

ORDINANCE NO 2532

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDWOOD CITY ADOPTING THE TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY AND ASSOCIATED TRANSPORTATION FEE PROJECT LIST, AMENDING ARTICLE XV (TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE) OF CHAPTER 18 OF THE REDWOOD CITY MUNICIPAL CODE AND UPDATING THE CITY'S TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE

WHEREAS, the Redwood City Municipal Code Chapter 18 (Local Improvements and Planning), Article XV (Transportation Impact Fee) imposes upon new development the requirement to pay a Transportation Impact Fee ("Transportation Fee"); and

WHEREAS, new development projects bring new residents and employees to the City of Redwood City ("City"), generating an increased demand for transportation facilities; and

WHEREAS, the City performed a transportation needs assessment to support the future growth and utilized the transportation needs assessment to develop a Transportation Fee Nexus Study setting forth the nexus between the amount of the Transportation Fee and the impacts of new development; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared and submitted a Transportation Fee Nexus Study, dated December 18, 2023, attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference (the "Nexus Study"); and

WHEREAS, the City desires to update the amount of the Transportation Fee upon new development projects to ensure that new development contributes its fair share to transportation improvements in the City consistent with the City's standards; and

WHEREAS, the Nexus Study substantiates a methodology that will charge new development projects only for the costs necessary to mitigate the impacts related to those new projects; and

WHEREAS, there is a reasonable relationship between the Transportation Fee's use and the development projects on which the Transportation Fee will be imposed because the Transportation Fee will only fund costs reasonably related to each new development; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Fee does not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the transportation facilities for which the fee is imposed; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Fee is not levied, collected, or imposed for general revenue purposes, but is levied specifically to fund facilities of the types set forth in the Nexus Study; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Fees bear a reasonable relationship to the use of transportation facilities by the future inhabitants of new development; and

WHEREAS, the Nexus Study establishes a proposed amount and provides an evaluation of the need for an updated Transportation Fee and establishes the nexus between the imposition of the new Transportation Fee and the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged; and

WHEREAS, the Nexus Study identifies the City's high priority multi-modal and transportation safety improvement projects in adopted plans and the existing level of transportation service, identifies the proposed new level of service, and includes an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the Nexus Study includes information that supports the City's actions, as required by subdivision (a) of Section 66001 of the Government Code; and

WHEREAS, the Nexus Study reviewed the assumptions of the prior nexus study, which supported the existing Transportation Fee, and evaluated the amount of fees collected under the existing fees; and

WHEREAS, the City is adopting a Transportation Fee Project List, which serves as its capital improvement plan pursuant to subdivision (a)(6) of Section 66016.5 of the Government Code, as part of the Nexus Study, for the development and maintenance of transportation facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Fee Project List indicates the approximate location, size, time of availability, and estimates of cost for all facilities or improvements to be financed with the fees; and

WHEREAS, the Nexus Study was presented to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the impact fees and charges imposed by this Ordinance are necessary and reasonable to implement the goals and objectives of the City's General Plan and are permitted by California state law; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Fees are "exempt charges", within the meaning of Section 1 of Article XIII C of the California Constitution and the Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act (Initiative No. 21-0042) because they are a charge imposed as a condition of property development; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code sections 66016.5, 66018, and 6062a, a notice of a public hearing on the proposed fee update was published on December 8, 2023, and December 15, 2023, in the San Mateo Daily Journal, a newspaper of general circulation; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code sections 66016.5, notice of the time and place of the meeting, including a general explanation of the matters to be considered and a statement that required data is available was provided at least 30 days prior to the meeting to those members of the public who filed a written request with the City; and

WHEREAS, at least 14 days prior to the public hearing referenced above, the City made available for public inspection information required under the Mitigation Fee Act; and

WHEREAS, on January 8, 2024, the City Council held a noticed public hearing to consider the City's proposed new Transportation Fees at which time all interested persons were given an opportunity to comment.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDWOOD CITY DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The above recitals are true and correct, and incorporated herein by reference and each is relied upon independently by the City Council for its adoption of the Ordinance.

Section 2. The Ordinance has been reviewed with respect to applicability of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the CEQA Guidelines. The Ordinance is not project under Public Resources Code Section 21065 and California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4) because the Ordinance does not have the potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, as the Ordinance creates government funding mechanisms which do not involve any commitment to any specific project. The Ordinance is also exempt from CEQA as there is no possibility for causing a significant effect on the environment, per CEQA Guideline Section 15061(b)(3). No specific transportation projects are associated with this Ordinance. The Ordinance is policy-oriented and would create a funding mechanism for the development of future transportation facilities. When and if specific transportation projects are developed and proposed for implementation, the environmental impacts of such facilities would be evaluated in accordance with CEQA and City practice.

Section 3. Redwood City Municipal Code, Chapter 18, Article XV, is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the text shown on **Exhibit B**.

Section 4. The City Council finds and determines that the Nexus Study, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, complies with California Government Code section 66000 et seq., and is consistent with the General Plan, and hereby approves and adopts the Nexus Study.

Section 5. The City Council hereby approves and adopts the Transportation Fee Project List included as Appendix B in the Nexus Study.

Section 6. The City Council hereby sets rates for the Transportation Fee as shown in **Exhibit C**, attached hereto, and incorporated by this reference.

Section 7. The terms of this Ordinance shall apply to all Developments (as that term is defined in section 18.246 of the Redwood City Municipal Code) in the City, except with respect to any portion of a project for which a building permit has been issued.

Section 8. The Transportation Fee as shown on Exhibit C, the Nexus Study, and the Transportation Fee Project List may be amended from time to time by ordinance or resolution of the City Council.

Section 9. If any provision, section, paragraph, sentence or word of this Ordinance, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is rendered or declared invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions, sections, paragraphs, sentences or words of this Ordinance, and their application to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby and shall remain in full force and effect and, to that end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

Section 10. The Transportation Fee shall automatically increase starting on July 1, 2025, and each year thereafter, in accordance with changes in regional construction costs. The amount of the adjustment shall be based on May over May construction cost changes according to the "Construction Cost Index" for the San Francisco Bay Area, as reported monthly in the Engineering News Record.

Section 11. This Ordinance shall become effective 30 days after the date of its adoption. The fees adopted by this Ordinance shall become effective 60 days after adoption.

Section 12. Once effective, the Transportation Fee shall be incorporated into the City's Master Fee Schedule.

Section 13. The City Clerk is directed to cause this Ordinance to be published in the manner required by law.

* * *



REDWOOD CITY TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE STUDY

December 2023 Update



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

To: Malahat Owrang, City of Redwood City

From: Teifion Rice-Evans

Subject: Nexus Study for Redwood City Transportation Impact Fee Update; EPS #231039

Date: December 18, 2023

This Nexus Study for the Redwood City Transportation Impact Fee Update (Report) provides the City of Redwood City (City) with the necessary findings and technical documentation to identify and adopt the maximum updated transportation impact fees that could be placed on new development in the City. It is understood that the City will consider different approaches to implementing fee updates in the coming months and that the City may choose to adopt transportation impact fees below the maximum, justifiable levels based on economic or other policy considerations.

The City of Redwood City updated its Transportation Impact Fee in 2012 authorizing the imposition of transportation impact fees under the Mitigation Fee Act.

The establishment of the City's updated, maximum transportation fee schedule includes three core components:

Nexus Findings and AB 602 Compliance. In order to establish or update its maximum allowable transportation impact fees, the City must be able to make a series of nexus findings as required by the Mitigation Fee Act. It must also comply with the more recently adopted refinements to the Mitigation Fee Act associated with AB 602. This memorandum provides the necessary nexus findings for the updated fee program and explains how the fee program meets the requirements of AB 602.

Technical Analysis. Detailed technical analysis, consistent with the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act (AB 1600 or CA Government Code §66000 et seq "Fees for Development Projects") is required to establish the maximum, justifiable transportation impact fees. The new and updated technical analysis identifies the required impact fee capital improvement program and ensures that the cost allocation to new

development is reasonable and proportional. This analysis (“Technical Analysis” was conducted by Hexagon Transportation Consultants (Hexagon), in collaboration with City staff, and is provided in **Appendix A**.

Capital Improvement Plan. The Transportation Impact Fee Project List was developed and is included in the Technical Analysis. **Appendix B** of this memorandum also provides the Transportation Impact Fee Project List that serves as the Capital Improvement Plan required by AB 602 and may be amended from time to time pursuant to Government Code section 66002. This Capital Improvement Plan, consistent with AB 602, will be adopted by the City as part of the fee update process.

Updated Maximum Fees by Land Use

Table 1 shows the maximum impact fees by land use categories calculated in the Transportation Impact Fee Technical Analysis (**Appendix A**), and the resulting updated maximum fee schedule when the per unit residential fees are converted into per square foot fees as requested by AB 602.

As part of this updated transportation impact fee nexus study, the City is recommending the adoption of a fee schedule with a consolidated set of land use categories to improve clarity around applicable fee levels and simplify fee program administration and implementation. The land use categories are similar to those in the recently updated parks impact fee nexus study, though they include a few more categories due to the unique transportation characteristics of some nonresidential land uses. Consistent with AB 3005, the fees that apply to residential development in the Downtown Precise Plan area are considered to satisfy the characteristics listed in Government Code section 66005.1, and therefore, the fees for that area have been discounted to account for expected lower trip generation rates.

Table 2 shows a comparison between the City’s existing transportation impact fees, the updated maximum fee schedule developed in the Technical Analysis, and the final set of maximum fees after the per unit single family and multi-family fees are converted into per square feet fees, pursuant to AB 602. Under the existing fee program there is a much larger set of non-residential categories, so one of the primary relevant categories from the existing fee schedule is shown for comparison purposes where there is no a direct correspondence. This comparison is for areas outside the Downtown Precise Plan area.

The City can choose to adopt fees at the maximum level or at a level below the maximum based on policy and other considerations. The City can also choose to exempt or discount fees for specific land uses, though that will typically result in the City collecting less revenue than what is required to serve new development.

Table 1 Summary of Maximum Potential Transportation Impact Fees by Land Use

| Land Use Category (1) | Maximum Updated Fees (2) | Maximum Fees Downtown (3) | Metric |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Residential (4) | | | |
| Single Family | \$3.22 | \$2.00 | Per Livable SF |
| Multi-Family | \$2.31 | \$1.43 | Per Livable SF |
| | | | |
| Non-Residential | | | |
| Office/ R&D | \$6.58 | \$6.58 | Per Gross Building SF |
| Medical/ Dental Office | \$21.87 | \$21.87 | Per Gross Building SF |
| Industrial | \$2.96 | \$2.96 | Per Gross Building SF |
| General Retail | \$4.50 | \$4.50 | Per Leasable Building SF |
| High Intensity Retail | \$56.79 | \$56.79 | Per Leasable Building SF |
| Entertainment Venue | \$47.43 | \$47.43 | Per Gross Building SF |
| Religious Facility | \$2.96 | \$2.96 | Per Gross Building SF |
| Hotel/ Lodging | \$4,853 | \$4,853 | Per Room |
| School | \$1,178 | \$1,178 | Per Student |
| Service Station | \$41,792 | \$41,792 | Per Fueling Station |

- (1) City proposes to use a consolidated set of land use categories compared to existing transportation fee schedule for improved fee program clarity and implementation.
- (2) Maximum transportation impact fees based on Transportation Impact Fee Technical Analysis. (Appendix A) with conversion of residential fees to per square foot fees per AB 602.
- (3) Consistent with Section 66005.1 of the Mitigation Fee Act, downtown rates for residential development are reduced. The applied reduction is 38 percent based on observed difference in trip rates for apartments in downtown vs. suburban settings.
- (4) The fee on ADU's is governed by its own legislation. Calculation of fees for ADUs 750 sq.ft. or larger shall comply with Government Code § 65852.2(f)(3)(A). For ADU's over this minimum threshold, the City is allowed to charge a maximum fee based on the ADU size as a percent of the primary dwelling unit size, that is then applied to the fee on the single family home.

