graphs: National Recreation and Park Association and Sustainable San Mateo County annual surveys to city Parks & Recreation Directors
**Volunteerism**

**Value of volunteer labor averaged $105,374 per nonprofit in 2003 survey**

*Why Is This Important?*

The nonprofit sector fulfills needs not met by the for-profit or governmental sectors. Nonprofits enhance the overall quality of life of the community and often provide a safety net for our neediest residents. Services provided by nonprofits include housing the homeless, feeding the hungry, caring for the sick, protecting the environment, and saving lives in times of disaster. Hundreds of nonprofit organizations in the community make a meaningful, measurable difference in people’s lives.

Because funding is often scarce, many nonprofits rely on volunteers. The annual number of volunteers and volunteer hours contributed to the county’s nonprofits is an indicator of the ability of nonprofits to accomplish their work.

*How Are We Doing?*

In January 2005 Sustainable San Mateo County (SSMC) mailed a survey on volunteerism to 22 San Mateo County nonprofits that use volunteers. Because only 8 responded and since the 22 survey recipients might not be representative of the general nonprofit community, survey results cannot necessarily be extrapolated to the wider nonprofit community. Nonetheless, three of the five respondents that provided trend data reported substantial increases in the number of volunteers and total volunteer hours in the past five or six years, but a decline in the number of hours per volunteer.

According to the same survey, in 2004 each nonprofit had an average of 406 volunteers who worked 48 hours each, for a total of 3,150 volunteer hours per nonprofit. Volunteer hours in 2004 ranged from 658 hours at HIP Housing (Human Investment Project) to a high of 7,580 hours at Half Moon Bay Restoration.

Thrive—The Alliance of Nonprofits for San Mateo County—administers an annual membership survey. The 86 members that responded to its 2004 survey identified fundraising and educating the public and policy makers about the contributions of nonprofits as their highest priority issues.

In 2003, the 33 members that participated in the annual survey identified lack of affordable housing as the top issue facing the community, followed by nonprofit funding and budget cuts that necessitate corresponding adjustments in their scope of work. The 2003 survey respondents served a total of 446,761 people in San Mateo County, with a median operating budget of $1.5 million and an average of $105,374 in volunteer labor per nonprofit (the total value of all reported volunteer labor was $3,477,353). The 2004 survey respondents reported an average of 335 volunteers per nonprofit, for a total of 13,742 volunteers.

Some San Mateo County schools participate in a school community service program whereby students donate time to off-campus activities. Because student service is a positive contribution to our community, SSMC encourages schools and school districts to track student volunteer hours contributed through school community service programs. Such tracking would enable SSMC to include measures of student volunteerism in future indicator reports.

See appendix page 53. Researchers: Cindy Lui and Samia Rogers

*“The 30 million trees planted by Green Belt Movement volunteers—mostly rural women—throughout Kenya over the past 30 years is a testament to individuals’ ability to change the course of environmental history.”*  

Wangari Maathai, 2004 Nobel Peace Prize winner
VOTER PARTICIPATION

2004 voter turnout highest in at least 15 years, but more than one-third don’t vote

Why Is This Important?

In a sustainable society, citizens participate in making decisions that will impact their lives. Voting is one way that people can participate in community-wide decision-making. High voter turnout indicates that people feel empowered to influence decisions affecting them. High voter participation is essential so that public policy accurately reflects the will of the people. Low voter turnout can signal disenfranchisement and skew public policy toward the desires of those who voted, rather than for the common good of all community members.

How Are We Doing?

In the 2004 presidential election, 63 percent of eligible adults (i.e., eligible to vote whether or not they were registered) in San Mateo County voted, compared with 57 percent statewide and 60 percent nationally. The county’s 2004 voter turnout was up substantially from the 2000 presidential election when only 54 percent of eligible adults voted. The number of county residents who voted early in 2004 more than doubled from the last presidential election. While the 2004 voter turnout was the highest for the county in at least 15 years, still less than two-thirds of eligible voters in the county are making decisions for the entire community.

The estimated percentage of adults voting was highest in the most affluent cities and lowest in the least affluent cities. More than an estimated 80 percent of adults voted in Portola Valley, Woodside, and Atherton while estimates show only 27 and 35 percent, respectively, of adults voted in East Palo Alto and Daly City.

Voter turnout—expressed as the percentage of eligible voters who voted—in San Mateo County has ranged from 15 to 63 percent since 1990. Turnout is highest in even years when federal and state offices and issues are on the ballot and lowest during odd years when elections consist of primarily local offices and issues.

A record 368,410 people were registered to vote in San Mateo County for the 2004 election. The percentage of eligible adults registered to vote increased from 69 percent in 2000 to 80 percent in 2004. A large number of registered voters, 78 percent, voted in the 2004 presidential election.

