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INTRODUCTION

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 they are moving toward sustainability.

What Would a Sustainable San Mateo County Be Like?

A sustainable San Mateo County would . . .
Key Issues

In this edition of the Indicators for a Sustainable San Mateo County, SSMC has chosen to focus particular attention on three key issues that threaten the sustainability of the county: CLIMATE CHANGE, HOUSING and WATER. No one of the 32 indicators in the report can hope to fully capture these key issues. In fact, each issue touches upon two or more of the indicators presented. SSMC asked San Mateo County, the 20 cities in the county, and the San Mateo County Community College District to describe their actions and policies regarding these three key issues.

CLIMATE CHANGE

One fundamental principle of sustainability is that today’s actions do not compromise future generations’ quality of life or ability to meet their needs. The greatest challenge to this principle today is climate change. Scientists have found that the increase in greenhouse gases (GHG), primarily carbon, over the past century has resulted in profound changes in the global climate. The major source of carbon emissions has been the burning of fossil fuels: coal, petroleum, and natural gas.

The greatest challenge to sustainability today is climate change.

Because of the nature of the atmospheric carbon cycle, carbon already released into the atmosphere will continue to change the climate for decades. The rate and severity of these changes will increase as more GHG are released into the atmosphere. Potential impacts from climate change include an increase in surface and ocean temperatures, a rise in sea levels, an increase in extreme weather events, changes in amounts and form of precipitation, and species migration.

Depending upon the amount of carbon and other types of GHG released into the atmosphere over the next 40 years, the California Climate Change Center (the Center) predicts temperatures in California to increase from 3.6 to 10.8 degrees Fahrenheit (F). Temperature changes in this range will reduce the Sierra Nevada snowpack and negatively impact the state’s water used for drinking, flood control, hydroelectric power, agriculture, and recreation. The Center predicts that potential heightened sea levels and high river inflows could endanger the levee system in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta of the San Francisco Bay estuary. The most dramatic potential impacts may be from extreme weather events such as heat waves, wildfires, and floods.

The following paragraphs present data on changes in the region’s climate and environment. Natural systems are inherently complex and we do not assert that carbon and other GHG emissions are responsible. These changes, however, fit the general outcomes scientists have predicted.

The Department of Meteorology at San José State University is studying temperature data from over 300 California weather stations. Data from Half Moon Bay show average annual maximum temperatures have increased 0.21 degrees F per decade since 1940 and the average winter maximum has increased by 0.32 degrees F per decade. Winters in Half Moon Bay are almost two degrees F warmer than they were in 1940. Such temperature changes can affect agriculture; many fruit crops require extended winter dormant periods to flower properly, and the Center is concerned about the northward migration of pests now killed by cold winter temperatures.

Measurements at Fort Point in San Francisco show that the sea level rose seven inches during the 20th century. Because of thermal expansion from ocean warming and the melting of land ice this trend will likely continue. Changes in the populations of marine species also appear to be occurring. According to research done at Pacific Grove in 1931 and repeated in 1993, 46 of the 62 invertebrate species studied showed significant population changes. Species from Southern California’s warmer waters had moved northward, while cold water species had moved away from Pacific Grove. The sea water at the study site had warmed 3.5 degrees F during the period. The Center expects this pattern to be repeated throughout California and for many marine and land species to become endangered or extinct as they migrate, or fail to migrate, in response to changing habitats. Impacts on San Mateo County’s fisheries may occur as sea waters warm and species migrate.

In September 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed into law AB32, a program of regulatory and market mechanisms aimed at reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, a 25 percent reduction. In the Governor’s press release announcing AB32, he stated “We simply must do everything in our power to slow down global warming before it’s too late.”

Policies and local developments

We can expect efforts to reduce carbon and other GHG emissions to dramatically impact “business as usual” in the county. These impacts, however, are presumed to be less traumatic than the impact of doing nothing. Many local governments are making efforts to reduce carbon emissions; the initiatives were not necessarily undertaken to reduce carbon emissions alone, often capital and maintenance costs were taken into consideration. Following is a sampling of what is happening in the county.

- High-mileage, low-emission vehicles such as hybrids have been purchased for government operations in Redwood City, Burlingame, San Carlos, Foster City, Menlo Park, the City of San Mateo, and South San Francisco.
- Renewable energy technologies have been installed in public facilities, such as solar panels in San Carlos, cogeneration systems at the Community College District and the Millbrae sewage plant, and solar heating in Brisbane and Menlo Park.
- Investments in energy efficiency have been made, such as the replacement of inefficient incandescent lighting with fluorescent lights in public facilities in many cities and the replacement of traditional traffic lights with long-lasting light-emitting diodes (LEDs) and low-power traffic lights in Foster City, San Carlos, and Millbrae.
- Alternative transportation schemes have been developed, such as bicycle lanes, shuttle services, housing and commercial developments near public transit, incentives for city employees to use public transit, and requirements that developers of commercial properties implement traffic reduction plans.

Often policies in other areas, such as housing and waste reduction, have carbon emission implications as well. continued
In sustainable communities, individuals and families can find safe, affordable housing near their places of work with access to services such as good schools, shopping, health care, and public transit. In San Mateo County, high housing costs have made this a challenge. Homeownership is out of reach for many and finding an affordable apartment is becoming increasingly difficult.

The shortage of affordable housing has significant negative consequences for the county. Some residents are forced into overcrowded living situations while others pay a significant portion of their income on housing, leaving less for other needs. When administering its housing programs, the federal government assumes that a household pays no more than 30 percent of its income on housing. The California Budget Project estimated that in 2004, nearly half of San Mateo County residents spent more than this amount on housing, and nearly 20 percent of residents spent 50 percent or more of their income on housing. With little room for savings, lower-income residents may be one financial emergency away from becoming homeless.

Another option for residents is to move where housing is more affordable even if that is far from work. This leads to longer commutes and more traffic congestion. Long commutes and traffic congestion are costly, requiring more gasoline purchases and leading to more wear on automobiles and roads. They lead to increased emissions of particulate matter that can compromise air quality and GHG that are linked to climate change. Long commutes also come with a personal sacrifice—time spent away from family. Besides disrupting family life, this can be expensive as child care costs in the region are rising as well.

If workers are unable to afford housing in the county, our economic future is threatened as it can become difficult for local employers to attract workers and for the county to attract new businesses.

A shortage of supply has made housing in San Mateo County increasingly unaffordable.

A shortage of housing supply is the primary cause of the county's high housing costs. During the 1990's and the first half of this decade, housing production did not keep up with population growth. Barriers to housing production include government regulation, fiscal policies that favor sales tax-generating commercial developments, inadequate funding for affordable housing, and community resistance to higher densities in existing neighborhoods. Local barriers to housing production can force development outside urban environments, leading to a loss of open space and fragmented habitat for native species of wildlife.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) cites another reason for high housing costs: a lack of housing choice. Many communities focus on the development of single-family homes rather than multi-family developments or townhouses which are often more affordable housing options.

Housing prices, housing production, and housing location—these factors are inextricably intertwined with our region's economic vitality.
Bay Area Council, Bay Area Housing Profile 2006

Policies and local developments

There are a number of policies that San Mateo County or its cities can adopt to encourage new, affordable, and sustainable housing development. These include:

- Inclusionary housing policies that require a certain percentage of newly constructed residential units be affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income households;
- Transit-oriented developments (TOD) where residential and commercial areas are designed to maximize access to public transit and encourage walking and biking;
- Zoning within downtown or commercial areas and along bus or transit corridors to encourage higher-density housing and mixed-use residential and commercial developments;
- Permitting or encouraging the construction of accessory units. Accessory units (also known as secondary units, guest apartments, or in-law apartments) create separate residences on a homeowner's property by converting all or part of a garage or by building a new structure; and
- Green building policies that maximize resource efficiency and reduce construction waste from new development.

San Mateo County and its cities have adopted some of these policies to address housing affordability and encourage new, sustainable housing developments. Following are results from our survey of the cities and the county regarding their housing policies and current developments.

- Inclusionary housing policies have been adopted in 16 jurisdictions, with affordability requirements ranging from 10 percent to the 20 percent required in Colma, East Palo Alto, Foster City, South San Francisco, and unincorporated San Mateo County.
- TOD projects near Caltrain and BART stations in Belmont, Burlingame, Menlo Park, Millbrae, San Bruno, San Carlos, the City of San Mateo, South San Francisco, Redwood City, and unincorporated San Mateo County are either being planned, in construction, or completed.
- Habitat for Humanity projects have been completed in Daly City, Redwood City, East Palo Alto, and Menlo Park. There is also a current project in Brisbane.
- East Palo Alto partnered in a 77-unit, 100 percent affordable housing complex that opened in April 2006. A rooftop solar photovoltaic system powers a portion of the complex.

In addition, a number of cities have policies encouraging higher-density housing and mixed-use development in their downtowns or along transit corridors. Awareness of green building is growing and many cities encourage different green building strategies, but no jurisdiction in the county has adopted comprehensive green building policies for residential or commercial developments.

Local governments are in the process of determining a new Regional Housing Needs Allocation, which will set housing production targets for all income levels for the next 5-10 years. Once those targets are established, the Housing Element of each jurisdiction's General Plan will be updated and approved by the state. This process provides an opportunity for local governments to enact policies that will encourage new, sustainable housing development.
Key Issues, continued

WATER

To be sustainable a population needs safe, clean drinking water and adequate water supplies to accommodate residential, agricultural, industrial, and other uses. San Mateo County has high-quality drinking water and sufficient supplies for its current needs. The county is dependent, however, upon the ability to move water efficiently hundreds of miles across the state. Nearly all of San Mateo County’s residents are serviced by water agencies who are members of the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA). During fiscal year 2004-05, 96 percent of the water supplied by those agencies was purchased from the San Francisco Regional Water System (the System), which is operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). The water the System currently delivers is made up of a combination of runoff into local Bay Area reservoirs and diversion from the Tuolumne River through the Hetch Hetchy Water and Power Project in the Sierra Nevada.

Primarily because of expected population growth, BAWSCA estimates that demand from the SFPUC in the county will exceed its assured supply of water (a contractual right to a certain amount of water) by fiscal year 2010-11. Exceeding the assured supply could lead to higher rates or other measures. Today, the System is subject to cutbacks of up to 30 percent during an extended drought. Any drought conditions in the future would put a squeeze on supplies even further, increasing the possibility for future water rationing absent new conservation measures or supplies. One further risk is seismic vulnerability, as the tunnels and pipelines which bring us water from the System cross all of the major Bay Area fault lines.

Population growth, any future drought conditions, and climate change could all threaten the sustainability of San Mateo County’s water supplies.

Another uncertainty comes from the future impact of climate change on the region’s water resources. San Francisco’s Hetch Hetchy system is fed by snowpack in the Sierra Nevada. The snowpack acts as a natural reservoir, slowly melting and feeding the Hetch Hetchy system during the spring and summer. Rising temperatures may reduce the average annual snowpack because of a rise in the snowline, a thinner snowpack at lower elevations, an increased amount of precipitation falling as rain rather than snow, and snowmelt occurring earlier in the year.

Climate change may affect the demand for water within the county as well. For example, reduced rainfall and higher temperatures in the county could lead to more intense residential and park irrigation than occurs today.

Bordered by the San Francisco Bay to the east and the Pacific Ocean to the west, the county also relies on water for recreational opportunities, to support local economies, and to draw tourists. Climate change could have a dramatic impact on these waters. Rising temperatures could drastically alter marine habitats and impact water quality. Further, rising sea levels could impact coastal and bayside communities and habitats, eroding beaches and cliffs, and making flooding more prevalent during storms. Salty ocean water could even flow into the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, putting the drinking water supply of many Californians at risk.

Policies and local developments

For San Mateo County to assure a sustainable source of water for the future, it will need to more efficiently use its water resources and increase the use of domestic sources of water. The California Urban Water Conservation Council suggests several best practices in water conservation, covering topics including residential surveys and retrofits, system water audits and leak repairs, landscaping, clothes washers and toilet replacement programs, and public information and school-based education.

Local governments have adopted many of these and other programs. Following are some highlights.

• San Mateo County and cities such as Foster City and South San Francisco are attempting to reduce water use in parks through the use of computer-managed irrigation equipment.
• Foster City, San Carlos, South San Francisco, and the Community College District have installed synthetic turfs or alternative grasses such as tall fescue in selected parks or sports fields. These reduce water usage and require lower maintenance. Synthetic turfs also eliminate the need for pesticides and fertilizers.
• A number of cities provide rebates to install water-saving toilets and washers for qualified residents.
• Daly City is using surplus water from wet years to recharge its aquifer. Other North County cities and the SFPUC are exploring greater coordination in aquifer management.

As the county currently receives over 90 percent of its water from the San Francisco Regional Water System, becoming water independent is not a possibility. To achieve greater sustainability in local water use, the county, however, will likely need to use more local sources of water. This may entail more intensive use of groundwater in the North County and an increase in the use of recycled water throughout the county. Currently, Pacifica’s Calera Creek Water Recycling Plant generates up to three million gallons of tertiary recycled wastewater each day. Other cities use recycled water for landscaped city properties or deliver it to customers with large watering needs, such as golf courses.

2000 SSMC Award Winner

Water from Pacifica’s Calera Creek Water Recycling Plant, an innovative waste water treatment plant is used for wetland restoration.
Many cities, counties, and regions in the United States and internationally are now using sustainability indicators as planning tools and to set community-wide goals. An indicator is a statistic or trend that allows us to evaluate whether we are moving toward sustainability in our community. An indicator helps us understand where we are and which way we are going. Each indicator that follows was chosen for its importance to one or more of the three goals of sustainability: a healthy environment, society, and economy.

Indicators of sustainability differ from traditional indicators of economic or environmental progress; they highlight the interconnectedness of the environment, society, and economy. Sustainability indicators show that a negative trend in one area affects the health of the other two.

Sustainability requires we make decisions so that future generations can enjoy a healthy environment, society, and economy. Sustainability indicators can be used to assist us in making sound decisions on issues that affect the future of the county.
**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 fifty years, it still contributes an estimated $567 million to the county’s economy, including “multiplier” effects.

Farmland—or “working landscapes”—if managed sustainably can provide significant environmental and quality of life benefits, such as open space and healthy microclimates. Controlled grazing helps minimize soil erosion and control invasive weeds. 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 farming practices are especially important for maintaining agricultural vitality because they reduce the harmful environmental and health effects of pesticides and protect long-term soil quality.

**What Is a Sustainable State?**

Sustainable agricultural practices provide for the economic viability of agriculture for both owners and laborers while conserving natural resources and biodiversity, maintaining healthy soils and ecosystems, and providing food security for local communities.

**How Are We Doing?**

About 19 percent of the county’s land is agricultural, of which three percent is cultivated and another 16 percent is suitable for grazing. In 2005, the vast majority of farmland—89 percent—was used for field crops (beans, grain, and hay) or pasture; seven percent was used for vegetable, fruit, and nut crops; and four percent was used for floral and nursery crops.

The gross production value of all crops in 2005 was $162 million, a 10.7 percent decrease from 2004 and a 22.5 percent decrease from 1992. Although relatively little farmland is used for floral and nursery crops, these generated 86 percent of the total crop production value. Vegetable crops generated eight percent of the total production value, with forest products, livestock and apiary products, fruit and nut crops, and field crops generating the remaining six percent.

Less than one percent of the county’s cultivated agricultural land is farmed organically. In 2005, organic farms totaled 163 acres, up from only 125 acres in 2004. The county is home to two Community Supported Farms, whereby residents commit to supporting and buying food from a local farmer. Most growers have some local markets, including the county’s 13 farmers’ markets.

Protecting the viability of family farms was the impetus for a new program, “As Fresh As It Gets,” begun in early 2006. Co-sponsored by the Convention and Visitors Bureau, the County Farm Bureau, and the County Harbor District, it connects the community of chefs, restaurateurs, residents, and visitors to local agriculture, fishing, and wine and beer industries. An awards program was established to honor restaurateurs and others who list local produce on their menus by farm name. Tours for food managers to local farms encouraged innovative ways to get local products to local establishments, and provided restaurateurs with information about when various crops or seafood are at their seasonal peak. A cookbook titled, “As Fresh As It Gets Cookbook,” featuring recipes using local produce and served in local restaurants was published in November, 2006.

The county has programs for eradication, control, or detection of pests, and enforcement of quarantines to exclude economically significant pests. In 2005, skeleton weed and purple loosestrife were eradicated and/or treated at seven sites. Ash whitefly and yellow star thistle were monitored and biologically controlled at 18 countywide sites. To detect pests before they become established, 4,354 insect traps were deployed. These traps were in addition to the Department’s regular inspections for exotic insects, weeds, and plant diseases that “hitchhike” into the county on plant or produce shipments from elsewhere. Shipments are rejected for the presence of live pests, improper container markings, or lack of valid certification. In 2005, there were 18,713 inspections and 485 rejections, of which 369 were air shipments.

The 2006 Agricultural report will not be released until mid-2007, but Agricultural Commissioner, Gail Raabe, called 2006 a “hot insect trapping year.” Four Gypsy moths, two Japanese beetles, and one August peach fruit fly were found. A “delimitation” survey was conducted in the immediate vicinity of each find and fortunately no further pests were found.

The San Mateo County Farm Bureau received numerous calls in 2006 following a national E coli scare. There are several factors that make this area less likely to be susceptible to E coli than other areas: the temperate climate, less spinach planted locally, and the average number of crops per year—1.3 crops here compared with 2.7 crops per year in the state as a whole.

See appendix page 66. Researcher: Marcia Pagels
**AIR QUALITY**

In 2006, the county continued to enjoy clean air; particle pollution is still a concern.

**Why Is This Important?**
Clean air is essential to human and environmental health. Certain air pollutants, such as particulate matter, ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen dioxide are of particular concern.

Suspended particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM10)—dust, smoke, and soot—is associated with serious health effects such as asthma and premature death, contributes to haze, and harms the environment. Generators of PM10 include vehicles, construction sites, unpaved roads, factories, wood burning, and fuel combustion at power plants and in industrial processes. Ground-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. Vehicles are the primary source of the pollutants that create ozone.

**What Is a Sustainable State?**
In a sustainable state, the air is clean and poses no threat to human health or environmental quality.

**How Are We Doing?**
San Mateo County enjoys 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 a result 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 onshore winds transporting clean air from the ocean inland.

The number of days that the county exceeds state standards for individual pollutants is an indicator of air quality. In 2006, San Mateo County exceeded the state PM10 standard on 1.6 percent of the estimated 61 days for which it was monitored, less than the previous year’s 3.3 percent. Ozone, which is monitored daily, did not exceed state standards in 2006 or 2005, and has not exceeded state standards more than one day per year since 1995. Carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide levels also continue to remain below state standards.

Although the county received a “B” grade in the American Lung Association’s (ALA) State of the Air 2006 report for short-term particle pollution (an improvement from its “D” grade in 2005), the ALA noted that the Bay Area ranked among the top 25 Metropolitan Areas most polluted by short-term particle pollution in the United States. PM10 is attributed primarily to automobiles, petroleum diesel engines, dust, wood burning, and industrial emissions. Seasons play a role as well, as the ALA reports that during winter months wood smoke from fireplaces is the largest stationary source of air pollution in the Bay Area. The ALA considers these small particles to be a greater health risk than ozone or other commonly monitored air pollutants because they can lodge deep in the lungs where they can remain embedded for long periods of time. Also, some particles are small enough to pass through the lung into the bloodstream.

Similar to 2005, the county received an “A” grade by the ALA for ground-level ozone. San Mateo County was one of 13 California counties ranked among the best in the country in this category.

In its 2004 Community Health Assessment, the Healthy Community Collaborative of San Mateo County reported that 15.4 percent of adults in the county suffered from asthma and 7.3 percent of adults suffered from chronic lung disease. In 1998, these figures were reported as 8 percent and 4.7 percent, respectively. In 2004, asthma was most prevalent among women (18.3 percent) and African Americans (20.3 percent). In 2004, 12.4 percent of children suffered from asthma, compared with 10.9 percent in 2001. Exposures to environmental toxins, air pollution, and secondhand smoke are considered contributing factors to the increase of asthma among children. Further, as children’s lungs are still developing, significant exposures to air pollution can lead to lower lung capacity when they reach adulthood.

For more information, please see the American Lung Association of California’s web page at [www.californialung.org](http://www.californialung.org).

*See appendix page 66. Researchers: Barrett Raftery and Manju Kaul*
Bay and Ocean Water Quality

San Francisco Bay is classified as an impaired body of water under the Clean Water Act; most beaches have good water quality.

Why Is This Important?
San Mateo County is bordered by the San Francisco Bay to the east and 54 miles of Pacific Ocean coastline to the west. Human activity affects water quality as it flows from creeks, streams, and wastewater systems to the Bay and ocean. Protecting Bay and ocean water quality is vitally important as these water bodies support marine and Bay ecosystems, local economies, recreational activities, tourism, and food resources.

Among the most significant issues impacting the region’s water quality are urban and agricultural runoff; decline of watershed habitats through construction, development, and overuse; the release of sewage and untreated stormwater; and human population growth. Also of concern to water quality are changes in characteristics of the Bay and ocean water like salinity or temperature because of watershed management decisions and climate change.

What Is a Sustainable State?
A sustainable state is one where harmful pollutants are reduced or eliminated from the region’s watersheds, and no longer run into the Bay and ocean, and where habitats for key watershed species are protected and restored to better support wildlife.

How Are We Doing?
Bay water quality

The water pollution indicators of most immediate concern are the concentrations of certain chemicals known or suspected to be toxic, particularly mercury, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs), Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether (PBDEs), selenium, and legacy pesticides such as Dichloro Diphenyl Trichloroethane (DDT) and dieldrin. When pollutants enter waterways, they collect in water and sediments and enter the food web where they can eventually become highly concentrated in larger species. Many of these toxicants are linked to cancer and neurological and endocrine disruption. Children are at elevated risk for such negative health effects. As a consequence, advisories recommend very restricted consumption of Bay fish.

High concentrations of mercury and PCBs in sport fish were the primary trigger for fish consumption advisories and for the classification of the Bay as an impaired body of water under the Clean Water Act of 1972. Mercury was mined in California for many decades and mine runoff still runs into the Bay. Mercury also enters the Bay from non-point sources like improperly disposed of household thermometers, thermostats, and compact fluorescent bulbs. Though banned by the federal government in 1979, PCBs used in electrical equipment and other applications persist in the Bay ecosystem. The Bay also has one of the highest accumulations of PBDEs in the world.

Eighty percent of pollution now entering the Bay comes from stormwater runoff. This pollution comes largely from non-point sources or from storm drain overflow. Non-point source pollution accounts for many potential pollutants: oil, heavy metals, and particulate matter from cars; medications and chemical products poured down drains and flushed down toilets; and construction debris, trash, and hazardous waste that is dumped or washed into local storm drains and creeks.

The Stormwater Management Plan of the San Mateo Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP) aims to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges and eliminate unauthorized non-stormwater discharges. More specifically, STOPPP seeks to minimize pollution produced by municipal government maintenance activities, industrial and illicit discharges, and construction and new development by providing information about best management practices and monitoring watersheds. A hopeful development in watershed protection in the county is the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board proposal to issue an order that will amend stormwater permitting, resulting in stricter controls on new construction and development in the watershed.

Beach quality

State and local regulations require beach water quality monitoring. Water samples are tested for three main bacteria: total coliform, fecal coliform, and enterococcus. All three enter the surf zone when bacterial levels exceed state standards, warnings are posted and contact with beach water is strongly discouraged. In San Mateo County beach closures have primarily been a result of either sewage spills or high levels of bacteria from wildlife fecal matter. Heal the Bay, a nonprofit water quality advocacy group, reported a sewage spill leading to a beach closure in August 2006 near Aquatic Park at the Marina Lagoon in San Mateo. Heal the Bay reported one beach closure because of a sewage spill during the year ending March 31, 2006 and five closures because of sewage spills in the year ending March 31, 2005.

Heal the Bay produces an annual report card grading the water quality of California beaches. In their 2005-06 report, they reported that over 90 percent of San Mateo County beaches had good water quality. However, Linda Mar Beach at San Pedro Creek scored very low during wet weather when higher volumes of potential pollutants and contaminants enter waterways. Venice Beach at Frenchman’s Creek and Capistrano Avenue Beach at Pillar Point Harbor received the lowest grades. Capistrano Avenue Beach was rated the sixth most contaminated beach in the state, the third year in a row it’s been among the 10 worst.

See appendix page 66. Researcher: Matthew Isles

What Can We Do to Help?
- Wash your car at a car wash, rather than on the curb or driveway.
- Dispose of old medicines, mercury thermometers, batteries, household chemicals and electronic waste at designated safe disposal sites.
- Clean up after your pets by throwing away or burying waste.
- Use your local recycling programs to reduce your waste.
- Use public transportation instead of driving when possible.
- Talk to family, friends, and officials about the importance of improving Bay and ocean water quality.

*For more information, visit www.recycleworks.org.
Why Is This Important?
Carbon emissions are changing the chemistry of the atmosphere and leading to global climate change. Scientists tell us that climate change, including global warming, will be detrimental to human health, ecosystems, food security, and water resources. The main source of manmade carbon emissions is the combustion of fossil fuels.

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 30 percent higher now than 150 years ago and, in fact, than at any time during the last 400,000 years. Concentrations are rising at roughly 0.6 percent per year. Atmospheric models predict that increasing carbon dioxide concentrations will result in increasing global temperatures. Average temperature variations are highly correlated with carbon dioxide concentrations.

Since 1988, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, comprising more than 2,000 scientific and technical experts from around the world, has conducted the most extensive peer-reviewed scientific inquiry in history. In its 2001 report, the panel said that 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.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, carbon emissions are reduced to a level that is in balance with nature’s ability to sequester or absorb those emissions. To stabilize the climate, scientists have said global reductions in carbon emissions of between 60 and 80 percent will likely be needed by 2050.

How Are We Doing?
Since California’s economic output is far larger than any other state as well as being one of the fastest growing state economies, it is not surprising that only Texas produces more greenhouse gases. California’s per capita output of such gas, and output per unit of economic value, however, is among the lowest of the 50 states. The total estimated carbon emissions from gasoline, electricity, and natural gas use in San Mateo County were 1.7 million tons in 2005, or nearly 4,700 pounds per person. Since 2001, total carbon emissions from these sources have decreased 9.9 percent (11.1 percent per capita). The transportation sector accounts for more than half (56.3 percent) of total carbon emissions in the county. The decrease from 2001 is primarily because of a reduction in the proportion of electricity derived from coal and a decrease in gasoline use. Carbon emissions from electricity fluctuate based on the sources of electricity; in years when a deep snow pack fills the Sierra’s reservoirs, more hydroelectric power is available. This power is carbon emission free and renewable. In other years, the deficit in hydroelectric power is replaced with electricity from carbon heavy fossil fuels. In 2005, gasoline sales (and related carbon emissions) increased 0.6 percent from 2004, from 359 million gallons to 361 million, but still remain 9.1 percent below the 397 million gallons sold in 2001.