Sources: City of Redwood City; Hexagon Transportation Consultants; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Table 2 Summary of Existing and Maximum Potential Transportation Impact Fees by Land Use

| Land Use | Existing Fees (1) | Maximum Updated Fees (pre-AB 602) (2) | Metric | Maximum Updated Fees (AB 602 Conversion) (3) | Metric |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Residential (4) | | | | | |
| Single Family | \$1,617 | \$5,728 | Per Unit | \$3.22 | Per Livable SF |
| Multi-Family | \$992 | \$2,758 | Per Unit | \$2.31 | Per Livable SF |
| | | | | | |
| Non-Residential | | | | | |
| Office/ R&D | \$2.38 | \$6.58 | Per Gross Building SF | \$6.58 | Per Gross Building SF |
| Medical/ Dental Office | \$5.54 | \$21.87 | Per Gross Building SF | \$21.87 | Per Gross Building SF |

| Land Use | Existing Fees (1) | Maximum Updated Fees (pre-AB 602) (2) | Metric | Maximum Updated Fees (AB 602 Conversion) (3) | Metric |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Industrial | \$1.55 | \$2.96 | Per Gross Building SF | \$2.96 | Per Gross Building SF |
| General Retail | \$3.94 | \$4.50 | Per Leasable Building SF | \$4.50 | Per Leasable Building SF |
| High Intensity Retail | \$27.08 | \$56.79 | Per Leasable Building SF | \$56.79 | Per Leasable Building SF |
| Entertainment Venue | N/A | \$47.43 | Per Gross Building SF | \$47.43 | Per Gross Building SF |
| Religious Facility | \$2.38 | \$2.96 | Per Gross Building SF | \$2.96 | Per Gross Building SF |
| Hotel/ Lodging | \$945.00 | \$4,853 | Per Room | \$4,853 | Per Room |
| School | \$272.00 | \$1,178 | Per Student | \$1,178 | Per Student |
| Service Station | \$12,878 | \$41,792 | Per Fueling Station | \$41,792 | Per Fueling Station |

(1) Under the existing fee program there is a much larger set of non-residential fee categories. Existing fees shown here represent fees for one of the primary categories of these land uses under the existing fee program.

(2) Maximum transportation impact fees as derived in Transportation Impact Fee Technical Analysis (**Appendix A**).

(3) AB 602 asks that jurisdictions establish updated impact fees on residential development on a per square foot basis. Per unit residential impact fees were converted to per square foot fees based on the existing average sizes (livable square feet) of single family (1,780 square feet) and multi-family (1,196 square feet) units in the City based on County Assessor data.

(4) The fee on ADU's is governed by its own legislation. Calculation of fees for ADUs 750 sq.ft. or larger shall comply with Government Code § 65852.2(f)(3)(A). For ADU's over this minimum threshold, the City is allowed to charge a maximum fee based on the ADU size as a percent of the primary dwelling unit size, that is then applied to the single family home fee.

Sources: City of Redwood City; Hexagon Transportation Consultants; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Mitigation Fee Act Nexus Findings

Development impact fees can be charged to new development under the Mitigation Fee Act and require a specific set of nexus findings. A summary of the key nexus findings are provided below. The technical information and calculations provided in the Technical Analysis developed by Hexagon support these nexus findings/requirements.

- Identify the Purpose of the Fee.** The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development contributes its proportionate share of funding to support improvements to the City's transportation infrastructure as identified in the City's adopted transportation programs and required to support the growth envisioned in the City's Focused General Plan Update.
- Identify the Use to which the Fee is to be Put.** The fee revenues will help fund improvements to the City's transportation infrastructure required to accommodate future travel demand associated with new developments. This includes multi-modal improvements and traffic operational and roadway improvements. The Technical Analysis (see **Appendix A**) provides the list of proposed multi-modal improvements and operational/ roadway improvements which are also provided in the Transportation Impact Fee Project List in

Appendix B. The Impact Fee Project List serves as the Capital Improvement Plan required by AB 602 and may be amended from time to time pursuant to Government Code section 66002.

- **Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee’s use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.** All the land uses on which the fee will be charged generate demand for the transportation improvements that will be funded. The fee is differentiated by land use to reflect different levels of use/demand for transportation improvements by different land uses. As described in the Technical Analysis, different land use development categories are charged fees based on their specific transportation demand as measured by their average daily trip generation rates (provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition (2021)). As a result, there is a careful calibration between fee level and use and the type of development project.
- **Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.** The City’s adopted transportation plans and associated Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program were developed in connection with the envisioned and expected growth and development under the City’s Focused General Plan. As a result, there is a direct relationship between the needed public facilities and new growth and development in the city. As noted above, the technical analysis specifically allocates costs to different land use developments based on their expected demand for the transportation improvements.
- **Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which it is imposed.** The Technical Analysis carefully develops cost allocations for different sets of transportation improvements to ensure a reasonable and proportionate allocation of costs to the new development on which the fee is imposed. This includes only allocating a portion of transportation improvements costs to new development based on expected demand relative to existing development, while also taking account of existing deficiencies and impacts of non-City regional growth.

For operational and roadway improvements, costs are allocated to the new development based on the transportation analysis conducted for each improvement. For multi-modal improvements, costs are allocated to new development based on the proportion of new Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) associated with new development relative to existing development. As a result, the technical analysis ensures that the fee schedule (amount of the fee) is directly and proportionally tied to the costs of the public facilities.

AB 602 Requirements

AB 602 went into effect on January 1, 2022, and adds additional requirements for development impact fee programs and updates adopted under the Mitigation Fee Act. Four topics that must be addressed in or in association with updated Nexus Studies, include: (1) the adoption of a capital improvement plan; (2) a discussion of the level of service; (3) review of the original nexus study; and, (4) establishment of residential fees on a per square foot basis, where possible. These topics are discussed below.

Capital Improvement Plan

AB 602 notes that “large jurisdictions shall adopt a capital improvement plan as a part of the nexus study.” The City of Redwood City falls under the definition of a large jurisdiction. As part of the Technical Analysis, City staff developed an impact fee capital improvement program that is also provided in **Appendix B**.

The City’s Transportation Impact Fee Project List, shown in **Appendix B**, identifies planned transportation improvements projects, estimated costs, and estimated timeframes for construction. As shown, the City has identified potential investment through 2040 of about \$321.2 million, including about \$104.2 million in multi-modal improvements and \$217.0 million in operational and roadway improvements. As documented in the Technical Analysis, only a portion of these transportation costs can be allocated to new development, summing to about \$101.7 million or 32 percent of total impact fee capital improvement program costs.

Levels of Service

AB 602 also notes that “when applicable, the nexus study should identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service, and include an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate.”

Similar to this update, the current TIF program and nexus study included both multi-modal facilities and operational/ roadway improvements. The level of service for multi-modal facilities has increased under the new TIF in line with the additional multi-modal service needs identified in the Redwood City General Plan, RWCMoves, and the Citywide Transportation Plan.

For operational and roadway improvements, the City considers a deficiency to exist if a facility operates at Level of Service (LOS) E or F. This level of service standard is used in the Technical Analysis to determine whether roadway improvements had existing deficiencies and, as a result, the associated portion of roadway improvement projects that cannot be allocated to new development. This updated transportation impact fee study does not include a change in this level of service standard.

Original Nexus Study

AB 602 also notes that “if a nexus study supports the increase of an existing fee, the local agency shall review the assumptions of the nexus study supporting the original fee and evaluate the amount of fees collected under the original fee.” City staff and Hexagon reviewed the 2012 nexus study. As documented in the Technical Analysis, the 2012 transportation impact fee project list was reviewed with determinations made where projects had been completed and funded, are no longer being pursued, or are not complete. The increase in fees associated with the updated Technical Analysis are associated with increases in costs as well as an expansion in the transportation projects consistent with City policy documents and plans and current growth forecasts. This expanded project list includes additional multi-modal facilities identified in the Redwood City General Plan and RWCMoves. Total project costs were reduced by the TIF revenues collected as well as known grant revenues and other developer payments.

Per Square Foot Residential Fees

AB 602 notes that for fees adopted after July 1, 2022, the nexus study must “either calculate a fee levied or imposed on a housing development proportionately to the square footage of the proposed units, or make specific findings explaining why square footage is not an appropriate

metric to calculate the fees.” AB 602 also notes that. “This bill would require that a local agency that calculates fees proportionately to the square footage of the proposed units be deemed to have used a valid method to establish a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.”

As noted above, the Technical Analysis developed per unit residential fees for single family and multi-family along with per square foot fees for non-residential units based, in part, on trip generation rates. While there is no clear data that ties unit size in square feet proportionately to trip generation rates, it is possible to convert per unit fees into per square foot fees by dividing the per unit fee by an average unit size.

The City’s Planning and Building Department reviewed detailed information on the existing single family and multi-family housing stock in the city by using the most recent San Mateo County Assessor’s parcel data. Based on this review, City staff determined the average size of an existing single-family unit in the city is 1,780 livable square feet, and the existing size of an existing multi-family unit in the City is 1,196 livable square feet. Livable square feet excludes building square footage that contains parking, common, and other non-livable areas. These average home sizes were then applied to the per unit fees to determine the maximum per square foot residential fee for single family and multi-family development respectively.

APPENDICES:

Appendix A: Traffic Technical Analysis for
Redwood City Traffic Impact Fee

Appendix B: Transportation Impact Fee Project List

APPENDIX A:
**Traffic Technical Analysis for
Redwood City Traffic Impact Fee**

Memorandum

Date: December 15, 2023

To: Malahat Owrang, City of Redwood City
Teifion Rice-Evans, Economic Planning Services, Inc.

From: Gary Black
Daniel Choi

Subject: Traffic Technical Analysis for the Redwood City Traffic Impact Fee Update

Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. has completed this technical report for updating the Redwood City's Traffic Impact Fee (TIF), which was adopted in year 2012. This study updates the list of projects and fee calculations based on the year 2040 land use projections. The fees will fund needed improvements to the City's transportation infrastructure to accommodate future travel demand projected as a result of new developments. The updated fee program will support the City's most recent General Plan and includes many high priority projects described in *RWCMoves (July 2018)*, which is the city's blueprint for improvements to the transportation network in Redwood City.

Traffic Technical Analysis Scope

The development of the fee program consists of producing a list of transportation improvements that is to be partially funded by the impact fees collected from new development and then calculating the fair share portion of the funding that is the responsibility of new development. The City's transportation project list and the analysis completed to determine new developments fair-share is described in the following sections. Additional information regarding potential adjustments to the maximum is provided for consideration.

Transportation Improvement Projects

The Redwood City Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee will partially fund needed improvements to the City's transportation infrastructure to accommodate planned growth within Redwood City as a result of new development. Improvements will include traffic operation and roadway infrastructure projects as well as multi-modal infrastructure projects throughout the incorporated areas of Redwood City. The most recent General Plan and RWCMoves, the citywide transportation plan, prioritize traffic safety and multi-modal transportation infrastructure projects. Traffic operation and roadway infrastructure projects were considered at select locations that do not conflict with the goals and policies described in the City's general plan or the citywide transportation plan.

