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Introduction

El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway: The Well-Traveled Road

Many of the world's great civilizations boast distinctive architecture or infrastructure that has endured a hallmark of their culture and history. In California, the name El Camino Real ("The King's Highway") has resonated for generations. Extending over 600 miles from San Diego in the south to Sonoma in the north, El Camino Real was, in essence, California's first highway, connecting 21 Franciscan missions. However, the road's importance and its name recognition have far outlasted that of the missions it originally served.

Even after the missions' decline, El Camino Real was a key link in the multistate road system used by the Butterfield Stage Coach Company for travel from Texas to San Francisco. In the 1850s, El Camino Real's prominence was supplanted by a new transportation technology: the railroad. Trains were a much faster and more comfortable way to move people and freight than were the old horse-drawn wagons. By the 1890s, concern about the loss of El Camino Real's historic significance prompted California history devotees to mark the route with the iron mission bells still in use today.

El Camino Real regained some of its importance in the early 20th century when the State decided to create a unified highway system to serve the newest form of transportation: the automobile. As part of this system, a single State agency (which later became the California Department of Transportation, or Caltrans) was assigned responsibility for overseeing street access and traffic flow along El Camino Real and the section of the road known as Monterey Highway. Paving El Camino Real, from the northern end of San Mateo County down into San Jose, was followed by a building boom that spawned many of the roadside motels, restaurants and historic business districts that continue to give El Camino Real its distinctive personality. The auto-oriented character that still defines El Camino Real/Monterey Highway today emerged in the 1920s, as the automobile increasingly became the desired mode of transportation.

The automobile, however, challenged El Camino Real's position as the state's pre-eminent north-south route. In the 1960s, construction began on Highway 101 as a limited-access freeway. El Camino Real/Monterey Highway no longer provided a faster alternative. So, while the road continued to be important for people traveling between San Jose and San Francisco, uses along the route focused less on statewide travelers and recreational trips, and more on local-serving retail centers with grocery stores, offices and businesses.

Today, the historic road that once served most of California functions more like a local street than like a State highway. While El Camino Real/Monterey Highway still accommodates some regional traffic, most trips on the road entail relatively short distances. This change in traffic patterns supports, and is supported by, changing land uses. Some of the auto-oriented businesses, borne out of El Camino Real's role as a regional street, are being replaced by housing and retail uses. A series of distinct neighborhoods are replacing the long, uniform corridor that once was El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. In response both to this evolutionary change and to a desire for a more urban lifestyle, communities are looking for ways to make stretches of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway more pedestrian-friendly and aesthetically pleasing. The grand old highway is evolving to serve residential neighborhoods mixed with traditional retail and commercial uses, as well as to accommodate multimodal transit and the increased use of bicycles and buses.
The Changing Corridor

Because the evolution of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway has been gradual, the perception is that the roadway and its associated land uses have changed little. Increasingly, there has been new development throughout the communities linked by El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. However, it is not only new development that is changing the face of the corridor. A cycle of “redevelopment” is also underway. Along parts of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, there is evidence of investment in improvements to existing properties. Investment in new development as well as in existing properties is crucial to the long-term economic health of the corridor. Both types of investment are necessary to keep land values stable and encourage ongoing revitalization. Communities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway can manage the ongoing transformation of the corridor in a way that balances the trend toward a more local-serving neighborhood street with the new market realities that favor a more urban lifestyle.

A Regional Vision for Revitalization

Development along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway presents a golden opportunity to simultaneously address the need for more affordable housing and the demand for better transportation services. Most communities along the corridor are essentially “built out.” In other words, there is limited vacant land available. Because San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties have far more jobs than housing units, many workers must travel to key employment centers from outside the region, resulting in longer commutes, more congestion and housing prices that are beyond the reach of most families. The El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor is an area where communities in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties can add housing along a major transportation route with adjacent public transportation. Adding housing can help preserve the historic and practical value of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. Older uses along the corridor—uses that may be financially marginal and no longer competitive in today’s marketplace—present an opportunity for reuse. Replacing existing buildings with higher-density housing, often mixed with up-to-date retail spaces designed to serve local neighborhoods, contributes to the regional housing pool and the revitalization of the corridor.