Voter registration rates are higher among older voters than younger voters. About 27 percent of county residents are age 56 and over, but they represent 33 percent of registered voters. In contrast, about 20 percent of residents are age 18 to 29, but they represent just 16 percent of registered voters. Approximately 54 percent of residents are between the ages of 30 to 55, but only 51 percent of registered voters are within this age range.

While the record number of registered voters in San Mateo County in 2004 is encouraging, the discrepancy among cities and age groups is a concern. Efforts to increase voter registration should continue, especially among lower-income communities and younger residents who are underrepresented among voters.

See appendix page 53. Researcher: Erin Gaines
APPENDIX

Introduction, page 3

Genuine Progress Indicator, page 5: Actual economic well-being was about 44 percent less in 2000 than that reported by conventional measure

Sustainable San Mateo County (SSMC) has replaced the per capita personal income indicator used in its previous indicators reports with the GPI. The GPI was deemed a more appropriate measure of economic activity from a sustainability perspective, and it is useful to compare it with the more widely known GRP. Both measures are imperfect, but the GPI represents an effort to use recognized sustainable values in the economic accounting system. The GRP uses the same accounting method as the national product accounts. In its analysis, SSMC identified the national system as the GNP. In the last decade or so, usage has shifted to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The difference between the GNP and the GDP in the United States, however, is very minimal. See http://www.regionalprogress.org/county_ca_bayarea.html for more information about the San Mateo County and Bay Area GPI.

Income Distribution, page 6: Per capita income in wealthiest city almost seven times higher than in least wealthy region

Jobs, page 7: Jobs down 4.3 percent in 2003, continuing 3-year decline
Data source for number of jobs by industry, job growth from 1990 to 2003, occupational employment projections, and number of employees by size category is the California Employment Development Department, www.calmis.ca.gov.

Poverty, page 8: Twenty-two percent of county residents earn less than the self-sufficiency level

Unemployment, page 9: Economy recovering as unemployment dropped to 3.9 percent in 2004
The unemployment rate is the number of unemployed as a percentage of the labor force. 2004 figures are annual averages through December 2004, and December 2004 data are preliminary. Figures used are not seasonally adjusted. Unemployment data are based on place of residence. The unemployment rate is calculated using unrounded data. Effective with the release of January 2003 data in February 2003, labor force data for all areas have been revised back to January 2000. This revision is the result of incorporation of the 2000 Census population controls at the State level and changes in methodology. Therefore, data for years prior to 2000 are not comparable with data for 2000 and later years. Census ratios used to calculate sub-county labor force are based on 1990 Census data.

The preliminary December 2004 unemployment rate figures for the cities and Census Designated Place are from the California EDD, Labor Market Information Division. At www.calmis.ca.gov click on Unemployment Rates, then look under “Sub-County Areas (Cities and Towns).” Atherton, Brisbane, Colma, Hillsborough, Portola Valley, and Woodside are excluded because the EDD consultants opted to exclude those cities from the EDD website, but they may be included in the future. Unincorporated areas are excluded because unemployment ratios are not available for unincorporated areas. An unemployment ratio is the ratio of unemployment in a particular city divided by countywide unemployment.

Housing Affordability & Homelessness, page 10: Only 15 percent of county households can afford a median-priced home

Data on the percentage of households that can afford the median-priced home are from press releases about the Housing Affordability Index issued by the California Association of Realtors (www.car.org). Median sales prices for homes and condominiums in San Mateo County are from the San Mateo County Association of Realtors (www.samcar.org). Information on homelessness and average rents for one- and two-bedroom apartments are from the Office of Housing in the County of San Mateo Human Services Agency (www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/smc/department/home/0,15587525_17488560,00.html). The income needed to afford a home, condominium, or apartment was calculated based on the following assumptions: (1) local lender's guidelines that homeowners not pay more than 35 percent of gross household income per year for housing, (2) 20 percent down payment and 30-year fully amortized loan, and (3) average interest rate on a 30-year fixed rate mortgage was 5.84 percent in 2004 according to Freddie Mac, (www.freddiemac.com). Data on 2004 countywide median family income are from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and were found on the CA State Housing & Community Development web page (www.hcd.ca.gov/) and represent median income for a family of four in San Mateo County. Information on the Fair Share housing production goals and actual housing production are from Bay Area Council's Bay Area Housing Profile: Second Edition 1999-2003, published in December 2004 found on their web page (www.bayareacouncil.org). Information on overcrowding was found in the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice for San Mateo County, prepared by the Office of Housing in the San Mateo County Human Services Agency in June 2004 and posted on their web page. Overcrowding is defined as more than one person per room. The quote is from the Bay Area Council and found on page 8 of the Bay Area Council’s Bay Area Housing Profile: Second Edition 1999-2003.

Population, page 12: Population is up 23 percent since 1980, 91 percent of growth is from births

Population data are from the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit. Data on the county’s ethnic and age composition are from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey. Note the 2003 American Community Survey universe is limited to the household population and excludes the population living in institutions, college dormitories, and other group quarters.