The transportation project list consists of several components:

- Multi-modal Projects: These projects would improve the safety, capacity, accessibility, efficiency, and comfort of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. These improvements include a variety of projects (some of which are in the planning/feasibility stage) in the following categories:
 - Vision Zero Projects: Vision Zero projects are multi-modal infrastructure projects identified in the *Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan* (Citywide Bicycle and Pedestrian

Master Plan and Vision Zero Action Plan) (June 2022) plan that aim to reduce pedestrian and bicycle fatalities and severe injuries at locations that have seen high levels of collisions.

- Transit Improvement Projects: These projects include the construction of facilities to bring ferry service into Redwood City, multi-modal supportive facilities at transit hubs, studies for the Caltrain Grade Separation within the City, and other transit-supportive facilities that enhance the accessibility and support the use of multi-modal transportation to reach transit options in the city.
- Bikeway Improvement Projects: These projects include new class II bike lanes, class III bike boulevards, and class IV cycle tracks based on the improvements identified in *Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan* needed to improve accessibility and safety for bicycle travel within the city.
- Pedestrian Improvement Projects: These projects include street crossing enhancements and new class I mixed-use trails identified in *Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan* needed to improve accessibility and safety for pedestrians at frequently used locations within the city.
- Corridor Improvement Projects: These projects include streetscape improvements, traffic calming measures, transit improvements, bicycle improvements, and pedestrian improvements within specific corridors. These improvements will encourage the use of multi-modal transportation, as outlined in *RWCMoves*.

Traffic operation and roadway infrastructure projects: These projects would improve the motor vehicle capacity or operational characteristics of roadway facilities. These improvements include signal installations, signal modifications, striping modifications, roadway improvements, and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) upgrades to enhance and improve the motor vehicle transportation network in the city.

Fee Program Background

Redwood City adopted its most recent Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee (TIF) in 2012. The fee was established to fund capital improvement projects needed to serve new development. The collected fees were not used to improve or correct deficiencies in baseline (2012) conditions, nor were they used to mitigate the impacts of regional through traffic (traffic that passes through but does not originate or end in Redwood City).

Since the 2012 TIF, the city has adopted several citywide transportation plans and focused general plan updates, which detail and reexamine the expected population and employment growth envisioned in the general plan. This update represents an inclusive transportation vision for Redwood City that distributes funds across the most prioritized projects in the most recently adopted transportation plans.

Current Fee Program

Transportation impact mitigation fees are collected for all new developments in Redwood City. Table 1 lists the schedule of the current traffic impact mitigation fees for each land use category.

Table 2 shows the 2012 TIF project list and the current status of each project. City staff have indicated that the City currently has approximately \$16,639,716.26 in additional revenues for transportation projects, which may be used to reduce the TIF program costs. These revenues include the TIF program balance, additional grant revenues, and other developer payments.

Table 1- Current Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program Fee Schedule

| Land Use Category | ITE Category | DUE Factor | Units | Non-Downtown Fee | Downtown Fee |
|--|--------------------|------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Residential Uses | | | | | |
| Single Family Residential ^[1] | 210 | 1.00 | Per Dwelling Unit | \$1,617 | \$1,212 |
| Multi-Family Residential ^[2] | 220 | 0.61 | Per Dwelling Unit | \$992 | \$744 ^[3] |
| Congregate Care Facility | 253 | 0.17 | Per Dwelling Unit | \$272 | \$204 |
| Below-Market-Rate Housing | n/a ^[4] | 0.43 | Per Dwelling Unit | \$695 | \$521 |
| Non-Residential Uses | | | | | |
| Industrial | 110 | 0.001 | Per square foot | \$1.55 | \$1.16 |
| Warehousing | 150 | 0.0003 | Per square foot | \$0.51 | \$0.39 |
| Hotel | 310 | 0.5842 | Per room | \$945 | \$709 |
| Motel | 320 | 0.4653 | Per room | \$753 | \$564 |
| Movie Theater | 445 | 0.0792 | Per seat | \$128 | \$96 |
| Private School (K-12) | 536 | 0.1683 | Per student | \$272 | \$204 |
| Church | 560 | 0.0005 | Per square foot | \$0.88 | \$0.66 |
| Office | 710 | 0.0015 | Per square foot | \$2.38 | \$1.79 |
| Medical Office Building | 720 | 0.0034 | Per square foot | \$5.54 | \$4.15 |
| Research and Development | 760 | 0.0011 | Per square foot | \$1.71 | \$1.28 |
| General Retail (Shopping Center) | 820 | 0.0024 | Per square foot | \$3.94 | \$2.96 |
| Supermarket | 850 | 0.0067 | Per square foot | \$10.75 | \$8.07 |
| Convenience Store | 851 | 0.0202 | Per square foot | \$32.72 | \$24.54 |
| Pharmacy/Drug Store without Drive Through | 880 | 0.0039 | Per square foot | \$6.33 | \$4.76 |
| Bank | 911 | 0.0064 | Per square foot | \$10.29 | \$7.72 |
| Quality Restaurant | 931 | 0.0042 | Per square foot | \$6.72 | \$5.04 |
| High Turnover Restaurant | 932 | 0.0063 | Per square foot | \$10.17 | \$7.63 |
| Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window | 934 | 0.0168 | Per square foot | \$27.08 | \$20.31 |
| Service Station | 944 | 7.965 | Per fueling position | \$12,878 | \$9,658 |
| Service Station with Convenience Market | 945 | 5.8289 | Per fueling position | \$9,424 | \$7,046 |
| Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) = \$1,617 | | | | | |
| Downtown is defined as properties located within the Downtown Precise Plan Area. | | | | | |
| [1] Single family residential is defined as a residential density of 1-15 units per acre regardless of whether units are attached or detached. | | | | | |
| [2] Multi-family residential is defined as a residential density of 16+ units per acre regardless of whether units are attached or detached. | | | | | |
| [3] The fee for residential developments in Downtown is consistent with requirements in GC 66005.1 for transit-oriented housing as it accounts for reduced automobile trip generation due to proximity to transit service and better pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. | | | | | |
| [4] Below-market-rate housing fee calculated by reducing the multi-family residential fee by 30 percent based on the results of the 2000 Census in San Francisco which shows about 30 percent less vehicle ownership (which corresponds to lower vehicle trip generation) in low-income neighborhoods. | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government, publicly owned is exempt. • A credit may be applied for the prior permitted use and occupancy of existing structures on a site. | | | | | |

Proposed Fee Program Projects

This proposed update includes a new list of transportation projects to fund based on the high-priority projects identified in *RWCMoves* and *Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan*. Roadway infrastructure projects that improve motor vehicle capacity or operational efficiency are included, as well as needed improvements to transit, pedestrian, and bicycle infrastructure.

Table 2- Status of 2012 TIF Projects

| Status of 2012 TIF Projects | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|
| # | Project | Description | Status |
| Intersection Improvements | | | |
| 1 | Bay Road/Woodside Road | 1) Provide signal pre-emption 2) NB Bay Road to provide one left, one through and one shared through/right lane | Funded/ In-Progress |
| 2 | Bay Road/Fifth Avenue | Install traffic signal | Funded/In-Progress |
| 3 | Redwood Shores Parkway/Bridge Parkway | Install traffic signal | Not Complete |
| 4 | Broadway/Charter Street | Install traffic signal | Completed |
| 5 | Broadway/Walnut Street | Install traffic signal | Not Complete |
| 6 | Broadway/Woodside Road | Add second right turn lane on NB Broadway | No Longer Pursuing (1) |
| 7 | El Camino Real/Beech Street - Lincoln Avenue | Median closure | In-Progress (2) |
| 8 | El Camino Real/Whipple Avenue | Add WB (Whipple) free right turn and merge lane | No Longer Pursuing (1) |
| 9 | Hudson Street /Roosevelt Avenue | Install traffic signal | No Longer Pursuing |
| 10 | Main Street/Bradford Street | Install traffic signal | Not Complete |
| 11 | Main Street/Woodside Road Ramps | Install traffic signal | Funded/In-Progress |
| 12 | Maple Street/Marshall Street | Install traffic signal | No Longer Pursuing |
| 13 | Middlefield Road/Jefferson Avenue | Restripe SB Middlefield to one through, one right lane, and prohibit SB left turns | Not Complete |
| 14 | Middlefield Road/Main Street | Restripe NB and SB (Middlefield) approaches to one left, one shared through/right, and change phasing from split to protected | Not Complete |
| 15 | Middlefield Road/Woodside Road | 1) Signal Pre-emption 2) Crosswalks and pedestrian signals | Completed |
| 16 | Veterans Boulevard/ Whipple Avenue | 1) Add second WB (Whipple) left lane 2) Add EB (Whipple) left lane and change from permitted to protected 3) Restripe EB (Whipple) shared though/left as a dedicated through lane 4) Add EB (Whipple) right turn overlap 5) Restripe though lane on SB Veterans Blvd to a shared right/ through lane | No Longer Pursuing (1) |

Status of 2012 TIF Projects

| # | Project | Description | Status |
|------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|
| 17 | Veterans Boulevard/ Whipple Avenue | Add EB (Whipple) right turn lane | No Longer Pursuing (1) |
| 18 | Veterans Boulevard/ Woodside Road | 1) Add WB (Woodside) right turn overlap 2) Add a shared left-through lane on SB Veterans and a second receiving lane on US 101 on-ramp | No Longer Pursuing (1) |
| 19 | Bay Road/Douglas Avenue | Install traffic signal with left-turn lanes on NB and SB Bay Road | Not Complete |
| 20 | Middlefield Road/Douglas Avenue | Provide protected phasing for NB and SB Middlefield Rd | Not Complete |
| 21 | Broadway/Second Avenue | Install traffic signal | Not Complete |
| 22 | Blomquist Street/Maple Street | Install signal and provide dedicated left-turn lanes | Not Complete |
| Corridor Improvements | | | |
| 25 | Blomquist Road Extension | Extend to East Bayshore, bridge Redwood Creek | Not Complete |
| 26 | East Bayshore Road | Widen south of Whipple | No Longer Pursuing |
| 27 | Veterans Boulevard | Widen to 4 lanes between Chestnut and Woodside | No Longer Pursuing (1) |
| 28 | Woodside Road (El Camino to Valota) | Median closures | Complete |
| 29 | US 101/Woodside Road/Seaport Boulevard Interchange | Interchange improvements (engineering studies and preliminary design) | Complete |
| 30 | Middlefield Road (Woodside to Main) | Pedestrian streetscape improvements | Complete |
| Other Modes | | | |
| 31 | Neighborhood Traffic Management Programs | Alleviate cut-through traffic and speeding in various neighborhoods | Ongoing (3) |
| 32 | Bicycle Improvements | New class I, II, and III bicycle facilities per the 2010 General Plan (See Appendix A regarding specific improvements included) | Ongoing (3) |
| 33 | Complete Streets Improvements | -Middlefield Rd between Flynn Ave and Douglas Ave: modify to 3 lanes plus bike lanes -Jefferson Ave between Clinton St and Farm Hill Blvd: Modify to 3 lanes plus bike lanes -Broadway between Maple and Chestnut Streets: modify to 3 lanes plus bike lanes -Broadway between Charter St and a quarter-mile east of Douglas Avenue: Modify to 3 lanes plus bike lanes -Farm Hill Blvd between Jefferson Ave and I-280: modify to 2 lanes where there is a median and 3 lanes where no median | Ongoing (3) |
| 34 | Streetcar System | Feasibility and preliminary studies for the streetcar system as envisioned in the 2010 General Plan | Complete |

| Status of 2012 TIF Projects | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|-------------|
| # | Project | Description | Status |
| 35 | Various Transit and TDM Measures | Various transit and TDM programs throughout the City to reduce single occupant automobile trips. | Ongoing (3) |
| 36 | Downtown Precise Plan Improvements | Various bicycle, pedestrian, traffic calming, and automobile connectivity projects. | Ongoing (3) |
| <p>Notes:</p> <p>(1) City is pursuing a new project that would supersede this project.</p> <p>(2) In-Progress, as part of a larger improvement project.</p> <p>(3) Ongoing activities.</p> | | | |

Transportation Fee Analysis

The technical analysis for this study was completed in six steps. Each step is described below.