Estimated Carbon Emissions in San Mateo County by Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Natural Gas</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources: Pacific Gas and Electric Company, California Department of Transportation, and California Energy Commission

The estimate of total carbon emissions excludes airplane fuel and thus airplane trips residents of the county made in 2005. An airplane flight to New York with a jumbo jet 80 percent full would add half a ton of carbon emissions per person. Carbon emissions from gasoline do not include those from our trips to Disneyland, Tahoe, or anywhere outside the county. In addition, our calculation does not include all of the carbon emissions related to products we buy: emissions generated by the manufacture and distribution of a refrigerator, a sweater, or a head of lettuce are not included to the extent these activities take place outside the county.

California has committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 2000 levels by 2010 and 1990 levels by 2020. The county’s emissions from gasoline, natural gas, and electricity are now below those of year 2000, largely because of reduced gasoline usage in the county and a greater percentage of hydroelectric power in the electricity mix. Reaching 1990 levels will be more difficult. Reaching Governor Schwarzenegger’s goal of 80 percent below current levels by 2050 will require a restructuring of our way of life.

See appendix page 67. Researcher: Tom Rounds

It may seem impossible to imagine that a technologically advanced society could choose, in essence, to destroy itself, but that is what are now in the process of doing.

Elizabeth Kolbert, Field Notes from a Catastrophe
**Why Is This Important?**
Healthy children in stable families provide the foundation for a sustainable community. Unable to protect themselves, children depend upon 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 can lead to fewer physical, psychological, and emotional problems and help to reduce the continuation of abuse in future generations.

**What Is a Sustainable State?**
A sustainable state is one in which all children are nurtured in stable, loving, and healthy families through their development to adulthood.

**How Are We Doing?**
In 2005, 4,082 children under the age of 18 in San Mateo County were referred to Child Protective Services as victims of child abuse—roughly 2.5 percent of the total population of children. The rate of child abuse referrals per 1,000 children in the county decreased from 25.5 in 2004 to 24.5 in 2005. As in previous years, this is roughly half the state rate of 50.1 per 1,000 children.

Rates of child abuse referrals were greatest among African American children and children in other ethnic groups where poverty rates are highest. The rate of child abuse referrals per 1,000 African American children in the county was 115, meaning more than one in 10 African American children were referred to Child Protective Services in 2005. Referral rates among Native American and Hispanic children were also higher than the county average. The lowest referral rate was among Asian/Pacific Islander children (13.7). The largest change in referral rates from 2004 was among Native American children, dropping from 42.7 to 33.4 per 1,000 children.

**Data source:** U.C. Berkeley Center for Social Services Research

**Child Abuse Referrals per 1,000 Children in San Mateo County by Ethnicity, 2005**

- African American: 115.0
- Native American: 54.5
- Hispanic: 33.4
- Caucasian: 24.5
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 15.1
- Other: 13.7

**Data source:** U.C. Berkeley Center for Social Services Research

Child abuse referrals are categorized into subgroups which are organized by levels of severity: sexual abuse; physical abuse; severe neglect; general neglect; exploitation; emotional abuse; caretaker absence/incapacity; at-risk, sibling abused; and substantial risk. In the county, general neglect was the most common allegation among child abuse referrals (34.7 percent), followed by substantial risk of abuse (23.2 percent) and physical abuse (15.9 percent).

A total of 184 children in the county first entered foster care between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006. Nearly half of these children were Hispanic (88 children or 48.9 percent of the total).

See appendix page 67. Researchers: Momoyo Ozawa and Margaret Tsai
CHILD CARE

In 2006, supply of licensed child care spaces was down 11 percent; affordable infant care is the highest need.

Why Is This Important?
The quality of child care, including preschool, during a child's early years influences 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 times of change.

The availability of quality child care also impacts employers' ability to utilize the county's highly skilled work force 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.

What Is a Sustainable State?
A sustainable state for child care, including preschool, consists of a web of options, both licensed and license-exempt, to meet parental choices and needs such as non-traditional schedules, care for a full range of ages, and care for children with special needs, that are affordable to all families. All providers have access to resources to offer quality programs and are paid a fair wage.

How Are We Doing?
In 2006, licensed spaces in family child care homes and infant, preschool, and school age centers existed for 27.9 percent of San Mateo County children. The gap in care, however, is not spread evenly across all age groups. While the number of licensed spaces for preschoolers met the needs of 85 percent of those needing child care, the needs of only 14.5 percent of infants and 11.4 percent of school age children were met in 2006 respectively. The gap in school age care is made up for, in part, by a variety of license-exempt programs through school districts or city recreation programs. Additionally, programs will be able to grow through the availability of Proposition 49 funding in 2007. Similar funding and programs will be able to grow through the availability of Proposition 49 funding in 2007. Similar funding and attention are lacking for infant and toddler care, making that gap in licensed care particularly troublesome.

Overall, the number of children needing care in San Mateo County remained fairly constant from 2005. The supply of licensed child care spaces dropped by 11.4 percent, however. Including previous year losses, the supply of licensed child care spaces has dropped by 20 percent since 2004. The California Early Care and Education Workforce Study (2006) points to the impact of low salaries on the retention of providers. In counties such as San Mateo where housing costs are high, family child care providers have trouble owning their own homes, complicating their ability to do business.

Despite the high demand for child care in the county, providers surveyed in 2004 reported vacancies, with 47 percent of child care centers citing a family's inability to afford child care the reason. With too many vacancies, programs may be forced to close. In 2006, the average monthly cost for care in a family child care home was $899 for infants (a 38 percent increase from 1998) and $840 for preschoolers (a 36 percent increase from 1998). For school age children, the hourly cost in a family child care home was $7.40 per hour (a 77 percent increase from 1998). For center based care, the average monthly costs were $1,210 for infants (a 53 percent increase from 1998), $793 for preschoolers (a 45 percent increase from 1998), and $364 for school-aged children (an 11 percent increase from 1998).

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. As governmental funding for subsidies has decreased, 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 (CEL). In 2006, countywide participation with the CEL was mandated by the legislature for all state subsidized child care. As the separate lists of 32 contractors were merged and parent outreach was conducted, the number of children on the CEL climbed from 782 in 2005 to 4,528 in 2006, providing a more accurate and compelling indication of parental need in our county.

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 67. Researcher: Sarah Johnson
CHILDREN’S HEALTH

In 2004, one quarter of fifth, seventh, and ninth graders were overweight.

Why Is This Important?
This indicator tracks a variety of children’s health measures including rates of childhood obesity, physical fitness, immunizations, and poverty. Children who are obese or physically unfit are at risk of developing high blood pressure, high cholesterol, asthma, and Type 2 diabetes, among other serious physical problems. Immunizations protect children against serious and potentially fatal diseases and can prevent the spread of communicable diseases. Children living in poverty are less likely to have their nutritional needs met and to have sustainable access to health care than other children. Also, they are more likely than other children to live in overcrowded or unstable housing and to live in unsafe neighborhoods.

What Is a Sustainable State?
A sustainable state is one in which all children are healthy, receive adequate physical exercise and a nutritious diet, have access to affordable health care, are immunized against diseases, and do not live in poverty.

How Are We Doing?
The California Center for Public Health Advocacy, a nonprofit health advocacy organization, analyzed the 2004 California Physical Fitness Tests administered to the state’s fifth, seventh, and ninth graders. The California Physical Fitness Test measures six areas of fitness: upper body strength, flexibility, aerobic capacity, body composition, abdominal strength, and trunk strength. According to results from the body composition component of the test, 25.2 percent of fifth, seventh, and ninth graders in San Mateo County were overweight, compared with 28.1 percent for California. The proportion of fifth, seventh, and ninth graders in the county who were overweight was greatest among Pacific Islander children (46 percent) and lowest among Asian children (16 percent). At the city level, the proportion of students who were overweight was greatest in South San Francisco (32 percent), Daly City (31 percent), and Redwood City (31 percent). The lowest proportions of overweight students were in Burlingame (16 percent), Foster City (16 percent), and San Carlos (17 percent).

In 2005, 33 percent of all seventh graders in the county met minimum fitness standards in each of the six components of the California Physical Fitness Test, a 1.5 percent increase from 2004 and a 22.7 percent increase from 2001. At the state level, 28.8 percent of seventh graders met the minimum standards in each of the six components. In 2005, 37 percent of female and 29.4 percent of male seventh graders in the county met the minimum fitness standards. The county’s Asian (48 percent) and White (40.2 percent) seventh graders met all six minimum fitness standards at the highest rates. Pacific Islander (18 percent) and African American (21.2 percent) students had the lowest rates.

In 2004, 82.5 percent of children enrolled in kindergarten in the county had received all of their required immunization by the age of two. This was a 9.1 percent increase from 2003 and a 22.7 percent increase from 2000. It also compared favorably with the 2004 state rate of 71.8 percent. The immunization level was still below the Healthy People 2010 objective of 90 percent, however. The Healthy People 2010 initiative is a set of health promotion and disease prevention objectives developed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to serve as a road map to improve the health of the nation’s residents.

In 2005, 7.2 percent of families in the county with children under the age of 18 had household earnings below the federal poverty level, a decrease from the eight percent of families living in poverty in 2002. At the state level, 14.9 percent of families with children under the age of 18 had household earnings below the federal poverty level. The figures for San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties were 10.9 percent and 8.7 percent respectively. Because the federal poverty level is not adjusted for local variations in the cost of living, the poverty levels described likely underrepresent the number of children in the high-cost Bay Area whose health is negatively impacted by their family’s inadequate resources.

See appendix page 68. Researcher: Rinku Bhaswati Bhadra

The truth is that children born today could become part of the first generation in American history to live shorter lives than their parents because so many are eating too much of the wrong things and not exercising enough.

President Bill Clinton

Data sources: Healthy Communities San Mateo County and the California Center for Public Health Advocacy
COMMUNITY HEALTH

In 2004, over 85 percent of adults exhibited at least one behavioral risk factor (e.g. no regular physical activity, smoking) related to heart disease.

Why Is This Important?
Community health is affected by many interrelated factors including environmental and neighborhood characteristics, social factors, and individual behavior. Environmental and neighborhood characteristics influencing health can be direct, such as exposure to toxic substances, or indirect such as access to recreation areas or the availability of affordable housing or quality educational opportunities. Social factors include the ease of transmission of health information (including linguistically and culturally appropriate information), norms encouraging healthy behaviors, and inequalities across socioeconomic or ethnic groupings.

Tracking community health outcomes for the most prevalent conditions, recognizing individual behaviors and social factors influencing health outcomes, and identifying disparities in access or outcomes are all important to form effective public policy to prevent disease.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, a community provides a healthy environment for all of its members, and healthy behaviors are reinforced through daily social interaction.

How Are We Doing?
Years of Potential Lives Lost (YPLL) is a measure of the years lost due to premature death. For San Mateo County the total number of YPLL for all causes of death declined from 42,614 in 1991 to 30,519 in 2001. Among the major sources of YPLL, the largest decrease during that period came from deaths due to HIV/AIDS. YPLL from HIV/AIDS decreased from 3,192 (7.5 percent of all YPLL) in 1991 to 762 (2.5 percent) in 2001. YPLL because of cancer deaths accounted for 27.5 percent of all YPLL in the county during 2001 with heart disease next, accounting for 15.9 percent.

---

**Percent of Total Years of Potential Lives Lost Due to Selected Causes, 2001**

- Cancer: 27.5%
- Heart Disease: 15.9%
- Other: 25%
- Suicide: 3.7%
- Unintentional Injury: 10.4%
- Cerebrovascular: 3.4%
- Liver Disease: 3.3%
- Infectious Diseases: 2.2%
- Respiratory Disease: 3.2%
- HIV/AIDS: 2.5%
- Homicide: 2.5%

---

Data source: 2004 Community Assessment: Health & Quality of Life in San Mateo County, Healthy Community Collaborative of San Mateo County

In 2001, heart disease continued to be the leading cause of death in the county. In its 2004 community health survey, the Healthy Community Collaborative of San Mateo County found that 85.9 percent of adults in the county exhibit at least one risk factor related to heart disease (i.e. smoking, no regular physical activity, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, or being overweight). The single biggest risk factor for heart disease is physical inactivity. The health survey found that 54.6 percent of adults in the county do not participate in regular, vigorous physical activity. The prevalence of inactivity in the county was found to be notably high among persons aged 65 and older (73.5 percent), persons with a high school education or less (62.6 percent), and women (57.8 percent).

One of the key findings of the community health survey was that the actual causes of premature death are rooted in behaviors influenced by environment and access, estimating that as many as 50 percent of premature deaths are because of alcohol, tobacco, and drug use; poor diet; a lack of physical activity; and other health risk behaviors. Another key finding was that health disparities exist in the county, with culture, behavior, education, income, class, and race among the major factors contributing to differences in health status.

In 2004, the county Health Department, along with community members and other local organizations held a summit to identify health disparities and develop a plan of action to address them. Through that and other followup efforts, three priority areas were identified: alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention; linguistic access to health care; and prevention of childhood obesity. The initiative to address these three priority areas is named Healthy Communities San Mateo County:A Community Health Improvement Initiative to Eliminate Health Disparities.

In the summer of 2006, Healthy Communities San Mateo County released its Roadmap for Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention to serve as a guide for prevention strategies for communities. The Roadmap sets out strategies to address the needs of individuals (i.e. building youth assets so individuals can make good choices, overcoming the social isolation of older adults and new immigrant populations), to support and influence cultural norms promoting healthy lifestyle choices, and to impact policies surrounding access to alcohol, tobacco, and drugs for youth.

In August 2006, Healthy Communities San Mateo County released a study designed to determine the capacity of health organizations in the county to serve limited English proficient (LEP) residents. Its key findings were that while some organizations in the county provide a high level of linguistic access to health care, others provide insufficient levels; many health care organizations are equipped to meet the language needs of Spanish or Tagalog speakers but not equipped to meet the language needs of other LEP residents (primarily Chinese, Russian, or Tongan); and social and economic factors compound linguistic barriers in many communities.

For a discussion of childhood obesity, see Children’s Health indicator on page 14.

See appendix page 68. Researcher: Joe Rois
In 2006, the number of known leaking underground storage tanks was down 37 percent from 1997.

**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.

Leaking underground storage tanks were used to store gasoline, heating oil, and other hazardous chemicals. Over time the tanks developed leaks and the 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. This category includes 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 are largely comprised 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. 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.

**What Is a Sustainable State?**
A sustainable state is one where the number of contaminated sites in the county continues to decrease and eventually reaches zero, and no new cases of contamination occur.

**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 37.4 percent over the past decade. On December 31, 1997, there were 838 cases open, compared with 525 open cases at the end of 2006. A total of 1,171 cases have been open in the county at some point over the past 10 years, 646 of which have been closed.

In addition to the 525 open cases of leaking underground storage tanks, 149 cases of other hazardous chemical leaks were open in the county as of December 31, 2006. 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 2006. 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 since 1997. 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. Difficult cases are often referred to the District Attorney.

**Open Cases of Leaking Underground Storage Tanks in San Mateo County (as of Year-End)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources: San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board and State Water Resources Control Board

**Open Cases of Underground Storage Tanks and Other Hazardous Chemical Leaks by City, as of December 31, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Leaking Storage Tanks</th>
<th>Other Chemicals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pescadero</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Beach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Granada</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Honda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gregorio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources: San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board and State Water Resources Control Board

See appendix page 68. Researcher: Tom Rounds
CRIME

In 2005, violent crime rate was up 13 percent from 2004 and 30 percent from 1999.

Why Is This Important?
A stable, secure, and safe environment is essential for sustainability. High crime levels indicate social disintegration and harm the economy by inhibiting investment. Property crimes like burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft result in loss and damage of property, drain police and judicial resources, increase insurance costs, and can decrease home values. Among the reasons for an increasing rate of crime are economic stagnation, declining job opportunities, and inadequate educational or police resources.

High juvenile crime rates are especially disturbing as youths who continue criminal behavior may not develop into emotionally stable and productive adults, harming the long-term stability of a community.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, the crime rate is low and the risk factors that contribute to high crime rates, such as poverty, socioeconomic disparities, and drug use are declining and marginal.

How Are We Doing?
The state's Office of the Attorney General reports on the number of crimes at the county level that fall into the following categories: violent crime, property crime, larceny, and arson. The total sum of crimes in these categories reported in San Mateo County declined in 2005 by 1.8 percent from 2004. However, the number of violent crimes, which includes homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, increased. This was primarily because of an 18.9 percent increase in the number of aggravated assaults (the unlawful attack or attempted attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury). Overall, the violent crime rate in the county increased 12.8 percent in 2005 to reach 339.2 violent crimes per 100,000 residents compared with the statewide violent crime rate of 512.3. In California, the violent crime rate has been dropping since the mid-1990s, whereas the county's violent crime rate in 2005 was 29.9 percent above the low of 261.2 per 100,000 residents reached in 1999.

In 2005, total juvenile arrests increased 0.9 percent in San Mateo County and 0.2 percent in the state. Both the county (8.4 percent increase) and the state (2.2 percent increase) saw the number of juvenile felony arrests grow from 2004. For both the county and the state, 2005 was only the second year in the past decade where the number of juvenile felony arrests did not decline from the previous year. In 2005, juvenile arrests for violent crimes increased by 15.2 percent in the county (from 184 arrests in 2004 to 212 arrests in 2005) and one percent for the state. Misdemeanor juvenile arrests decreased in both the county and the state in 2005.

At the city level, South San Francisco saw the largest percentage increase in major crimes (33.7 percent) from 2004 to 2005, followed by Colma (23.1 percent) and Pacifica (19.2 percent). Major crimes are defined as the four categories of violent crime previously mentioned along with three categories of property crime (burglary, motor vehicle theft, and larceny-theft over $400). The cities with the largest percentage decreases in major crimes from 2004 to 2005 were Brisbane (26.1 percent), Half Moon Bay (22 percent), and the City of San Mateo (12.9 percent).

The County Board of Supervisors has made public safety a primary concern in the county. Crimes related to increased gang activity and methamphetamine use are of special concern in the state, and several cities in the county have formed task forces to tackle these issues.

See appendix page 68. Researcher: Sapna Singh
**DRINKING WATER QUALITY**

**In 2005, drinking water quality continued to meet state and federal standards.**

Why Is This Important?

High quality drinking water is essential to human health. Contaminated water can cause acute disease, birth defects, infant mortality, and increased cancer rates. Federal and state safe drinking water regulations 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 and lead because of risks associated with these contaminants. Trihalomethanes, chemicals that form as a byproduct of chlorination, 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.

What Is a Sustainable State?

In a sustainable state, drinking water is safe for all to drink.

How Are We Doing?

Twenty water districts in San Mateo County are members of the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA). The water districts serving the county publish annual water quality 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. The reports indicate that the water delivered by these water districts met state and federal drinking water regulations.

Most of the water delivered to the county’s BAWSCA member water districts comes from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). During 2005 the state and federal standard for total trihalomethanes (TTHMs) was 80 parts per billion (ppb) based upon a running average of results. While no district exceeded 80 ppb, average TTHM concentrations ranged from a low of 22.2 from the San Bruno Water District to a high of 69.0 from the Bear Gulch Water District managed by CalWater.

In February 2004, the SFPUC and the San Mateo County water agencies switched from chlorine to chloramine to disinfect the water as chloramine is a more stable disinfectant, lasts longer in water, and produces lower levels of TTHMs as a byproduct. The switch has resulted in a significant decrease of TTHM levels. In 2005, the average TTHM concentration of all water districts in the county was 34.4 percent lower than 2003, the last full year before the switch from chlorine. Some people are concerned about the public health effects of the change, however, and a small number have reportedly experienced allergic reactions, including skin rashes and asthma attacks that they attribute to drinking water. Still, no scientific evidence exists that chloramine-treated water is more harmful than chlorine-treated water.

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. There were also no detectable levels in the SFPUC transmission system of three other compounds with potential health risks: arsenic, methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE), or chromium 6+. The Coastside County Water District did detect arsenic in water from two of its local treatment plants; the concentrations (two and three ppb), however, were well below the MCL of 10 ppb.

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 42.

*See appendix page 68. Researcher: Jeremy Fisher*
**ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT**

**Average resident's use of natural resources exceeds nature's ability to replenish them.**

**Why Is This Important?**

All human activities depend on the biological support of nature. An Ecological Footprint measures the area of land and water a population requires to produce the resources it consumes and absorb the waste it produces. When a population has a footprint exceeding the area available to replenish its resources, it draws down the natural inventory of those resources. From a sustainability standpoint, this is important because it can impact the quality of life of future generations. The Global Footprint Network, a nonprofit organization based in Oakland, CA, has calculated that the worldwide Ecological Footprint is 23 percent larger than what the planet can regenerate. This ecological "overshoot" is maintained by liquidating the planet's resources.

The components of an Ecological Footprint include:

- Natural resources used in production (crop land, grazing land, fishing grounds, and forest land),
- Surface area of the earth (land and water) needed to sequester carbon dioxide emissions from energy use and production, and
- Land required to accommodate human infrastructure (housing, transportation, industrial production, and other built-up land).

Ecological Footprints vary widely across nations, with developed nations having much larger footprints than less developed nations. This is primarily because of different levels of energy use. There is also variability at the local level, as individuals within populations consume energy and other resources at widely different rates.

**What Is a Sustainable State?**

A sustainable state exists when society's demand upon nature is in balance with nature's productive and regenerative capacity, and each person has access to the natural resources necessary to sustain his or her needs.

**How Are We Doing?**

For 2003, the Global Footprint Network calculated the global per capita Ecological Footprint to be 5.5 acres, whereas the earth's ecological capacity to produce and regenerate was calculated to be only 4.4 acres per person. There were large disparities between high-, middle-, and low-income countries, with Ecological Footprints averaging 15.9 acres, 4.7 acres, and 2.0 acres respectively. The per capita Ecological Footprint for the United States was calculated to be 23.7 acres. Its per capita ecological capacity was calculated as only 11.7 acres, leading to an ecological deficit of 12 acres for each American.

For 2001, Redefining Progress, an Oakland, CA based nonprofit organization, calculated the per capita Ecological Footprint for the nine county Bay Area to be 20.9 acres. San Mateo County's footprint was the same. San Francisco County had the smallest footprint among the nine counties at 18.6 acres per person. These compare favorably with the national figure (calculated in 2001 to be 23.5 acres) but still much higher than is ecologically sustainable.

The largest component of San Mateo County's footprint was energy, accounting for over 13 acres per San Mateo County resident. This component includes not just the energy we use to heat our homes and for transportation, but the energy used in the production and transportation of food and other products we enjoy as consumers. The next largest components were crop lands and forest lands. Recycling efforts have reduced San Mateo County's footprint but only by a small fraction compared with the impact of other human activities.

For more information on ecological footprints, please see the Global Footprint Network at [www.footprintnetwork.org](http://www.footprintnetwork.org) and Redefining Progress at [www.rprogress.org](http://www.rprogress.org). To estimate your individual ecological footprint, see [www.myfootprint.org](http://www.myfootprint.org).

*See appendix page 69. Researcher: Joe Rois*
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### The Ecological Footprint of San Mateo County in 2001—Acreage Used Per Capita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy Footprint</th>
<th>Crop Land Footprint</th>
<th>Grazing Land Footprint</th>
<th>Forest Land Footprint</th>
<th>Built Area Footprint</th>
<th>Fishing Grounds Footprint</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Redefining Progress. The left-hand column lists the human activities that consume natural resources and the remaining columns break out the Ecological Footprint into its component parts. Because of rounding, not all columns and rows will add up.
EDUCATION

In 2006, Academic Performance Index scores continue to rise; it is unclear whether all children have an equal opportunity to excel.

Why Is This Important?
A good education provides a foundation for children to become productive members of society, obtain high-quality jobs, and contribute towards their community’s general welfare. By providing equal access to a good education, schools can play a large role in creating a level playing field for all children, regardless of their socioeconomic status. The outcome of a good education is the ability for children to fully reach their human potential. By contrast, a poor educational foundation can make children more vulnerable to crime, substance abuse, and poverty. Further, a highly skilled and educated work force will attract businesses to the area with resulting economic benefits.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, all children receive a good education that equips them with the tools, knowledge, and confidence to fully reach their human potential and become active participants in society.

How Are We Doing?

School achievement
The Academic Performance Index (API) is the cornerstone of California’s Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999. The API is a numeric index ranging from 200 to 1,000 that indicates a school’s or local educational agency’s performance level based on the results of statewide testing. The performance target for all California schools is 800. In 2006, the median API for elementary schools in the county was 798. For middle and high schools, the median API figures were 766 and 720 respectively. The county has seen improvement in each school category since 2002.

In every category, San Mateo County schools compared favorably with the statewide API figures of 751 for elementary, 715 for middle, and 679 for high schools. Making direct comparisons like these is problematic, however, because schools and districts serving different student populations. A high proportion of socioeconomically disadvantaged students or English learners will have a negative impact on a school’s or district’s API as these students generally score lower than other students. For example the median API for San Mateo County school districts was 783 for 2006, whereas the district level median API for socioeconomically disadvantaged students and English learners was 674 and 667 respectively.

In 2005, 43.1 percent of the county’s high school graduating classes met University of California and California State University eligibility requirements, compared with 35.2 percent for the state. San Mateo Union High (50.9 percent) and Cabrillo Unified (48.4 percent) had the highest percentages among districts in the county. South San Francisco Unified (35.9 percent) and Jefferson Union High (36.4 percent) had the lowest percentages among districts.

School preparedness
In 2005, the Peninsula Partnership for Children, Youth, and Families, along with the Santa Clara County Partnership for School Readiness, assessed children in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties on their readiness for school, both socially and academically. The assessment was based on teacher evaluations of kindergartners in 20 skills grouped in five categories. These categories (physical well being and motor development, social and emotional development, approaches toward learning, communications and language usage, and cognition and general knowledge) correspond to the National Education Goals Panel framework for measuring kindergartners’ school readiness. San Mateo County students’ average readiness in each category ranged between “in progress” and “proficient”, with an overall score of 3.4 on a 4.0 scale. This is up slightly from the 3.3 average score in 2003.

Among the findings of the assessment were that students coming from very low-income families are nearly four times more likely to be considered unready for kindergarten than their counterparts. Additionally, children without any sort of preschool experience are two and a half times more likely to perform below teacher expectations for readiness than those who had some preschool education.

By familiarizing children with the learning process during key developmental years, a preschool education establishes a foundation for children to meet future educational challenges. Consequently, the San Mateo County Office of Education, with support from First 5 San Mateo County, works to provide high-quality preschool education for the county’s three and four year olds through its Preschool for All (PFA) program. In 2005 the PFA program provided preschool opportunities for 228 children at six sites in Redwood City and East Palo Alto.

School equity
The level and quality of resources dedicated to individual schools and districts also impact student achievement. During the 2005-06 school year, 93.7 percent of the 4,773 teachers employed in county schools were fully credentialed, having fulfilled all state requirements including the California Basic Educational Standards

continued
Education, continued

Test which assesses a teacher’s English and Mathematics skills. The county’s teachers have remained in their districts for an average of 9.6 years. These figures are very close to the state averages of 94.6 percent fully credentialed teachers and average district tenure of 10.4 years.

During the 2004-05 school year, there was wide variability across county school districts in per student spending. Portola Valley Elementary and Woodside Elementary School Districts had the highest per student expenditures at over $14,000 per student. Their figures were more than double the per student expenditures of nine other county school districts. Much of the differential in the county is driven by the availability of local revenue sources to supplement state and federal dollars. It could also reflect revenues received for specific services, such as special education dollars.