Carbon Emissions, page 13: Carbon emissions increase 20 percent since 1993; vehicles the largest contributor

Information about “Why Is This Important?” is from: the 2003 Silicon Valley Environmental Index, www.svip.org; It’s Much Too Late to Sweat Global Warming, by Mark Hertsgaard, San Francisco Chronicle, 2/13/05, http://www.truthout.org/docs_2005/021405X.shtml; and Global Warming Approaching Point of No Return, Warns Leading Climate Expert, by Geoffrey Lean, The Independent on Sunday U.K., 1/23/05, http://www.truthout.org/docs_05/012505G.shtml. Since 1988, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, comprised of more than 2,000 scientific and technical experts from around the world, has conducted the most extensive peer-reviewed scientific inquiry in history.


Conversion factors are as follows. To convert from gallons of gasoline to tons of carbon, multiply gallons of gasoline by 5.3 (average pounds of carbon per gallon), then divide by 2,000. To convert from therms of natural gas to tons of carbon, multiply therms of natural gas by 3.174 (average pounds of carbon per therm), then divide by 2,000. To convert from kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity to tons of carbon, multiply kWh by the average pounds of carbon per kWh for that year, then divide by 2000. Calculation of carbon emissions from electricity requires knowledge of sources of the electricity (coal, gas, hydroelectric, nuclear, and other). These data, called the “power mix,” are not known for years 2001 and later. To estimate carbon emissions from electricity, we began with PG&E’s projected power content label distributed with bills each year and also available on the web. Discussions with PG&E led us to adjust PG&E’s published data on projected hydroelectric generation to reflect the California Energy Commission’s data on actual hydro generation. Hydro generation is the key variable in the state’s power mix, as it depends upon the depth of the winter snow pack. When hydro production falls, PG&E and others substitute energy from coal and gas. We used a conversion factor of 0.5750 pounds of carbon per kWh of electricity from coal, 0.3478 pounds of carbon per kWh of electricity from natural gas, and zero pounds of carbon for electricity from all other sources. The data source for the pounds of carbon per kWh of electricity from coal and natural gas is the Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.

Information about the number of new jobs that would be created by the Climate Stewardship Act is from the Natural Resources De-
family Council; see http://www.truthout.org/docs_2005/021205W.shtml.


Oracle saved almost $900,000 a year and reduced average monthly electricity use per employee by 20 percent in two years by upgrading its lighting, working on its HVAC systems, and installing occupancy sensors. The return on investment was less than eight months.


Green Building Policies, page 18: Cities slowly but increasingly explore green building approach Data sources: Two separate telephone surveys of San Mateo County and cities during October 2004 through January 2005, conducted by Sustainable San Mateo County volunteers and County RecycleWorks staff; Report on Green Building Policies and Practices in San Mateo Cities and Towns, 2004, prepared for the City/County Association of Governments (CCAG) by RecycleWorks; Worldwatch Institute; and article San Mateo continues green trend with new main library, San Francisco Chronicle, September 19, 2003. Please note the SSMC survey was undertaken by volunteers, and in many cases the cities did not have a designated individual to answer questions about the city’s green building policies and practices. Information collected is subject to the knowledge and perspective of the person interviewed; thus the information presented in this indicators report may not represent the full city policy or actions. This underscores the importance that cities should appoint someone to handle public inquiries regarding green buildings.

Transportation, page 20: More carpooling and transit use, smart planning, and cooler economy ease congestion Commute data shown on the top graph are generated by RIDES for Bay Area Commuters, Inc. via random telephone surveys. Survey results are statistically valid at the 95 percent level, with a confidence interval of +/- 5 percent. This means that 95 times out of 100 the characteristics of the sample would reflect the characteristics of the population, within +/- 5 percent. Data shown are from Commute Profile 2004 for San Mateo County, available at http://rideshare.511.org/research/.

Daily delay 2003 data are from Bay Area Transportation State of the System 2004 by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/library/state_of_the_system/index.htm. Daily delay data for prior years are from Information Memorandum, Year 2002 Bay Area Freeway Congestion Data published by Caltrans District 4, Office of Highway Operations. See http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/documents/d4hicomp2002.pdf, or follow the link from http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/ to Caltrans Reports. The information represents average freeway traffic conditions on a typical weekday. Information on the estimated cost of congestion is calculated using data from the same two sources, as follows:
$1,486,000 cost per day in District 4 in 2003, divided by 121,800 hrs/day delay in District 4 in 2003, multiplied by 7,300 hrs/day delay in San Mateo County in 2003, multiplied by 250 days per year (weekends minus 10 holidays). See “Methodology” section of Information Memorandum, Year 2002 Bay Area Freeway Congestion Data for more details about methodology.


Information about transportation accomplishments for 2004, transit oriented development, and the El Camino Grand Boulevard Project is from the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans). The national urban planning group collaborating with the cities is called Project for Public Spaces.