Step 1 - Determine Capital Projects and Costs Needed to Accommodate Future Growth and Enhance the City’s Multi-Modal Infrastructure

The multi-modal transportation infrastructure envisioned in the City’s General Plan and *RWCMoves* would consist of a variety of improvement projects including intersection improvements, roadway improvements, pedestrian improvements, new bicycle facilities, and transit infrastructure. A variety of reference documents, including the City’s General Plan, *RWCMoves*, *Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan*, Precise Plan updates, environmental documents, and other planning studies have identified specific improvements that would provide additional capacity or enhance the multi-modal network needed to serve Redwood City through 2040.

Roadway enhancements and multi-modal projects to be included in the updated TIF program were selected in coordination with city staff. High priority multi-modal projects identified in *RWCMoves* and *Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan* that would be needed to accommodate future growth and achieve the City’s transportation goals are included in the updated fee program.

Multi-Modal Improvement Projects

Table 3 lists the multi-modal transportation improvement projects, their descriptions, and cost estimate for each project. Some of the listed projects would provide funding for planning-level studies.

The total cost of the multi-modal transportation improvement projects included in the TIF program is estimated to be \$104 million. The detailed cost estimate for each multi-modal transportation improvement project is included in Attachment A.

Table 3- Multi-Modal Project Cost Estimate

| # | Project | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|---|--|--|-----------------|-------------|
| 1 | El Camino Real and Jefferson Avenue Intersection Improvements | Install intersection enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading crosswalks, adjusting median noses, installing leading pedestrian interval, installing retroreflective backplates, installing ADA compliant curb ramps, installing traffic calming measures, and installing advance limit lines. | within 5 years | \$315,000 |
| 2 | Broadway and Main Street Intersection Improvements | Install intersection enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading crosswalks, installing pedestrian countdown heads and push buttons, upgrading signal heads and installing retroreflective backplates, and installing ADA compliant curb ramps. | within 5 years | \$1,080,000 |
| 3 | Broadway and Woodside Road Intersection Improvements | Install intersection enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading crosswalks, adjusting median noses, installing leading pedestrian interval, refresh cat tracking through intersection, installing green bike conflict markings, installing ADA compliant curb ramps, and installing advance limit lines. | within 10 years | \$690,000 |
| 4 | Broadway and 5th Avenue Intersection Improvements | Install intersection enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading crosswalks, installing new crosswalk, and installing flashing stop signs. | within 5 years | \$60,000 |
| 5 | Whipple Avenue, between Veterans Blvd and El Camino Real | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading lane lines, adjusting median noses, installing accessible pedestrian signals (APS), installing retroreflective backplates, installing mid-block crossing, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and installing buffered bike lanes. | within 10 years | \$1,455,000 |
| 6 | Broadway, between Cassia Street and Winslow Street | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading lane lines, installing accessible pedestrian signals (APS), installing retroreflective backplates, installing leading pedestrian intervals, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and installing buffered bike lanes. | within 5 years | \$1,070,000 |
| 7 | El Camino Real, between Center Street and Roosevelt Avenue and Class IV Cycle Track on El Camino Real within City Limits | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading lane lines, installing accessible pedestrian signals (APS), adjusting median noses, installing retroreflective backplates, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and lighting enhancements. Caltrans has a planned installation of a Class IV bikeway along the entire El Camino Real within city limits. The City would install protected intersection treatments and HAWK beacons, where feasible. | within 10 years | \$4,665,000 |
| 8 | Woodside Road, between Hess Road and Kentfield Avenue | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: installing retroreflective backplates, installing speed feedback signs, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and installing bulb outs at unsignalized intersections. Funds would also be used | within 10 years | \$2,045,000 |

| # | Project | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|----|---|---|-----------------|---------------|
| | | to conduct a complete streets corridor study and coordinate with Caltrans to conduct a bike facility feasibility study. | | |
| 9 | Redwood Shores Parkway, between Twin Dolphin Dr and Shoreline Dr | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: installing wayfinding signage for bikers, installing accessible pedestrian signals (APS), adjusting median noses, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, installing green bike conflict markings, and tightening curb radii. | within 10 years | \$1,220,000 |
| 10 | Commuter Ferry Service | Construct Ferry Terminal in Redwood City | within 5 years | \$ 23,760,000 |
| 11 | Alameda de las Pulgas Corridor Improvements | Install pedestrian safety improvements along Alameda de las Pulgas | within 5 years | \$ 940,000 |
| 12 | Caltrain Grade Crossings | Conduct environmental review studies for Caltrain grade separation within Redwood City. Funds would be used for Environmental Review. | within 5 years | \$4,000,000 |
| 13 | Redwood City Bike Lanes | Install bike lanes along roadway segments identified in Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan. | various years | \$1,170,000 |
| 14 | Redwood City Bike Boulevards | Install bike boulevards along roadway segments identified in Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan. | various years | \$2,125,000 |
| 15 | James Avenue Cycle Track (RWC Transit Center to Elwood Street) | Install two-way Class IV cycle track | within 5 years | \$1,160,000 |
| 16 | Maple Street Cycle Track (Main Street to El Camino Real) | Install two-way Class IV cycle track | within 5 years | \$895,000 |
| 17 | Middlefield Road Cycle Track (Winslow Street to MacArthur Avenue) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$2,575,000 |
| 18 | Bay Road Cycle Track (Woodside Road to Florence Street) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$2,970,000 |
| 19 | Main Street Cycle Track (Convention Way to El Camino Real) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$3,385,000 |
| 20 | Winslow Street Cycle Track (Whipple Avenue to Middlefield Road) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$2,000,000 |
| 21 | Brewster Avenue Cycle Track (Main Street to King Street) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$3,540,000 |
| 22 | Stafford Street Cycle Track (City Limit to F Street) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | 10 to 20 years | \$285,000 |
| 23 | Arguello Street Cycle Track (Whipple Avenue to Brewster Avenue) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | 10 to 20 years | \$850,000 |
| 24 | Industrial Way Cycle Track (City Limit to Whipple Avenue) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | 10 to 20 years | \$1,080,000 |

| # | Project | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|----|--|--|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 25 | Seaport Boulevard Bicycle Path (North of US 101) | Upgrade existing sidewalk to shared mixed-use bicycle path | within 10 years | \$1,565,000 |
| 26 | Bay Trail in Redwood Shores Enhancements | Conduct planning/feasibility studies for Bay Trail | within 10 years | \$100,000 |
| 27 | Bay Trail (between Whipple and Woodside Road) Enhancements | Conduct planning/feasibility studies for Bay Trail | within 10 years | \$100,000 |
| 28 | Bay Trail (south of Woodside Road) Enhancements | Conduct planning/feasibility studies for Bay Trail | within 10 years | \$100,000 |
| 29 | Seaport Boulevard Path (Blomquist Street to Broadway) | Install shared mixed-use (bicycle and pedestrian) near Seaport Boulevard, under US 101 | within 10 years | \$5,000,000 |
| 30 | Intersection Safety Improvements | Specific improvements to be determined. Funds will be used to enhance safety elements at 25 intersections identified in Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan. | various years | \$6,250,000 |
| 31 | Charter Street (Spring Street to Middlefield Road) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | within 10 years | \$545,000 |
| 32 | Chestnut Street (Spring Street to Heller Street) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | 10 to 20 years | \$1,520,000 |
| 33 | Hoover Street (Fifth Avenue to Eighth Avenue) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | within 10 years | \$205,000 |
| 34 | Middlefield Road (from Woodside Road to Douglas Avenue) | Install complete streets corridor improvements and Install corridor enhancements between Woodside Road and Charter Street including, but not limited to: upgrading lane lines, installing retroreflective backplates, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and installing bike lanes and green pavement conflict markings. | within 10 years | \$2,950,000 |
| 35 | Broadway (El Camino Real to Charter Street) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | within 10 years | \$7,370,000 |
| 36 | Jefferson Avenue (El Camino Real to Farm Hill Boulevard) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | 10 to 20 years | \$9,845,000 |
| 37 | Massachusetts Avenue | Install complete streets corridor improvements | 10 to 20 years | \$1,125,000 |
| 38 | RWC Transit Center | Install an indoor bike station/long-term parking at the Redwood City Transit Center. Funds would be used for capital improvements. Short-term improvements can include long-term bicycle storage lockers. Long-term improvements include construction of a new building and/or improvements to nearby building to house a staff bicycle station with repair facilities. | 10 to 20 years | \$3,750,000 |
| 39 | Jefferson Avenue Operation Improvements | Conduct planning/feasibility study for operational improvements along Jefferson Avenue. | within 5 years | \$400,000 |
| | | Total Cost Estimate: | | \$ 104,160,000 |

Notes: Cost represents total funding needed for each project.

Traffic Operation and Roadway Improvement Projects

Table 4 lists the traffic improvement projects, their descriptions, and cost estimate for each project. These projects will improve motor vehicle operations on key roadways that would experience an increase in traffic congestion due to the forecasted growth in the city. These projects include signal installations, modifications, new streets, and ITS upgrades to improve vehicular operations.

The 101/Woodside Interchange project is estimated to cost \$308 million. However, those project costs have been reduced to account for other funding and developer payments that can be used for the project. The remaining balance to be funded is \$184 million.

The Blomquist Road Extension Project is estimated to cost \$29 million. However, those project costs have been reduced to account for other funding and developer payments that can be used for the project. City staff have estimated the remaining balance to be funded is \$25 million.

Table 4- Traffic Operation and Roadway Improvement Project Cost Estimates

| # | Location | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|----|--|--|----------------|-------------|
| 1 | Bridge Parkway & Redwood Shores Parkway | Install traffic signal | 10 to 20 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 2 | Broadway & Walnut Street | Install traffic signal | 10 to 20 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 3 | Main Street & Bradford Street | Install traffic signal | 10 to 20 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 4 | Middlefield Road & Jefferson Avenue | Restripe southbound Middlefield Road to prohibit left-turns | within 5 Years | \$55,000 |
| 5 | Middlefield Road & Main Street | Restripe Middlefield Road and install protected phasing | within 5 Years | \$85,000 |
| 6 | Veterans Boulevard & Whipple Avenue | Evaluate signal operations and install protected phasing as needed | 5 to 10 Years | \$170,000 |
| 7 | Bay Road & Douglas Avenue | Install traffic signal and left-turn lanes along Bay Rd | within 5 Years | \$1,035,000 |
| 8 | Middlefield Road & Douglas Avenue | Provide protected phasing along Middlefield Road | 5 to 10 Years | \$10,000 |
| 9 | Broadway & Second Avenue | Install traffic signal | 5 to 10 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 10 | Blomquist Street & Maple Street | Install traffic signal | 5 to 10 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 11 | Veterans Boulevard & Hansen Way | Install traffic signal | 5 to 10 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 12 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Woodside Road | Install adaptive signal control | 5 to 10 Years | \$130,000 |
| 13 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Jefferson Avenue | Install adaptive signal control | 5 to 10 Years | \$130,000 |
| 14 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Whipple Avenue | Install adaptive signal control | 5 to 10 Years | \$130,000 |

| # | Location | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|-----------------------|
| 15 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Edgewood Road | Install adaptive signal control and protected phasing along Alameda de las Pulgas | within 5 Years | \$160,000 |
| 16 | Blomquist Road Extension | Extend Blomquist Road from Maple Street to Bair Island Road | within 5 Years | \$25,000,000 (1) |
| 17 | US 101/Woodside Road Interchange | Complete US 101/Woodside Road Interchange Improvements | 5 to 10 Years | \$184,000,000 (2) |
| Total Cost Estimate: | | | | \$ 216,995,000 |

Notes:

- (1) The total project cost is estimated to be \$29,000,000. Cost shown represent estimated remaining funding needed for the project after accounting for grants and previous developer contributions.
- (2) Total project cost is estimated to be \$308,000,000. Cost shown represent estimated remaining funding needed for the project after accounting for grants and previous developer contributions.