Data sources: California Department of Education and the Education Data Partnership

The seven districts with the highest per student expenditures also had the highest average teacher salaries in 2004-05, ranging from $67,294 at Woodside Elementary to $77,246 at Los Lomitas Elementary. On the other end, the districts with four of the five lowest average teacher salaries also had the lowest expenditures per student. None of the average teacher salaries among this group was higher than $56,000.

Enrichment opportunities

In a sustainable state, educational opportunities allow all students to reach their potential. To this end, vocational, environmental, and alternative educational programs should be available for students. The County Office of Education offers career training in technical fields through its Regional Occupation Program (ROP). The program, available free to high school students, is open to all county residents for a small fee. The ROP offers over 100 course options at 13 learning sites.

Another program is the San Mateo Outdoor Education Program which, since its inception in 1969, has hosted more than 175,000 fifth and sixth graders at Jones Gulch to interact and learn about nature. Children have the opportunity to explore tide pools, visit marshes, and hike with a team of naturalists who teach them about the coastal environment and living sustainably.

Art is an essential component of a good education. In addition to studying the arts for their own value, experiencing and making works of art benefits students in their intellectual, personal, and social development, and can be particularly beneficial for economically disadvantaged students and those at risk of not succeeding in school. The total number of fine arts courses offered at schools in the county during the 2005-06 school year was 807, a 7.5 percent increase from the 751 course offerings in 2004-05. San Mateo Union and Sequoia Union High School Districts had the most fine arts offerings, with 120 and 103 respectively. On average, the county school districts offered one fine arts class for every 109 students. Brisbane Elementary and Woodside Elementary School Districts had the lowest ratios, offering one fine arts class for every 34 and 38 students respectively.

See appendix page 69. Researcher: Brittany Bendix

Let us think of education as the means of developing our greatest abilities, because in each of us there is a private hope and dream which, fulfilled, can be translated into benefit for everyone and greater strength for our nation.

President John F. Kennedy
ENERGY USE

In 2005, energy use from electricity and natural gas was up 16 percent from 1995; the overall capacity of solar installations, however, grew rapidly in 2006. Why Is This Important?

In the twentieth century humans used more energy than all previous human societies combined. Most of that energy was produced by burning nonrenewable fossil fuels such as coal, petroleum, and natural gas. Although we use a wider mix of energy sources today, we are still heavily reliant on fossil fuels, which can negatively impact air quality and release significant amounts of carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas linked to climate change. Two other major sources of electricity for San Mateo County are large hydroelectric and nuclear facilities. Large hydroelectric projects can damage or eliminate habitat and adversely impact fish populations. Nuclear energy produces radioactive waste that needs a long-term, safe storage facility.

The U.S. economy's vulnerability to volatile oil and natural gas prices and the acknowledgement of the environmental and health costs of burning fossil fuels are leading to the rapid growth of clean-energy markets. The price of renewable and other clean energy technologies are decreasing through economies of scale and technological advances.

What Is a Sustainable State?

In a sustainable state, energy consumption is balanced with our ability to produce clean energy. Energy is used efficiently and is produced from clean, renewable sources such as wind, solar, small-scale hydroelectric, and other emerging technologies.

How Are We Doing?

Electricity and natural gas

In 2005, energy from electricity and natural gas in San Mateo County totaled 40 trillion British thermal units. This was an increase of 0.1 percent from 2004 and 15.6 percent from 1995. Natural gas accounted for 57.3 percent of that energy, a similar proportion to 2004 (57.8 percent). Total natural gas usage in the county decreased slightly (0.4 percent) from 2004 but this was offset by a 0.8 percent increase in electricity usage. Natural gas usage increased 11.1 percent and electricity usage 22.3 percent since 1995.

Residential use accounted for 47.1 percent of the county's energy from electricity and natural gas in 2005, down from 48 percent in 2004 and 52.9 percent in 2003. Nonresidential energy use of electricity and natural gas grew 1.8 percent from 2004. Commercial enterprises consumed roughly 70 percent of nonresidential energy, industrial users roughly 29 percent, and agricultural users the remaining one percent.

The average household in San Mateo County used 5,772 kilowatts of electricity in 2005, up slightly from 5,766 kilowatts in 2004. The average household in 2005 used 539 therms of natural gas, down 5 percent from the 568 therm average in 2004. As in previous years, average household use of electricity and natural gas varied by city and was generally greater in more affluent neighborhoods. Atherton, Woodside, Hillsborough, and Portola Valley consumed two to three times more electricity and natural gas per household than the countywide average. Colma, Brisbane, and Daly City had the lowest average household electricity and natural gas consumption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Residential Electricity Use per Household, 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilowatt Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Pacific Gas and Electric Statistical Research Unit

In 2005, 42 percent of the county's electricity was generated from natural gas, while nuclear and large hydroelectric generation comprised 24 percent and 20 percent respectively. Renewable energy sources, including biomass and waste, geothermal, small hydroelectric, wind, and solar, accounted for 12 percent of the county's electricity. Although it did not constitute a majority of our energy sources, renewable energy made up a greater proportion Continued
of the energy in San Mateo County than the state overall, which received 10.7 percent of its electricity from renewable sources.

### Average Residential Natural Gas Use per Household, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Natural Gas Use (Therms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>1529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Average</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data source: Pacific Gas and Electric Statistical Research Unit*

### Solar Photovoltaic Systems in San Mateo County (Watts Installed Each Year)

- **1998:** 9,800
- **1999:** 16,000
- **2000:** 16,200
- **2001:** 16,970
- **2002:** 24,980
- **2003:** 24,640
- **2004:** 57,160
- **2005:** 55,970
- **2006:** 20,493

*Data source: California Energy Commission, Emerging Renewables Program*

### Emerging technologies

#### Over the last year, there has been a surge in venture capital investment in wind, solar, fuel cell power systems, and biofuel production technologies.

For example, in 2006 U.S. Renewables Group—with partners such as locally-based Kleiner Perkins Caufield & Byers—raised more than $250 million from venture capital firms for clean energy.

New technologies that turn polluting waste products into energy and clean, distributed technologies such as micro-turbines and fuel cells offer economic and efficiency benefits for users. Energy efficiency technologies such as home automation, smart appliances, advanced cooking devices, and automated building controls offer energy and money saving opportunities as well. In San Mateo County, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) offers rebates to its residential and business customers who become more energy efficient. In 2006, PG&E paid over $2 million in rebates to customers in the county on projects that saved over 57 million kilowatt hours of electricity and 153 thousand therms of natural gas.

In 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed SB107, accelerating California’s Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) requirement from 2017 to 2010. The RPS requires that retail sellers of electricity procure at least 20 percent of their energy from renewable sources.

*See appendix page 69. Researchers: Danielle Lee, Tina King, and Isabelle Gecils*
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**2007 SSMC Award Winner**

The City of Millbrae’s cogeneration facility uses kitchen grease from local restaurants to power its wastewater treatment plant. The facility reduces greenhouse gas emissions, increases city revenues, and reduces energy costs.
GASOLINE USE AND VEHICLE FUEL EFFICIENCY

Why Is This Important?
Both San Mateo County and the state rely almost exclusively on petroleum to support its transportation needs. As a result, 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 of estimated total carbon emissions, a greenhouse gas linked to climate change. Reducing transportation-related gasoline consumption is crucial to reducing total carbon emissions and mitigating potentially catastrophic climate change.

In addition to carbon 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 and supply disruptions. Further, Californians are spending more of their household income on gasoline than ever before, and prices for all goods are affected by the higher cost of gasoline.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, consumption of non-renewable and polluting petroleum products is reduced to zero. Transportation energy consumption comes entirely from renewable energy sources.

How Are We Doing?
In 2005, San Mateo County broke a three-year downward trend in gasoline consumption. Total highway gasoline consumption was 361 million gallons, up from 359 million gallons in 2004; per capita gasoline consumption was 499 gallons, the same as in 2004. While per capita gasoline consumption has decreased by 10.4 percent since a 2001 high of 557 gallons, it remains 1.2 percent higher than 1995’s figures. In 2005, San Mateo County’s per capita gasoline consumption was 5.1 percent higher than the national per capita gasoline consumption of 475 gallons.

The technology to increase fuel economy already exists.
We just need the political will.

Senator Dianne Feinstein
Genuine Progress Indicator

County’s actual economic well-being was 44 percent below that reported by conventional measure.

Why Is This Important?
The Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) is an alternative to the conventional measure of economic progress, Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The GPI was developed by Redefining Progress, a nonprofit organization based in Oakland, CA, to correct an inherent limitation of GDP in describing a nation’s general well-being (i.e. GDP measures only the quantity of market activity without accounting for the social and ecological costs involved). As Nobel Prize winning economist and father of the GDP Simon Kuznets said “the welfare of a nation can scarcely be inferred from a measure of national income as defined (by the GDP).” He later added “distinctions must be kept in mind between quantity and quality of growth, between its costs and return, and between the short and the long run.”

The GPI begins with the same data as the GDP but makes adjustments to reflect both positive and negative items that are left out of GDP calculations. What is derived is a truer measure of a society’s well-being than conventional economic accounting. Positive adjustments include such things as household and volunteer work. Negative adjustments include environmental degradation, resource depletion, and the effects of crime and underemployment. There are more than 20 different adjustments in the GPI calculations, representing substantial levels of economic, social, and environmental impacts.

Nonmarket activities are difficult to calculate. Conventional economic accounting overcomes this difficulty by placing a value on these items: zero. In fact, conventional economic accounting adds a perverse twist to how we value things. In the case of pollution, GDP rises because of the economic activity creating it and rises again as resources are expended to clean it up. Any health expenditures because of adverse impacts on humans will lead to another increase in GDP. In the GPI calculation pollution has a negative value, and the costs associated with cleaning up the pollution or dealing with potential health effects are “defensive expenditures” and are viewed as costs, not benefits.

Similarly, a parent taking family leave can reduce GDP because a valued activity (working outside the home) is replaced by an unvalued one (child care). GPI corrects for the omission of this household work from the GDP calculation.

What Is a Sustainable State?
A sustainable society uses a more accurate measure of its economic well-being by including social and environmental dimensions that are now misrepresented or ignored in conventional economic accounting. This measure would provide policy makers a more accurate measure of how policies affect the economy and the quality of life of citizens.

How Are We Doing?
In their most recent update published in 2004, Redefining Progress compared U.S. GDP and GPI calculations for the period from January, 2000 to January, 2003. While inflation-adjusted per capita GDP grew from $34,758 in 2000 to $34,938 in 2002, per capita GPI actually declined from $10,240 to $10,033. In 2002, the GDP overstated the value of economic activity in the U.S. by over $7 trillion, or about $25,000 per American. The largest factors in this differential came from the degradation of our natural resources and the rise in the national debt. On the positive side, the GPI showed a $600 billion increase in the value of household and volunteer work from 2000 to 2003.

At the request of the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, in 2004 Redefining Progress calculated the GPI for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay region for the year 2000. For San Mateo County, the 2000 per capita GPI was $20,040. This compared favorably with both the Bay Area average per capita GPI of $16,972 and the U.S. per capita GPI of $10,240. The county’s GPI was 44 percent below the Gross Regional Product (GRP) of $36,045 for the same year, however. The GPI calculation pollution has a negative value, and the costs associated with cleaning up the pollution or dealing with potential health effects are “defensive expenditures” and are viewed as costs, not benefits.

The largest factors in the differential between the county’s GPI and its GRP came from $6 billion of unaccounted for household and volunteer work, $1.5 billion from commuting and job/housing imbalance costs, and $1.4 billion in costs because of the consumption of nonrenewable resources. Other major adjustments were costs associated with income inequality, loss of leisure time, ozone depletion, carbon dioxide emissions, net foreign lending, auto accidents, and underemployment.

Per Capita Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) versus Gross Regional Product (GRP) for 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPI per capita</th>
<th>GRP per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>$20,040</td>
<td>$36,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Average</td>
<td>$16,972</td>
<td>$31,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (GDP)</td>
<td>$10,240</td>
<td>$34,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Redefining Progress

For more information on the GPI, please see Redefining Progress at www.rprogress.org

See appendix page 70. Researcher: Joe Rois
Green Building

In 2006, more local governments were encouraging green building strategies, but only the county has a formal green building policy.

Why Is This Important?
Although indispensable to humans, buildings have a substantial impact on the environment. Currently construction consumes 25 percent of all wood that is harvested, produces 25 percent of the carbon dioxide added to the atmosphere, and generates two to 2.5 pounds of waste per square foot. Building construction also accounts for a sixth of the world's fresh water withdrawal and nearly half of its energy and materials. Inefficient resource use leads to both large environmental impacts and high operating costs for owners and occupants. Many buildings also contain chemicals that pollute the indoor air, which may harm the health of building occupants. According to the Environmental Protection Agency indoor air quality can be three to five times worse than outdoor air.

What Is a Sustainable State?
Green buildings are energy efficient, water conserving, durable and nontoxic, with high-quality spaces and use high recycled-content materials. By employing green building techniques, one can reduce operating costs of the building, enhance building comfort, and preserve the environment. In a sustainable state, green buildings are the norm and are encouraged through policies at the city and county level.

How Are We Doing?
Awareness and support of green building has greatly increased over the past few years. Many government agencies are adopting green building policies, which are written ordinances, codes, policies, or guidelines that promote the construction of green buildings. In 2004, Governor Schwarzenegger established the Green Building Initiative with the goal of reducing electricity from the grid by existing government and commercial buildings by 10 percent per square foot by 2010 and 20 percent by 2015. San Mateo County adopted a formal green building policy, the Sustainable Building Policy, in 2001 requiring future county buildings over 5,000 square feet to be built to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards as developed by the U.S. Green Building Council. The Public Works Department approved a policy in 2006 to encourage Fly Ash and Mixed Aggregates use as a substitute for a portion of the cement used in construction. The goal of this policy is to make concrete with as much recycled material as possible.

Brisbane and Pacifica are working on developing green building policies. Portola Valley and Pacifica currently distribute the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide with each building permit application, and request that the checklist be completed and returned. This guide and its accompanying checklist were developed by a committee consisting of county staff, architects, builders, and Sustainable San Mateo County and published in February 2004.

Although the county has the only formal green building policy, many cities in the peninsula are encouraging green building in their communities and taking steps to improve and protect our environment. Nineteen jurisdictions have a construction debris and waste management ordinance or policy that requires reuse and recycling of materials from construction sites. Cities have been offering educational opportunities for staff and/or residents or businesses to learn about green building. Many cities have adopted other policies to support elements of green building. For example, Colma has a water efficiency ordinance, Burlingame exempts solar panels from design review, Woodside has an ordinance that encourages solar panels and natural materials, and Portola Valley, San Carlos, and Millbrae have reduced their permit fees for solar panels.

More than half of the cities in the county are using, or considering, green practices for public buildings. For example, the City of San Mateo built a LEED silver Public Library, and is considering green aspects for the design of its new police stations; the county's new Youth Services Center incorporates green features; Pacifica's wastewater treatment plant has installed 1,800 solar panels to provide 10 to 15 percent of the plant's energy needs; San Carlos installed a 60 kilowatt photovoltaic solar power system on an existing corporation yard; and Millbrae completed a new facility at its Water Pollution Control Plant that turns inedible kitchen grease from local restaurants into biogas, powering 80 percent of the plants power needs. The county is also starting to see an increase in the number of commercial and residential green buildings.

Barriers to greater adoption of green building polices and incorporating green practices in projects include the perception that it costs more, lack of knowledge on the subject, competing priorities, and limited staff time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Green Building Policies Among San Mateo County and the Cities, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Building Policy Adopted—1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building Policy Not Adopted—20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Telephone survey of San Mateo County and Cities, December 2006-January 2007

Please see the RecycleWorks.org website for information on local green buildings. Also available on this page is the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide.

See appendix page 70. Researcher: Dianne Anderson
HEALTH CARE

In 2005, the percentage of residents with health insurance was up from 2003; health care costs grew by 10 percent in 2006.

Why Is This Important?
Quality, affordable health care is key for a healthy and productive life. Health insurance allows access to health care and spreads the cost 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. Deferring care because of cost often leads to more severe illness, which burdens individuals and the health care system further.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, all members of the community have access to affordable, quality health care. Health insurance coverage ensures that preventive care is available and that medical emergencies do not bankrupt individuals and burden the health care system.

How Are We Doing?
Based on findings from the Community Health Interview Survey, a collaborative research project of the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, the California Department of Health Services, and the Public Health Institute, 7.8 percent of San Mateo County residents lacked health insurance in 2005—roughly 56,000 individuals. This is a decrease from the 10.4 percent lacking health insurance in 2003. The 7.8 percent lacking health insurance in the county compares favorably with the state rate (13.5 percent) as well as both San Francisco (9.4 percent) and Santa Clara (8.1 percent) Counties. This 7.8 percent figure, however, represented only the percentage of respondents who were lacking insurance at the time of the survey; 14.1 percent of survey respondents lacked health insurance at some point during 2005.

Estimated Percentage of Residents Lacking Health Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Mateo County</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: California Health Interview Survey

In 2005, 70.4 percent of county residents received health benefits through their employer. From 2003 to 2005, the percentage of residents whose employer did not provide health benefits increased from 7.6 percent to 11.8 percent. Only 61 percent of Hispanics and 62.8 percent of Asians surveyed in the county reported receiving health benefits through their employer, compared with 90.3 percent of African Americans and 77.7 percent of Whites. Among those earning between zero and 199 percent of the federal poverty line, only 53.3 percent received health benefits through their employer compared with 73.9 percent of those with higher incomes.

The cost of health care in the Bay Area Metropolitan region, as measured by increases in the medical care category of the Consumer Price Index, grew by 10 percent in 2006 compared with a 3.2 percent increase for all goods. Over the past decade, medical costs have risen at an annual average growth rate of 4.4 percent compared with a 3.5 percent growth rate for all goods. Items included in the health care category include prescription drugs and medical supplies, physicians’ services, eyeglasses and eye care, and hospital services.

Annual Increase in the Medical Care Category of the Consumer Price Index for the Bay Area


See appendix page 70. Researcher: Rinku Bhaswati Bhadra
HOMELESSNESS

In 2005, homelessness was down slightly.

Why Is This Important?
Homeless individuals lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. Homelessness detracts from an individual’s ability to reach his or her full human potential. Difficulty finding a safe place to sleep at night can undermine a person’s ability to maintain a steady job. Homelessness can impact a child’s ability to succeed in school, putting them at risk of becoming homeless as an adult. Furthermore, homelessness jeopardizes the safety of both homeless individuals and the communities in which they seek shelter.

Many homeless individuals in the county are employed but their jobs are often unstable or low wage. Many have limited education or lack the necessary skills to acquire higher paying jobs. Others only receive income from public benefits, or have no income whatsoever. Many homeless suffer from physical or mental health problems, are substance abusers, or are victims of domestic violence.

What Is a Sustainable State?
A sustainable state is one in which no one is homeless, and those at risk of becoming homeless have access to safe temporary shelters, more affordable permanent housing, and counseling and support services.

How Are We Doing?
During its 2005 homeless count, the San Mateo County Human Services Agency identified 1,385 homeless individuals in the county. This was a slight decrease from the 1,429 individuals counted in 2004. This figure does not represent the total homeless population throughout the year, but the total count on one specific day. The Human Services Agency estimated that throughout 2005, there were 4,030 individuals who were homeless at some point. The most recent homeless count was conducted on January 30 and 31, 2007. This count used three times the number of volunteers as in past efforts, phone surveys of property owners aimed at counting the number of homeless individuals staying in vehicles or on private property, and homeless guides to work with volunteers and help direct the search. The findings of the count will be available in the spring of 2007.

Among those counted in the 2005 homeless survey were 96 families comprising 310 individuals. The Human Services Agency estimates that among families who are homeless, most (roughly 95 percent) are temporarily homeless rather than chronically homeless (homeless for over one year or who have experienced four or more episodes of homelessness in three years). These families become homeless through a combination of the high cost of housing in the region, unstable or low-wage employment, mental or chronic health problems, substance abuse, or domestic violence issues. The Shelter Network, a provider of housing and social services for the homeless in the county, cites financial emergency as the reason for the homeless status of the majority of families in its programs, with only 10 percent becoming homeless as a result of substance abuse problems or mental illness.

A chronically homeless individual is more likely to be a single adult than a member of a homeless family. Within this group, substance abuse problems, mental illness, and chronic health conditions are more prevalent than among the temporarily homeless. Samaritan House, a provider of health and human services to low-income individuals in the county, estimates that close to 50 percent of the homeless population it serves need substance abuse treatment counseling and 30 percent suffer from some form of mental disability. It is unclear how many of Samaritan’s clients are chronically rather than temporarily homeless.

In 2005, San Mateo County initiated HOPE (Housing our People Effectively), a collaboration between the county, its cities, and local service providers to eradicate homelessness within 10 years. In 2006 under the HOPE plan, the county along with the City of San Mateo and local nonprofit service providers, established the Homeless Outreach Team Project to provide housing and services for the chronically homeless within the City of San Mateo. One pilot project scheduled for 2007, “Project Homeless Connect,” will provide a one-stop shop for homeless individuals in the South County to connect with service agencies. The program will be modeled on the “Homeless Connect” program in San Francisco and 40 other jurisdictions in the country.

See appendix page 70. Researcher: John Kittermaster

Data source: San Mateo County Human Services Agency

2007 SSMC Award Winner

Samaritan House, a nonprofit health and human services agency, provides housing assistance to 90 homeless individuals per night. Along with a warm bed, they offer meals, drug and alcohol counseling, referrals, and job training programs.
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The cost of the median-priced home and condominium has more than doubled in the last decade.

Why Is This Important?
Housing affordability in San Mateo County and the Bay Area in general is at an all time low. A lack of affordable housing limits the ability of people to live here and employers to recruit qualified workers. Therefore, families are left with the options of living in another county and facing long commutes, paying more than they can comfortably afford for housing, living in overcrowded conditions, or moving out of the area entirely.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, affordable housing is available to all members of society and new housing developments are built to meet projected regional population and job growth.

How Are We Doing?
The housing crunch in San Mateo County continued in 2006, affecting everyone from renters to homebuyers to homeowners. The National Low Income Housing Coalition found that San Mateo County was tied with San Francisco and Marin Counties as the least affordable counties in the United States in 2006, based on the hourly wage required to rent a two-bedroom apartment. According to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) estimates, the median family income for the San Francisco Metropolitan area in 2006 was $91,200, down from a high of $91,500 in 2003. During that same time span, however, the median price of a single-family home grew by 33.7 percent. In 2006, the median price of a single-family home in San Mateo County was $869,000, up from $854,858 in 2005. Homes in the cities of Atherton, Hillsborough, Woodside, and Portola Valley continued to be the least affordable in the county; the most affordable homes were in La Honda, East Palo Alto, Colma, Brisbane, and Pacifica.

In 2006, a household income of $118,159 was needed to purchase a median-priced condominium, a 6.9 percent increase from 2005 and well above the median family income of $91,200. Furthermore, the annual income needed to afford a median-priced home was $186,691, a 6.7 percent increase from the previous year, and a 134.2 percent increase over the past decade. This left many residents with only the option of renting, though rents throughout the county continued to rise as well. In order to rent a one- or two-bedroom apartment in the county, households needed an income of $47,554 and $53,863, respectively. From 2005 to 2006, the income necessary to rent a one-bedroom apartment rose at roughly the same rate as the income necessary to buy (7.2 percent), and rose at a slightly higher rate for two-bedroom apartments (8.4 percent). Since 1996, rents of one- and two-bedroom apartments in the county have increased by 49.1 percent and 43.5 percent, respectively.

Data source: San Mateo County Association of Realtors

continued
In 2006, housing affordability even affected existing homeowners. According to Freddie Mac, average monthly mortgage rates increased nationally from 5.9 percent in 2005 to 6.4 percent in 2006. For many homeowners with adjustable-rate or interest-only mortgages, this rate increase resulted in a significant spike in their monthly payments.

According to a recent report by the Center for Responsible Lending, foreclosure rates in California’s subprime market are projected to be 21.4 percent for loans originated in 2006, a huge jump from the 4.5 percent for similar loans originated from 1998-2001. For the San Francisco Metropolitan area, the expected foreclosure rate for 2006 subprime loans is expected to be 16.7 percent, compared with the three percent foreclosure rate for subprime loans originated from 1998-2001. The subprime market provides home loans to households with limited or blemished credit. The subprime market currently represents nearly a quarter of the total mortgage originations in the United States. The Center for Responsible Lending notes that the dominant type of subprime loan today is an adjustable-rate mortgage, sometimes referred to as an “exploding ARM,” that features semi-annual interest rate adjustments after a two-year fixed period. The “exploding ARM” is just one of the features often found in subprime loans that can increase a borrower’s risk of foreclosure.

A significant shortage of housing supply remains the primary cause of the high housing costs in the county. This is inextricably connected with the limited supply of land available for development and strict zoning ordinances that limit the density of housing that can be built.

According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), between 1999-2006 San Mateo County issued permits for only 16 percent of the housing units needed for moderate-income households, 45 percent for low-income households, and 19 percent for very low-income households, as determined by the most recent Regional Housing Needs Allocation. As a result, in its 2006 Bay Area Housing Profile, the Bay Area Council gave the county an “F” in its housing production report card.

Currently local jurisdictions are in the midst of determining a new Regional Housing Needs Allocation, which will set housing production targets for all income levels for the next 5-10 years. Once these numbers are established, jurisdictions will enter into a process of updating their Housing Element, the part of every General Plan that outlines how each jurisdiction plans to meet their housing need. This process will continue through June 2009, when the Housing Elements must be approved by the state of California.

See appendix page 71. Researcher: Dorcas Cheng-Tozun

Data sources: Freddie Mac, San Mateo County Association of Realtors, San Mateo County Human Services Agency, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Housing Affordability, continued

![Graph showing annual gross income needed to afford median-priced home, condominium, and rents in San Mateo County, 2006](image-url)

2001 SSMC Award Winner
Peninsula Habitat for Humanity builds homes for low-income families in San Mateo County through volunteer and community support. In its 18 years, they have empowered 95 families to become homeowners.

The housing shortage takes a toll on individuals, families, and the entire Bay Area.

Association of Bay Area Governments, A Place to Call Home: Housing in the San Francisco Bay Area
JOBS

In 2005, the county halted a four-year trend of job losses, adding 200 jobs.

Why Is This Important?
A diversified job base helps communities be resilient during economic downturns and provides economic opportunities for individuals with different talents and capabilities. When employment is concentrated in a few large industries, a community’s economic vitality is threatened if those industries decline. Rapid growth in new or emerging industries 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.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, jobs would be sufficient in number to employ all those seeking work and job growth would keep pace with population growth. Employment would be diversified across many industries and company sizes.

How Are We Doing?
The California Employment Development Department (CA EDD) provides estimates on the number of jobs in San Mateo County from its monthly Current Employment Statistics survey given to a sampling of California employers. These estimates do not represent the number of San Mateo County residents with jobs, but rather the number of people employed in the county. The resulting reported number of jobs may underestimate the actual number of workers as self-employed persons, unpaid family workers, and private household workers are not counted. According to the CA EDD figures, the total jobs in the county across all industries grew from 327,800 to 328,000 in 2005, halting the trend of reported job losses that began in 2000.