Agriculture, page 21: Summit yields steps toward securing water supply, “right to farm” ordinance, and marketing program to stem agricultural decline

Data on the acres of county land that are agricultural land and grazing land are from the California Department of Conservation, based on 2002 data. Additional data sources are as follows: 2003 Agricultural Crop Report, San Mateo County Department of Agriculture/Weights and Measures; and conversations with: Gail Raabe, Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights & Measures; and conversations with: Gail Raabe, Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights & Measures, on October 8, 2004; Jack Olsen, Executive Administrator of San Mateo County Farm Bureau, on October 21, 2004; and Tim Frahm, Director of Conservation and Water Quality Program, San Mateo County Farm Bureau, on November 3, 2004.

Bird Populations, page 23: California Quail apparently under pressure from urban expansion and habitat changes

The Crystal Springs and Año Nuevo counts each encompass a 15-mile diameter circle. Teams of observers are assigned to specific areas in order to maximize coverage within the circle, and throughout the day they record every bird that is seen or heard in their areas. These current and historical census data are maintained in a database that can be a valuable resource for scientific studies and reviews. Caution must be applied when comparing local results with national trends because of the variables in natural environments and habitats.

Total numbers of birds counted can fluctuate for a variety of reasons, including weather conditions, tide levels, and the general mobility of birds. As a result, the emphasis is on long-term data collection that can clearly establish trends. For example, when the weather is clear and sunny, gulls are hard to count as they disperse along the coast and offshore while foraging for food. When the weather is inclement, many thousands of gulls fly inland seeking shelter on lakes and fields. The 2004 Crystal Springs count (good weather) had fewer than 12,000 gulls counted compared with more than 22,000 in 2003 (showers) and over 20,000 in 2002 (rain and wind).

Large numbers of shorebirds feed along shorelines and are especially numerous on an outgoing tide when feeding areas are being exposed. Shorebird populations may not be as numerous at high tide when there is little exposed area on which to forage.

Rafts of waterfowl also move around San Francisco Bay. They cannot be counted if they swim outside of the count circle. For example, a large flock of waterfowl was reported on the bay north of San Francisco International Airport on the date of the 2004 Crystal Springs count. They could not be included in the count since they were just outside of the count circle. The normally expected flocks of waterfowl near Foster City were missing on the count day. Count circles cannot overlap, so gaps in coverage do occur. In this instance, several thousand ducks could not be included in the count.

Access to some areas within the count circle may also be limited. For example, a large section of San Francisco International Airport is included in the Crystal Springs count circle but is not accessible because of security reasons.

The Crystal Springs count occurred on December 18, 2004 with 61 observers participating in the count, totaling 243.75 hours in the field. The weather was clear and beautiful. A total of 188 species was seen, and 68,755 birds were counted. The species total of 188 is similar to the 192 species seen in 2003 and better than the 2002 total of 177 species when the weather was a problem. The total number of birds counted at Crystal Springs in 2004 was less than in 2003 (87,797) and only slightly greater than in 2002 (62,023). A total difference of 19,000 birds between the 2004 and 2003 counts may appear to be significant. However, large fluctuations in numbers can occur because of such variables as weather conditions and mobility; some examples have been described above.

The Año Nuevo Count occurred on January 2, 2005 with 51 observers totaling 186 hours in the field. Steady rain fell throughout most of the day. A total of 172 species was seen and 26,721 birds were counted. The species total is close to the 177 species seen in 2003 and 176 in 2002. The total number of birds counted compares closely with 2003 (27,419 birds) and 2002 (22,981).

Ecological Footprint, page 24: Average county resident consumes more than 4.5 times his “fair share” of global resources

Data sources include: Redefining Progress, San Francisco Bay Area Ecological Footprint, 2004 (see www.redefiningprogress.org); Wackernagel & Rees, Our Ecological Footprint (New Society Publishers: British Columbia) 1996; and World Wide Fund for Nature, Living Planet Report, 2004. Note the scientists who devised the ecological footprint ratios believe the “energy land” figures underestimate the many impacts of fossil fuel usage. For instance, the impact of acid rain is not included. See chart on following page.

Habitat Protection, page 26: Invasive species and fragmentation threaten open space habitats

Information about habitat restoration activities is from a Sustainable San Mateo County survey sent to the agencies in the last quarters of 2003 and 2004.
The Ecological Footprint of San Mateo County
Acreage used per capita

The left-hand column lists the human activities that use the earth’s productive resources, and the remaining columns break out the acres of each type of land used for those activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Energy Land</th>
<th>Crop Land</th>
<th>Pasture</th>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Built Area</th>
<th>Fishing Grounds</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODS &amp; SERVICES</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECYCLING</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total acres</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>20.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Francisco Bay Area Ecological Footprint Copyright 2004 Redefining Progress

Solid Waste, page 27: Waste disposal down 18 percent since 2000


Water Use, page 28: Water use up seven percent in 2003-04; largest usage is residential indoors


Air Quality, page 29: Particulate air pollution up slightly in 2004; 11 percent of kids have asthma

The source of the 1993-2003 data are the Bay Area Air Quality Management District website, www.baaqmd.gov—click on Air Status / Technical Data, then Annual Air Quality Summaries. Data are based on the Redwood City monitoring station, number of days over the state standard, divided by the total number of days monitored per year. PM10 is monitored only once every six days, while ozone is monitored every day. 2004 data for PM10, ozone, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen dioxide exceedances are from BAAQMD staff on 1/4/05 and are preliminary. Sulfur dioxide is not measured in San Mateo County.