The roadway improvement projects included in the TIF program are estimated to have an overall cost of about \$217 million. The detailed cost estimate for each roadway improvement project is included in Attachment B.

Step 2 – Identify Redwood City Growth

The growth in Redwood City was determined using the San Mateo City and County Association of Government (C/CAG) and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Bi-County transportation model (C/CAG-VTA Model). The C/CAG-VTA model was most recently used to determine the daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) estimates for the City’s Focused General Plan Update (GPU). The Year 2015 C/CAG-VTA Model was used to develop trip and VMT forecasts for Baseline Conditions, while the Year 2040 C/CAG-VTA Model was used to develop trip and VMT forecasts for Year 2040 Conditions.

Model Description

The C/CAG-VTA Model includes the regional roadways and major arterials of the nine-county Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) region, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) region, and portions of the San Joaquin (Central) Valley. The model features additional transportation network detail and refined Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) for San Mateo County and Santa Clara County. The C/CAG-VTA Model land use inputs are based on the ABAG 2017 land use projections (*Plan Bay Area 2040*), 2010 Census socioeconomic data, and future regional transportation infrastructure consistent with *Plan Bay Area 2040*.

The Year 2015 C/CAG-VTA Model was adjusted to represent Year 2023 (existing) conditions. In coordination with city staff, developments completed since 2015 were added to the existing condition land uses to reflect Year 2023 (existing) development conditions. All other model inputs were assumed to be consistent with the current Year 2015 C/CAG-VTA Model.

The Year 2040 C/CAG-VTA Model was not adjusted from the land uses assumed for the City's Focused General Plan Update (Housing Element). The Focused General Plan Update included additional land uses from the Focused General Plan Update (Housing Element), Downtown Precise Plan Plan-Wide Amendments, and the Transit District Plan. All other model inputs were assumed to be consistent with the current Year 2040 C/CAG-VTA Model.

The number of daily trips and VMT generated by Redwood City land uses were included in the trip and VMT metrics. Internal to internal, internal to external, and external to internal trips were included in the metrics. External to external trips were excluded from the metrics.

Redwood City Growth

The service population growth in Redwood City from existing (2023) conditions to Year 2040 conditions is summarized in Table 5. The trip and VMT growth from existing (2023) conditions to Year 2040 conditions are summarized in Table 6. The Model shows a net increase of 139,996 daily trips and a net increase of 1,777,119 daily VMT for Redwood City-related trips.

Table 5- Redwood City Service Population Growth

| Redwood City Growth | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Existing (2023) | Growth | Future (2040) |
| Population (1) | 95,513 | 38,910 | 134,423 |
| Jobs | 66,788 | 30,119 | 96,907 |
| Total | 162,301 | 69,029 | 231,330 |
| Percent Allocation | 70% | 30% | 100% |

Note: (1) Populations is estimated based on assumption of 2.75 residents per household.

Table 6- Redwood City Trip and VMT Growth

| Year | Redwood City * | | | | | | VMT/Trip | | |
|------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| | ADT Trips | | | VMT | | | In | Out | Total |
| | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | | | |
| 2023 | 239,918 | 243,485 | 483,403 | 2,646,139 | 2,583,087 | 5,229,226 | 11.03 | 10.61 | 21.64 |
| 2040 | 309,247 | 314,152 | 623,399 | 3,519,640 | 3,486,705 | 7,006,345 | 11.38 | 11.10 | 22.48 |
| 2023-2040 | 69,329 | 70,667 | 139,996 | 873,501 | 903,618 | 1,777,119 | | | |
| Growth | | | 22% | | | 25% | | | |

Notes:

* Includes trips and VMT from the following:

- (1) between TAZ within Redwood City and
- (2) TAZ within Redwood City to/from TAZ outside Redwood City.

Step 3 – Calculate Project Costs Attributable to New Development for Multi-Modal Improvements

Since multi-modal projects typically add capacity to alternative modes or enhance the experience of alternative mode travel, it will typically decrease the VMT on the transportation infrastructure. Therefore, the VMT growth expected for Redwood City was used to calculate the contribution needed to fund multi-modal improvements within Redwood City. Because TIF funds cannot be used to correct existing deficiencies, the expected VMT growth is attributable to the maximum share of improvement project costs within the updated TIF program. Based on the VMT growth identified in Step 2, Table 7 shows the maximum share of the multi-modal improvement project cost is 25% of \$104 million, equating to a TIF share of \$26,040,000. Note that this represents a conservative estimate for the city’s share, as the service population growth (see Table 5) is greater than the VMT growth expected in Redwood City.

Table 7- Multi-Modal Improvement Project TIF Share

| | Total Cost |
|------------------------|---------------|
| Multi-modal Projects | \$104,160,000 |
| 25% Redwood City Share | 25% |
| Total | \$26,040,000 |

Step 4 – Identify Existing Deficiencies for Roadway Improvements

As previously mentioned, fee programs cannot be used to fund any existing deficiencies. For traffic capacity enhancing projects, such as signal installations, or roadway modifications, a deficiency is considered to exist if the facility operates at Level of Service (LOS) E or F, depending on the LOS standard of a facility, under existing conditions.

Recent traffic volumes were used to conduct LOS analysis at intersections and roadways identified for roadway improvement projects. Table 8 summarizes the existing LOS at these intersections and streets. Facilities that are already operating at a deficient level under existing conditions are identified as having “existing deficiencies”, which indicates that the deficiencies are not due to future traffic, but due to existing conditions. The detailed level of service calculation sheets for intersections not included in recent planning studies are included in Attachment C.

Step 5 – Calculate Project Costs Attributable to New Development for Traffic Operation and Roadway Improvement Projects

Fee programs are developed to charge fees to new developments in order to fund improvements needed to serve the demand or correct the impacts as a result of new developments. Therefore, only the proportion of the costs related to new developments in Redwood City can be included in the fee and charged to new developments.

For operational improvement projects, if a facility has been identified as having an existing deficiency, the cost of the improvement is divided between the usage of the facility by existing development, new Redwood City development, and new non-Redwood City developments.

For operational improvement projects for facilities that do not have an existing deficiency, the cost of the improvement is divided between new Redwood City development, and new non-Redwood City developments.

Table 8- Level of Service Summary

| # | Intersection (Jurisdiction) | Control | Source | Existing | | | | Deficiency? |
|----|--|---------|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|-------------|
| | | | | AM | | PM | | |
| | | | | Delay (sec.) | LOS | Delay (sec.) | LOS | |
| 1 | Bridge Parkway & Redwood Shores Parkway | AWSC | New Count | 17.7 | C | 22.5 | C | No |
| 2 | Broadway & Walnut Street | TWSC | New Count | 9.0 | A | 9.3 | A | No |
| 3 | Main Street & Bradford Street | TWSC | New Count | 12.2 | B | 14.8 | B | No |
| 4 | Middlefield Road & Jefferson Avenue | Signal | HEU | 24.6 | C | 31.3 | C | No |
| 5 | Middlefield Road & Main Street | Signal | DTPP | 54.1 | D | 54.6 | D | No |
| 6 | Veterans Boulevard & Whipple Avenue | Signal | HEU | 38.7 | D | 38.0 | D | No |
| 7 | Bay Road & Douglas Avenue | AWSC | New Count | 13.6 | B | 13.2 | B | No |
| 8 | Middlefield Road & Douglas Avenue | Signal | New Count | 6.3 | A | 4.9 | A | No |
| 9 | Broadway & Second Avenue | AWSC | New Count | 14.9 | B | 11.0 | B | No |
| 10 | Blomquist Street & Maple Street | TWSC | New Count | 9.6 | A | 9.9 | A | No |
| 11 | Veterans Boulevard & Hansen Way | TWSC | New Count | 16.8 | C | 19.6 | C | No |
| 12 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Woodside Road | Signal | HEU | 63.5 | E | 99.7 | F | Yes |
| 13 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Jefferson Avenue | Signal | HEU | 23.5 | C | 25.5 | C | No |
| 14 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Whipple Avenue | Signal | HEU | 25.4 | C | 27.4 | C | No |
| 15 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Edgewood Road | Signal | DTPP | 119.8 | F | 95.6 | F | Yes |

Notes:
 AWSC = all-way stop controlled intersection; TWSC = two-way stop-controlled intersection
 HEU = 2023 Housing Element Update (Focused General Plan Update LTA); DTPP = 2023 Downtown Precise Plan Update (Transit District LTA)
 Average intersection delay and LOS are reported for signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections. Worst movement delay and LOS are reported for two-way stop-controlled intersections.
Bold indicates a substandard level of service.

For the US 101/Woodside Road interchange project, existing deficiencies are present at the Woodside Road/Broadway intersection. Therefore, the cost of the improvement project is divided between existing traffic, new Redwood City development, and new non-Redwood City developments. The city’s estimated share towards each improvement project is based on the number of vehicle trips that would utilize each project location. The C/CAG-VTA Model was used to determine the number of existing trips (in Year 2023), new Redwood City growth trips (Year 2040 – Year 2023), and new non-Redwood City growth trips (Year 2040 – Year 2023). As described above, the city’s contribution towards each project is dependent on whether there is an existing deficiency at each project location and the expected future trip growth at each project location.

Table 9 summarizes the total cost of each improvement project and the City’s share allocated for each project, as described above. Only the City’s growth share is allocated to the TIF. Based on the

results from the Model, the fee share of the roadway improvement projects that can be included in the updated TIF is \$75,553,000, which is approximately 35% of the total cost of the roadway improvement projects.

Table 9- Roadway Improvement Program Cost

| # | Location | Cost | % Contribution to Project | | | Fee Share Project |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | | | of Existing Cost | RWC Growth | Non-RWC Growth | |
| 1 | Bridge Parkway & Redwood Shores Parkway | \$ 1,015,000 | 0% | 88% | 12% | \$ 894,000 |
| 2 | Broadway & Walnut Street | \$ 1,015,000 | 0% | 99% | 1% | \$ 1,006,000 |
| 3 | Main Street & Bradford Street | \$ 1,015,000 | 0% | 100% | 0% | \$ 1,013,000 |
| 4 | Middlefield Road & Jefferson Avenue | \$ 55,000 | 0% | 100% | 0% | \$ 55,000 |
| 5 | Middlefield Road & Main Street | \$ 85,000 | 0% | 100% | 0% | \$ 85,000 |
| 6 | Veterans Boulevard & Whipple Avenue | \$ 170,000 | 0% | 87% | 13% | \$ 147,000 |
| 7 | Bay Road & Douglas Avenue | \$ 1,035,000 | 0% | 91% | 9% | \$ 946,000 |
| 8 | Middlefield Road & Douglas Avenue | \$ 10,000 | 0% | 71% | 29% | \$ 7,000 |
| 9 | Broadway & Second Avenue | \$ 1,015,000 | 0% | 98% | 2% | \$ 991,000 |
| 10 | Blomquist Street & Maple Street | \$ 1,015,000 | 0% | 93% | 7% | \$ 946,000 |
| 11 | Veterans Boulevard & Hansen Way | \$ 1,015,000 | 0% | 89% | 11% | \$ 899,000 |
| 12 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Woodside Road | \$ 130,000 | 77% | 16% | 6% | \$ 21,000 |
| 13 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Jefferson Avenue | \$ 130,000 | 0% | 90% | 10% | \$ 117,000 |
| 14 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Whipple Avenue | \$ 130,000 | 0% | 98% | 2% | \$ 127,000 |
| 15 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Edgewood Road | \$ 160,000 | 94% | 6% | 0% | \$ 9,000 |
| 16 | Blomquist Road Extension | \$ 25,000,000 | 0% | 97% | 3% | \$24,185,000 |
| 17 | US 101/Woodside Road Interchange | \$ 184,000,000 | 73% | 24% | 3% | \$44,186,000 |
| Total Cost Estimate: | | \$ 216,995,000 | | | | \$75,634,000 |

Step 6 – Determine Fee Per Daily Trip

The fee amount is determined by dividing the total program cost by the growth of daily trips within Redwood City. As shown in Table 10, the total program cost of \$101,674,000, less the existing balance of TIF program revenues, additional grant funds, and other developer payments of \$16,639,716.26, is divided by the growth of daily trips determined in Step 2, for a total of \$607.41 per daily trip generated by new development.