The largest increase in jobs came in the professional and business services sector, where 2,300 jobs were added. This is the same sector that was hit the hardest during the job-loss years, losing over 15,000 jobs from 2001 through 2003. Other sectors that saw job increases include leisure and hospitality services (700 jobs) and educational services (300 jobs). The natural resources, mining, and construction sector saw the largest decrease in jobs (1,500 jobs lost), followed by transportation, warehousing, and utilities (800 jobs lost), information services (500 jobs lost), and manufacturing (400 jobs lost). Over the past decade, there has been a net increase of 22,200 jobs. Those gains, however, happened primarily between 1995 and 2000; the current number of jobs reported is far below the 375,800 reported in 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Jobs by Industry in San Mateo County in 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Mining, &amp; Natural Resources:  5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information:  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance:  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, &amp; Utilities:  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing:  9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services:  9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality:  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government:  13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services:  14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale &amp; Retail Trade:  15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services:  3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The county’s job base is well diversified among a number of industries, with seven different sectors each employing over 25,000 workers. The two largest sectors are professional and business services and wholesale and retail trade. These sectors accounted for over 106,000 jobs in 2005, nearly one-third of the total county employment. Jobs are also well diversified across different company sizes. At the end of the third quarter of 2005, 53.5 percent of the work force was employed by organizations with fewer than 100 employees while 13.7 percent was employed by large companies with over 1,000 employees.

See appendix page 71. Researcher: Rakshya Dahal
LAND USE AND HABITAT PROTECTION

Land use has been fairly stable since 1990 but could be disrupted by expected population growth.

Why Is This Important?
Good growth management policies are necessary to balance a community’s needs and preserve a high quality of life. Sprawling growth and inadequate protections of open space and agricultural land can lead to development far from urban centers where jobs are located, resulting in long commutes, traffic congestion, and more air pollution from automobiles. The county’s lands also contain habitats that support many types of plants and animals. Habitat destruction from development in sensitive areas, pollution, and the introduction of invasive species can all endanger populations of native species.

What Is a Sustainable State?
A sustainable community balances land uses to meet the need for housing, commerce, services, agriculture, open space, and habitat protection.

How Are We Doing?

Land use
Land use in San Mateo County has been fairly stable since 1990. Urban land, however, has grown from 24.2 percent of the county’s total land in 1990 to 24.8 percent in 2004. This growth represents over 1,800 acres of new urban land. In order to create this new urban environment, other land was lost, the largest portion of which came from the category “other land,” which includes low-density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for grazing; and open space not categorized as grazing land. “Other land” declined from 56.6 percent of the county’s land in 1990 to 56.1 percent in 2004. Between 2002 and 2004, 120 acres of “other land” were converted into new urban land. By 2040, the county is projected to add nearly 100,000 new residents. Absent good policies to accommodate this growth, the county’s recent history of stable land use may be disrupted.

During 2005 and 2006, the Greenbelt Alliance, a nonprofit land conservation and planning organization, surveyed each city and county in the Bay Area on their policies to accommodate growth. Cities were scored on policies in seven areas: growth boundaries, park proximity, affordable housing, mixed-use development, density, parking, and development standards. Across the Bay Area, the average score for the 101 surveyed cities was 34 percent (or 95 points of the possible 280). The average score for cities in San Mateo County was 25 percent, the lowest among the nine counties. Only five cities in the county scored higher than the overall average, with the City of San Mateo leading at 49 percent, followed by Millbrae, South San Francisco, San Carlos, and Half Moon Bay. The county’s cities scored highest in the mixed-use development category (67 percent), although this was still below the category’s average (79 percent) for all cities in the region. The county’s cities lowest average scores were for their policies in the growth boundaries and park proximity categories.

Habitat protection
The county is home to over 30 species of plants and animals that are state or federally listed as endangered or threatened. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has designated areas within the county as critical habitat for six of these species: the central California coastal coho salmon, the Bay checkerspot butterfly, the central California steelhead, the California red-legged frog, the marbled murrelet, and the western snowy plover. Critical habitat is defined as a specific area essential to the conservation of a listed species.

The Bay checkerspot butterfly once thrived in the county’s Edgewood Park, but no butterfly larvae or adults have been observed there since 2003. The primary cause of its disappearance has been an invasive species of plant impeding the growth of the native host plant of the butterfly larvae. The invasive species has thrived as the park’s soil has become nitrogen rich from automobile emissions. In March 2001, the San Mateo County Department of Parks was granted funding to initiate habitat restoration studies and experiments at Edgewood Park to help bring back the butterfly. In 2007, the butterfly will be reintroduced in the park with the release of 1,000 larvae between January and March and the release of 12 adult butterflies in April.

Data source: California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

See appendix page 71. Researchers: Teresa McWalters and Joe Rois
**PARKS AND OPEN SPACE**

There are over 110,000 acres of parkland and open space; it is unclear if recreational opportunities and access are equal across communities.

**Why Is This Important?**

The presence of parks and open space enriches a community’s quality of life. The availability of active (playgrounds, playfields, etc.) and passive (hiking trails, picnic areas, etc.) recreational opportunities offer public health benefits, increases values of nearby property, and can decrease teen crime. Parks and other public facilities are also used for community events such as art fairs, parades, or holiday gatherings. These events foster social cohesion and cultural enrichment, bring people together, and build a sense of community. They also can lead to economic gains as local merchants benefit from the increased crowds drawn to the area.

**What Is A Sustainable State?**

In a sustainable state, parks and open space are abundant, of good quality, and readily accessible to all residents. In addition, recreational opportunities and events are plentiful, relevant, and open to all community members.

**How Are We Doing?**

In total, there are over 110,000 acres of parklands and protected open space in the county, the majority of which are open to public use. City parks are generally the most accessible and most used park facilities. They can range from small pocket parks located within individual neighborhoods and consisting solely of a playground and a few picnic tables, to larger community or regional parks offering multiple active and passive recreational opportunities. One way to measure the spread of city parks across the county is to look at the acreage of city parks per 1,000 residents in each city. At the high end, Belmont has 27.4 acres of city parkland per 1,000 residents. On the lower end is Woodside which currently does not have any city parks, but plans to open the six acre Barkley Field and Park in 2007.

This simple measure has limitations, however. First, it does not take into account other outdoor recreation facilities such as school playgrounds or county parks easily available to city residents. Second, it does not say anything about whether these parks appropriately meet the level of service desired by a particular community. For example, the recreational opportunities desired by a senior community may differ greatly from those desired by a community of young families. Also, one large community park may have more acreage than a number of pocket parks distributed throughout the city but may not meet the community’s needs as well. Finally older, fully built out cities may show poorly with this measure because of the scarcity of lands available for parks, but still provide a high level of recreational services to the community.

In addition to city parks, the County Parks Department operates 16 parks and multiple trail systems totaling 15,680 acres. The parks accommodate roughly 2.25 million visits annually. Based on a needs analysis conducted in 2001, the Department identified a number of strategic priorities including additional trail development, improved access for disabled visitors, and environmental education. These items remain on the Department’s priority list.

The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District manages over 20,000 acres of open space in the county. The District offers many opportunities for hiking and other activities on its lands. The District has an active resource management program to enhance native species’ habitat and reduce the influx of invasive plants, and a Coastside Protection Program to preserve agricultural lands and the coast’s rural heritage. The Coastside Protection Program will also open new coastland areas for public enjoyment. In 2006, the District purchased roughly 3,600 acres of land, the Driscoll Ranch, from the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), adding significantly to its land holdings. POST itself owns or manages over 14,000 acres of open space, roughly a quarter of which is open for public use.

---

### Acres of City Parks per 1,000 Residents, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Acres per 1,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Recreation District</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Survey of parks and recreation directors, November 2006-December 2006

Other major parcels of protected space in the county include parklands and ecological reserves managed by the state, Golden Gate Recreational Area lands managed by the National Park Service, and watersheds managed by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. Not all of these lands are available for public use, however.

In 2006, a ballot measure to support parks and recreation programs in the county was defeated. The measure would have raised $16 million annually for the county and cities to maintain and improve picnic areas, athletic facilities, and park bathrooms; repair and upgrade playgrounds and play structures; improve access to parks and playgrounds for the disabled; preserve natural open spaces; maintain hiking, walking, and biking trails; and improve recreation programs for youth and seniors. A majority of county voters actually favored the bill (55.4 percent) but it failed to reach the 2/3 approval necessary for passage.

See appendix page 71. Researcher: Joe Rois
PESTICIDE USE

In 2005, use of the most toxic pesticides (excluding residential use) was up 22 percent.

Why Is This Important?
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 areas run off into our waterways, polluting water and threatening the health of wildlife. Organic food production (a $13.8 billion dollar industry in the United States that grew 16.2 percent in 2005) and nontoxic pest management are emerging as alternatives to toxic pesticide use.

What Is a Sustainable State?
A sustainable state is one where the most toxic chemicals are eliminated from use and nontoxic management practices are widespread.

How Are We Doing?
Of the 275,231 pounds of pesticides applied in San Mateo County during 2005—excluding residential use—59.7 percent, or 164,437 pounds, were classified as most toxic by the Pesticide Action Network. Use of the most toxic pesticides was up 22.2 percent from 2004, and 23 percent from 1995. This growth from 2004 can be attributed to increases across all categories of pesticide use, with particularly large increases in agriculture (7,457 pound increase), landscape maintenance (7,740 pound increase), and other uses (11,351 pound increase).

Five pesticides accounted for 76.1 percent of the most toxic pesticides used in the county in 2005. Sulfuryl fluoride was by far the most heavily used 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 31.8 percent of the most toxic pesticides used countywide. Applications of sulfuryl fluoride have been steadily increasing as a result of the gradual phase-out of methyl bromide because of international concerns regarding its role in ozone depletion. As with all fumigants, because an entire space is treated as opposed to targeted surfaces, significant quantities are used. 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.

The fourth most used toxic chemical was sodium hypochlorite, a disinfectant, which showed the largest single increase of all of the most toxic chemicals from 2004 to 2005. Use of this chemical increased by over 900 percent, or almost 12,000 pounds, accounting for a little more than eight percent of the most toxic chemicals used. The vast majority, almost 85 percent, of sodium hypochlorite use was for treating swimming pools. The increase may be because of an increase in reporting rather than usage, however, as pool service companies are not required to report their pesticide use. Chlorothalonil, used in agriculture and landscape maintenance, was the fifth most toxic pesticide used in the county in 2005.

Consumer use of home and garden pesticides is not reported, nor is 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 71. Researcher: Jeremy Fisher

Data sources: California Department of Pesticide Regulation and Pesticide Action Network

The overwhelming majority of the most toxic pesticides used in the county during 2005—excluding residential use—were for agriculture (46.4 percent), structural pest control (32.1 percent), and landscape maintenance (10 percent). Structural pest control includes measures such as termite, ant, and roach control.

British Medical Association

Until we have a more complete understanding of pesticide toxicity, the benefit of the doubt should be awarded to protecting the environment, the worker, and the consumer—this precautionary approach is necessary because the data on risk to human health from exposure to pesticides are incomplete.
**POPULATION**

**Population is up nearly six percent over the last 10 years.**

**Why is This Important?**
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 efficiently and/or each person must consume less.

**What Is a Sustainable State?**
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 2.1 for an extended period of time, and immigration and emigration are in balance. Also, all residents would be legal residents and be able to fully participate in the economic and political life of the county.

**How Are We Doing?**
San Mateo County’s population grew by 0.8 percent, or 5,600 residents, from July 1, 2005 to July 1, 2006. As of July 1, 2006, the total population of the county was 729,400. Overall, the county’s population has increased 5.6 percent since 1997, adding 39,000 residents in 10 years. Since July 1997, the population increase because of births (minus deaths) was 48,460. During this same time net migration, or the net total of new immigrants less those individuals who have left the county, was a negative 9,575.

**San Mateo County Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population (Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>631.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>635.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>640.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>646.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>698.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>716.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>733.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>751.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>764.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>779.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: California Department of Finance, Demographics Research Unit

In the year ending July 1, 2006 the county saw positive net migration (251 new residents) for the first time since the year ending July 1, 2000. Net migration consisted of net immigration (persons moving into the county from a foreign country less residents leaving to live abroad) of 5,137 and negative domestic migration (persons moving to and from the county within the United States) of 4,886. The average net immigration since the year ending July 1, 2001 has been 5,732 new residents each year. Over those same years, the average domestic migration has been a negative 8,094 residents each year leaving the county. Almost half of our legal immigrants come from the Philippines, China, India, Iran, Korea, and Taiwan. The remainder is primarily from Latin American nations. Overall, 34.6 percent of county residents are foreign born. We do not know the number of illegal immigrants living in the county. Despite positive net migration in 2006, current trends indicate continuing net migration away from high cost of living counties such as San Mateo to inland counties where more affordable housing exists.

The fertility rate in San Mateo County in 2004 was 2.08 children born per female, slightly less than the replacement rate of 2.1 and less than the 2006 state rate of 2.14. Although the county’s population continues to grow, population stabilization eventually could occur if the total fertility rate remains close to the replacement rate for an extended period of time and if immigration and emigration are in balance.

The county’s population continues to be ethnically diverse. In 2004, 46.6 percent of county residents were White (non-Hispanic), 23.7 percent Hispanic, 22.3 percent Asian, 3.5 percent African American, 1.4 percent Pacific Islander, 0.2 percent American Indian, and 2.4 percent multi-racial or other.

In 2005, 20.1 percent of the county’s residents were children age zero to 14, 10.9 percent were teens and young adults age 15 to 24, 56.4 percent were working-age adults age 25 to 64, and 12.6 percent were seniors age 65 and over. The median age in 2005 was 39.2 years. Projections to 2050 show a significant increase in the number of senior residents in the county.

**2006 Population By City**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population (Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. San Francisco</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: California Department of Finance, Demographics Research Unit

See appendix page 72. Researcher: Carol Mink
POVERTY AND INCOME DISTRIBUTION

In 2006, more than one-third of households continued to earn less than the self-sufficiency level.

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 range of quality of life measures, including academic performance and health. Poverty trends are indicators of economic health. High rates of poverty shift government revenues toward entitlements and away from parks, libraries, and other civic enrichments. 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.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable society, community members of all income levels are able to meet their basic needs, enjoy a high quality of life, and have the opportunity to develop and realize their potential.

How Are We Doing?
A great deal of disparity exists in the distribution of incomes of San Mateo County's households. In 2005, 33.3 percent of households earned less than $50,000 per year while 35.3 percent earned $100,000 or more. At the lower and upper ends, 15.4 percent of households earned less than $25,000 per year while 18.3 percent earned more than $150,000. This disparity in household income has remained fairly constant since at least 1999.

Per capita income in 2006 ranged from a low of $21,121 in parts of Redwood City to nearly six times that ($123,857) in Atherton. Median incomes ranged from a low of $72,603 in Colma to a high of $270,446 in Atherton. The Gini coefficient—a measure of inequality of wealth distribution—was calculated to be 0.407 for the county in 2005, very close to the U.S. Gini coefficient of 0.408. The Gini coefficient is a number between zero and one, where zero represents perfect equality, and one represents perfect inequality. Most developed nations have a Gini coefficient between 0.24 and 0.36, whereas the U.S. value of over 0.4 indicates relatively greater inequality.

In 2005, 7.4 percent of San Mateo County residents lived below the federal poverty threshold of $15,720 for a family of three. The countywide poverty rate was far lower than the federal or state rates (each was 13.3 percent). In 2005, 9.7 percent of children in the county lived below the poverty threshold, compared with 6.7 percent of adults age 18 and older. According to 2000 Census data, Hispanics and African Americans are three times as likely as Whites and more than twice as likely as Asians to live below the federal poverty level.

Comparisons to the federal poverty threshold are misleading, however, since it 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 $66,442 in 2006 to remain self-sufficient, more than four times the federal poverty threshold. More than one-third of households in the county earned less than the self-sufficiency level. The United Way of the Bay Area reports that the county is home to several neighborhoods with high concentrations of poverty: North Fair Oaks, East Palo Alto, a portion of northern Daly City, northeastern Redwood City, and the eastern portion of the City of San Mateo.

According to the Second Harvest Food Bank, 43,218 county residents were either hungry or food insecure in 2005. Because hunger of one adult almost always indicates a problem for the rest of the household, the total number of people “touched” by hunger in San Mateo County was estimated to be 160,761 or roughly 22 percent of the population.

In 2005, 4,239 households received food stamp benefits. Nevertheless, federal nutrition programs to address hunger are severely underutilized in our county. In 2005, it was estimated that 55 percent of county residents eligible for the federal Food Stamp Program did not use it because of the social stigma surrounding food stamps, burdensome paperwork and recordkeeping, and a lack of knowledge about eligibility. Full participation in the program could have brought nearly $12 million of federal funds to the county to fight hunger.

See appendix page 72. Researcher: Nishita Bakshi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Capita Income by City in 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside/Redwood City (94062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame/Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City/San Mateo (94404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo (94402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Honda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gregorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo (94403)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City (94061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo (94401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto/Palo Alto (94030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pescadero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City (94063)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: ESRI Business Information Solutions, 2006 Community Sourcebook for ZIP Code Demographics
**PUBLIC LIBRARY USE**

In 2004-05, expenditures per capita were up 10 percent from 2003-04 and 71 percent from 1994-95.

**Why Is This Important?**
Public Libraries are cultural assets that add richness to a community; they are gateways to information for people of all income levels, providing access to the internet, reference tools, and a wide array of published materials. For some individuals, libraries are the only place they can access the internet or reading material. Libraries are important institutions for promoting social equity as they do not discriminate but rather provide equal access to all members of society. Community rooms as well as special literacy programs are offered by most of our libraries, helping foster an environment of unity and learning. Libraries are also important to the business community for reference use.

The level of library expenditures indicates a community’s support for libraries. A library’s annual hours open shows the level of its public accessibility, and its circulation per capita indicates the library’s usage.

**What Is a Sustainable State?**
In a sustainable state, all members of society have access to public libraries, and the community continues to support their operation.

**How Are We Doing?**
Annual expenditures per capita for all public libraries in San Mateo County increased 9.6 percent in 2004-05 to $55.83, continuing a seven-year upward trend. Since 1994-95, annual expenditures per capita have increased by 70.8 percent. Just as in previous years, expenditures were primarily for operating costs (94 percent) rather than capital expenditures. In 2004-05, the total number of hours public libraries in the county were open decreased by 1.9 percent from the previous year but remain up 13.8 percent from 1994-95.

**Data source:** California State Library, Library Development Services Bureau

Of the eight public library systems in the county, all but Daly City exceeded the statewide average per capita operating expenditure of $27.54, and all but Daly City and San Bruno surpassed the $44.06 figure for the neighboring Santa Clara County library systems. Operating expenditures per capita were greatest in Burlingame and Redwood City.

**Annual Operating Expenditures per Capita for Library Systems in 2004-05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library System</th>
<th>Operating Expenditure per Capita</th>
<th>State Average ($27.54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>$89.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>$71.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>$55.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>$52.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park (City)</td>
<td>$44.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>$37.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>$24.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data source:** California State Library, Library Development Services Bureau

Average countywide circulation per capita increased by 6.9 percent from 2003-04 to 9.8 materials borrowed (a 44.2 percent increase from 1994-95). The average number of reference questions asked per capita was up slightly from 2003-04 but was still down 19.7 percent from 10 years ago. This was likely because of the increased use of the internet instead of reference librarians, both in research and locating books. The number of internet terminals in county libraries was 0.6 per 1,000 residents, comparing favorably with the statewide average of 0.4 per 1,000 residents. The South San Francisco and Burlingame libraries had the highest rates at 1.2 and 1.1 respectively. All county library systems but San Bruno exceeded the statewide average for internet terminals per 1,000 residents.

In general, library systems with greater per capita expenditures are open for longer hours and have more circulation than other libraries. Menlo Park continued to be a notable exception; despite the greater per capita expenditures of libraries such as Burlingame and Redwood City, Menlo Park had the highest level of circulation at 19.7 materials per capita and led the county in hours open per capita. Burlingame and Redwood City followed Menlo Park in each category. Daly City and the City of San Mateo trailed the rest of the county libraries in both categories.

**See appendix page 72. Researcher: Seth Terpstra**
SOLID WASTE

In 2005, solid waste disposal was up two percent from 2004 but was still down 16 percent since 2000.

Why Is This Important?
San Mateo County’s quality of life depends upon the availability and use of natural resources such as timber, metals, petroleum, and others. Many of these resources are renewable, but our consumption may outpace nature’s ability to replenish them. Waste reduction and recycling efforts focus on ways to achieve a balance between resource consumption and renewal, and ensures the highest end use for our resources.

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

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, consumption of resources is in balance with nature’s ability to replenish them. Source reduction creates less waste, and the products that are produced are reused, recycled, or composted rather than thrown away.

How Are We Doing?
The amount of solid waste generated in San Mateo County and disposed of in landfills totaled 760.9 thousand tons in 2005, an increase of 2.3 percent from 2004. Although disposal is still 16.5 percent below the 911.6 thousand tons of solid waste generated in 2000, this increase ended a four-year decline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Residential Waste per Capita per Day, 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roughly one-third of the waste in the county in 2005 was residential waste, a similar proportion as 2004. The largest component of this was food and other organic waste such as leaves and grass. On average, county residents generated 1.9 pounds of household waste each day. Based on estimates breaking down residential and commercial waste by city, this ranged from an estimated high of 5.6 pounds per day for Colma residents to 0.9 pounds per day for residents in the unincorporated parts of San Mateo County.

Redwood City businesses generated the most commercial solid waste overall in 2005 (93,789.2 tons), followed by businesses in the City of San Mateo (72,987.6 tons) and South San Francisco (72,327.4 tons). Portola Valley, Hillsborough, Woodside, and Pacifica each have small commercial sectors and generated under 5,000 tons of commercial waste in 2005. In the commercial sector, paper and food are the largest components of the waste stream. Restaurants and retail establishments are the largest generators of waste, followed by the construction and medical/health services industries.

In 1989, California passed the Integrated Waste Management Act requiring municipalities to divert 50 percent of their waste from landfills. For measurement purposes, diversion is any combination of waste prevention (source reduction), recycling, reuse, and composting activities that reduce waste. The most recent year for which the California Integrated Waste Management Board has approved local municipalities’ diversion rates was 2004. Among those cities with approved diversion rates, East Palo Alto had the highest diversion rate at 84 percent, followed by Brisbane and Woodside (each at 73 percent). Colma’s diversion rate of 47 percent was a Board Approved Good Faith Effort. Although only one city had a Board approved rate of less than 50 percent in 2004, 10 cities have not had their 2004 diversion rates approved and preliminary figures show that some of these may be below the 50 percent level.

See appendix page 72. Researcher: Danielle Lee
TRANSPORTATION

In 2005, daily vehicle hours of delay were down 30 percent from 2001; driving alone was the mode of choice for 70 percent of commuters.

Why Is This Important?
Transportation has a significant impact on the economy, environment, and quality of life. Traffic congestion causes costly delays resulting in 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 are linked to global climate change. An over-reliance on automobiles also encourages low-density land use patterns that can waste precious land and lead to habitat fragmentation.

With housing increasingly unaffordable in the Bay Area, families wishing to own homes may be forced to live far from their jobs, resulting in two- to three-hour commutes. In San Mateo County, we have heavy traffic transiting the corridor between Santa Clara and San Francisco Counties.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, land use patterns and transportation infrastructure allow individuals to live close to their place of work and have access to affordable, efficient, and reliable means of public transportation.

How Are We Doing?
Traffic congestion in San Mateo County decreased in 2005. The average daily vehicle hours of delay on county freeways dropped from 7,800 hours in 2004 to 7,600 hours in 2005, a 2.6 percent reduction. This also represented a 30.3 percent reduction from the 10,900 vehicle hours of daily delay in 2001. In 2005, the per capita vehicle miles driven in the county was 25.9 miles per day, an 8.9 percent decrease from 2001. Part of these decreases was likely because of job losses in the county between 2001 and 2004.

Data source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Another possible factor for the decrease in the average daily delay on county freeways was commuter choice. Based on surveys of commuters conducted by RIDES Associates for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, between 2001 and 2005 transit riders grew from nine percent of all commuters to 12 percent. The percentage of survey respondents reporting using other modes of commute, including bicycling, walking, riding a motorcycle, and telecommuting, grew from two percent to five percent. According to the survey driving alone was still by far the predominant mode of commute, however, with 70 percent of respondents reporting that as their commuting choice in 2005.

Caltrain runs 96 weekday trains, including 22 daily Baby Bullet trains between San Francisco and San José with stops in a number of locations in San Mateo County. In 2006, Caltrain achieved its highest annual average weekday ridership level in its history, with more than 35,000 daily rides. This was a 25 percent increase in daily rides from 2003, the last full year before the Baby Bullets were introduced. Caltrain plans to open a new service along the Dumbarton rail corridor from Union City to the Peninsula in 2012. Six trains per day are projected to leave Union City each morning—three destined for San Francisco and three for San José—with return trips scheduled for the afternoon commute. The Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) operates five stations in the county (Daly City, Colma, South San Francisco, San Bruno, and Millbrae), connecting residents to San Francisco and the East Bay.

The San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) is a partner in the El Camino Real-Grand Boulevard project. This project seeks to redevelop the transit corridor with transit-oriented development (TOD), focusing on Caltrain, BART, and the SamTrans bus service on El Camino Real. The project also supports the construction of destination “places” in cities along the corridor and hopefully will greatly enhance transit ridership. SamTrans has also partnered on other TOD projects, including the Colma Apartments project near the Colma BART station. With First Community Housing, a low-income housing developer, SamTrans is developing a pilot program to provide annual passes to residents of one of First Community Housing’s developments.

See appendix page 73. Researchers: Robert Batista and Arthur Lloyd
UNEMPLOYMENT

In 2006, unemployment rate was down for third consecutive year.

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

What Is a Sustainable state?
In a sustainable state, the level of unemployment is low and adequate resources are available for the unemployed to obtain unemployment insurance benefits and access to new jobs.

How Are We Doing?
San Mateo County’s preliminary 2006 annual average unemployment rate was 3.7 percent, down from 4.3 percent in 2005. This rate translated to roughly 13,600 unemployed county residents. This was the third consecutive year of a declining unemployment rate from the 5.9 percent high reached in 2003. It was still slightly higher than a decade ago, however, and nearly twice the two percent unemployment rate of 1999. Over the past decade, the county has enjoyed relatively low rates of unemployment compared with the state. The preliminary state annual average was 4.8 percent for 2006.

Unemployment rates fluctuate with economic cycles and can vary widely across different cities and regions. In 2006 this was again the case in San Mateo County, with unemployment rates at the sub-county level ranging from a high of 8.9 percent in East Palo Alto to 1.5 percent in Hillsborough. The highest unemployment rates in the county were found in East Palo Alto, the North Fair Oaks Census Designated Place (CDP), Brisbane, and the Broadmoor CDP. North Fair Oaks CDP is located adjacent to Redwood City, Menlo Park, and Atherton. Broadmoor CDP is located in northern San Mateo County near Daly City. Both are unincorporated areas. Despite the high unemployment rates in each of these areas, their respective unemployment rates have declined since 2003, similarly to the state and county figures.