The state 24-hour standard for PM10 is 50 micrograms per cubic meter. The state one-hour standard for ozone is nine parts per hundred million. Information about the effects of PM10 and ozone pollution is from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website, http://www.epa.gov/air/urbanair/6poll.html, on 1/2/04.


Crime, page 31: Major crime rate up six percent in 2003 to a five-year high

Data are from the California Criminal Justice Profile 2003 – San Mateo County, published by the Criminal Justice Statistics Center of the Department of Justice, State of California. Data are also available at www.caag.state.ca.us/cjcs, click on “Statistics.” An additional information source was San Mateo County Crime Report 2003-2004, published by the Criminal Justice Council of San Mateo County, www.criminaljusticecouncil.org. A crime index consists of specific crimes chosen to gauge fluctuations in the overall volume and rate of crime. The California Crime Index tracks the total number of major crimes in cities and counties with more than 100,000 people. The offenses included in the California Crime Index are chosen because of the seriousness and likelihood of being reported to the police by the public. 2003 California Crime Index data were not available on the website for Portola Valley and Woodside.

Drinking Water Quality, page 32: 2004 switch to chloramines drastically reduces TTHMs, a potential carcinogen

Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) are developed based on toxicological risk calculations to ensure that the contaminant’s presence in drinking water does not pose any short-term or long-term health effects. MCLs have been established for most, though not all, of the contaminants in drinking water. Such standards are typically based on lifetime exposure for an adult. Some MCLs, however, may not be as protective of sensitive populations such as children and those with immune system disorders. Also, these standards are set for contaminants on an individual basis and do not address any potential synergistic effects between mixtures.

Contaminated Sites, page 30: Leaking underground storage tanks decline by half in 10 years

Data on leaking underground storage tanks are from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) database of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Board. Data on other hazardous chemical leaks are from the Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Clean-Ups (SLIC) database of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Board. Data are available at http://www.geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/.

“Some people have asked what the relationship is between peace and environment, and to them I say that many wars are fought over resources, which are becoming increasingly scarce across the earth. If we did a better job of managing our resources sustainably, conflicts over them would be reduced. So, protecting the global environment is directly related to securing peace.”

Wangari Maathai, 2004 Nobel Peace Prize winner
of chemicals that may exist. Data are from the 2003 Consumer Confidence Reports (Water Quality Reports) issued by each water district. Additional information was provided by: Eric Lacey, District Engineer, California Department of Health Services Drinking Water Division; and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

For more information about the 21 BAWSCA-member water agencies serving San Mateo County, see the BAWSCA website, www.bawsc.ca.org. Coastside County Water District provides water to the City of Half Moon Bay and several unincorporated coastal communities in San Mateo County, including El Granada, Miramar, and Princeton By the Sea (Pillar Point Harbor). Estero Municipal Improvement District serves the City of Foster City and part of the City of San Mateo. The Guadelupe Valley Municipal Improvement District consists primarily of an industrial park development located within the Brisbane City limits, and a small residential enclave. Los Trancos County Water District is located in the rural foothills west of Highway 280 near the Town of Portola Valley and serves a residential population of nearly 1,260 people.

2005 SSMC AWARD WINNER

The Surfrider Foundation is a group of San Mateo County residents dedicated to protecting the wetlands, bird life, beaches, and surf spots in coastal environments. Through its Surfrider Foundation Blue Water Task Force, the San Mateo Chapter helps the county monitor water quality by collecting water samples and managing data. It also promotes equal, free, and open access to county beaches for all people and supports businesses that embody sustainable practices in accordance with the CERES (formerly Valdez) Principles.