Table 10- Fee Determination per Trip

| | Total Cost | RWC % Share | RWC Share |
|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Multi-Modal Projects | \$104,160,000 | 25% | \$26,040,000 |
| Operational Improvement Projects | \$216,995,000 | Varies* | \$75,634,000 |
| Total | | | \$101,674,000 |
| | | Less existing TIF balance: | \$16,639,716 |
| | | | \$85,034,284 |
| | | Total New Trips (2023-2040): | 139,996 |
| | | Cost/Trip: | \$ 607.41 |

Notes: *Redwood City share for operational improvement projects vary based on new trips from new development.

Step 7 – Determine Fee by Land Use

The fee amount for new development can be determined by the expected number of daily trips a new development would generate. The cost per trip was multiplied by the daily trip generation rate found in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition* (2021). The average trip generation rates for Single-Family Detached Housing (Land Use 210), Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) (Land Use 221), General Office Building (Land Use 710), General Light Industrial (Land Use 110), Shopping Center (Land Use 820), and Hotel (Land Use 310) were used for the fee determination.

Additional Consideration

Retail Development

Since retail development typically generates a large number of trips, the fee per trip generated for retail development can be very high. However, it should be noted that retail development typically generates very short trips that are often pass-by trips, which are trips along the route of a longer trip. Therefore, there should be some consideration for the reduction of fees related to the trips generated from a retail development. The following assumptions could be made for retail development:

- 10% of retail trips are employee trips
- Half of all retail trips are pass-by trips
- Retail trips are typically 25% of the length of a typical residential or employment trip

Table 11 calculates the adjustment that could be utilized from determining the fee for retail development. The typical retail development would generate 20% of the distance traveled relative to a full-length residential or employee trip. Therefore, the retail development fee could be reduced by 80%.

Table 11- Retail Development Adjustment

| Land Use | Share | ETL* | Adjustment |
|--|-------|------|------------|
| Workers | 10% | 1.00 | 10% |
| Pass-By Trips | 50% | 0.00 | 0% |
| Standalone Retail Trips | 40% | 0.25 | 10% |
| | | | 20% |
| *ETL = Equivalent Trip Length, relative to one employment trip | | | |

General Retail and High Intensity Retail

Drive-through restaurants and cafes and convenience markets create a larger number of trips compared to other types of retail projects. Drive through refers to a food establishment which in addition to customary restaurant services is designed to sell products through a sales window to customers who are in vehicles. For the purpose of this technical memo, these two types of retail uses are categorized under high-intensity retail and all other retail uses are categorized under the General Retail category.

Retail Development- Service Station

Similar to retail development, service stations generate a large number of trips. However, many of these trips are pass-by trips. The pass-by rate for service stations found in the *ITE Trip Generation Manual Handbook* is 58%. Therefore, a conservative 60% reduction in the service station development fee was applied to account for pass-by trips.

Residential Development Near Transit Center

Per California Government Code Section 66005.1, housing development located within one-half mile of a transit station shall set a rate that reflects a lower rate of automobile trip generation. For the purposes of this analysis, all new developments located within the Downtown Precise Plan area are considered near a transit station and considered to satisfy the characteristics identified in Section 66005.1. The transportation analysis completed for *RWCMoves* includes an observation of peak hour trip rates at apartments in a suburban neighborhood, as well as in the downtown area (see Table 12). The observed trip rate in downtown locations were 38% lower than that of observed conditions in a suburban neighborhood. Therefore, a 38% reduction in fees can be applied to multifamily housing development in the downtown area.

Table 12- Observed Peak Hour Apartment Trip Rates

| | Location (Observed Trip Rate, per DU) | | Downtown Trips %* |
|-----------------------|--|----------|-------------------|
| | Suburban | Downtown | |
| AM Peak Hour | 0.49 | 0.27 | 55% |
| PM Peak Hour | 0.46 | 0.32 | 70% |
| Average | 0.48 | 0.30 | 62% |
| *Relative to suburban | | | |

After applying the appropriate trip rates for new categories of new development and applicable reductions, the proposed fee schedule is shown on Table 13.

Table 13- Proposed Fee Schedule

| Land Use | ITE Land Use | Rate | Unit | Fee | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-------|----------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | New Development | Downtown ¹ |
| Fee per Trip | | | | \$607.41 | \$ 376.59 |
| Residential (per DU) | | | | | |
| Single-Family Housing | 210 | 9.43 | per DU | \$5,727.88 | \$ 3,551.28 |
| Multifamily Housing ² | 221 | 4.54 | per DU | \$2,757.64 | \$1,709.74 |
| Employment (per s.f.) | | | | | |
| Office/R&D | 710 | 10.84 | per s.f. | \$6.58 | |
| Industrial | 110 | 4.87 | per s.f. | \$2.96 | |
| Medical/Dental Office Building | 720 | 36.00 | per s.f. | \$21.87 | |
| Other | | | | | |

| Land Use | ITE Land Use | Rate | Unit | Fee | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | New Development | Downtown ¹ |
| General Retail ³ | 820 | 37.01 | per s.f. | \$4.50 | |
| High Intensity Retail ³ | 934 | 467.48 | per s.f. | \$56.79 | |
| Service Station ⁴ | 944 | 172.01 | per fueling station | \$41,792.24 | |
| Hotel/Lodging | 310 | 7.99 | per room | \$4,853.21 | |
| School | 525 | 1.94 | per student | \$1,178.38 | |
| Religious Facility | 560 | 7.60 | per s.f. | \$4.62 | |
| Entertainment Venue | 445 | 78.09 | per s.f. | \$47.43 | |

Notes:

¹ Downtown rates for residential uses reduced by 38%. The observed trip rate for apartments in a suburban setting is 38% higher than in a downtown setting. This reduction would not increase the fees for other development.

² Multi family housing includes congregate care facilities.

³ Rate for retail reduced by 80% after applying consideration for employee trips, pass-by trips, and typical retail trip length. This reduction would not increase the fees for other development.

⁴ Rate for service station reduced by 60% after applying consideration for pass-by trips. This reduction would not increase the fees for other development.

APPENDIX B:
Transportation Impact Fee Project List

MULTI-MODAL PROJECTS COST ESTIMATE

| # | Project | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|---|--|--|-----------------|-------------|
| 1 | El Camino Real and Jefferson Avenue Intersection Improvements | Install intersection enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading crosswalks, adjusting median noses, installing leading pedestrian interval, installing retroreflective backplates, installing ADA compliant curb ramps, installing traffic calming measures, and installing advance limit lines. | within 5 years | \$315,000 |
| 2 | Broadway and Main Street Intersection Improvements | Install intersection enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading crosswalks, installing pedestrian countdown heads and push buttons, upgrading signal heads and installing retroreflective backplates, and installing ADA compliant curb ramps. | within 5 years | \$1,080,000 |
| 3 | Broadway and Woodside Road Intersection Improvements | Install intersection enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading crosswalks, adjusting median noses, installing leading pedestrian interval, refresh cat tracking through intersection, installing green bike conflict markings, installing ADA compliant curb ramps, and installing advance limit lines. | within 10 years | \$690,000 |
| 4 | Broadway and 5th Avenue Intersection Improvements | Install intersection enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading crosswalks, installing new crosswalk, and installing flashing stop signs. | within 5 years | \$60,000 |
| 5 | Whipple Avenue, between Veterans Blvd and El Camino Real | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading lane lines, adjusting median noses, installing accessible pedestrian signals (APS), installing retroreflective backplates, installing mid-block crossing, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and installing buffered bike lanes. | within 10 years | \$1,455,000 |
| 6 | Broadway, between Cassia Street and Winslow Street | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading lane lines, installing accessible pedestrian signals (APS), installing retroreflective backplates, installing leading pedestrian intervals, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and installing buffered bike lanes. | within 5 years | \$1,070,000 |
| 7 | El Camino Real, between Center Street and Roosevelt Avenue and Class IV Cycle Track on El Camino Real within City Limits | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: upgrading lane lines, installing accessible pedestrian signals (APS), adjusting median noses, installing retroreflective backplates, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and lighting enhancements. Caltrans has a planned installation of a Class IV bikeway along the entire El Camino Real within city limits. The City would install protected intersection treatments and HAWK beacons, where feasible. | within 10 years | \$4,665,000 |
| 8 | Woodside Road, between Hess Road and Kentfield Avenue | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: installing retroreflective backplates, installing speed feedback signs, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and installing bulb outs at unsignalized intersections. Funds would also be used to conduct a complete streets corridor study and coordinate with Caltrans to conduct a bike facility feasibility study. | within 10 years | \$2,045,000 |

| # | Project | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|----|---|---|-----------------|---------------|
| 9 | Redwood Shores Parkway, between Twin Dolphin Dr and Shoreline Dr | Install corridor enhancements including, but not limited to: installing wayfinding signage for bikers, installing accessible pedestrian signals (APS), adjusting median noses, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, installing green bike conflict markings, and tightening curb radii. | within 10 years | \$1,220,000 |
| 10 | Commuter Ferry Service | Construct Ferry Terminal in Redwood City | within 5 years | \$ 23,760,000 |
| 11 | Alameda de las Pulgas Corridor Improvements | Install pedestrian safety improvements along Alameda de las Pulgas | within 5 years | \$ 940,000 |
| 12 | Caltrain Grade Crossings | Conduct environmental review studies for Caltrain grade separation within Redwood City. Funds would be used for Environmental Review. | within 5 years | \$4,000,000 |
| 13 | Redwood City Bike Lanes | Install bike lanes along roadway segments identified in Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan. | various years | \$1,170,000 |
| 14 | Redwood City Bike Boulevards | Install bike boulevards along roadway segments identified in Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan. | various years | \$2,125,000 |
| 15 | James Avenue Cycle Track (RWC Transit Center to Elwood Street) | Install two-way Class IV cycle track | within 5 years | \$1,160,000 |
| 16 | Maple Street Cycle Track (Main Street to El Camino Real) | Install two-way Class IV cycle track | within 5 years | \$895,000 |
| 17 | Middlefield Road Cycle Track (Winslow Street to MacArthur Avenue) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$2,575,000 |
| 18 | Bay Road Cycle Track (Woodside Road to Florence Street) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$2,970,000 |
| 19 | Main Street Cycle Track (Convention Way to El Camino Real) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$3,385,000 |
| 20 | Winslow Street Cycle Track (Whipple Avenue to Middlefield Road) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$2,000,000 |
| 21 | Brewster Avenue Cycle Track (Main Street to King Street) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | within 10 years | \$3,540,000 |
| 22 | Stafford Street Cycle Track (City Limit to F Street) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | 10 to 20 years | \$285,000 |
| 23 | Arguello Street Cycle Track (Whipple Avenue to Brewster Avenue) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | 10 to 20 years | \$850,000 |
| 24 | Industrial Way Cycle Track (City Limit to Whipple Avenue) | Install Class IV separated bicycle lanes | 10 to 20 years | \$1,080,000 |
| 25 | Seaport Boulevard Bicycle Path (North of US 101) | Upgrade existing sidewalk to shared mixed-use bicycle path | within 10 years | \$1,565,000 |