The experience of other communities, such as those in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area, illustrates the many potential upsides of developing higher-density housing along existing traffic corridors. Communities have discovered that encouraging dense development with a mix of uses along major arterial roads can stimulate growth and reinvestment without any significant increase in traffic, and can improve the local tax base at the same time. The increase in revenues, in turn, has helped pay for new amenities for the older single-family neighborhoods in these communities. El Camino Real/Monterey Highway offers an opportunity to realize these various benefits for cities in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.

The Best of Both Worlds

Not all of the existing uses along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway are going to go away, nor should they. Some existing businesses, like car dealerships, provide an important source of sales-tax revenues to their communities. Other businesses and historic buildings give El Camino Real/Monterey Highway its unique character and help distinguish one city from another. The objective is to manage change along the corridor in a way that creates positive benefits, without displacing uses and buildings that are economically viable. New projects need not compete with existing commercial centers. In some communities, the downtown is situated right along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, while in others the downtown main street is perpendicular, sometimes just off El Camino Real/Monterey Highway and sometimes several blocks to the east or west. In any case, new retail uses can be scaled to provide local neighborhood services that complement, rather
than conflict with, existing downtowns. Additional housing and good pedestrian connections also will bolster new and existing commercial districts.

**One Road, Many Cities**

El Camino Real/Monterey Highway from the northern boundary of San Mateo County to the southern end of Santa Clara County traverses 20 cities. Each city has a different residential character and a different economic base. Moreover, the road plays a different role in Gilroy, Morgan Hill and San Jose than it does in the cities to the north. However, all 20 cities along the corridor face the challenge of balancing the roadway’s role as a regional automobile route with its emerging role as a local street that accommodates a combination of cars, buses, bicycles and pedestrians. This challenge is faced by all “in-town” highways in California that are still designated as State highways; such roads must meet Caltrans standards, which are not necessarily tailored to respond to local needs. Consequently, cities are often faced with a highway design that does not integrate well with adjacent land uses, including nearby residential neighborhoods.

Although cities along El Camino may have different visions for their communities, they can all achieve a better outcome by embracing a regional approach to making the roadway design compatible with the uses along the roadway itself. As the City of Palo Alto points out in its proposed El Camino Real Master Schematic Design Plan, many of the stakeholders who use El Camino Real now, including drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists, local merchants and neighborhood residents, are not satisfied with the way the street operates or with its aesthetic appeal. To respond, cities will have to first establish a clear physical vision, one that integrates goals for mobility, economics, public spaces, amenities and urban design. Then, as change to the street’s functional operations occur, cities will need to address how the road transitions from one city to the next.

The bottom line is that in order to achieve the dual objectives of improving mobility on the roadway and changing the uses along it, cities will make more progress with a unified vision and plan. This approach will also enable them to work more effectively with Caltrans and with each other to capitalize on the opportunities presented by this historic road.

**Main Street Silicon Valley**

Main Street Silicon Valley, a project sponsored by Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network, is based on the premise that revitalizing a regional transportation corridor requires regional cooperation and a shared vision. The project is intended to help the 20 cities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway better understand the common challenges of this urban highway, highlight and leverage some of the successful actions these communities have already taken, and identify tools, or models, that can guide local improvements along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway.

Working with a Technical Advisory Committee and a Policy Advisory Committee, as well as staff representing all 20 cities, both counties, and the five transportation agencies that serve the region, the Main Street Silicon Valley project team developed four “models” to enable cities to manage land-use changes, work cooperatively with each other, and work more effectively with Caltrans. These four models are detailed in the “Models for Moving Forward” section of this report. Two of the models (Models 1 and 3: “A Place-Based Retail Analysis” and “Parcel Assembly for Transit-Oriented Development”) will help cities to guide and encourage projects that stimulate reinvestment and reduce traffic congestion. These models are critical because they provide insights for facilitating development that realizes the vision, described above, of linking high-density housing, economic revitalization and improved transit. Another model (“Regional Implications for Local Transportation-Improvement Decisions”) offers strategies to help communities frame local decisions in a regional context, rather than work at cross-purposes. A fourth model (“Multijurisdictional
Partnerships with Caltrans”) presents a way to work with Caltrans to implement street-design standards that will transform El Camino Real/Monterey Highway into a street with multimodal transit connecting vibrant commercial districts and residential neighborhoods.