Mid-Peninsula Water District serves Belmont and portions of San Carlos and unincorporated county areas. North Coast County Water District serves Pacifica. Skyline County Water District serves a portion of the Town of Woodside and unincorporated areas of San Mateo County along Hwy 35 (Skyline Blvd) from Hwy 84 to Hwy 92. California Water Service Bear Gulch District serves Atherton, Portola Valley, Woodside, portions of Menlo Park, and adjacent unincorporated portions of San Mateo County including West Menlo Park, Ladera, North Fair Oaks, and Menlo Oaks. California Water Service Mid-Peninsula District serves San Carlos and San Mateo and adjacent unincorporated portions of San Mateo County, including The Highlands and Palomar Park. California Water Service South San Francisco District serves South San Francisco, Colma, a small portion of Daly City, and the unincorporated area known as Broadmoor. Burlingame serves Burlingame plus portions of the unincorporated Burlingame Hills area and a few properties in San Mateo and Hillsborough. Daly City serves Daly City and some unincorporated portions of the county. Hillsborough serves the Town of Hillsborough and portions of unincorporated San Mateo County. Though the population of Menlo Park is 31,262, the Menlo Park Municipal Water Department serves only about 10,300 residents in two separate enclaves; other portions of Menlo Park are served by California Water Service’s Bear Gulch District and O’Connor Water District. Millbrae serves Millbrae and Capuchino High School in San Bruno. Redwood City serves Redwood City, unincorporated areas of the county, and portions of the City of San Carlos and the Town of Woodside. San Bruno serves San Bruno and unincorporated areas of the county.

Health Care, page 33: An estimated 10.4 percent lacked health insurance in 2003, up from 7.1 percent in 2001


The Consumer Price Index (CPI) is a measure of the average change over time in the prices paid by urban consumers for a market basket of consumer goods and services. The CPI market basket is developed from detailed expenditure information provided from a survey of families and individuals on what they actually bought. The reference base for the Bay Area CPI is 1982-84. That is, the index for the 36-month period from 1982 to 1984 equals 100. The CPI numbers in subsequent years measure changes in price relative to the 1982-84 base time frame. Data about the Bay Area CPI medical care category are from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, http://stats.bls.gov/ on 3/4/05. The data represent the Bay Area CPI for all urban consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Combined Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA). The San Francisco CMSA includes the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma. The medical care category of the CPI includes prescription drugs and medical supplies, physicians’ services, eyeglasses and eye care, and hospital services.

Data on births with inadequate or intermediate prenatal care utilization in 2001 are from http://datamch.berkeley.edu/ccpr/2001/081/prenatal.html#prenatal7, and the original data source is the California Department of Health Services. Data on infant mortality by race in 2000 are from http://datamch.berkeley.edu/ccpr/2001/081/mortality.html#mortality13, and the original data source is the California Department of Health Services. Note the 2001 mortality estimates are preliminary and not official estimates published by the California Department of Health Services.

The number of county substance abuse and mental health clients represents unduplicated clients. Data about substance abuse clients are from the San Mateo County Human Services Agency’s DADS/CADDS data system and represent alcohol and drug treatment. Data on the percentage and number of county residents who reported needing help for emotional or mental health problems, and those experiencing delays getting mental health care, in 2001 are from the 2001 California Health Interview Survey, http://www.chis.ucla.edu. The number of mental health clients in fiscal year 1999-2000 served by local county mental health programs is from the California Department of Mental Health, http://www.dmh.ca.gov/SADA/default.asp.


**Pesticide Use, page 34: Use of most toxic pesticides (excluding residential use) down 40 percent since 1997**

Information on “Why Is This Important?” is from the 2003 Silicon Valley Environmental Index published by the Silicon Valley Environmental Partnership. The national size and growth rate of the organic food industry are from the Organic Consumers Association. Data on the pounds applied, types, and uses of pesticides in San Mateo County are from the California Department of Pesticide Regulation Annual Pesticide Use Reports, www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/puts/purmain.htm. Data on the most toxic pesticides are from the Pesticide Action Network (PAN), www.pesticideinfo.org. See PAN’s data processing methodology at http://docs.pesticideinfo.org/Docs/ref_PURCA.html. The term “most toxic” refers to “PAN Bad Actor Pesticides” and is defined by registered pesticide active ingredients in at least one of the following five categories (assigned by Californians for Pesticide Reform), http://docs.pesticideinfo.org/Docs/ref_toxicity7.html: 1) known or probable carcinogens, as designated by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), U.S. EPA, U.S. National Toxicology Program, or the state of California’s Proposition 65 list; 2) reproductive or developmental toxicants, as designated by the State of California’s Proposition 65 list; 3) neurotoxic cholinesterase inhibitors, as designated by California Department of Pesticide Regulation, the Materials Safety Data Sheet for the particular chemical, or PAN staff evaluation of chemical structure (for organophosphorus compounds); 4) known groundwater contaminants, as designated by the state of California (for actively registered pesticides) or from historic groundwater monitoring records (for banned pesticides); 5) pesticides with high acute toxicity, as designated by the World Health Organization (WHO), the U.S. EPA, or the U.S. National Toxicology Program. The list of “most toxic” pesticides used in this report is based on PAN “Bad Actor Pesticides” downloaded on approximately 11/25/04. Structural pest control represents any pest control work performed within or around buildings or other structures. “Other” pesticide use includes: public health pest control; vertebrate pest control; fumigation of nonfood and nonfeed materials such as lumber, furniture, etc.; pesticides used in research; regulatory pest control used in ongoing control and/or eradication of pest infestations; other fumigation; and uncultivated non-agricultural areas. Qualitative information about sulfuryl fluoride and potassium N-methyldithio carbamate is from Gail Rabea, Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights & Measures, on 2/11/05.