| # | Project | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|----|--|--|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 26 | Bay Trail in Redwood Shores Enhancements | Conduct planning/feasibility studies for Bay Trail | within 10 years | \$100,000 |
| 27 | Bay Trail (between Whipple and Woodside Road) Enhancements | Conduct planning/feasibility studies for Bay Trail | within 10 years | \$100,000 |
| 28 | Bay Trail (south of Woodside Road) Enhancements | Conduct planning/feasibility studies for Bay Trail | within 10 years | \$100,000 |
| 29 | Seaport Boulevard Path (Blomquist Street to Broadway) | Install shared mixed-use (bicycle and pedestrian) near Seaport Boulevard, under US 101 | within 10 years | \$5,000,000 |
| 30 | Intersection Safety Improvements | Specific improvements to be determined. Funds will be used to enhance safety elements at 25 intersections identified in Redwood City Walk Bike Thrive Plan. | various years | \$6,250,000 |
| 31 | Charter Street (Spring Street to Middlefield Road) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | within 10 years | \$545,000 |
| 32 | Chestnut Street (Spring Street to Heller Street) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | 10 to 20 years | \$1,520,000 |
| 33 | Hoover Street (Fifth Avenue to Eighth Avenue) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | within 10 years | \$205,000 |
| 34 | Middlefield Road (from Woodside Road to Douglas Avenue) | Install complete streets corridor improvements and Install corridor enhancements between Woodside Road and Charter Street including, but not limited to: upgrading lane lines, installing retroreflective backplates, installing traffic calming measures, installing advanced limit lines at intersections, and installing bike lanes and green pavement conflict markings. | within 10 years | \$2,950,000 |
| 35 | Broadway (El Camino Real to Charter Street) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | within 10 years | \$7,370,000 |
| 36 | Jefferson Avenue (El Camino Real to Farm Hill Boulevard) | Install complete streets corridor improvements | 10 to 20 years | \$9,845,000 |
| 37 | Massachusetts Avenue | Install complete streets corridor improvements | 10 to 20 years | \$1,125,000 |
| 38 | RWC Transit Center | Install an indoor bike station/long-term parking at the Redwood City Transit Center. Funds would be used for capital improvements. Short-term improvements can include long-term bicycle storage lockers. Long-term improvements include construction of a new building and/or improvements to nearby building to house a staff bicycle station with repair facilities. | 10 to 20 years | \$3,750,000 |
| 39 | Jefferson Avenue Operation Improvements | Conduct planning/feasibility study for operational improvements along Jefferson Avenue. | within 5 years | \$400,000 |
| | | Total Cost Estimate: | | \$ 104,160,000 |

Notes: Cost represents total funding needed for each project.

TRAFFIC OPERATION AND ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS COST ESTIMATE

| # | Location | Description | Time Frame | Cost |
|-----------------------------|--|---|----------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Bridge Parkway & Redwood Shores Parkway | Install traffic signal | 10 to 20 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 2 | Broadway & Walnut Street | Install traffic signal | 10 to 20 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 3 | Main Street & Bradford Street | Install traffic signal | 10 to 20 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 4 | Middlefield Road & Jefferson Avenue | Restripe southbound Middlefield Road to prohibit left-turns | within 5 Years | \$55,000 |
| 5 | Middlefield Road & Main Street | Restripe Middlefield Road and install protected phasing | within 5 Years | \$85,000 |
| 6 | Veterans Boulevard & Whipple Avenue | Evaluate signal operations and install protected phasing as needed | 5 to 10 Years | \$170,000 |
| 7 | Bay Road & Douglas Avenue | Install traffic signal and left-turn lanes along Bay Rd | within 5 Years | \$1,035,000 |
| 8 | Middlefield Road & Douglas Avenue | Provide protected phasing along Middlefield Road | 5 to 10 Years | \$10,000 |
| 9 | Broadway & Second Avenue | Install traffic signal | 5 to 10 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 10 | Blomquist Street & Maple Street | Install traffic signal | 5 to 10 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 11 | Veterans Boulevard & Hansen Way | Install traffic signal | 5 to 10 Years | \$1,015,000 |
| 12 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Woodside Road | Install adaptive signal control | 5 to 10 Years | \$130,000 |
| 13 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Jefferson Avenue | Install adaptive signal control | 5 to 10 Years | \$130,000 |
| 14 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Whipple Avenue | Install adaptive signal control | 5 to 10 Years | \$130,000 |
| 15 | Alameda de las Pulgas & Edgewood Road | Install adaptive signal control and protected phasing along Alameda de las Pulgas | within 5 Years | \$160,000 |
| 16 | Blomquist Road Extension | Extend Blomquist Road from Maple Street to Bair Island Road | within 5 Years | \$25,000,000 (1) |
| 17 | US 101/Woodside Road Interchange | Complete US 101/Woodside Road Interchange Improvements | 5 to 10 Years | \$184,000,000 (2) |
| Total Cost Estimate: | | | | \$ 216,995,000 |

Notes:

(1) The total project cost is estimated to be \$29,000,000. Cost shown represent estimated remaining funding needed for the project after accounting for grants and previous developer contributions.

(2) Total project cost is estimated to be \$308,000,000. Cost shown represent estimated remaining funding needed for the project after accounting for grants and previous developer contributions.

EXHIBIT "B"

ARTICLE XV. TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE

Sec. 18.244. INTENT AND PURPOSE:

New development projects bring new residents and employees to the City of Redwood City, generating an increased demand for transportation facilities. The intent of this Article is to establish a transportation impact fee upon new development projects to ensure that new development contributes its fair share to transportation improvements in the City consistent with the City's standards.

Sec. 18.245. SHORT TITLE, AUTHORITY AND APPLICABILITY:

- A. This Article shall be known and may be cited as the "Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance".
- B. The fees established pursuant to this Article are development fees authorized under California Government Code section 66000 et seq.
- C. This Article shall apply to the extent permitted by the statutes and laws of the State of California.

Sec. 18.246. DEFINITIONS:

The following words and terms as used in this Article shall have the meaning respectively ascribed thereto:

ADMINISTRATOR: Means the Director of Community Development or their designee, who shall administer the provisions of this Article.

APPLICANT: Means the owner of real property proposed for development, or the Applicant's authorized agent.

DEVELOPMENT: Means a proposal for the construction, alteration, addition, or change of use of any building or structure in or upon real property in the City that requires any entitlement from or by the City including, without limitation, a building permit, use permit, zoning or rezoning approval, subdivision or resubdivision map approval, lot line adjustment, architectural permit, general plan amendment, specific plan approval, or any other entitlement or approval.

DEVELOPER: Means an individual, group of individuals, partnership, corporation, association, or other person undertaking Development and their successors and assigns.

DWELLING UNIT: Means a dwelling unit as defined in the Building Code as adopted and amended from time-to-time by the City.

LIVABLE AREA: Means the livable area is the building area minus garage area and unfinished basement or unfinished attic areas. Closets, stairwells, and other interior spaces are included within this definition.

ENTERTAINMENT VENUE USE: Means “Assembly and Meeting Facility” (excluding therefrom “Religious Facilities Use” as defined in this Section) and “Theater, Indoor or Outdoor” as those terms are defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code.

EXPANSION: Means, in relation to the capacity of a road or intersection of roads or of a bridge, to accommodate traffic, extensions, widening, reconfiguration, improvements to or for signalization, rerouting, reconstruction of existing facilities, and construction of new facilities.

FEE PAYER: Is a person undertaking a development which generates new trips and which requires the issuance of a building permit, or any other entitlement.

FLOOR AREA: Means the total floor area of all stories of a building or structure, including basements, and all aboveground stories for various types of land use as used in the determination of traffic generation in the “Trip Generation Manual,” published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (latest edition).

IMPACT FEE OR FEES: Means the fee or fees imposed on a development pursuant to this Article, the revenues from which shall be used to fund a proportionate share of the cost of transportation improvement projects and transportation system improvements necessary to mitigate the transportation impacts of such Development in Redwood City.

IMPACT FEE PROJECT LIST: Means the capital improvement plan that is adopted by the City Council and may be amended from time to time pursuant to Government Code section 66002, which sets forth the transportation improvement projects and transportation system improvements that are intended to be funded in part or in whole by transportation impact fees. The Impact Fee Project List shall be maintained on file in the office of the Administrator.

IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE: Means the schedule of impact fee rates per development unit for specific land uses or land use categories approved by ordinance or resolution of the Council and maintained on file in the office of the Administrator.

SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL USE: Means any single family residential unit at a residential density of 1-15 units per acre regardless of whether the units are attached or detached.

MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL USE: Means any dwelling unit which is not a single-family residential use, with a residential density of 16+ units per acre regardless of whether the units are attached or detached; including, without limitation, “Residential Care Facility,

General,” “Residential Care Facility, Senior,” and “Skilled Nursing Facility” as those terms are defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code.

INDUSTRIAL USE: Means warehousing, light industrial, manufacturing, and general industrial uses including without limitation, “Electronic Equipment Facility,” “Handicraft/Custom Manufacturing,” “Industry, Limited,” “Industry, General,” “Maintenance and Repair Services,” “Personal Storage (Mini-Storage),” “Truck Terminal,” “Warehousing,” “Wireless Communications Equipment Building,” and “Wireless Communications Facility” as those terms are defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code.

LODGING USE: Means “Lodging” as defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code.

OFFICE / R&D USE: Means any business, financial, general, and professional offices and research and development use, and including, without limitation, “Administrative Office and Service Facility,” “Business Office,” “Financial Institutions and Related Services,” “Financial Service,” “Offices - Business, Government, and Professional,” “Professional Office,” and “Research and Development” as those terms are defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code.

OFFICE USE, MEDICAL: Means any medical or dental office uses, including without limitation, “Hospital,” “Medical Clinic, and “Medical Office” as those terms are defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code.

RELIGIOUS FACILITY USE: Means religious institutions including associated assembly halls, meeting rooms, and weekend school programs. For weekday schools see “School Use” definition within this Section.

RETAIL USE, GENERAL: Means a place where retail sales, personal services, health and fitness, and certain cultural, recreation, and entertainment activities occur including, without limitation, “Alcohol Sales, Off-Sale Outlet,” “Alcohol Sales, On-Sale Outlet,” “Animal-Related Uses,” “Bar/Cocktail Lounge,” “Business, Wholesale,” “Check Cashing,” “Cultural Institution,” “Health/Fitness Club,” “Liquor Stores,” “Nightclubs,” “Personal Services, General,” “Personal Services - Studio: Art, Dance, Martial Arts, Music, etc.,” “Recreation, Indoor Commercial,” “Restaurants (excluding Restaurant, Drive-Through – See Retail, High Intensity) “Retail Sales, General (excluding Convenience Market – See Retail High Intensity),” “Tasting Lounge,” “Vehicle/Equipment Rental,” “Vehicle/Equipment Repair,” “Vehicle/Equipment Sales and Leasing,” “Vehicle/Equipment Repair, Major,” “Vehicle/Equipment Service and Repair, Minor”, and “Vehicle Parts - Retail Sales and Repair” as those terms are defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code.