See appendix page 73. Researchers: Marissa Hom and Aarati Asundi

I do not believe we can repair the basic fabric of society until people who are willing to work have work. Work organizes life.
It gives structure and discipline to life.

President Bill Clinton
VOTER PARTICIPATION

In 2006, voter turnout was up from 2005 and last midterm election, but still less than half of eligible voters voted.

Why Is This Important?
Voting allows people to participate in community-wide decision-making. High voter turnout indicates citizens are engaged and 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.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, all members of society participate in the democratic process by voting, assuring that all elected officials and ballot measures represent the will of the people. Further, elections would be free of error and fraud so that every vote cast is counted accurately.

How Are We Doing?
In the 2006 midterm election, voter turnout—as expressed as the percentage of eligible voters who voted—was 45.1 percent in San Mateo County, compared with 39.3 percent statewide. This number was both higher than the countywide turnout for the 2005 special statewide election where 41.5 percent of eligible adults voted and the last midterm election in 2002, when only 38.8 percent of eligible adults voted. Still, less than half of the eligible voters in the county made decisions for the entire community.

In the past decade, voter turnout has ranged from a low of 15 percent in the 1997 off-year election to a high of 62.9 percent during the 2004 election. Turnout is typically highest in even years when federal and state offices are on the ballot and lowest during odd years when elections consist primarily of local offices and issues. The 2006 election followed this trend.

Despite a slight increase in eligible voters from 2005, the number of registered voters in San Mateo County decreased slightly from 351,506 in 2005 to 350,427 in 2006. The percentage of eligible adults registered to vote remained 75 percent. Countywide, 60.1 percent of registered voters voted in 2006, compared with a statewide figure of 56.2 percent. The percentage of registered voters voting was greatest in the most affluent cities and lowest in the least affluent cities, similar to past elections. Portola Valley had the highest percentage of its registered voters voting in 2006 with 72.9 percent compared with East Palo Alto and Daly City whose figures were 39 percent and 47.7 percent respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Registered Voters Voting in 2006 Statewide Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: San Mateo County Statement of Vote

Voter registration rates are higher among older voters than younger voters. In 2006, 26.5 percent of county residents were age 56 and over, but they represented 35.5 percent of registered voters. In contrast, 20.7 percent of county residents were 18 to 29 years old, but they made up just 14.9 percent of registered voters. Residents ages 30 to 55 accounted for 52.8 percent of the county population and 49.6 percent of registered voters.

Given the trend of voter turnout below 50 percent as well as voting disparities across cities and age groups, more effort should be made to emphasize how elections directly impact citizens’ lives and to increase voter registration among lower-income communities and younger residents.

See appendix page 73. Researchers: Mia Costello and Ashley Soldavini
In 2004-05, water use was down eight percent to lowest level since 1997-98.

Why Is This Important?
Water is a basic necessity. 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 further strain our finite water supply.

The county's water comes primarily from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, which is fed by snowmelt from the Sierra Nevada. Less than four percent comes from local sources such as groundwater created by rain percolating through the soil and less than one percent comes from recycled water or other sources. Paved surfaces and buildings typically divert rainfall into storm drains, preventing natural recharging of groundwater levels. The combination of overdrawing groundwater supplies and reducing inflow can collapse the surrounding earth, thereby decreasing capacity for future water storage.

What Is a Sustainable State?
In a sustainable state, water use remains within the limit of the water supply, and a large portion of water used is recycled water.

How Are We Doing?
Water use in San Mateo County decreased in fiscal year 2004-05, down 8.4 percent from 2003-04. In 2004-05, 90.6 million gallons of water per day were used in the county compared with nearly 99 million gallons per day in 2003-04. The main reason for this was likely the unusually cool and wet winter the county experienced. The cool weather lingered into the spring and summer and may have led to lower water use, especially for landscape irrigation purposes. Another possible factor may be the increased prevalence of low volume toilets: a change in the plumbing codes in the 1990's reduced the maximum flushing volume of new toilets. Also, there has been increased emphasis by many water agencies on water efficiency education programs, particularly relating to outdoor water use. Because of expected population growth however, water use in the county is projected to grow to over 111 million gallons per day by 2030—a 23 percent increase from current usage.

Residential water use accounted for 60.8 million gallons of water per day in 2004-05, or roughly two-thirds of the county's total. The trend of less affluent cities using less residential water per capita than more affluent communities continued during 2004-05. Although Hillsborough reduced its per capita water usage by 13.4 percent from 2003-04 (from 331.9 to 287.4 gallons per capita per day), it remained the largest per capita water user in the county. The lowest per capita user, East Palo Alto, used 44.4 gallons of water per capita per day.

Residential indoor water is most commonly used in toilets and washing machines. Therefore, to move San Mateo County to a more sustainable future, it is important to see an increased use of more water-efficient low-volume toilets and “Energy Star” clothes washers. Many water suppliers offer incentives such as in-home water audits, bathroom retrofit kits, and rebates for ultra low-flow toilets and efficient washing machines.

See appendix page 73. Researchers: Karl Lowood and Thomas Tao
SUSTAINABILITY UPDATES FROM THE CITIES AND COUNTY

Local governments play an integral role in building a sustainable future for the county. In October-November 2006, SSMC asked San Mateo County, each city in the county, and the San Mateo County Community College District to describe their progress in moving toward sustainability. SSMC specifically requested they describe their actions on three key issues: carbon emissions (which are a contributor to climate change), housing, and water. SSMC believes these three issues represent major challenges to future sustainability and was interested to learn of local efforts to address them through specific policies and programs. SSMC was also interested in local governmental efforts to educate citizens on these issues as well as in the challenges the cities and the county have encountered as they try to build more sustainable communities.

The 20 cities and the county government have each enacted policies and instituted programs in other areas to make their communities more sustainable as well. SSMC encouraged them to highlight these other actions. In the following pages are the reports from the cities and the county on their current sustainability efforts.
Atherton is a small community characterized by beautiful foliage, elegant gardens, and heritage trees. It is purely residential in nature, having no businesses within the town limits. Atherton continually strives to preserve its character as a scenic, rural area with abundant open space.

**Water Use**
New housing construction in Atherton is required to maintain all newly created runoff water onsite in detention ponds that percolate into the ground, which helps replenish the aquifers and lessen the amount of runoff to San Francisco Bay.

**Recycling**
Atherton offers free recycling of paper, cardboard, bottles, cans, and green waste, and a reduced fee for organic materials. The Town requires recycling of construction and demolition materials. These programs have resulted in a 69% diversion rate for the Town. Household battery and cell phone recycling for residents is available at Town Hall.

**Belmont**
The Belmont Community takes great pride in its scenic open space with its rugged canyons, rolling hills of oak trees, and scenic vistas. This commitment to the natural state of the land is long standing and reflected in Belmont’s land use policies. Included in that commitment are policies that seek to preserve existing trees and encourage new plantings of all forms of native flora. This mindset is in harmony with sustainability efforts that include seeking alternatives to fossil fuels, encouraging housing near shopping and public transportation, and preserving the water quality of our creeks and San Francisco Bay.

**Carbon Emissions**
Currently the City of Belmont operates four vehicles that run on compressed natural gas, a fuel that produces less carbon emissions than gasoline and diesel fuel. Two of the vehicles are street sweepers, which are in extended use everyday. The other two are a van that provides services to senior citizens and a shared vehicle used by City staff.

This past year the City of Belmont has lowered fees and streamlined the permit process for photovoltaic installations. This clean, sustainable technology reduces demand on the state’s power grid and reduces the use of fossil fuels in the creation of electricity. In addition, Belmont encourages the use of photovoltaics by providing contractors and property owners written guidelines that clarify code and submittal requirements.

Plans are currently underway for the installation of photovoltaic systems at City-owned properties including the Corporation Yard, City Hall, and the Community Center.

**Housing**
This past year the City of Belmont had the unique opportunity to create affordable housing and preserve a historical landmark in one project. As part of its downtown redevelopment plan, the City will be relocating an historic building, the Emmet House, from a busy commercial corridor to a more residential setting and converting its use from offices to low- to moderate-income units. Construction will begin in late summer 2007 and be completed by mid-2008.

Mixed-use development policies that encourage housing development near both shopping and public transportation have continued to prove effective. Belmont is fortunate to have several sites where moderate-density housing will be located within walking distance to a variety of retail businesses, San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) and Caltrain. Thirty such units are anticipated for construction in 2007-08.

**Water**
Belmont takes a proactive approach to safeguarding the water quality of our streams and the San Francisco Bay by rigorously enforcing erosion control measures for all new development and substantial additions and alterations to the existing building stock. All projects are encouraged to try and dissipate water from roofs and other improved surfaces on their site, rather than further impact the storm drain system which drains to natural waterways.

In order to ensure that best management practices (BMP) are implemented at each stage of development, preconstruction meetings are held with design and construction teams to discuss methods of controlling dust and silt runoff. During the rainy season routine inspections are performed by City staff to ensure that erosion control methods are in place. At the completion of a project onsite meetings are held to ensure that the design measures for the safeguarding of water quality have been implemented and are consistent with generally accepted post-construction BMPs.
The City of Brisbane's General Plan includes numerous policies in its open space, conservation, and land use elements that promote sustainability. A General Plan update is underway that will incorporate many new policies and programs to encourage greater energy conservation and efficiency. Sustainable programs and practices undertaken in Brisbane address a variety of issues, including open space protection, energy and water conservation, and waste reduction and recycling.

**Carbon Emissions**

The City has made significant efforts to reduce its energy use. The City has replaced office lighting at City Hall with fluorescent bulbs and ballasts, replaced old windows with double pane glass for increased insulation, and upgraded to energy saving flat panel computer monitors. Brisbane purchases recycled paper that contains as much post-consumer content as feasible. City facilities recycle mixed paper, cardboard, glass, aluminum cans, and plastic bottles. Brisbane City Hall also houses containers for citizens to drop off their old batteries, cell phones, and compact fluorescent bulbs for proper disposal.

A solar thermal supplemental heating system for Brisbane's community pool was installed in 2006. In order to encourage more residents and businesses to install photovoltaic systems, the City amended its master fee schedule. While building permit fees had previously been based on project valuation, the City now uses a flat fee for single-family residential solar installations, so that larger solar systems will not result in higher fees. Brisbane is planning to incorporate a rooftop photovoltaic system as part of a major remodel of City Hall projected for 2007.

To help reduce carbon emissions, resource consumption, and waste, the City is working on the development of a green building policy that will set sustainability standards for new construction. The program will utilize the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system for significant commercial construction and the GreenPoints rating system for large residential developments.

The City promotes public transportation by supporting a shuttle service for employees in Crocker Industrial Park. The shuttle runs between BART, Caltrain, and Brisbane’s Crocker Industrial Park office buildings during commute hours. The City Council has also encouraged greater pedestrian and bicycle access by establishing a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

The City has installed several new bike lanes this year and is in the process of applying for more funding to install others. It is also working on a safe routes to school program to encourage school kids to walk to school. The City also converted the old Crocker Park Southern Pacific Railway Right of Way to a new Crocker Park Recreational Trail geared for walkers, joggers, and bicyclists.

**Housing**

Peninsula Habitat for Humanity, in cooperation with the City of Brisbane, has begun construction of seven affordable homes for very low-income families with occupancy projected for 2007. With partial construction financing provided by the Brisbane Redevelopment Agency, the homes are being built using green building principles, and include solar photovoltaic panels integrated into the roof of each unit to generate renewable energy for the owners.

Construction also began on a 15-unit condominium that includes two affordable units, with occupancy expected in late 2007 or early 2008. A 30-unit condominium with seven affordable units was also approved.

In addition to partnering with Peninsula Habitat for Humanity and offering a First Time Homebuyer Assistance program, Brisbane has implemented inclusionary housing requirements that mandate a percentage of affordable housing units. Brisbane has also adopted zoning codes that encourage mixed-use development.

**Water**

The City is among the lowest per capita water users in San Mateo County. Brisbane has instituted a water conservation program that consists of public education efforts as well as two ordinances aimed at reducing excessive water use. A water-efficient landscaping ordinance requires large landscape plans use drought tolerant plants and water-efficient irrigation. Another ordinance prohibits water waste, such as excessive watering of impervious surfaces.

In an effort to improve the quality of water flowing into San Francisco Bay, the City has an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) policy requiring IPM plans to utilize nonpesticide alternatives when possible and, when necessary, the application of least toxic chemicals. These best practices are critical to ensuring the quality of storm water runoff into the Brisbane Lagoon and Bay. The City is also continuing its “Adopt-a-Drain” program this year with volunteers maintaining a storm drain in their neighborhoods to prevent flooding and reduce pollutant discharges.
Carbon Emissions
The City of Burlingame has implemented the following measures to reduce carbon emissions:

• The City installed energy-efficient light fixtures in its facilities to reduce the use of energy.
• The City promotes the use of bicycles as an alternative means of transportation. The City Council adopted a Bicycle Transportation Plan in 2004, containing several strategies to improve bicycle facilities and encourage the use of bicycles for transportation. Last year, the City installed bicycle route signs on all bicycle routes throughout the community. These routes direct bicycle traffic to the best available routes within Burlingame and to those connecting to adjoining communities. Next year, Burlingame proposes to provide striped bicycle lanes on streets that make up a part of the countywide north-south bicycle route, and improve routes that connect across U.S. 101 to the recreation facilities along San Francisco Bay.
• The Public Works Department has a fleet of eight vehicles, two of them hybrids.
• The City promotes public transportation by supporting a shuttle service which operates between the BART and Caltrain stations and the City’s employment centers: the Burlingame Bayfront hotels and offices and Peninsula Hospital.
• Burlingame adopted the North Burlingame/Rollins Road Specific Plan in 2004, which promotes higher-density residential development in the area of Burlingame closest to the Millbrae Intermodal BART/Caltrain station. Housing within one-third mile of this major transit hub will promote the use of BART and Caltrain as an alternate to automobile travel. As a result of the adoption of this plan, Burlingame has approved one application for a 45-unit residential condominium facility in this area, and is processing three other applications for high-density residential projects within one-half mile of the Millbrae BART/Caltrain station.

Housing
The City of Burlingame has the following policies/programs regarding housing and sustainability:

• Although the City has not adopted a formal green building policy, the City requires every construction project to recycle a minimum of 60 percent of its demolition and construction waste materials.
• The North Burlingame/Rollins Road Specific Plan promotes transit-oriented development by designating areas for higher-density residential and mixed-use projects in the area closest to the Millbrae BART station.
• Burlingame has adopted an affordable housing ordinance mandating that 10 percent of units in new developments be affordable to low-income residents with higher percentages for smaller projects (a project with four units requires at least one affordable unit, 25 percent of the project). The Planning Commission has approved three projects totaling 74 units that required a total of eight affordable units. In addition, there are four projects in process totaling 64 units, that would require seven affordable units.

Water
Burlingame has instituted the following to promote efficient water use:

• City Facilities Management is implementing retrofits of all public buildings with more efficient fixtures such as low-flow toilets for conserving water.
• Burlingame has adopted a requirement that any new development that includes more than 2,500 square feet of landscaping prepare an irrigation water management plan to promote water-efficient landscaping.

Storm Water Runoff
• Burlingame requires that all runoff from construction projects be managed to reduce the pollutants entering the storm drain system. The system drains to the San Francisco Bay.
• The City requires new storm drain systems to have filters that keep oil sediments from runoff waters that drain to the Bay; the City employs an inspector who verifies that the filters are changed on a biannual basis.
• The City requires design features in new developments such as landscaped swales to reduce pollution of runoff waters.
Colma is a greenbelt community with attractive cemeteries and agricultural fields surrounding a regionally oriented commercial core. The Town of Colma promotes sustainability within its organization, the town, and throughout the region. Sustainability related policies include requiring construction and demolition debris recycling, providing the public with information regarding recycling, promoting private and public open space opportunities, promoting a multi-modal transportation system, maintaining a rapid emergency response time, and annual funding of nonprofit organizations.

**Carbon Emissions**
The Town continues to promote alternatives to private automobile usage to reduce carbon emissions. In the past year, the Town added new sidewalks and plantings along numerous streets to create safe and attractive environments for pedestrians. These efforts will continue in 2007, with new sidewalks and bike lanes planned for Hillside Boulevard.

Several new mixed-use developments are proposed near the Colma BART/San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) station. By creating a more vibrant streetscape, the ground floor retail stores in these projects will fulfill convenience shopping needs and encourage walking. The residents of these developments will have convenient access to the regional transit network, allowing them to reach destinations outside of Colma without using their car. By driving less, households in these developments can significantly lower their individual carbon emissions.

The Town is collaborating with SamTrans, as well as other county jurisdictions and interest groups on the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI). The vision of the GBI is to transform El Camino Real into an attractive, walkable environment that accommodates all modes of transportation. While the GBI is a work-in-progress, the Town expects to implement this vision through the use of high-quality building design, additional street trees, attractive public spaces, and effective integration of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit amenities along El Camino Real. Collectively, these efforts will provide the Town with a mix of transportation choices that can help reduce carbon emissions.

**Housing**
The Town owns 19 housing units that are rented to very low- and low-income households at below market rate rents. The Town's affordable housing stock is expected to increase in the coming years through the Town's new Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Implemented in 2006, the ordinance requires that 20 percent of the units in new residential developments be affordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households. In addition to increasing the supply of affordable housing, inclusionary zoning disperses affordable housing throughout the growth areas of a region. This strategy avoids concentrating all affordable housing in a few areas, and enables lower paid workers to find housing close to employment centers. It also enables low- and moderate-income families to live in homes indistinguishable from, and adjacent to, market rate housing, with access to quality recreation and educational opportunities.

**Water**
From 2001 through Nov 2006, Colma used the following amounts of water in the City facilities and parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Water Used (Galons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8,581,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6,203,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9,685,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11,066,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9,353,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 (through Nov)</td>
<td>7,103,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,994,976</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainable Design, Green Buildings, and Recycling**
The Town's General Plan is being updated and will feature a Community Identity Element that will incorporate walkability and livability into new public and private development through policies shaping streetscape and building design. The Town is developing a green building ordinance requiring the use of green building design in capital improvement projects to reduce pollution, use of natural resources, energy, and operating costs, while enhancing asset value, optimizing building performance, and creating healthier workplaces for Town employees. Green building design has the potential to reduce operating costs associated with heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC); lighting systems; water consumption; stormwater management; solid waste; and recycling management.

The Town requires contractors proposing to demolish or renovate a building to maximize the reuse or recycling of all salvageable and recyclable materials. This minimizes the amount of construction debris directed to landfills, and reduces the energy and resource consumption that results from the manufacture of replacement materials. The Town educates residents on the importance of recycling, including the unique disposal issues associated with electronic waste. On average, Colma residents divert around half of their household waste to recycling rather than sending it to a landfill (47 percent for the year 2006).

Numerous beautification projects are underway to add landscaping to medians and sides of streets. These efforts create areas where stormwater runoff can percolate into the ground and irrigate plants, rather than being directed toward storm drains. The landscaping helps filter oils, motor fuel, and other pollutants that are often found in stormwater runoff.
Known as the “Gateway to the Peninsula,” Daly City has the largest population of all cities in San Mateo County. Located at the northernmost edge of the county adjacent to San Francisco County, it has become a regional hub for retail, health care, and small business. Following are some ways the City is moving toward sustainability.

**Carbon Emissions**
Daly City is a member of the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance, a joint powers authority formed to address regional transportation issues. Daly City, in conjunction with Seton Medical Center, provides a free shuttle from the Daly City BART station to the Civic Center and Seton. The Top of the Hill Mission Street Muni stop is the most frequently boarded bus stop west of the Mississippi River. In addition to its fixed-route service, the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) also operates a free shuttle service in the Bayshore neighborhood of Daly City.

Daly City purchases Energy Star certified products whenever possible and includes energy conservation measures in its building specifications. Where practical the City has retrofitted buildings such as City Hall with energy-efficient lighting and heating systems.

**Housing**
Daly City maintains inclusionary housing requirements mandating 15 percent of new housing construction in its two redevelopment areas be affordable to low-income residents. The City utilizes a variety of funding sources to subsidize the development of affordable housing. The City works with affordable housing developers to ensure that its scarce housing funds are used as effectively as possible. The City conducts at least two public hearings each year to obtain citizen comment on community development needs, the City's funding plan, and community development accomplishments.

Of all the sustainability initiatives in the community, the City is most proud of the development of the Habitat for Humanity housing units on Third Avenue. Seven families, composed of 35 family members, have become first-time homeowners at 173 Third Avenue, formerly a flower nursery. The development consists of two- and three-bedroom townhouses, including one unit that is completely accessible to persons with disabilities. The City of Daly City provided $1,040,076 in subsidy financing for Habitat Way.

**Water**
Beginning in August 2004, Daly City has delivered tertiary recycled water to the Olympic Club, the Lake Merced Golf Club, the San Francisco Golf Club, and landscaped median islands along John Daly Boulevard. Since the inception of the program through September 2006, a total of 349.3 million gallons (1,072 acre feet) of recycled water has been delivered.

Daly City has been an ongoing participant in conjunctive water use in northern San Mateo County with San Bruno and the California Water Service. More than four billion gallons (more than 12,275 acre feet) of water have been stored within the Westside Basin Groundwater Aquifer between 2002 and 2005. This storage has resulted from using available surplus surface water off the Hetch Hetchy and local reservoir system in lieu of groundwater pumping. The additional water stored provides water for use in a future drought or water emergency.

Through 2005-06, 1,307 rebates for water-saving washing machines have been provided to Daly City residents. Each account that received a rebate saves roughly 968 gallons of water per month (totaling 46.6 acre feet per year for all accounts).


Reportable sanitary sewer overflows in the past five years: one in 2001-02, zero in 2002-03, zero in 2003-04, one in 2004-05, and three in 2005-06. (Note that reporting standards for overflows decreased as of December 1, 2004 from 1,000 gallons or more to 100 gallons or more.)

**Other**
Daly City employs a pay-as-you-throw variable rate for solid waste collection. This incentive-based system encourages customers to recycle more and discard less into the waste stream. The majority of households in Daly City choose a 32-gallon container (or smaller) for weekly collection. Daly City has a per capita disposal rate of less than two pounds per day, among the lowest of comparably-sized cities in California.

Daly City offers both a residential and commercial curbside recycling program for the collection of mixed paper, metals, glass, and plastic. Additionally, a biweekly curbside yard waste recycling program is available for residential and commercial customers.
Sustainability efforts in East Palo Alto began in 1916 when Charles Weeks founded Runnymede, a utopian agricultural colony of independently-owned farms whose owners could become economically self-sufficient through the poultry, eggs, and vegetables produced on their one-acre plots. Today, while few signs of the City’s agricultural past remain, East Palo Alto is making progress towards sustainability through a variety of efforts.

**Carbon Emissions and Energy Use**

In 2001, East Palo Alto completed an urban design plan for the City’s northeastern industrial area, known as the Ravenswood Business District. This plan aims to create a pedestrian friendly, dense, efficient, and livable mixed-use district that incorporates energy-efficient and sustainable building design and is sensitive to the character of the City and the adjacent San Francisco Bay. As part of the plan, the City will soon begin constructing improvements to Bay Road, the main east-west thoroughfare in the City. The improvements will create a transit and pedestrian friendly boulevard with enhanced bus stops that will reduce transportation energy use. Over the past few years, the City’s Redevelopment Agency has been working to encourage transit-oriented and mixed-use development consistent with the urban design plan. The Agency is also considering policies to encourage or require sustainable building practices in redevelopment projects.

East Palo Alto operates free shuttle programs for residents to meet critical transportation needs and reduce reliance on single occupant vehicles. The City’s community shuttle connects residents to Caltrain and San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) routes, the City’s youth shuttle provides access to jobs for local youth, and the City’s senior shuttles transport seniors to programs, services, and medical appointments. In 2007, the City will implement a pilot transit pass subsidy program for low-income bus riders.

**Housing**

The City of East Palo Alto is strongly committed to providing quality affordable housing for residents. The City’s Below Market Rate ordinance requires that 20 percent of new residential units be affordable to low-income residents. The City’s Rent Stabilization Ordinance limits increases in rent at 2,588 rental units and provides education and mediation for landlords and tenants.

The City is a partner in the Courtyard at Bay Road, a 77-unit, 100 percent affordable housing complex that opened in April 2006. A rooftop solar photovoltaic system powers a portion of the complex. The City also loaned the East Palo Alto Community Alliance Neighborhood Development Organization (EPA CAN DO) $1.2 million for Nugent Square, a 32-unit, 100 percent affordable housing development that opened in January 2005. In addition, the City is home to California’s first Department of Energy-certified Zero Energy Home development—the Shorebreeze Envirohomes. This 40-unit single-family development was completed in 2003 and incorporates solar electric power, tankless water heaters, and sustainable building materials.

In January 2007, East Palo Alto’s first Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building—the new East Palo Alto YMCA—opened to the public. This state-of-the-art 32,000 square foot green building uses 30 percent less energy than state standards and incorporates sustainable building materials, low volatile organic compound coatings, and water conservation measures.

**Local Hiring and Purchasing**

The City’s First Source Hiring and Local Business Enterprise ordinance applies to developers, new businesses, and construction contractors. It establishes a goal that 30 percent of new jobs created be filled with City residents and encourages new developments to purchase goods and services from East Palo Alto businesses. The City works with Opportunities Industrialization Center West, the local job training center, to provide training and hold job fairs for local residents.

**Open Space and Trees**

East Palo Alto has a severe lack of parks and open space. To address this, the City adopted a Park-in-Lieu Ordinance. It requires housing developers of more than five units to either provide park space based on a formula of three acres per 1,000 residents or pay an in-lieu fee that the City can use to purchase or refurbish parks and open spaces. The City is developing a Bay Access Plan to increase recreational access to the San Francisco Bay and San Francisquito Creek for East Palo Alto residents and workers. The Redevelopment Agency acquired a contaminated rail spur that will be cleaned up and converted into public open space as part of two new residential development projects adjacent to the spur. The City is also moving forward with plans to develop a nature center and recreational resource at Cooley Landing, a former county landfill on the Bay. In addition, the City of East Palo Alto and Canopy, a Palo Alto based nonprofit, launched the East Palo Alto Tree Initiative in 2006 to plant nearly 1,000 trees in East Palo Alto by 2010. The first set of trees was recently planted along freeway soundwalls. These trees are intended to reduce energy use, improve air quality, provide shade, and enhance the sense of community.

**Waste Management and Recycling**

In 2004, 84 percent of solid waste generated in East Palo Alto was diverted from landfills through recycling and reuse efforts. This was achieved in part through implementation of the City’s construction and demolition debris ordinance. In addition, the City’s Corporation Yard helps conserve resources by accepting appliances, furniture, tires, used motor oil, yard waste, scrap metals, and universal wastes for recycling/reuse. Increased public awareness about the Corporation Yard’s services helped reduce illegal dumping in the City in recent years. The City also partnered with Allied Waste to provide free compost for City residents.