**Child Abuse, page 36: Child abuse referrals up 8 percent over 5 years to 2.7 percent of children**


**Child Care, page 37: Child care supply up 10 percent, demand up 19 percent as economy improves**

The number of children residing in San Mateo County was calculated from the State of California, Department of Finance, Race/Ethnic Population with Age and Sex Detail Fact Sheet from May 2004. Information about the Labor Force Participation Rate, defined as the percentage of children with either both parents or a single parent working, is from the 2003 American Community Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. By multiplying these two numbers, we arrive at an estimate of the number of children in San Mateo County needing care. The total number of children in San Mateo County ages 0-13 years is 130,076 (broken down by: 29,953 infants 0-2 years; 28,552 preschoolers 3-5 years; 35,042 children 6-9 years; and 36,529 children 10-13 years.) The total number of children age 0-13 years with both or a single parent working is 88,389 (broken down by: 18,870 infants 0-2 years; 17,988 preschoolers 3-5 years; 25,230 children 6-9 years; and 26,301 children 10-13 years.)

According to data supplied by the Child Care Coordinating Council of San Mateo in December 2004, the total number of full- and part-time licensed child care spaces in San Mateo County for children age 0-13 years was 27,892 in 2004. This consists of 9,076 in family child care homes (up 41 percent since 2003) and 18,816 in child care centers (down one percent since 2003). Of the 18,816 spaces in child care centers, 1,041 are for infants 0-2 years, 11,808 are for preschoolers age 3-5 years, and 5,967 are for school age children 6-13 years.

Data on the supply of and demand for child care for 1999-2003 were gathered from the Child Care Portfolios published by the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network for those years. Data on child care costs are from the Child Care Coordinating Council of San Mateo, November 2004. Data on percentage increase in child care costs since 1998 are based on the Child Care Needs Assessment, San Mateo County 1999-2000. The Preschool for All, Supply and Demand Study provided data on child care providers’ opinions about the reason for vacancies and the behaviors of parents earning between $35,000 - $75,000 annually.

**Children’s Health, page 38: Fourteen percent of children lacked continuous health insurance in 2002**

by Professional Research Consultants, Inc., January 2003. Data on the immunization rate by age 2 are from Children in Our Community, A Report on Their Health and Well-Being, by the San Mateo County Children's Report, Peninsula Partnership Council, 2002, pcf.org/peninsula_partnership/child_report.html. Data on immunization rates at kindergarten are from kidsdata.org (the original data source is State of California Department of Health Services, Division of Communicable Disease Control, Immunization Branch, http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/dec/dcgroup/levels.htm.) Data on the number of children who received mental health treatment are from the California Department of Mental Health, http://www.dmh.cahwnet.gov/SADA/default.asp, click on “other reports,” and see section on “County Mental Health Clients by age (0-17 and 18+) and county.” Data represent local county mental health unduplicated clients served, and the source is the Client and Service Information System. Data on children diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder are from the 2001 California Health Interview Survey, www.chis.ucla.edu, click on “Ask CHIS.” Note the data are deemed statistically unstable.

Education, page 39: Countywide Academic Performance Index (API) is up nine percent in five years Data on API scores are from the California Department of Education, http://api.cde.ca.gov. Countywide averages were calculated by taking the averages of the school districts (or of the schools if district-level data was unavailable) and weighting by the number of students included in the API for that year. “Socio-economically disadvantaged” is defined as a student whose parents both have not received a high school diploma OR a student who participates in the free or reduced price lunch program (also known as the National School Lunch Program). Data on the proportion of English-learner students, average class size, and University of California and California State University eligibility are from Ed-Data, www.ed-data.k12.ca.us. Data on California High School Exit Exam results are from the California Department of Education, http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/. The data source for high school dropout rates is the California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Office, www.cde.ca.gov/demographics.

Arts Participation, page 42: Arts funding suffers from economic downturn and government budget cuts Information about the correlation between art courses and improved academic performance is from the No Child Left Behind website, http://www.ed.gov/teachers/how/tools/initiative/updates/040826.html. Information about funding for arts organizations is from a survey administered by Sustainable San Mateo County (SSMC) to arts and cultural organizations within the county. SSMC wishes to thank Bonny Zanardi with ARTshare for supplying the list of arts and cultural organizations. Data on the number of students per fine art course by school district for 2003-04 are from the California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/ and http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/NumCrs2.asp?RptYear=2003-04&RptName=CoNumClas1&CoName=41,SAN,MATEO,,,,,..