RETAIL USE, HIGH INTENSITY: Means “Restaurant, Drive-Through,” and “Retail, Convenience Market,” as those terms are defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code.

SCHOOL USE: Means a private (not public) academic educational institution, including but not limited to boarding school, community college, college, university, elementary, middle, or junior high school, high school, and military academy. It also includes schools providing specialized education/training but excludes facilities under the definition of “Studio—Art, Dance, Martial Arts, Music, etc.” listed under “Personal Services” when used for smaller-scale facilities offering specialized instruction.

SERVICE STATION USE: Means “Service Station” as defined in Article 2 of the Zoning Code but excludes any space devoted to “High Intensity Retail Uses” as defined in this section.

SITE-RELATED IMPROVEMENTS: Are Capital Improvements and right-of-way dedications for direct access to, and/or for traffic circulation within, a development. Direct access improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A. Access roads leading to the development;
- B. Driveways and roads within the development;
- C. Acceleration and deceleration lanes and right-and left-turn lanes leading to such roads and driveways;
- D. Traffic-control measures for such roads and driveways;
- E. Curbs, gutters, sidewalks, bike facilities, and parking lanes adjacent to the development; and
- F. Non-vehicular (pedestrian and bicycle) access to the site;

SQUARE FOOT: Means every square foot of floor area as defined in the “Trip Generation Manual,” published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (latest edition) for the purpose of calculating traffic generation. The Building Code, as adopted and amended from time to time by the City, shall be used for determining the square foot area of any development which cannot be calculated by using the definition in the Trip Generation Manual.

Sec. 18.247. IMPOSITION AND PAYMENT OF TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE:

- A. Impact fees shall be established as adopted by ordinance or resolution of the Council and maintained on file in the office of the Administrator.

- B. Impact fees shall be collected from the applicant for the development, prior to the issuance of a building permit, in the amount calculated for the development authorized by the building permit being issued, in accordance with the impact fee schedule then in effect.
- C. The Administrator shall establish the impact fee rate from the aforesaid impact fee schedule. The applicant shall submit all information requested by the Administrator for the purpose of determining an impact fee rate pursuant to Section 18.248.
- D. For a change in use of an existing building, or any part thereof, the impact fee shall be the applicable impact fee for the land use category of the new use, less the impact fee for the land use category of the prior use. For any development that includes a change of use involving an alteration, expansion, replacement or new accessory building, the impact fee shall be the impact fee for the new use using the metric that is listed in the schedule of fees (including the existing use plus the additional use) less the impact fee for the land use category of the preexisting use, based upon the corresponding preexisting use floor area.
- E. A development that involves the alteration, expansion or replacement of an existing single dwelling unit shall not be subject to the impact fee unless it results in construction of an additional dwelling unit(s) for rent or sale, including an accessory dwelling unit.
- F. For a development that involves alteration, expansion or replacement of an existing single dwelling unit resulting in additional dwelling units, the impact fee shall be the applicable impact fee for the land use category of the total dwelling units after development, less the applicable impact fee for the existing single dwelling unit.
- G. For a mixed-use development, impact fees shall be based upon the proportionate share of the development that each discrete land use bears to the total development using the impact fee corresponding to each such use in the impact fee schedule.
- H. All revenues collected from imposition of impact fees shall be accounted for separately from all other City funds and shall be used solely for the purposes specified in this Article and for the projects or purposes described in the impact fee project list.

Sec. 18.248. CALCULATION OF TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE:

- A. Calculation of Impact Fee:
 - 1. Impact fees shall be based upon the land use categories and rates specified in the impact fee schedule. References in said schedule to

square feet refers to average livable area square footage or gross leasable square footage as listed in the most recent schedule of fees and defined for a particular land use category in the "Trip Generation Manual" published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (latest edition), for the purpose of calculating trip generation.

2. When more than one land use is proposed within the same development, the impact fee for each land use shall be calculated separately and the total fee of the various uses shall be imposed.

B. Calculation of Fee Credit for Existing Uses:

If new development changes or intensifies the existing use on the development site, thereby requiring the payment of a new or additional transportation impact fee, the fee amount associated with the existing use on the project site shall be credited against the new total fee due, as determined by the Administrator; provided, however, that in no event shall the City refund the fees previously paid.

Sec. 18.249. USE OF FUNDS:

- A. Revenues from impact fees shall be used to fund a proportionate share of the cost of transportation improvement projects and transportation system improvements necessary to mitigate the transportation impacts of such Development in Redwood City. The transportation system improvements intended to be funded by the impact fees shall be set forth in the Impact Fee Project List, which may be amended from time to time pursuant to Government Code section 66002.
- B. No such revenues shall be used for periodic or routine maintenance of roadways, intersections, or other transportation-related capital improvements.
- C. In the event that bonds or similar debt instruments are issued for construction of capital improvements for which impact fees may be expended, impact fees may be used to pay debt service thereon to the extent that the improvements provided are of the type described in subsection A of this Section and are located within the City.
- D. Impact fee revenues may be used to provide refunds pursuant to Section 18.250.

Sec. 18.250. REFUND OF FEES PAID:

If a building permit expires without commencement of construction, then the fee payer shall be entitled to a refund, without interest, of the impact fee paid as a condition for its issuance, except that the City shall retain two percent (2%) of the fee to offset a portion of the costs of collection and refund. The fee payer shall apply in writing for such a refund

within thirty (30) calendar days of the expiration of the permit; provided that the Administrator may extend such period for good cause, not to exceed six (6) months.

Sec. 18.251. APPEALS:

An applicant may file an appeal and apply to the Administrator for a reduction, adjustment or waiver of the impact fee imposed pursuant to this Article based upon the absence of a reasonable relationship between the impact of that applicant's development project on transportation facilities in the City and the amount of the fee charged.

- A. Application. An applicant shall file a written request to adjust fees with the Administrator not later than 10 days after the city notifies the developer of the amount of the fee to be charged as provided in Section 18.247(B). The application shall provide evidence illustrating that the payment of the fee authorized by this Article bears no reasonable relationship or nexus with the impact of the development on the need for transportation facilities within the City and shall state in detail the factual basis for the request for reduction, adjustment or waiver. If an applicant desires to receive a building permit prior to the completion of the appeal process, the applicant shall deposit the fee being appealed with the application. Such fee or portion thereof will be refunded if the appeal is successful.
- B. Decision of the Administrator. The Administrator shall issue a decision on the application within 30 days after the application is filed. The Administrator's decision shall state their determination regarding the amount of the impact fee that may reasonably be imposed on the new development and include a brief description of the basis for the Administrator's decision. Should the Administrator determine that they need additional information in order to issue a decision, they shall notify the applicant, in writing, prior to the expiration of the 30-day period, and provide a description of the additional requested information. The Administrator shall then have 30 days from the date the applicant responds to the Administrator's request for additional information to issue their decision.
- C. Appeal of the Decision of the Administrator. Decisions of the Administrator may be appealed to the City Manager or their designee. Appeals must be filed within 10 days of the Administrator's decision. The City Manager shall review the application and evidence presented to the Administrator and issue a decision within 15 days. The decision of the City Manager is final and may be appealed or protested pursuant to Government Code Section 66020.

Sec. 18.252. EXEMPTIONS AND CREDITS:

- A. Any claim of exemption from the impact fee shall be made no later than the time of application for a building permit. Any claim not so made shall be deemed waived. The following shall be exempted from payment of the impact fee:

1. Alterations or expansion of an existing building where no additional dwelling units are created, where the use is not changed;
2. The construction of accessory buildings or structures which will not generate additional vehicular trips over and above those generated by the principal building or use of the development and which will not be used for other than storage;
3. The replacement of a destroyed or partially destroyed building or structure with a new building or structure of the same size and use; provided, that no additional trips will be generated over and above those generated by the original use of the land to which the new development pertains;
4. Development that does not result in any additional vehicular trips as determined by the Administrator;
5. Publicly owned facilities;
6. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65852.2(f)(3), accessory dwelling units of less than 750 square feet; and
7. Day care centers.

B. Credits:

1. Credit shall not be given for site-related improvements, right-of-way dedications providing paved access to the development or payments to special assessment or taxing districts.
2. Credits for an applicant's construction of a capital improvement included in the impact fee project list shall be given when the construction is completed and accepted by the appropriate governmental body.
3. Any claim for credit must be made no later than the time of application for a building permit. Any claim not so made shall be deemed waived.
4. Credit may be given for redevelopment of existing uses pursuant to subdivision B of Section 18.248.

Sec. 18.253. ADJUSTMENTS TO FEES:

The Transportation Impact Fee shall automatically increase starting on July 1, 2025, and each year thereafter, in accordance with changes in regional construction costs. The amount of the adjustment shall be based on May over May construction cost changes

according to the “Construction Cost Index” for the San Francisco Bay Area, as reported monthly in the Engineering News Record. This adjustment shall not require any action of the City Council.

Sec. 18.254. VIOLATION—PENALTY:

Any person, corporation, or other business entity violating or causing the violation of any of the provisions of this Article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punishable in accordance with Section 1.7A of this Code. Notwithstanding, the foregoing, the provisions of this Article may also be enforced by legal or equitable action, or both such actions, all such remedies being cumulative.

Exhibit C

TIF

Effective 3/22/2024

Effective 7/22/2024

| Residential ¹ | Per Livable Square Foot | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Single Family | \$1.61 | \$3.22 |
| Multi Family | \$1.15 | \$2.31 |
| Single Family-Downtown Area | \$1.00 | \$2.00 |
| Multi Family Downtown Area | \$0.71 | \$1.43 |
| Non-Residential | Per Gross Building Square Foot | |
| Office/ Research and Development | \$3.29 | \$6.58 |
| Medical/Dental Office | \$10.89 | \$21.78 |
| Industrial | \$1.48 | \$2.96 |
| Entertainment Venue | \$23.71 | \$47.43 |
| Religious Facility | \$1.48 | \$2.96 |
| Per Leasable Building Square Foot | | |
| General Retail | \$2.25 | \$4.50 |
| High Intensity Retail | \$28.39 | \$56.79 |
| Per Room | | |
| Hotel/Lodging | \$2,426.50 | \$4,853.00 |
| Per Student | | |
| School | \$589 | \$1,178 |
| Per Fueling Station | | |
| Service Station | \$20,896 | \$41,792 |

Notes:

¹ Pursuant to Government Code Section 65852.2(f)(3), the Transportation Fee shall not apply to accessory dwelling units of less than 750 square feet. For ADU's over this minimum threshold, the City is allowed to charge a maximum fee based on the ADU size as a percent of the primary dwelling unit size, that is then applied to the fee on the single-family home.

ORDINANCE NO. 2532

At a Joint City Council/Successor Agency Board/Public Financing
Authority Meeting thereof held on the 22nd day of January 2024 by the following
votes:

AYES, and in favor of the passage and adoption of the foregoing ordinance:

AYES: Aguirre, Eakin, Howard, Martinez Saballos, Sturken, Vice Mayor
Espinoza-Garnica, and Mayor Gee
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAINED: None
RECUSED: None



Jeff Gee
Mayor of the City of Redwood City

Attest:



Yessika Castro, CMC, CPMC
City Clerk of Redwood City

I hereby approve the foregoing
Ordinance this 23rd day of January 2024.



Jeff Gee
Mayor of the City of Redwood City