**Crime Reduction**

In 2006, the City made crime reduction a top priority because of the increase in homicides and other crimes that occurred in 2005. Through community involvement, collaboration with outside agencies, and City leadership, homicides were reduced by 60 percent and overall crime was down 11 percent in 2006.
Carbon Emissions
Foster City encourages residents and workers in Foster City to reduce the number of single-rider trips they make. As a member of the Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance, the City works with employers to ensure that trip-reducing alternatives are available, introduced to employees, and publicized on a regular basis. Specifically, Foster City sponsors a number of initiatives to encourage alternate transit strategies:

Shuttle services:
- Provides partial funding (with the remaining costs grant-funded) for the Connections Shuttle, an in-town shuttle service that is free to Foster City residents and employees of local businesses. This shuttle provides connections to recreational activities and to other regional mass transit alternatives.
- Promotes the AC Transit transbay bus service.
- Promotes employer-operated shuttles to and from the San Mateo Caltrain Station and the Millbrae Intermodal Station from three areas of town: Lincoln Centre, North Foster City, and Mariners Island.
- Operates a Senior Express Shuttle to transport groups of Foster City residents age 55 and older to events and activities in the region.

Bicycle alternatives:
- Requires that bicycle racks be installed at all new commercial/office developments in town. Bicycle racks are also on all shuttles.
- Maintains a bicycle/pedestrian path along the bayline—a leg of the Bay Trail that connects with trails maintained in neighboring cities and allows for easy commute between Foster City and a number of Peninsula cities.

Alternative fuel vehicles:
- The City currently has three hybrid vehicles in its fleet and has plans to increase the percentage of hybrids in the fleet as traditional vehicles are replaced.

Foster City’s other carbon-reducing policies have included:
- Converted all traffic and pedestrian signals to light-emitting diodes (LED’s); these lights use about 20 percent of the electricity of the older, halogen lights. Also, because they last much longer, they are cheaper to maintain.
- Installed 25 fully-actuated traffic signals to maximize traffic flow and minimize idling at intersections.
- Adopted regulations for wood burning appliances and materials.

Housing
Foster City’s Housing Element was approved by the State of California in 2002. In the approval letter, the state commended the City for “developing housing and land use strategies that maximize limited land resources to address projected housing needs and promote vital, livable neighborhoods.” Specifically, policies include the following to address the City’s housing needs:
- Requires all housing developers to have at least 20 percent of the units in their plans be affordable to low-income residents. Of the approximately 12,500 residential units, 295 are available to those that meet reduced income criteria.
- As a master-planned community, Foster City’s founders planned for a variety of housing types, including multi-family townhouse, condominium, duplex, and apartment developments. A little over one-third of the residential units are single-family homes on generally small lots. Foster City also allows second units, which tend to be smaller, and therefore more affordable than larger-sized units.
- Offers first-time homebuyer/second mortgage program to assist buyers to get a start in the housing market.

Water Conservation
Foster City’s Parks Department is on the cutting edge of water conservation and has implemented the following water conservation practices in order to keep water usage down in City parks:
- Matched precipitation rated sprinkler heads to ensure that water is applied evenly over entire field areas, no matter what shape they are.
- Mulches all ground cover areas with fir bark to keep soil temperatures lower and to lower the evaporation rate.
- Controls all park sprinkler systems from a main computer so that irrigation can be constantly changed according to current weather conditions. Evolution controllers, which shut the system down if a water line leak is detected, are used in some parks. Sprinkler systems in some parks are equipped with rain sensors so they shut down automatically if the weather is wet.
- Generally selects drought tolerant plant materials for planting in City parks.
- Installed artificial “turf grass” in selected park locations; artificial turf requires less water and no fertilizers. Also, as it highly resistant to damage, youth sport teams can use the fields after storms.
- Funds Energy Star washing machine and low-flow toilet rebates.

Other
Foster City continues to look for ways to be sustainable through a number of methods and programs:
- Installed 2,100 high-efficiency, high-density pressure vapor street lights.
- With Audubon Society, created new seasonal wetlands for bird habitat as part of lagoon dredging project.
- Passed an ordinance requiring a minimum of 50 percent of the debris generated from certain construction and demolition projects be diverted from landfills to recycling facilities.
- Promotes residential and commercial recycling efforts. Foster City increased its solid waste diversion rate by five percent from 2004 to over 8,300 tons in 2005. Although final numbers have not been calculated, indicators in 2006 point to additional improvements in diversion rates for that year.
- Implemented integrated pesticide management program for all parks and grounds maintenance.
- Rehabilitated contaminated gas station and cleaners sites as part of shopping center redevelopment projects.
HALF MOON BAY

Carbon Emissions
The City aggressively seeks grants for trails to accommodate pedestrians, bicycles, and horses. The City’s master plan trail system interconnects parks, schools downtown businesses, shopping centers, and other major employers. The City has had recent success in obtaining funding from local (Transportation Development Act Article Three funds) and state (River Parkways Grants Program, Coastal Conservancy grants) sources.

The City is seeking possible grants to purchase alternative fuel or hybrid vehicles.

The City has noticed more interest and use of solar panels for energy in homes and businesses. The City recently supported a solar energy exposition and home tour within the City.

Housing
Half Moon Bay encourages green design but has no specific requirements. There have been two recent building permits for green design homes in Half Moon Bay. Cost and architectural familiarity seem to be obstacles to the use of green building design. The City has at the front counter for public use and information the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide for anyone to use in designing their home or building.

Water and Wastewater
Half Moon Bay has neither a municipal water supply nor municipal sewer treatment facility. The City’s water is supplied through Coastside County Water District and its sewage is treated in a Joint Power Authority sewage treatment plant. The City encourages drought tolerant landscaping that uses little potable water. The City requires projects to utilize National Pollution Discharge Elimination System best management practices for maintaining storm runoff waters. These can maximize onsite storm water management through landscaping and permeable pavement. This has led to the use of natural bioswales (vegetated swales) to direct storm runoff waters through a site, permeable pavement on driveways, and other practices.

The Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside treatment plant is currently researching the possibility of providing treated sewage water for agricultural, municipal park, or golf course landscaping purposes. In the election of November 2005, the citizens of Half Moon Bay approved passage of Measure P, which promoted and supported the use of recycled water wherever possible and feasible.

Other
The City’s Solid Waste and Recycling franchise agreement includes a recent provision for the waste hauler to pick up recyclables on a weekly basis as opposed to the more common practice of every other week on the Peninsula.

The City’s Public Works Department includes as much as practicable and feasible the reuse of materials in its public works construction project specifications. For example, the City includes in its contracts the reuse of asphalt concrete roadway surfaces by requiring the contractor to grind up the material to be used as base material with new asphalt concrete placed on top.

HILLSBOROUGH

Hillsborough’s origins date back to the mid-1800’s. When Hillsborough was incorporated in 1910 the population was approximately 750 residents. Today, Hillsborough is home to over 11,000 people. In addition to its park-like setting and quiet atmosphere, people are attracted to Hillsborough for its excellent public schools; outstanding police, fire, and emergency services; and strong sense of community.

Hillsborough strives to maintain the standard of quality, rustic character, and rural charm that are its hallmark. Residents are dedicated to preserving the history, natural beauty, architectural heritage, and small town atmosphere that make up the essential character of the Town. Despite its small size, Hillsborough has made many positive strides toward sustainability and can report many successes, some of which are highlighted below.

Carbon Emissions
The Town participated in the Association of Bay Area Governments’ Local Government Energy Program in which the Public Works facilities, pumps, Town Hall, and the Fire and Police Stations were evaluated. The evaluation found that the Town’s facilities use 386,754 kWh of electricity and 9,275 therms of gas annually. The evaluation concluded that the Town did well when compared with other benchmark cities and provided suggestions for additional conservation.

All Town buildings use low-energy light bulbs and have energy-efficient water heaters. The Town’s water and sewer pumps have been tested for efficiency and the least efficient are scheduled to be upgraded. Timers are used for heating and cooling systems and motion sensors are used where feasible for lights. The Town plans to consider a fireplace ordinance and will be evaluating sustainable programs for public works, including pavement recycling.

In July 2006, the City Council passed an ordinance that eliminates constraints to the installation of solar panels. Requirements for design review were eliminated and applications are fast-tracked to help residents qualify for rebates. An article was published in the Hillsborough quarterly Town Newsletter explaining the benefits of, and process for, using solar energy systems. The use of solar panels was evaluated for the Corporation Yard and Fire Stations and, although at this time the option is not cost effective, the concept will be periodically reevaluated.

The steep hills in Hillsborough tend to be a detriment to the use of some alternative energy vehicles. Many roads are too steep for bicycles and for electric vehicles. In fact, the Town purchased some electric vehicles as an alternative to gas powered city pool vehicles but the terrain proved to be too much for them, and they had to be returned. All Town vehicles are kept in good working order and on a regular maintenance schedule to prevent excessive emissions. Most were purchased after 1995 and have lower emission engines. For future purchases, the Town will consider hybrids and more efficient diesels, including biodiesels.
**Housing**

Although Hillsborough is generally comprised of large estate homes on large lots, the Town strives to ensure housing opportunities for all residents. In June of 2002, the City Council adopted a Housing Element to the General Plan that encourages creative approaches to addressing the community’s housing needs. One of the policies encourages the development of second units; to date over 60 have been approved. The policy’s primary purpose is to allow elderly residents who wish a smaller home to remain in Hillsborough.

In addition, Hillsborough has been a leader in developing creative regional approaches to addressing the housing need. The Town’s Mayor plays a key role in the San Mateo County Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) and Hillsborough was the first agency to join the countywide subregion for the purposes of developing the regional housing needs allocation for the next Housing Element cycle.

The General Plan has a policy to encourage public and private development within the Town to use green building methods and practices as outlined in the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide. The San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Checklist is provided to building permit applicants providing information on green building methods and staff attends meetings of the RecycleWorks Countywide Green Building Committee to keep up to date on the latest ideas and methods. An article, “It’s Easy Being Green” was published in the quarterly Town Newsletter to help expose citizens to the concepts of green building methods. Two of the houses approved this year in Hillsborough classify as green buildings and new facilities of a private school currently under construction reflect state-of-the-art green building techniques.

**Water**

A citizen’s Water Conservation Committee developed a special water conservation ordinance that was adopted by the City Council. Chapter 13.16 of the Municipal Code encourages voluntary water conservation strategies, promotes conservation by specifying a tiered system for water billing, and provides incentives for those who conserve. The Municipal Code limits the amount of hard landscape and high-water use plant materials that can be included in a landscape plan in Hillsborough. Hardscape refers to a building’s grounds consisting of structures, such as patios and walkways, made with hard materials. In addition, a water conservation demonstration garden at Town Hall is available as a resource to homeowners in planning their garden designs. Hillsborough has an active Garden Club that promotes water conservation measures.

**Carbon Emissions**

The City of Menlo Park has pursued the following strategies and programs to reduce carbon emissions:

- Implementation of the Comprehensive Bicycle Development Plan: The plan creates a comprehensive Citywide vision for traffic and transportation facilities for bicyclists. With input from diverse stakeholders, the goal is to make bike travel safer, more feasible, and more attractive to school children, commuters, shoppers, and recreational riders.

  The City also provides material and staff support for the Bike to Work Day event which attracts new bicyclists every year and acknowledges the efforts of those who make bicycling to work an everyday commute choice. Rain is the only unpredictable factor that significantly reduces the number of participants.

- Operation of free shuttles: Caltrain Shuttle Service, Midday Shuttle Service, and Shopper’s Shuttle Service. The Midday and Shopper’s Shuttle are made possible with funds from the City and County Association of Governments, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s Transportation Fund for Clean Air, and the City of Menlo Park. By providing these services to employees, residents, and visitors, we have reduced the number of single-occupant vehicles on the roads and in turn reduced air pollution.

  There are a number of challenges when managing and coordinating shuttle programs. They include funding issues, driver turnover, driver training, accurate data collection, train schedule changes, school schedule changes, and marketing costs.

- Energy conservation programs: In recent years a significant percentage of funding for building maintenance and upgrades has been allocated for energy conservation in the 19 municipal buildings the City owns and occupies. Examples of projects include retrofitting heating and air conditioning systems; including solar hot water system on a new municipal pool; adding insulation to buildings; installing energy-efficient lighting; installing “cool” roofing materials; and replacing windows. The City is currently evaluating the potential of adding a photovoltaic power system to its maintenance facility.

- Water conservation programs: Programs aimed at conserving water also save energy when they reduce the use of hot water.

---

**Menlo Park**

Hillsborough contracts with the cities of Burlingame and San Mateo for wastewater treatment.
Two specific programs have been implemented—a residential clothes washer rebate program and a commercial spray-valve installation program targeted at restaurants.

The City owns and operates one compressed natural gas (CNG) powered forklift at its corporation yard and owns three pickup trucks that can use CNG.

The City has decreased its use of natural gas and electricity in its plants and facilities over the past five years; use of natural gas has declined primarily because of the closure of Burgess Pool for construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Natural Gas (therms)</th>
<th>Natural Gas ($)</th>
<th>Electricity (kWh)</th>
<th>Electricity ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>153,129</td>
<td>$47,877</td>
<td>4,066,572</td>
<td>$547,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>121,580</td>
<td>$92,114</td>
<td>4,053,865</td>
<td>$591,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>114,805</td>
<td>$101,084</td>
<td>4,173,990</td>
<td>$593,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>73,678</td>
<td>$74,118</td>
<td>3,728,174</td>
<td>$480,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>72,081</td>
<td>$94,303</td>
<td>3,807,991</td>
<td>$495,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

The City's General Plan includes goals, policies, and implementation strategies that encourage a diversity of housing types and densities for all economic segments and geographical areas of the community. Specifically, residential uses are encouraged in mixed-use developments and in developments in close proximity to the commercial areas of downtown. The City has updated both its General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to support transit-oriented development (TOD) by allowing for residential densities of up to 40 dwelling units per acre in the downtown area, along El Camino Real, and in close proximity to public transit stations and major transportation corridors in the City.

To date, the City has approved one residential project under the higher-density land use designation. Two additional mixed-use projects with a total of approximately 300 one- and two-bedroom units in close proximity to the Caltrain station are currently pending approval. Similarly, the City has embarked on a major TOD land use study for an area that would surround a proposed new Caltrain station related to the reactivation of the Dumbarton rail line from Union City to Redwood City. The study is intended to result in a Specific Plan that would enable development of the area with high-density housing and compatible commercial uses.

The City also sponsors an active Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program that creates affordable ownership and rental housing units. The program was initiated in 1986 and requires both the inclusion of BMR units in residential projects of five or more units and the payment of in-lieu fees by commercial development. The past year has seen a dramatic increase in the number of BMR units, going from 28 units to 68 units currently under construction or approved, and an additional 44 units pending approval. Additionally, some of the newer units will be serving smaller households of one and two persons and the rental market—segments of the population not previously served by the program. In-lieu fees paid by commercial development have resulted in a BMR Fund of approximately $4.5 million, with additional payments of approximately $3 million expected in the coming year. The BMR Fund provides opportunities for the City to provide a first-time homebuyer loan program and pursue other affordable housing projects.

In addition to the BMR program, the City's Redevelopment Agency invests more than the minimum 20 percent tax increment set-aside required for housing, partially funding the City's rehabilitation and emergency-repair loan programs.

In the past year, the City's Redevelopment Agency successfully partnered with a private developer to obtain land use entitlements and begin construction of the first green building zero-energy housing project in the City. The development will provide 47 new housing units in a small-lot configuration with a one-acre public park. All 47 homes incorporate sustainable, environmentally-friendly, and energy-efficient systems and materials, including components such as solar electric home power systems, energy-efficient windows, water-conserving features, high-efficiency furnaces, radiant roof-barrier sheathing, tankless water heaters, and engineered wood construction. Additionally, 20 of the units are part of the City's BMR program.

The City provides the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Checklist and other green building guides as resources to homeowners and the development community at City Hall's public counter and through the Community Development Department. The City reviews approximately 20 new single-family residences annually. In the past year, three new residences included green building materials. Additionally, the public lobby of City Hall houses a large display on green building practices that includes samples of building materials.

**Water**

The following water conservation programs have been initiated for the coming year:

- Residential Clothes Washer Rebate Program.
- Commercial Spray Valve Installation Program.
- Water Wise Kits for Schools.
- High Efficiency Urinal/Toilet Replacement Program.
- GardenSoft CD Project: A CD for landscapers on water-efficient plants for the Bay Area is being produced and will be distributed free of charge.

For FY 2005-06, approximately $26,000 was spent on these programs. For FY 2006-07, the City is allocating approximately $62,000 to conserving water in the Menlo Park Municipal Water District. Since water rates will be increasing, it makes economic sense for water districts to invest in water conservation. As with all municipal services, however, it is challenging to expand activities when budgets are constrained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Hundred cubic feet (CCF)</th>
<th>Gallons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>55,529</td>
<td>413,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>59,310</td>
<td>443,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>64,078</td>
<td>479,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>53,681</td>
<td>401,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>58,458</td>
<td>437,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Millbrae has undertaken a number of actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, encourage environmentally-friendly and affordable housing, and promote water conservation. The City will evaluate further strategies through its new Sustainable Millbrae Program. The program aims to improve the health of residents and municipal employees, preserve the environment and property values, save money, and enhance the quality of life and community partnerships.

**Carbon Emissions**
In November 2006, Millbrae completed a first-of-its-kind cogeneration and grease receiving facility at its wastewater treatment plant that will reduce carbon dioxide emissions by roughly 1,178,000 pounds annually, equivalent to planting 166 acres of trees or 116 cars not driven for a year. This cutting-edge project uses inedible waste kitchen grease to produce electricity that will help power the plant. It will produce 1,700,000 kilowatt hours (kWh) each year from a renewable resource, increasing the amount of “green power” generated by the facility's cogeneration plant by 40 percent and saving about $112,000 annually.

In 2001, the City transitioned to energy-conserving light-emitting diode (LED) technology for its traffic signals and energy-efficient lights at City facilities. A Facility Assessment Report and an Energy Efficiency Study for the Community Center were developed to help further reduce energy use at City facilities. In 2006, staff contracted with Right Lights to ensure the City uses the most advanced and energy-efficient technology where the lights are brightest. The City also planted more than 300 trees along parts of El Camino Real and side streets to help offset carbon emissions.

City staff is working with the Association of Bay Area Governments’ Local Government Energy Watch Program and Pacific Gas and Electric to identify other energy conservation programs and opportunities for the City, residents, and businesses. From November 2003 through October 2004, City facilities used 1,699,902 kWh of electricity and 20,465 therms of natural gas (includes the library and excludes the wastewater treatment plant and fire station #38).

The City educates staff and the community about Spare the Air days by posting signs at City facilities, preparing educational displays for City Hall, and e-mailing alerts to staff. In 1997 it began purchasing compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles to reduce tailpipe emissions. Currently 45 percent of its fleet consists of CNG vehicles. The City was able to defray part of the cost via funding from the Vehicle Incentive Program through the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The City's General Plan and the Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan promote the development of high-density housing and jobs near transit, thereby encouraging residents to reduce vehicle-related carbon emissions.

**Housing**
As previously mentioned, Millbrae's General Plan and the Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan encourage the development of high-density housing and jobs around transit to conserve resources and reduce auto use. The City has 365 residential units approved or under construction within one mile of the new BART-Caltrain Station. The Specific Plan allows developers to reduce required parking by 20 percent within 800 feet of the station. The Station Plan requires developers to contribute significant fees to improve transit and pedestrian facilities.

For the past 20 years the City has worked to improve the pedestrian quality of the downtown and access to public transit. The City is currently designing two pedestrian crossings along El Camino Real to promote access to transit. The City and Redevelopment Agency are working with San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) and 19 other agencies to improve the viability of El Camino Real as a pedestrian corridor via the Grand Boulevard Initiative. The City is currently writing its first Bicycle Transportation Plan, and has already built a significant system of bicycle trails. A crucial element—the crossing of US 101 on Millbrae Avenue—is in design.

The City Redevelopment Agency's Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund provides funds to meet the state requirement that 15 percent of residential units within a Redevelopment Area be affordable to low- and moderate-income households. The Agency makes non-amortizing second mortgages to School District employees who purchase homes in the City. The agency also has negotiated options to buy 10 percent of all the new housing built in the project area, for resale to low- and moderate-income buyers. Developers must pay $125,000 for very low-income units, which the agency uses to provide housing in other parts of the City. It also supports the Human Investment Project, a home-sharing program. The agency is preparing to work with a nonprofit organization to buy rental property to provide long-term housing to low-income residents.

The City's Conditions of Approval for construction and demolition (C&D) projects require waste to be cut in half or more. It distributes the Conditions and C&D guides to building applicants and contractors and the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide to interested applicants. Recycling Program staff works with Planning and Building staff and sits on the Staff Review Board to provide input on projects. The City encourages applicants to incorporate green building principles into their projects. In June 2006, the County's RecycleWorks staff held a green building presentation for Community Development and other City staff.

The City Council and Planning Commission attempt to ensure that modern green techniques are used to the greatest extent possible. This led to the inclusion of many green features in the construction of the new Millbrae Library. While the City has not yet adopted a green building program, there is keen interest in doing so, and first steps have been taken toward establishing a policy. Through its Sustainable Millbrae Program it will evaluate additional means to promote green building.

**Water**
The City's Water Resources and Conservation Program helps residents reduce water use through education and incentives, including distributing Lawn Watering Guides, sprinkler gauges, and toilet leak dye tablets; holding workshops on water-wise landscaping; issuing low-flow toilet rebates; and facilitating water awareness activities among students. The City also uses recycled water to irrigate the 101-Millbrae interchange.

The City follows the County's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP) C3 provisions for development projects to reduce storm drain runoff. New development projects must comply with the STOPPPP Better Management Practices.
Pacifica is a small coastal community of 40,000 people located 15 miles south of San Francisco. It is an area rich in open space, parklands, beach access, and hiking trails. The City has approved policies for sustainability that include alternative energy production, water recycling, and solid waste recycling.

Carbon Emissions and Water
The City has undertaken several projects to generate energy locally and to provide citizens with transportation alternatives to their automobiles.

- The construction of a photovoltaic power generation system for the wastewater treatment plant has a peak generating power capacity of 350 kilowatt.
- An innovative recycling plant generates up to three million gallons of tertiary recycled wastewater treated to near drinking water standards. The water is currently being used in wetland restoration.
- Through grant funding and collaboration with the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance, Pacifica started a local ‘Goldline’ shuttle as a pilot program to offset congestion and to encourage local merchant patronage.

Land Use/Habitat Protection
The City adopted a no litter/smoking ordinance for City beaches in an effort to preserve sensitive ecosystems, wildlife, and reduce pollution of sands, wetlands, and water.

Since the Helen Putnam Award for the Pacifica State Beach Improvement Project was awarded in 2005, beach usage is at an all-time high, the restored wetlands are drawing more than 75 bird species, the trout are spawning in the lower streams, and the local merchants are enjoying the increased vitality of the Linda Mar Beach area.

The excavation and planting near the San Pedro Creek mouth, planting in and around Linda Mar Pump Station, and the wetland at the new Skate Park were completed. Well organized community groups sponsor ongoing beach cleanups for the community as well as native plantings.

The City has developed major links to its ‘hiking and biking’ trails along the Coast and Highway One corridor in an ongoing expansion project to provide opportunities for nonpolluting travel. Goals include increased tourism and community enjoyment of open space. The trails are listed in the Coastal Conservancy’s ‘Wheelchair Riders’ guide.

Health & Safety
The City of Pacifica continues to maintain public awareness as a top priority in disaster preparedness. The emergency management staff and the Disaster Preparedness and Safety Commission recently held a disaster preparedness fair, which was attended by over 500 citizens. The City continues to hold annual disaster exercises for staff. Most recently, a pandemic flu exercise was held for City staff and department heads. During the month of November, the City also participated in the statewide Golden Guardian exercise.

The City Council approved the Public Works project for a Citywide tree survey and Citywide landscape plan. These surveys will assist staff prioritize work and identify hazardous tree situations as a part of the new tree program.

Partnership for a Safe and Healthy Pacifica, a grass-roots group, garnered a $500,000 grant for work on alcohol awareness/prevention for teens, and in collaboration with the City, implemented a Responsible Merchant Award for the prevention of alcohol sales to underaged youth. The Partnership is working with Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Department (PB&R) to provide more activities for teens.

Pacifica has a well-developed Meals on Wheels program and an information and referral program for at-risk seniors and people with disabilities.

Civic Participation/Culture
The PB&R is committed to serving the community by providing a wide variety of recreational programs and services for all ages, utilizing facilities, parks, and beaches. A well-developed aquatics program provides a year-long indoor swim program and sponsors swim meets, bringing many people into the community.

Pacifica Center for the Arts houses artist studios, two galleries, the Performing Arts center featuring renowned artists, and a digital photography studio. Spindrift Players Theater group provides play productions and hosts a school for performing arts for youth.

The newly renovated Pacifica State Beach/Linda Mar hosts a variety of surfing events and is used all year round. Adjacent to the beach is a Class 10 Skate Park which made its debut with a grand opening this year, bringing people from all over the globe into the City.

Child Care
The City maintains a growing, grant-funded childcare program serving over 320 families, accommodating over 160 subsidized families, helping them stay in the area. In addition to these school-site programs, two state preschool programs are in operation with the opening of a new free or reduced-fee all-day preschool program at a City facility.

Celebrating Our Cities

The City of Pacifica's Calera Creek Water Recycling Plant, a SSMC 2000 Award Winner. Photo Courtesy of the City of Pacifica.
Carbon Emissions
On September 13, 2006 the Portola Valley Town Council authorized the Mayor to sign the U.S. Mayors’ Climate Protection Agreement, pledging to reduce the Town’s emissions of greenhouse gases to at least seven percent below 1990 levels by the year 2012. To reach that goal, the Climate Protection Task Force was formed in early October. Based on models from other cities the task force formed three subcommittees: Metrics, Building Performance and Energy Efficiency, and Education. The purpose of the committees will be to formulate lines of inquiry and goals and to craft a work plan and timetable for accomplishing those goals. The task force will submit recommendations to the Town Council in the spring of 2007. To assist this effort, the Town has joined Sustainable Silicon Valley and ICLEI–Local Governments for Sustainability.

The task force will recommend target greenhouse gas reductions, investigate historic aggregate residential energy consumption in Town, determine baseline emissions and target levels, look into next generation incentives for green design on residential building projects and retrofits, investigate changes in design regulations, institutionalize Bike to School days, support student projects, and establish school climate clubs.

Housing
In March 2004, a presentation was made to the Town Council, Planning Commission, and Architectural & Site Control Commission (ASCC) on the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide. The information provided was to encourage a discussion with the Council, Commissions, and staff regarding the adoption of an ordinance or policy at the Town level to encourage green building practices in the design of private, commercial, and municipal buildings.

As a result of this meeting, staff has provided architects and homeowners with copies of the Guide and the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Checklist for their review and use. Staff requests that the architects and homeowners use the guidelines and complete the checklist as part of the submittal on applications that require ASCC and Planning Commission review. This has been a submittal requirement since June 2004.

Carbon Emissions
Alternative Transportation Program
Redwood City’s Alternative Transportation Committee offers incentives to encourage employee use of transportation other than driving alone. For example, a City employee may buy up to six Commuter Checks, each with a face value of $20, for $10 each, and use them to buy passes or tickets for any of the Bay Area Transit agencies, effectively cutting in half the cost of using public transit by City employees.

As a further incentive, for every 20 times a City employee uses alternative transportation, he or she can purchase a $20 grocery gift card for half price. There is also a monthly drawing for two $25 gift cards, open to any employee who has used an alternate form of transportation five times in a month. An estimated 100 employees (or approximately 20 percent of City employees) participate in the alternative transportation program.