**Standing Shoulder to Shoulder**

Though regionalism has recently become a very popular approach, many cities find it hard to justify participating in such efforts because there is no clear focus or explicit local benefit. Lessons learned for El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, however, show that when regional cooperation is geared to a specific opportunity, it can generate powerful solutions, benefiting individual cities and the region simultaneously. Cities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway can no longer afford to be parochial in their interests at the expense of sustaining the greater region’s economic vitality. Main Street Silicon Valley provides a way to preserve El Camino Real/Monterey Highway as a valuable asset for the region.

**From Vision to Action**

The Main Street Silicon Valley project demonstrates that communities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway do share common issues and can successfully find mutually beneficial solutions. The regional collaboration that has been forged through the Main Street Silicon Valley project itself provides the foundation for future actions. Together, communities can move forward on the following steps, recommended by the project’s Technical Advisory and Policy Advisory Committees, to ensure that El Camino Real/Monterey Highway continues to build on its legacy as a vital link connecting Californians.

- Implement a partnership between Caltrans and multiple jurisdictions to expedite the review of improvement/development plans and to support local street-design options.
- Prepare a place-based retail analysis for multiple jurisdictions to define the appropriate location and mix for retail uses along the corridor.
- Provide a web-based regional clearinghouse for street improvements affecting the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.
- Develop a list of funding resources for planning, designing and constructing development and improvement projects.
- Prepare a “pattern book” for potential design guidelines appropriate for development and improvements along the corridor.
- Coordinate with the Grande Boulevard project and the City/County Association of Governments’ (C/CAG ‘s) T-Plus Grant in San Mateo County.
- Assist cities in defining a vision for the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.
Main Street Silicon Valley Project Overview

There are a total of 20 cities, two counties and five transportation agencies included in the Main Street Silicon Valley study area, all with a deep interest in the future of the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway (State Highway 82) corridor. Although each has unique characteristics and policy issues, the standardized roadway and frontage configurations associated with a State highway have resulted in similar forms of development from city to city along the corridor. In recent years, at least 15 corridor cities have independently taken steps to develop a vision for all or part of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway within their communities. Most of these cities have identified specific opportunities and constraints, and addressed frontage development and streetscape improvements. When these cities' individual plans are reviewed, a shared regional vision begins to emerge, one that revolves around transforming El Camino Real/Monterey Highway from a wide, unlandscaped arterial street into an attractive boulevard with opportunities for increased transit and more intensive land uses. Changes along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway over the past two decades point toward the implementation of this common vision, consistent with current industry trends in urban design, planning, transportation and economic development.

Project Genesis

In 2002, Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network received a grant from The James Irvine Foundation’s Collaborative Regional Initiative (CRI) Program to help communities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway begin working toward a shared vision for this crucial corridor. Initially conceptualized by Joint Venture's Economic Development Roundtable (consisting of city representatives from both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties), this project aims to both provide a forum for interagency communication and to develop informational resources that both highlight and catalyze successful responses to issues common to cities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. The project—called “Main Street Silicon Valley”—is based on the principle that managing and improving a regional transportation corridor requires regional collaboration.

As a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization, Joint Venture provides a neutral forum for the development of creative solutions to issues that extend beyond city boundaries. Its role as a regional leader and convener enables Joint Venture to foster meaningful collaboration that does not compromise the autonomy, identity and diversity of individual communities. Consistent with this approach, Main Street Silicon Valley relies on stakeholders from across the region to oversee the project, with support from a team of private consultants with expertise in project management, planning, urban design, economics, transportation and civil engineering.

Led by Joint Venture Board members Frank Benest, City Manager of Palo Alto, and Rose Jacobs Gibson, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, the project was launched with a kickoff event on June 17, 2003. At this meeting, attended by over 30 city managers and economic-development directors, members for the project’s Technical Advisory Committee and Policy Advisory Committee were identified. Both committees include representatives from public and private entities located throughout the region. In addition, staff from each city, county and transportation agency with jurisdiction over El Camino Real/Monterey Highway has been included at every step along the way. The process used to develop this Main Street Silicon Valley report is, itself, an example of regional collaboration and provides a foundation for future actions.

It is important to underscore that even prior to this project, many individual jurisdictions had taken positive steps to improve El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, including participation in ambitious planning efforts like the Peninsula Corridor Plan. The focus of Main Street Silicon Valley is to
identify these promising efforts and sustain the momentum they have initiated. This report—the primary information resource from the project—has been developed in three phases.