City Parks & Recreation, page 43: City parks acres up 31 percent per capita but still about half the recommended level Developed city parks are defined as developed park lands within each city's boundaries, not including school playgrounds, undeveloped lands, open space, watershed lands, or adjacent county or state parks. Data sources: National Recreation and Park Association for recommendation of four to five acres of developed city parks per 1,000 population; Sustainable San Mateo County (SSMC) annual surveys to city Parks & Recreation Directors for information on acres of developed city parks; budget for developed city parks; and number of community events in each city. The SSMC survey also inquired about the number of people using a city’s recreation facilities during 2004, but half of the cities did not have those figures available. Excludes unincorporated areas of San Mateo County. Portola Valley did not report in 2002 so 2001 figures were used for 2002 as so not to skew the data.

Volunteerism, page 44: Value of volunteer labor averaged $105,374 per nonprofit in 2003 survey Data sources include: Responses to a volunteerism survey administered by SSMC in January 2005; and Thrive - The Alliance of Nonprofits for San Mateo County (formerly the San Mateo County Council of Nonprofits). SSMC wishes to thank The Volunteer Center, Serving the Peninsula Communities of San Mateo County for providing the list of nonprofits in San Mateo County to which we sent our survey.

Voter Participation, page 45: 2004 voter turnout highest in at least 15 years, but more than one-third don’t vote Data on San Mateo County voter turnout and registration are from election reports titled San Mateo County Statement of Vote (see www.shapethefuture.org for most recent years), the California Secretary of State Statement of Vote (see http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/), and California Secretary of State Report of Registration for the number of eligible voters. Data on 2004 California voter turnout are from the California Secretary of State website on 1/12/05, Statement of Vote 2004 Presidential General Election November 2, 2004, http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/sov/2004_general/contents.htm. Data on 2004 national voter turnout are from the United States Elections Project 1/12/05, http://elections.gmu.edu/. Estimated percentage of adults voting in 2004 by city was calculated as follows. The percentage of the population age 18 and older was multiplied by the estimated 2004 population of each city. Then the total number of ballots cast in each city was divided by the estimate of adult population in each city, to arrive at estimated percentage of adults voting in each city for the 2004 election. Data sources for this calculation were San Mateo County Statement of Vote for 2004 (see www.shapethefuture.org); California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit for 2004 city population estimates; and the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices PCT12 and P13 for data on percent of population 18 and over in 2000 by city. Data on early voting are from the article Early Voting Proves a Hit by Connie Skipitiars in the San Jose Mercury News on 11/02/04. Data for age of registered voters are from Election Information Services, County of San Mateo. Data on percent of county residents within various age ranges are from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices P13 and PCT12, from http://factfinder.census.gov/. For purposes of our calculation, we assumed the number of people age 55 was one-fifth of people age 55 to 59.
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Yes, I want to contribute money to support the research and publication of the *Indicators* report and other activities of Sustainable San Mateo County.

- ☐ Benefactor $1,000
- ☐ Sustainer $500
- ☐ Sponsor $250
- ☐ Friend $100
- ☐ Member $50
- ☐ Senior/Student/Low Income $25

Yes, I want to contribute time and effort.

- ☐ Help with presentations
- ☐ Help research the *Indicators*
- ☐ Participate in presenting the Annual Sustainability Awards
- ☐ Work on one of SSMC’s committees or projects
- ☐ Promote sustainability through other actions or proposals

SSMC is a nonprofit public charity exempt from federal income tax under IRS Code Section 501c(3)

WILL YOU HELP?

Yes, I want to contribute money to support the research and publication of the *Indicators* report and other activities of Sustainable San Mateo County.

- ☐ Benefactor $1,000
- ☐ Sustainer $500
- ☐ Sponsor $250
- ☐ Friend $100
- ☐ Member $50
- ☐ Senior/Student/Low Income $25

Yes, I want to contribute time and effort.

- ☐ Help with presentations
- ☐ Help research the *Indicators*
- ☐ Participate in presenting the Annual Sustainability Awards
- ☐ Work on one of SSMC’s committees or projects
- ☐ Promote sustainability through other actions or proposals

Would you like a copy of our newsletters/announcements, volunteer opportunities, and the next *Indicators* report?

Your Name___________________________________________________________________________________________________

Address___________________________________________________________________________________________________

City____________________________________________________________________________Zip____________________________

Daytime Phone_________________________________________________E-mail_________________________________________

Yes, I can give you names and contacts.

- ☐ Here are names of businesses, organizations, agencies, or individuals who are practicing sustainability in some way (candidates for Sustainability Awards).

  Name_________________________________________Daytime Phone________________________________________

  Business, organization ________________________________________________________________

  Address____________________________________________________________________________________

  City________________________Zip

- ☐ Here are names of individuals who have expertise relevant to__________________________indicator.

  Name_________________________________________Title (if any)_______________________________

  Business/Organization____________________________________________________________

  Address________________________________________________________________________________________

  City________________________Zip Daytime Phone________________________________________

Please return this form to:

*Sustainable San Mateo County Indicators Project*

177 Bovet Road, Sixth Floor, San Mateo, CA 94402

Questions: Call us at 650-638-2323, email advocate@sustainablesanmateo.org, or visit www.sustainablesanmateo.org