City fleet vehicles
City fleet vehicles offer a significant opportunity to reduce carbon emissions. A total of 15 older general sedans have already been replaced with Toyota Prius hybrid sedans (purchased with the help of a $2,000 per vehicle incentive from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District). Hybrids represent one quarter of the City’s entire fleet vehicles, focusing on replacement vehicles powered with engines certified as super ultra low- or ultra low-emission and concentrating...
on replacing older vehicles with hybrid vehicles whenever possible. Among the City’s challenges are the limited number of manufacturers and models available for alternative and hybrid vehicles, thus somewhat restricting the use of the competitive bidding process, and the lack of fueling infrastructure for alternative fuel vehicles.

Redwood City has scheduled the replacement of six of its oldest heavy duty vehicles with new ones that meet California’s stringent 2007 emissions standards. This is a significant investment, at an estimated replacement cost of $1.5 million—but one which it feels is very worthwhile for the City and the community.

Redwood City has already converted to ultra low sulfur diesel fuel, which produces less air borne emissions than that produced by ordinary diesel. The City also plans to test biodiesel when it becomes readily available from suppliers.

**Housing**

**Transit-oriented development**

The updated General Plan will incorporate transit-oriented development (TOD). The proposed Downtown Precise Plan, which covers most of the area within 1,500 feet of the Caltrain Station, incorporates the basic tenets of TOD, including more intensive development in the form of multi-story buildings, mixed-use, higher residential densities, and a pedestrian-oriented street environment.

The updated General Plan will also address the El Camino Real Grand Boulevard Initiative as it pertains to transit and pedestrian orientation. The Transportation and Circulation Element will address the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) proposal to develop enhanced bus transit along most of the length of El Camino Real, providing an opportunity to develop TOD. The General Plan will also consider opportunities for incorporating TOD in conjunction with a new ferry terminal, depending on where the terminal will be located.

The Precise Plan estimates that 2,500 to 3,700 residential units could be accommodated as TOD. Fifteen percent of these units will be affordable to low-income residents. At present, there are a series of residential projects existing, under construction, or proposed, that can be considered TOD. The completed projects include City Center Plaza (81 units, 100 percent affordable) and Franklin Street Apartments (206 units, 15 percent affordable). Montgomery Village (58 units, 100 percent affordable) on El Camino Real and Vera Avenue is currently under construction. Another residential project proposed on Woodside Road calls for 43 units of which 15 percent would be affordable (because there is a bus route along this portion of Woodside Road, this project is considered TOD).

**Green building**

Some basic policies addressed in the Conservation Element include promoting energy efficiency in new building construction, incorporating green building principles, and reducing overall energy consumption. In the last year, a total of 69 residential units have been approved (58 are multi-family units, and the remaining 11 are single-family units). Of these, 59 units will meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards. They include the 58 units at Montgomery Village residential project and one single-family residence.

The Transportation and Circulation Element will emphasize reducing automobile use, thereby conserving energy while at the same time reducing air pollution. This includes policies and actions to encourage walking, bicycling, and use of public transportation. The Land Use Element will also address transportation by encouraging land use patterns that reduce automobile use while creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment.

**Water**

A separate Water Supply Element will also be included in the City’s General Plan. This element establishes policies for water conservation and also discusses Redwood City’s recycled water system and includes policies for more widespread use of recycled water.

One hundred percent of Redwood City’s water comes from the Hetch Hetchy water system, operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The City’s contractual supply assurance is 12,243 acre feet of water per year (10.9 million gallons per day) which it has been exceeding regularly since FY 1998-99. Redwood City’s Water Utility has 23,000 water service accounts, serving approximately 83,000 people in its 35-square-mile service area.

Redwood City has implemented several important conservation programs which combined have achieved significant water savings. The conservation programs in place use a mix of incentives and rebates, free conservation devices, one-on-one residential conservation consultations, site water use analysis, and education and public outreach to increase water use efficiency in homes, businesses, and institutions.

The total water savings as a result of water conservation efforts for FY 2005-06 are 149,333,336 gallons, (approximately 458 acre feet) accomplished through the following programs and activities:

- 694 Smart Home Water Use House Calls—Residential Water Surveys.
- 1,099 free Smart Home Water Conservation Kits given to households.
- 448 Residential High-Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebates.
- 5,500 water-wasting toilets replaced through the Toilet Replacement Program.
- 21 nozzles replaced through the High-Efficiency Pre-Rinse Spray Nozzle Replacement Program.
- 12 Commercial High-Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebates provided.
- 38 Large Landscape Irrigation Efficiency audits performed.

Through its aggressive water conservation efforts, the City expects the community will be conserving 815 acre feet per year by end of 2009 (0.7 million gallons per day). Combined with the expected 900 acre feet of additional potable water savings resulting from the implementation of a recycled water project, Redwood City will erase its annual water deficit of 1,000 acre feet and provide additional water supply to support future growth.

The City’s public education on water conservation focuses not only on publicizing its programs but also in educating the next generation. Redwood City’s Annual Poster Contest is a fun and dynamic way for school children to think about and express their understanding of water conservation. Prizes are awarded to the best posters in each class level and to their teachers for participation in the program. The City also provides onsite school presentations designed to educate students on the value of water and the importance of using it efficiently. Education materials and videos on a variety of water topics, such as conservation, our water planet, the forms water takes, and the water cycle, integrating social studies and science themes are made available to schools.

The City’s award winning website tells the community what conservation programs are available and how individuals can participate. The City mails a newsletter insert with its water bills providing information on specific programs and water conservation education tips and techniques.
The City of San Bruno’s commitment to sustainability is expressed in policies and practices that guide City operations, the City’s evaluation of new development, and educational/informational efforts to encourage awareness among City residents. This commitment also includes a variety of ongoing programs and activities that are an integral part of the San Bruno’s routine operations.

**Carbon Emissions**

In 2006, the City of San Bruno became one of approximately 400 cities nationwide to sign on to the U.S. Mayors’ Climate Protection Agreement. This action provides a policy framework and recommended practices to reduce emissions of City operations through recycling, energy-efficient facilities, vehicles and equipment, tree planting, and other means. In many of these areas, the City is achieving good results.

By meeting standards set by the National Arbor Day Foundation and the National Association of State Foresters, the City is also recognized as a “Tree City USA.” San Bruno’s 2007 annual tree planting event will be enhanced with over 300 trees purchased as a requirement of new development.

The City’s major remodel of its City Hall facility in 2002-03 included a retrofit of all lighting to low-energy, motion-activated fixtures and the installation of low flow, motion activated bathroom fixtures in the public restrooms. Energy cost savings are continuing to be generated and used to cover the retrofit capital costs. The City evaluates purchasing alternative fuel vehicles with each new fleet addition. Currently about 20 percent of the City’s light duty fleet consists of alternative fuel vehicles. An informal ridesharing program allows City employees commuting on BART to travel from public transportation to their workplace.

**Housing**

Several City policies promote affordable housing, green design, and transit-oriented development (TOD) in San Bruno. The General Plan Housing Element calls for 15 percent of all new housing to be available to low- and moderate-income households. Payment of an in-lieu housing fee provides an alternative for for-sale housing projects where affordability cannot be provided economically onsite. These payments are expected to generate over $3 million in the next two years. The General Plan Update currently being completed will include TOD zones and associated development standards including reduced parking requirements and possible development incentives. The City’s most recent fee schedule update includes a 10 percent reduction in building permit fees as an initial strategy to promote use of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified green building design.

The Crossing/San Bruno project on El Camino Real adjacent to the newly renovated Shops at Tanforan and the San Bruno BART station best demonstrates successful implementation of the City’s focused housing policy and its investment to achieve community affordable housing and TOD goals. The mixed-income project consists of 1,065 luxury apartments and condominiums on a 20-acre former naval site and is a nationally recognized model of successful TOD and inclusionary affordable housing. Thirty percent of the units are affordable at the low- and very low-income levels including 228 units reserved for low-income senior citizens. The initial phases of the Crossing are now complete and were quickly leased-up.

The City invested over $2 million to prepare a specific plan and Environmental Impact Report to define future use of the site when it was first declared surplus. This strong statement of the City’s policy and community expectations not only clarified the City’s intent, but also served to minimize the developer’s risk of uncertainty in the entitlement and environmental review process. Subsequent agreements with the City and Redevelopment Agency assured a reduced TOD parking requirement, development fee reductions and credits, and an ongoing subsidy for affordable housing of over $300,000 annually.

**Water**

Assuring a continuous supply of high-quality potable water and promoting effective and coordinated stewardship of the groundwater supply are the City’s highest priority water policy objectives. Historically, the City produces approximately 50 percent of its supply through groundwater pumping. In 2006, the City obtained a state grant and initiated a saltwater intrusion monitoring project. With the cooperation of the San Francisco Airport and the City of Burlingame, the City is installing monitoring wells adjacent to San Francisco Bay to detect any potential contamination in the aquifer.

Along with other water suppliers in the North County, the City completed a pilot project to evaluate the effectiveness of reduced groundwater pumping on recharge of the groundwater aquifer in 2005. The City is currently evaluating the establishment of a long-term conjunctive use program together with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and other North County pumpers to coordinate extraction in the shared aquifer and actively manage groundwater storage for dry-period usage.

In coordination with the City of South San Francisco, the City is completing a feasibility study on water recycling at its shared wastewater treatment facility. Recognizing the high cost of water transport and limited options for use of recycled water, the City is currently focused on use of low-water, drought-tolerant landscaping in City medians and parks, including an upcoming renovation of all City medians along El Camino Real. The City’s Beautification Task Force provides annual awards to encourage and recognize residents for installing drought tolerant landscape improvements.
During 2006, the City of San Carlos continued to make significant progress towards sustainability. The City’s “Enhancing the City of Good Living” initiative developed by Council Member Inge Tiegel-Doherty is designed to involve the community in making the City a better place to live and includes programs to advance sustainability.

Carbon Emissions and Energy Use
Key efforts to reduce carbon emissions and energy use include installing photovoltaics at the City Corporation Yard (saving $15,000 per year in electrical and energy costs); upgrading the City Hall heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system; and implementing energy efficiency improvements (saving $80,000 per year). The solar system addresses the increasing cost and fluctuation of energy prices while increasing renewable energy production. Other efforts include replacing office lighting with fluorescent bulbs and ballasts and replacing traffic signal lighting with light-emitting diodes (LEDs).

An electric truck is being used for maintenance at one of our parks. In addition, at the City Corporation Yard, two Senior Park Maintenance professionals are forming a Global Warming Prevention Committee to create policies to combat global warming at the City level.

Housing
The San Carlos City Council has amended the City’s Municipal Code to increase the number of affordable housing units required in new developments. For developments of seven or more units, the developer must now set aside 15 percent (formerly 10 percent) of the units to be affordable to low-income residents.

The City Council has also waived all fees for permits requested by residents and businesses in San Carlos that want to add solar and photovoltaic panels and systems. This is designed to make the housing and commercial building stock in the community more energy sufficient and sustainable. The City Building and Planning Departments also use the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide and have approved green homes in the past year.

Recycling
San Carlos has a Construction and Demolition Ordinance that requires the recycling of materials associated with remodels and new construction.

San Carlos residents and businesses are provided with free recycling collection services for paper, cardboard, bottles, and cans, and reduced recycling service charges for organics (food waste). The City has teamed up with San Mateo County’s Environmental Health Department to offer battery recycling at several City buildings including City Hall as well as composting and recycling programs. Partnering with Allied Waste and the South Bayside Waste Management Authority, San Carlos community members now can include pumpkins in their yard trimmings cart for composting.

In the Parks and Recreation Department, wood chips from downed trees are reused in parks as part of our Integrated Pest Management Program. The Parks and Recreation Department also conducts composting workshops for the community. In addition, multiple youth programs incorporate picking up trash and cleaning up the parks. Partnering with Allied Waste Services, the Youth Center now recycles plastic, aluminum, glass, paper, and food waste, teaching youth to be eco-friendly.

Civic Facilities Go Green
The City recently completed construction of a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) silver-certified new Main Library. The 90,000 square-foot state-of-the-art facility will save energy by maximizing natural light and ventilation so that no heating or cooling will be needed 60 percent of the time. The library has energy-efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems with an under-the-floor air supply which reduces energy consumption and improves indoor air quality. More than 90 percent of the materials and debris from the old library building was recycled, and many of the new building materials are of sustainable content. To conserve water, the library’s landscaping is irrigated with rainwater collected from the roof. As a public building with more than 3,000 visitors a day, the new Main Library also educates and increases the awareness of environmentally responsible building practices.

The City has made progress on plans to build a new Police Station and reconstruction of Fire Station # 24, both of which will incorporate sustainable development and green building features wherever possible.

The City also completed the first phase of construction of Shoreline Parks, which promotes sustainability in several ways. The new parks provide more than 70 acres of outdoor exploration and feature educational stations with interpretive signs and information.
about the wildlife and natural habitat. The parks also include two outdoor classrooms, one near the wetlands area and one along the bay. These classrooms offer teachers and educators an opportunity to provide hands-on environmental education activities. Overall, the Shoreline Parks not only offer the community a beautiful spot to enjoy the outdoors, but they also foster greater awareness and understanding of our natural surroundings.

**Carbon Emissions**

The City has reduced carbon emissions through multiple strategies, including reducing its direct consumption of energy and encouraging residents to conserve energy and use alternative, environmentally-friendly energy sources. The City has incorporated biodiesel into its fueling program and almost a third of the City’s vehicle fleet uses alternative fuels, including seven hybrid, four electric, and 79 vehicles that use biodiesel fuel. After auditing the overall use of energy in all City operations, City staff increased fluorescent lighting and installed variable frequency drives on air-circulation equipment in one of the City’s garages. The City decreased its gas usage in most of its civic facilities by almost 30 percent between 2001 and 2005, and reduced its electric usage by about five percent during that time. The City also plans to evaluate the feasibility of using solar panels in any newly constructed City buildings, such as the new Police Station for which construction will begin in 2007.

The City encourages residents to conserve energy and use alternative, environmentally-friendly energy sources through multiple avenues. The City created a wall map of all of its parks and recreation areas as a user-friendly resource to encourage residents to visit City parks. The City is also working on mapping all pedestrian, bike, and public transportation routes linking highly frequented areas throughout the City, such as schools, commercial areas, and parks. The City is a member of the Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance and works with the Alliance to reduce single-occupant automobile travel within the county. The City helps residents curb their energy use by posting many forms, maps, and information on its website so that residents do not have to travel to City facilities. Similarly, the City offers a variety of online services so that residents can complete their business tax application, register for recreation classes, or complete other tasks online.

**Land Use, Housing, and Transit-Oriented Development**

The City has several housing policies and programs that promote sustainable development, from promoting transit-oriented development (TOD) to increasing affordable housing and embracing green building practices. The City adopted its Transportation Corridor Plan which provides for TOD and created two zones for such development, one close to the new Hillsdale train station and one near the Hayward Park train station. The Bay Meadows Specific Plan Amendment, adopted in 2005, also includes TOD. The City also operates a below market rate (BMR) housing program, which requires that 10 percent of the units in a new residential development be below market rate. The City is currently reviewing its land use policies in relation to housing, particularly focusing on potentially increasing the BMR requirements for new development. Also, the City and its Redevelopment Agency approved the acquisition of a site within the new TOD zone for affordable housing and a second site downtown to provide single-resident only housing and some assistance to the homeless population. Lastly, the City started a process to define expectations for sustainable development in private projects. In June 2006, the City Council approved a Sustainable Development Strategy which relies on the voluntary inclusion of sustainable development elements into private developments.

The City uses the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Checklist to promote sustainable development when discussing potential projects and provides information at the Building and Planning permit counter in City Hall.

**Water**

The City requires new development to meet water conservation design standards. The approved Bay Meadows Main Track development will be installing a parallel distribution system to permit the use of reclaimed water if it is available from the wastewater treatment plants in the City or Redwood City. The City is currently exploring the viability of using reclaimed water from the Redwood City wastewater treatment plant for irrigation purposes. The City also uses an automated sprinkler system in most of its parks which allows for central monitoring of water use and automatically adjusts the timing and flow of irrigation based on weather conditions.

The City manages a wastewater treatment plant that serves 130,000 people and businesses in our service area, which includes San Mateo, Foster City, half of Hillsborough, and parts of Belmont and unincorporated San Mateo County, at an average flow of 12 million gallons each day.
Carbon Emissions

South San Francisco has purchased an opacity meter to check City owned diesel trucks and buses for emissions. Staff is looking into retrofitting all of its diesel trucks that are 14,000 gross vehicle weight and up. The City’s current goal is to have 20 percent of its fleet retrofitted by the end of 2007, 60 percent retrofitted by 2009, and 100 percent by 2011.

The City has dedicated one above ground diesel tank, with a tank capacity of 1,000 gallons, for biodiesel. Staff is currently monitoring one bus for mileage and emission performance and is tracking any changes and advantages. Currently, the City is researching hybrid vehicles as an alternate way of saving money and fuel. While the City is still in the testing stages, financing these improvements is a significant challenge.

In an effort to reduce air quality impacts associated with the increased traffic new development generates, the City has implemented an aggressive Transportation Demand Management Ordinance. Developers and tenants of all nonresidential developments that will generate an excess of 100 average daily vehicle trips must implement measures to promote alternative commute modes. Such measures include shuttles to transit stations, bicycle lockers, carpool/vanpool preferential parking, showers/clothes lockers, transit information kiosks, and promotional programs. Additionally, larger projects must implement supplemental measures such as transit pass subsidies, parking cash out, inclusions of onsite amenities (e.g., ATMs, childcare, electric vehicle charging), reduced parking standards, and parking charges. Depending on the size and density of development there are alternative mode shift targets that must be maintained over the life of the project, ranging from 28-35 percent, with mandated annual monitoring procedures and potential financial penalties for noncompliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Natural Gas (therms)</th>
<th>Natural Gas ($)</th>
<th>Electricity (kWh)</th>
<th>Electricity ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>192,237</td>
<td>$210,479</td>
<td>12,754,201</td>
<td>$1,444,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>149,140</td>
<td>$97,188</td>
<td>13,499,725</td>
<td>$1,725,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>151,113</td>
<td>$133,675</td>
<td>13,557,675</td>
<td>$1,752,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>135,903</td>
<td>$123,718</td>
<td>14,988,100</td>
<td>$1,693,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>152,959</td>
<td>$179,164</td>
<td>13,739,533</td>
<td>$1,531,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water

The Public Works Department utilizes various methods and techniques to effectively use and conserve water. Starting in November water in the park system is essentially turned off until February. During this time, landscape irrigation is operated at a minimum (once per week) only to keep valves operational. New landscaping at Orange Memorial Park utilizes drip irrigation for water conservation year round.

In general, irrigation clock timing is based upon need and not set schedules. Modern “Cal Sense” irrigation clocks utilize weather reports from nearby weather stations to send moisture data to City computers. This allows staff to remotely adjust irrigation clocks to compensate for wet weather conditions allowing for additional conservation options.

Staff also looks for ways to conserve by taking advantage of new varieties of turf such as tall fescue which have a higher tolerance to drought conditions and recycling tree trimming chips which continued
are recycled back into the landscape to reduce water evaporation and suppress weeds.

The City realizes that facility infrastructure can also play an important role in conservation, and the City now ensures that any needed replacement of toilets or faucets is done with units that are low flow and/or have automatic turnoff sensors depending on staff and site requirements. The upgrades to some facilities such as City Hall and Grand Avenue Library are limited because of their aged infrastructure. That said, the City will continue to pursue any options that may become available that would allow upgrades to these buildings as well.

Financing these items is the most daunting challenge since not all sustainable items are designed to accommodate heavy public use and replacements are costly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gallons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>75,416,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>77,307,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>78,228,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>73,328,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>75,212,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>60,064,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Town of Woodside did not provide information regarding its current sustainability efforts.
San Mateo County's ambitious plans to improve the environment include cutting carbon emissions, designing buildings that use minimal energy, and engaging the public.

**Carbon Emissions**

The San Mateo County Board of Supervisors approved a resolution in November 2005 pledging to reduce carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) emissions by 10 percent by 2010. To achieve this goal, the County is retrofitting buildings with energy-efficient lighting and installing more efficient heating and cooling systems, among other steps. One building retrofit alone is projected to reduce annual electrical use by nearly 10 percent, or 179,482 kilowatt hours (kWh), and carbon dioxide by 24,338 pounds.

The County’s new Youth Services Center (YSC), a $155 million project that includes a juvenile hall, girls’ camp, courts, administration, and other services, was designed with energy in mind. Opened in September 2006, the buildings feature abundant glass areas to allow natural daylight, energy-efficient windows, and a roof specially designed to reduce the need for summer cooling and winter heating.

Above is a summary of the County’s energy use and the corresponding CO$_2$ emissions. CO$_2$ emissions are targeted for reduction by the Kyoto Treaty and by the Sustainable Silicon Valley Initiative because they contribute to global warming.

**Green Building**

The YSC represents a landmark for San Mateo County in many ways. It is the largest capital project in its 150-year history and includes innovative techniques to reduce energy consumptions, water use, and its impact on the environment.

A cogeneration plant allows YSC to generate its own power for lighting, heating, and hot water. Local building materials were used whenever possible. Landscaping features drought tolerant native plants. The play field is constructed of synthetic grass made from recycled tires, saving both water and maintenance costs and allowing for use during inclement weather. Computer systems monitor the entire facility constantly to operate at the most energy-efficient level 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Moreover, electric vehicles will be used for onsite transportation. An endangered flower found in the area, fritillary, was protected throughout construction. Once the old juvenile hall and courts are torn down the area will be turned into a community garden. The YSC is expected to receive national recognition for its design practices and earn a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating.

**Housing Policies and Initiatives**

As the price of housing continues to rise, the issue of affordable housing has become a top priority for the County, evidenced in recent years by the establishment of a County Department of Housing (formerly the Office of Housing within the Human Services Agency) and the Housing and Endowment Regional Trust (HEART).

To alleviate traffic congestion and minimize environmental impacts, the County is focusing on infill housing and transit-oriented development. In 2006, the County Department of Housing initiated the Countywide Housing Strategy Project. Over the course of the next two years, this project will focus on increasing collaboration among existing initiatives and efforts, developing housing related tools and resources, and offering best practices for increasing the supply of affordable housing.

An ongoing initiative is the HOPE Plan to End Homelessness, which has set specific production targets for supportive housing and permanent housing for very low-income families. A best practice that works well is inclusionary zoning, which requires a certain percentage of new housing units (usually around 15 percent) be reserved for moderate- or lower-income residents. In 2006, 16 jurisdictions in San Mateo County (Belmont, Brisbane, Burlingame, Colma, Daly City, East Palo Alto, Foster City, Half Moon Bay, Menlo Park, Millbrae, Portola Valley, San Bruno, San Carlos, San Mateo, South San Francisco, and the County) had some type of inclusionary housing program, and several are currently considering strengthening their current policies or adopting new ones.

2006 marked the beginning of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation Process, which precedes the review of each jurisdiction’s...
Housing Element. San Mateo County was the first in the state to form a subregion that would internally manage its housing need allocation by allowing jurisdictions to trade allocation numbers in exchange for equivalent resources, in hopes that the overall housing need within the County would have a greater chance of being met. This next round of Housing Element review, set to take place through June 2009, will be critical in supporting policies that encourage the development of more affordable housing.

While the need for affordable housing is clear, significant challenges remain. The high cost of land in the County and the continued rise of construction costs make financing affordable developments exceedingly difficult. With federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds on the decline, the Board of Supervisors is exploring a permanent source of funding for HEART, which would increase its capacity to fund affordable housing development and assist first-time homebuyers.

Water
To reduce water use in all its facilities, the County is installing an online utility management program. In real time, this program will monitor utility usage in each County facility for water, electricity, and natural gas consumption. It will send an alarm when there is unexpected usage and track consumption data over time.

As an example of a specific program, the County has installed 40 water controllers in the Maguire Correctional Facility to limit length of showers and flushes, flow restrictors in all faucets, and 10 waterless urinals over the past two years.
Celebrating Our County

San Mateo County Community College District

Each year approximately 40,000 people throughout San Mateo County attend one of the three colleges in the San Mateo County Community College District: Skyline College in San Bruno, Cañada College in Redwood City, and the College of San Mateo. The academic and vocational programs offered by the Colleges are designed to meet the educational needs of the community: quality transfer programs, more than 80 vocational degree and certificate programs, upgrade training for working professionals, and developmental education to prepare students for college studies.

Carbon Emissions
The District saves $1 million annually through energy efficiency and cogeneration. Those savings are achieved as a result of many efficiency improvements at dozens of buildings across the three campuses, and they occurred as a result of very cost-effective upgrades of existing equipment rather than replacing entire systems outright. The improvements were funded by utility rebates and voter approved bonds, reducing the District’s annual electricity usage by 22 percent and natural gas use by 15 percent. Cogeneration systems were also installed at Skyline College and the College of San Mateo. Together these savings translate to avoided local electric utility emissions of roughly 3,200 tons of carbon dioxide annually, the equivalent of planting more than 900 acres of trees or 628 cars not driven for a year. The District was recognized in 2005 with a Pacific Gas and Electric Flex Your Power Award, and in 2006 by the Environment California Research and Policy Center in “Greening the Bottom Line: California Companies Save Money by Reducing Global Warming Pollution.”

Housing and Other Facilities

Green building
The Board of Trustees of the District has adopted the following two goals in support of sustainable building practices:

- As new buildings are brought on line, District operational plans need to incorporate appropriate staffing and resource efficiencies in order to ensure the long-term sustainability of the new structures. The District must also leverage to the greatest extent possible available state and local resources to reduce operational costs.
- Investigate green building design guidelines and standards, such as the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Buildings Guide and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) to determine the applicability to District projects.

Affordable faculty and staff housing
On a parcel of District owned land in San Mateo adjacent to the District office at CSM drive, the District has constructed and provided to faculty and staff 45 units of affordable housing in a project called College Vista. In addition, the Board of Trustees has adopted the following two goals in support of additional affordable faculty and staff housing:

- The District will continue its efforts to assist employees with the high cost of housing in the area, including offering a second loan program for first-time homebuyers.
- The District will explore additional program options that make the program even more valuable and useful for faculty and staff.

Following the first year of operations of College Vista, the District will evaluate whether a second residential community should be constructed.

Water
The District has implemented the following water saving programs:

- Changing the kinds of plants used in landscaping to reduce trimmings. For example, instead of grass the District uses more groundcovers that do not take as much maintenance effort and do not generate grass clippings. Also, the District chips tree trimmings and places the chips as mulch, thus reducing the amount of organic material entering the waste stream as well as creating healthier landscaped areas.
- Conversion of many of the colleges’ natural turf athletic fields to synthetic turf, resulting in a dramatic decrease of water usage, grass clippings, and maintenance; as well as creation of fields available in all weather conditions.

Waste Management
The District has consistently exceeded state mandated waste reduction goals, using measures including the following:

- Placement of copiers that have the ability to make double-sided copies.
- Placement of recycling containers throughout the campuses, and modifying waste collection activities to keep recyclables separate from garbage.
- Development and encouragement of the use of information technology for electronic processing of business transactions and communications.
- Development of a donation and resale program to identify downstream users for unwanted furniture and equipment, including a District online auction site for sale of unwanted assets with residual value, and development of a network of nonprofit agencies that need and appreciate the District’s old items.
APPENDIX

Key Issues, pages 4-6


In October 2006, SSMC sent requests to the offices of the San Mateo County Manager, the various City Managers in the county, and the San Mateo County Community College District asking for an update on their sustainability policies, successes, and challenges. SSMC specifically requested information related to carbon emissions, housing, and water. The full responses are included in the Celebrating Our Cities section of the report and summarized in our Key Issues section.

Agriculture, page 8: In 2005, total production value of agriculture was down 22 percent from 1992.

Data on the acres of county land that are agricultural land and grazing land are from the California Department of Conservation, based on 2004 data, www.consrv.ca.gov; 2005 Agricultural Crop Report, San Mateo County Department of Agriculture/Weights and Measures; and conversations with: Gail Raabe, Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights & Measures, on November 2, 2006; Jack Olsen, Executive Administrator, Farm Bureau of San Mateo County on November 6, 2006; some background material on the “As Fresh As It Gets” program comes from press releases from the Convention and Visitors Bureau of San Mateo County, and California Country, California Farm Bureau Federation, May/June, 2006 issue. “Multiplier” effects refer to benefits to the local economy as a result of income circulating through the economy.

Air Quality, page 9: In 2006, the county continued to enjoy clean air; particle pollution is still a concern.


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 January 2, 2004. The American Lung Association's State of the Air Report 2006, was found at http://lungaction.org/reports/stateoftheair2006.html. The Healthy Community Collaborative of San Mateo County's 2004 Community Health Assessment: Health & Quality of Life in San Mateo County was found at http://www.plsinfo.org/healthysmc/index.html. Information about the causes of asthma is from Clean up the Bay Area's air to help kids fight asthma, by Anne Kelsy Lamb and Joel Ervice, June 6, 2004, San José Mercury News.

Bay and Ocean Water Quality, page 10: San Francisco Bay classified as an impaired body of water under the Clean Water Act; most beaches have good water quality.


Information on fish advisories can be found at the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, at http://www.oehha.ca.gov/fish/general/sfbaydelta.html. Information on stormwater
runoff and the San Mateo Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program were found at http://www.flowstobay.org/. Heal the Bay’s 16th Annual Beach Report Card for 2005-2006, May 2006, was found at http://www.healthebay.org/brc/annual/default.asp and its 2006 Summer Beach Report Card, October 2006 was found at http://www.healthebay.org/brc/summer/default.asp. We are grateful for the input from Habtemariam Kifle, Water Resources Control Engineer, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region.

Carbon Emissions, page 11: In 2005, carbon emissions were down 10 percent from 2001; transportation accounts for more than half of all carbon emissions.

Background on carbon emissions and climate change can be found in Field Notes from a Catastrophe: Man, Nature, and Climate Change, 2006, by Elizabeth Kolbert; The Weather Makers: How Man is Changing the Climate and What it Means for Life on Earth, January 2006, by Tim Flannery; Dangerous Anthropogenic Interference, a lecture by Dr. James Hansen found at http://www.physics.uiowa.edu/lecture_series/dai_complete.pdf.


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. http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/420f05001.html#carbon. 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. (EPA, ibid). 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). This datum, called the “power mix,” is not known for the years beginning 2001–2004. To estimate carbon emissions, 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. Beginning with 2005, at the direction of the State Legislature, energy retailers provide their power mix. For PG&E, see http://www.pge.com/customer_service/bill_inserts/2006/dec.html#topic3. 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. The data source for pounds of carbon per gallon of gasoline and a therm of natural gas is also the Energy Information Agency, found at http://www.americanforests.org/download.php?file=graytogreen/energy.pdf. Please note all the data used in these calculations are estimates: population figures, the power mix for electricity, natural gas, and gasoline deliveries, etc. Sometimes, as with power mix, the estimate’s margin of error is large, and so the resulting estimate—tons of carbon per capita—is only indicative. We believe our calculations err on the conservative side.

The airplane fuel use calculation is from The Carbon Neutral Company at http://www.carbonneutral.com/cncalculators/flight-calculate.asp.

Child Abuse, page 12: In 2005, child abuse referrals were down for third straight year, but remains high among African American children.

Information from the California Child Welfare Performance Indicators Project, Child Welfare Services Reports for California, retrieved from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Research website, http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSReports/ on December 19, 2006. Data represent unduplicated counts of children per year who have been identified as victims in child abuse referrals. Of the 4,082 child abuse referrals in San Mateo County during 2005, 750 were substantiated. Data on children who first entered foster care in fiscal year 2005-06 represent children in care five days or more.

Child Care, page 13: In 2006, supply of licensed child care spaces was down 11 percent; affordable infant care is the highest need.

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 2005 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 129,904 (broken down by: 17,041 infants 0-2 years; 17,229 preschoolers 3-5 years; 22,861 children 6-9 years; and 35,437 children 10-13 years). The total number of children age 0-13 years with both or a single parent working is 79,981 (broken down by: 29,343 infants 0-2 years; 29,667 preschoolers 3-5 years; 35,457 children 6-9 years; and 35,437 children 10-13 years). The total number of children age 0-13 years with both or a single parent working is 79,981 (broken down by: 17,041 infants 0-2 years; 17,229 preschoolers 3-5 years; 22,861 children 6-9 years; and 22,885 children 10-13 years).

According to data supplied by the Child Care Coordinating Council of San Mateo in December 2006, the total number of full- and part-time licensed child care spaces in San Mateo County for children age 0-13 years was 22,310. This consists of 5,733 in family child care homes (down 15 percent since 2005) and
16,577 in child care centers (down 10 percent since 2005). Of the 16,577 spaces in child care centers, 914 are for infants 0-2 years, 11,349 are for preschoolers age 3-5 years, and 4,314 are for school age children 6-13 years. Community Care Licensing defines family child care as care and supervision of children in a provider's own home; child care centers are licensed care outside of a home environment.


Children's Health, page 14: In 2004, one quarter of fifth, seventh, and ninth graders were overweight. The percentage of fifth, seventh, and ninth graders in San Mateo County who were overweight in 2004 is from the California Center for Public Health Advocacy and was found on kidsdata.org. The breakdowns by race and city are from the Center for Public Health Advocacy and were found in the Healthy Communities San Mateo County’s Blueprint for Prevention of Childhood Obesity: A Call to Action, 2006. The percentage of children meeting the minimum fitness standards was from the California Department of Education, DataQuest and found on kidsdata.org. Information on immunizations was from the San Mateo Department of Public Health, County Immunizations Program and is found on kidsdata.org. Information on the Healthy People 2010 initiative can be found at http://www.healthypeople.gov/. The figures for the number of families with children under the age of 18 with household earnings are from the U.S. Census Bureau's annual American Community Survey's found at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/. Previous year's figures have been adjusted to reflect figures found in the American Community Surveys.

Community Health, page 15: In 2004, over 85 percent of adults exhibited at least one behavioral risk factor (e.g. no regular physical activity, smoking) related to heart disease. Information on Years of Potential Lives Lost, heart disease, and behavioral factors contributing to premature death is from the Healthy Community Collaborative of San Mateo County's 2004 Community Health Assessment: Health & Quality of Life in San Mateo County, January 2005, found at http://www.plsinfo.org/healthysmc/. Information on the Healthy Communities San Mateo County: A Community Health Improvement Initiative to Eliminate Health Disparities was found in the Healthy Communities San Mateo County’s Roadmap for Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention: A Guide for Community Action, Summer 2006, and Linguistic Access Study: Summary of Findings and Recommendations, August 2006. We are grateful for the input from S.T. Mayer, Management Analyst with the San Mateo County Public Health Department.

Contaminated Sites, page 16: In 2006, the number of known leaking underground storage tanks down 37 percent from 1997.

Data on leaking underground storage tanks are from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) database of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board & State Water Resources Control Board. Data on other hazardous chemical leaks are from the Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Clean-Ups (SLIC) database of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board & State Water Resources Control Board. Data are available at http://www.geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/. Previous year's figures have been revised to reflect the addition of open cases to the database not previously included.

Crime, page 17: In 2005, violent crime rate was up 13 percent from 2004 and 30 percent from 1999.

Data are from the California Office of the Attorney General's Criminal Justice Statistics Center found at http://ag.ca.gov/cjsc/cdatatabs.php. Our analysis has changed slightly from previous years because of the state's inclusion of larceny-theft over $400 within its major crime category. Previous data have been adjusted to reflect that change. The offenses in the major crime category are chosen for their seriousness and likelihood of being reported to the police by the public. City level data were not available on the website for Portola Valley and Woodside.

Drinking Water Quality, page 18: In 2005, drinking water continued to meet state and federal quality standards.

Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) are developed based upon 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 of chemicals that may exist. Data are from the 2005 Water Quality Reports issued by each water district.

For more information about the 20 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 Guadalupe Valley Municipal Improvement District consists primarily of an industrial park development located within the Brisbane City limits, and a small residential enclave. 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 Skyline
Boulevard. 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 Los Trancos Valley. California Water Service Mid-Peninsula District serves San Carlos and San Mateo and adjacent unincorporated portions 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 the unincorporated San Mateo County. The Menlo Park Municipal Water District serves only about 10,300 residents in two separate enclaves; other portions of Menlo Park are served by California Water Services’ 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. For a San Francisco Department of Public Health statement on chloramines, see http://sfwater.org/Files/PressReleases/chloramines.pdf. For a list of products that filter chloramines, see http://www.nsf.org/Certified/dwtu/#function. We are grateful for the help we received from Joe Guistino, Coastside Water District, Superintendent of Operations.

Ecological Footprint, page 19: Average resident’s use of natural resources exceeds nature’s ability to replenish them.


Education, pages 20–21: In 2006, Academic Performance Index scores continued to rise; it is unclear whether all children have an equal opportunity to excel.

Academic Performance Index scores are from the California Department of Education and were found at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/aporeports.asp. Socioeconomically disadvantaged is defined as a student whose parents 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). Information on the percentage of high school students meeting University of California and California State University eligibility requirements is from the California Department of Education DataQuest at http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/.

The school readiness assessments for San Mateo County kindergartners were found in Are Children Ready? Assessment of Kindergarten Readiness in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, 2006, by Applied Survey Research for the Peninsula Partnership for Children, Youth, and Families and the Santa Clara County Partnership for School Readiness. This report can be found at http://www.uwsv.org/?id=38&sub=27. The information on the Preschool for All program was found on the First 5 San Mateo County web page at http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/smc/department/home/0,4313274_254692172_123861501,00.html.

Information on the number of fully credentialed teachers comes from the California Department of Education DataQuest. Expenditures per student and average teacher salaries were found at the Education Data Partnership web page at http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/welcome.asp.

Information on the Regional Occupation Program and the San Mateo Outdoor Education Program was found in the San Mateo County Office of Education web page at http://www.smcoe.k12.ca.us/. Information on the number of arts classes comes from the California Department of Education DataQuest.

Energy Use, pages 22–23: In 2005, energy use from electricity and natural gas was up 16 percent from 1995, however the overall capacity of solar installations grew in 2006.

Data on electricity and natural gas use in San Mateo County are from the California Energy Commission. Data are converted from therms and kWh to British thermal units (100,000 BTU per therm of natural gas and 3,413 BTU per kWh of electricity). Information on the average residential use of electricity and natural gas and the percentage of non-residential power that goes to industrial, commercial, agricultural users is from the PG&E Statistical Research Unit. The county’s 2005 power mix is from PG&E at http://www.pge.com/customer_service/bill_inserts/2006/dec.html#topic3. The state power mix is from the California Energy Commission and was found at http://www.energy.ca.gov/electricity/gross_system_power.html.


Gasoline Use and Vehicle Fuel Efficiency, page 24: In 2005, total gasoline consumption increased despite high gasoline prices.


Genuine Progress Indicator, page 25: County’s actual economic well-being 44 percent below that reported by conventional measure.


Prior to the 2005 edition of the SSMC Indicators Report, SSMC included a per capita personal income indicator. The Genuine Progress Indicator has replaced that indicator. The Genuine Progress Indicator was deemed a more appropriate measure from a sustainability perspective.

Genuine Progress Indicator, page 26: In 2006, more local governments were encouraging green building strategies, but only the county has a formal green building policy.

Information on California’s Green Building Initiative was found at http://gov.ca.gov/index.php/?press-release/2434/. Information on San Mateo County’s green building policy and its fly ash and mixed aggregates policy was found at the RecycleWorks web page, http://www.recycleworks.org. Information on city policies and developments was per a telephone survey of San Mateo County cities, conducted between December 2006 and January 2007.

Health Care, page 27: In 2005, the percentage of residents with health insurance was up from 2003; health care costs grew by 10 percent in 2006.

The information on the percentage of residents in California and San Mateo, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Counties as well as the information on whether residents received health insurance from their employer is from the Community Health Information Survey found at http://www.chis.ucla.edu/. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) is a measure of the average change over time in the prices paid by consumers for a market basket of consumer goods and services. The CPI market basket is developed 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. 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/. The data represent the Bay Area CPI for all urban consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San José 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.

Homelessness, page 28: In 2005, homelessness was down slightly.

Information on homeless figures is from the San Mateo County Human Services Agency. The 2005 homeless figure is from Housing Our People Effectively (HOPE), through the San Mateo County Human Services Agency, at http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/vgn/images/portal/cit_609/11/24/563286703Housing_H_L_Context_Presentation-REV12-7-05.pdf. The definition of chronic homelessness is from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and was found at http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/rule-sandregslaws/index.cfm. Information on the Shelter Network and its clients was found on their web page at www.shelternetwork.org. Information on the Samaritan House was from a discussion with Ben Leroi, Grants Manager, Samaritan House as well as its web page at www.samaritanhouse.com. Information on Project HOPE was found at http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/scr/publications/2434/Hospice-REV12-7-05.pdf. Information on Project HOPE was found at the RecycleWorks web page, http://www.recycleworks.org. Information on San Mateo County’s homeless count is from First Day of Homeless Tally Turns a Little Tricky, by Edward Carpenter, San Francisco Examiner, January 31, 2007. Information on Project Homeless Connect is from Officials Hope Tally Marks a Turning Point, by Michael Manekin, San Mateo Times, January 31, 2007. We are grateful for the help and input from Wendy Goldberg with the San Mateo County Human Services Agency.
Housing Affordability, pages 29-30: The cost of the median-priced home and condominium has more than doubled in the last decade.

The National Low Income Housing Coalition’s analysis of affordability among U.S. counties was found in Out of Reach 2006, December 2006 located at http://www.nlihc.org/oor/oor2006/mostexpensiveivable.pdf. The HUD median family income estimates are found at http://www.ffed.ca.gov/hmda/censusproducts.htm#MSAincome. 2004 and 2005 figures have been corrected. The San Mateo County Association of Realtors provided us with the median price of a single-family home and condominium in San Mateo County. Average rents were provided by the San Mateo County Department of Housing. 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 6.41 percent in 2006 according to Freddie Mac at www.freddiemac.com.

Information on the foreclosure rates in the subprime market was found in the Center for Responsible Lending’s Losing Ground: Foreclosures in the Subprime Market and Their Cost to Homeowners, December 2006 found at http://www.responsiblelending.org/issues/mortgage/reports/page.jsp?itemId=31217189. Information on housing production in San Mateo County was found in the Association of Bay Area Government’s A Place to Call Home: Housing in the San Francisco Bay Area, June 2006 found at http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/housingneeds/aplace.html and the Bay Area Council’s BayArea Housing Profile 2006, found at http://www.bayareacouncil.org/site/pp.asp?cdkLRK7MMIqG&b=1859335.

Jobs, page 31: In 2005, the county halted a four-year trend of job losses, adding 200 jobs.

Data source for number of jobs by industry and by company size is the California Employment Development Department, Employment by industry data found at http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/?PageID=4&SubID=166. Data from previous years have been updated and findings have thus been altered slightly.

Land Use and Habitat Protection, page 32: Land use has been fairly stable since 1990, but could be disrupted by expected population growth.


Parks and Open Space, page 33: There are over 110,000 acres of parkland and open space; it is unclear if recreational opportunities and access are equal across communities.

Data on the acreage of city parks were from a survey of Parks and Recreation Directors in the county in November-December, 2006. Parks and Recreation Directors were surveyed on the number of parks and total acreage found in each city. Parks were defined using International City/County Management Association definitions for pocket parks, neighborhood parks, community parks, regional parks, metro parks, linear parks, and special purpose parks. We are grateful to Jim Skeels, Parks and Recreation Director, City of Brisbane and Randy Schwarz, Parks and Recreation Director, City of Burlingame for their help in developing the survey. Information on the County Parks is from a conversation with Sam Herzberg with the San Mateo County Department of Parks as well as the Department’s page at http://www.eparks.net/smc/department/home/0,,5556687_5557733,00.html. Information on the Midpeninsula Open Space District is from Rudy Jurgensen and Elaina Cuzick with the Midpeninsula Open Space District as well as their web page www.openspace.org. Information on the Peninsula Open Space trust is from Paul Ringgold, Director of Land Stewardship. Information on Measure A found at http://www.smartvoter.org/2006/11/07/ca/sm/meas/A/.

We are also grateful for the help and input from B.C. Capps with the Bay Area Open Space Council; Barry Weiss, Parks and Recreation Director, City of San Carlos; and Julia Bott, Executive Director, San Mateo County Parks & Recreation Foundation.

Pesticide Use, page 34: In 2005, use of the most toxic pesticides (excluding residential use) was up 22 percent.

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 Trade Association Environmental Partnership. The national size and growth rate of the organic food industry are from the Organic Trade Association.
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 Proposition 65 list; 3) neurotoxic cholinesterase inhibitors, as designated by the 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 the PAN “Bad Actor Pesticides” downloaded on December 3, 2006. 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 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 sulfonyl fluoride and potassium N-methylthio carbamate is from Gail Raabe, Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights & Measure, on February 11, 2005. Qualitative information about disinfectant use is from Maria Mastrangelo, Deputy Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer of Weights & Measure for San Mateo County on January 25, 2007.

Population, page 35: Population is up nearly six percent over the last 10 years.

Population data are from the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit found at http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/ReportsPapers/ReportsPapers.asp. Specifically we used the E-2, E-3, E-4, and E-6 reports found on that page. Fertility rate data are from the California Department of Health Services and are calculated as follows: 1) Obtain age-specific birth rates in your region by year for women ages 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-44. 2) Add together the age-specific birth rates for that year. 3) Multiply the sum by the number of years in each age group. 4) Divide by 1,000. The resulting number is the total fertility rate in the region for that year; it represents the average number of children that each woman would bear in her lifetime if she bore children at the rate implied by the age-specific birth rates for a specific period.

Poverty and Income Distribution, page 36: In 2006, more than one-third of households continued to earn less than the self-sufficiency level.

The 2005 household income data for the county are from the American Community Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau and represent income and benefits. See U.S. Census Bureau website at http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en.

The data on per capita income and median household income by city in 2006 are from the ESRI BIS Sourcebook of Zip Code Demographics obtained from the Association of Bay Area Governments and are derived from data by zip code. In some cases the zip code data may not correspond exactly with actual city boundaries, thereby skewing the income figures. The Gini coefficient is calculated using the household income distribution from the U.S. Census Bureau,American Community Survey. The U.S. Gini coefficient rate for 2000 is obtained from http://wwwreference.com/browse/wiki/Gini_coefficient. CDP stands for Census Designated Place, and is a geographical unit used in the 2000 U.S. Census.

The $15,720 federal poverty threshold in 2005 was obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau at http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshold/thresh05.html. Data on percent of San Mateo County residents living below the federal poverty threshold versus state and national rates are from the U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2005 Data Profiles. Data on percentage and number of children, adults, and families in poverty are from the U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2005 Data Profiles.

The $66,442 estimate for a family of three (one parent, one infant, and one school-age child) to remain self-sufficient in San Mateo County represents data for 2006, is from the County of San Mateo, Human Services Agency, and was found in Working at a Minimum, by Michelle Durand, San Mateo County Journal, October 19, 2006 located at http://www.smdailyjournal.com/article_preview.php?id=65709. Information about the county’s most concentrated poverty neighborhoods is from the Northern California Council for the Community, http://www.uwba.org/helplink/datacentral.html. Data on hunger and Food Stamp Program participation were obtained from California Food Policy Advocates at http://www.cfpa.net/press/FSSpring2006release/3foodstamreports.pdf.

Data on number of people “touched by hunger” were obtained from the California Food Policy Advocate’s 2005 Touched By Hunger: A County-by-County Report on Food Insecurity and Hunger in California at http://cfpa.net/2005TouchedByHunger/PDF%20Reports/San%20Mateo.pdf. The number of individuals “touched” by hunger is estimated by adding the number of individuals reporting hunger or food insecurity and the total number of other people living in those households.

Public Library Use, Page 37: In 2004-05, expenditures per capita were up nearly 10 percent from 2003-04 and 71 percent from 1994-95.

The County Library System includes the following 11 libraries: Atherton, Belmont, Brisbane, East Palo Alto, Foster City, Half Moon Bay, Millbrae, Pacifica, Portola Valley, San Carlos, and Woodside. The City of San Mateo Library also serves one-third of Hillsborough. The Burlingame Library also serves two-thirds of Hillsborough. Data are from the annual publication California Library Statistics for the fiscal years 1994-95 through 2004-05, published by the Library Development Services Bureau, California State Library found at http://www.library.ca.gov/html/LibraryStats.cfm.

Solid Waste, page 38: In 2005, solid waste disposal was up two percent from 2004 but was still down 16 percent since 2000. All data are from the California Integrated Waste Management Board. The county and individual city waste stream profiles were found at http://www.ci.wmmb.ca.gov/Profiles/. Information on diversion rates was found at http://www.ci.wmmb.ca.gov/lgcentral/divmeasure/stepbystep.htm. Population figures used in the per capita calculations are from the California Department of
Transportation, page 39: In 2005, daily vehicle hours of delay were down 30 percent from 2001; driving alone was the mode of choice for 70 percent of commuters.


Commute modes are generated by RIDES for Bay Area Commuters, Inc. via random telephone surveys. Data shown are from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Commute Profile 2005, available at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/library/commute_profile/.


Unemployment, Page 40: In 2006, unemployment rate was down for third consecutive year.

The unemployment rate is the number of unemployed as a percentage of the labor force. 2006 figures are preliminary estimates. Previous year’s data have been changed to reflect revisions made by the state to figures previously classified as preliminary. Figures used are not seasonally adjusted. Unemployment data are based on place of residence.

Voter Participation, page 41: In 2006, voter turnout was up from 2005 and last midterm election, but still less than half of eligible voters voted.

Water Use, page 42: In 2004-05, water use was down eight percent to lowest level since 1997-98.

Unemployment, Page 40: In 2006, unemployment rate was down for third consecutive year.

Water Use, page 42: In 2004-05, water use was down eight percent to lowest level since 1997-98.

See the appendix entry for Drinking Water Quality for more detail about which water districts serve which cities. In 2005 the California Water Service acquired the Los Trancos County Water District; and included it as part of the CWS- Bear Gulch District. Information on water use in the county is from the Bay Area Water Supply & Conservation Agency’s Annual Survey FY 2004-05 found at http://www.bawsca.org/almanac.html. We are grateful for the input from Benjamin Pink, a water resource planner with the Bay Area Water Supply & Conservation Agency.
HOW YOU CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

ENVIRONMENT

Fuel-Efficient Cars  Choose a fuel-efficient, low-polluting vehicle as your next car. This reduces our dependence on foreign oil and helps reduce local pollution. Look for SULEV or PZEV emissions ratings and 40 MPG or more (www.fueleconomy.gov).

Smart Energy Use  Invest in energy-efficient lighting, insulation, thermostats, appliances, windows, etc. Look for the Energy Star rating on thermostats and appliances (www.energystar.gov).

Nontoxic and Natural  Use nontoxic or natural alternatives to fertilizers, pesticides, solvents, or chemical cleaners; or simply reduce how much you use (www.betterbasics.com).

Get Active  Whenever practical, walk, bicycle, or take public transit. Good for your health and for the environment (www.commute.org).

Conserve Water  Choose low-flow toilets, low-water washing machines, and water-wise landscape plants (and don’t over-water) (www.waterwiser.org).

SOCIAL EQUITY

Equal Opportunity  Support job training efforts by schools, business, and nonprofits. Volunteer time or money to nonprofits that provide a hand up for our residents in need. Examples include SSMC Sustainability Award winners OICW (www.oicw.org) and The Bread Project.

Affordable Housing  Volunteer time or money to nonprofits that support affordable housing so that people who work here can afford to live here. Examples include SSMC Sustainability Award winners Peninsula Habitat for Humanity (www.peninsulahabitat.org), Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition (www.midpen-housing.org), and Shelter Network (www.shelternetwork.org).

Donate, Don’t Trash  Donate gently-used items for the benefit of others. RecycleWorks’ (www.recycleworks.org) Re-Use Guide can help you find a new home for just about anything.

ECONOMY

Buy Local  Shop locally-owned businesses. Dollars spent at local retailers support not only that store, but also a variety of other local businesses (banks, accountants, printers, etc.).

Support Our Local, Organic Farmers  Buy and eat local, organic foods. Shop your farmers’ market or try a farm share (www.mariquita.com/csa).

Working Conditions  Patronize businesses that pay a living wage and provide health benefits. Invest in socially responsible mutual funds.
WHAT BUSINESSES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS CAN DO

Plan for Sustainability
Develop a sustainability plan. Assess your business and develop a plan that includes goals, objectives, and performance measures that can be used to gauge progress towards sustainability. Think about improving your performance in all three aspects of sustainability: economy, social equity, and environment. A triple bottom line.

Smart Growth
Revise the general plan to incorporate smart growth design concepts (local governments). Rather than allowing developer-initiated, piecemeal development, local governments should take charge of the planning process. General plans should designate where new growth, infill, or redevelopment will be allowed to occur. See www.lgc.org.

Purchase Responsibly
Adopt an environmentally and socially responsible procurement policy. Specify recycled content products, non-toxic cleaners, integrated pest management, hybrid vehicles, energy-efficient computers/equipment, and compact fluorescent lights.

Retrofit Buildings
Improve the energy efficiency of existing buildings by upgrading windows, HVAC systems, and replacing inefficient lighting systems. See www.energystar.gov.

Be Water Wise
Conserve and/or recycle water. Water-efficient landscapes conserve water without sacrificing beauty. Recycled water can be used for manufacturing, landscape irrigation, fountains, and fire protection.

Build Greener
Employ green building principles for new construction. Green building practices save energy, water, resources, and money, while improving air quality and worker productivity. Encourage green building in your community. See www.recycleworks.org.

Provide Transportation Options
Local governments should provide citizens with transportation options such as transit, bike lanes, sidewalks and pedestrian amenities. Employers should reward employees for carpooling, walking, biking, and taking transit to work. See www.commute.org.

Compensate Fairly
Provide health insurance and a living wage to employees. Support a living wage policy for your community.
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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  ☐ Friend $100
☐ Sustainer $500  ☐ Member $50
☐ Sponsor $250  ☐ Senior/Student/Low Income $25

Yes, I want to contribute time and effort.

☐ Help with presentations  ☐ Participate in presenting the Annual Sustainability Awards
☐ Help research the Indicators  ☐ 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)

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