- **Phase I** (Current Issues, Trends and Visions, November 2003): Based on a review of information provided by individual cities and agencies, this phase examined existing conditions to determine common issues faced by jurisdictions along the corridor. Phase I described the significance of these issues for El Camino Real/Monterey Highway and discussed challenges and opportunities with respect to each.

- **Phase II** (Snapshots of Success, May 2004): This phase highlighted best practices in response to the shared issues from across Silicon Valley. Each of these “snapshots of success” offers examples of strategies that might be adopted by other jurisdictions along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.

- **Phase III** (Models for Moving Forward, July 2004): This phase included development of four analytical models to assist cities and public agencies in addressing the corridor’s most significant challenges. Each model examines one or more priority issues identified by the Main Street Silicon Valley Policy Advisory Committee, with the objective of facilitating local decision-making and regional cooperation. Phase III also identified potential next steps so that work toward a shared vision for El Camino Real/Monterey Highway can continue.

The analysis from each of the three phases have been combined into this single report, intended as a resource for a broad audience of: staff and elected officials at the city, county and state levels; professionals in planning, urban design, economic development, transportation and civil engineering; and leaders in the private development and business sectors. (Phase I and Phase II also were released earlier as separate interim reports.) This final report provides the tools to help individual cities manage their sections of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway as well as to facilitate regional collaboration aimed at improving the economic vitality and a strong sense of place along the corridor. The most up-to-date information on the Main Street Silicon Valley project and its associated reports can be found at www.jointventure.org/mainstreet.

**Study Area Description**

The Main Street Silicon Valley study area includes all of the communities and agencies within San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties with jurisdiction over El Camino Real and Monterey Highway. The study’s focus is the street right-of-way itself in conjunction with the adjacent properties. In addition to the two counties, there are 20 cities and five transportation agencies with an interest in the corridor. From north to south, the cities include: Daly City, Colma, South San Francisco, San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, Redwood City, Atherton, Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Los Altos, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, San Jose, Morgan Hill and Gilroy (see map on the following page). Regional transportation agencies include: San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and Caltrain.

In general, cities have jurisdictional authority over the land-use and development of property adjacent to El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. For unincorporated pockets of land, the counties assume this authority. SamTrans and VTA are the chief providers of transit services within the street right-of-way in their respective counties. BART and Caltrain are responsible for a rail-transit system that features numerous stations adjacent to the street. Since most of the corridor is a State highway, Caltrans has a significant role in shaping the response to regional issues along the corridor based on its authority over all improvements, access points, landscaping and design for the street.
Although this study focuses on conditions that are common across jurisdictions, it is important to note that the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor is far from homogeneous. Even a consistent name for the street is not maintained across the region. State Highway 82 is called Mission Street in Daly City and Colma, and becomes El Camino Real from South San Francisco through Santa Clara. In San Jose, the street is The Alameda, San Carlos and First Street to the south of downtown, where it becomes Monterey Highway through Gilroy. El Camino Real/Monterey Highway serves as the “main street” in some municipalities, while in others it intersects the city’s main street, providing a gateway to downtowns. Characteristics of the various segments of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway range from high-density residential and commercial centers to agricultural zones and cemeteries. Single- and multifamily residential uses, low-density commercial uses and historic districts characterize other segments.
Shared Vision

El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway is no longer the lifeline for regional travel and commerce; that role has been taken over by the major freeways: Highways 101 and 280. Yet, El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway remains a major regional connector. Cities along its length share a common inheritance and now have an opportunity to create a shared future for the corridor.

With cities and other jurisdictions along the corridor exploring new alternatives in transportation and development, a shared regional vision for El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway is emerging. This vision supports more intensive infill development and street improvements in preparation for the anticipated increase in regional transit opportunities and higher-density housing. For many communities, there is a desire to retain certain auto-related uses while replacing strip-commercial uses with office-over-commercial or residential-over-commercial buildings, with parking underneath or to the rear. Intensification of the corridor likely will result in a greater number of buildings facing El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway, with relatively consistent heights and setbacks and varied architectural styles. This emerging streetscape encourages pedestrian activity through the use of safe crosswalks, street trees and ornamental streetlights. Special locations, such as municipal boundaries and junctures with downtown commercial districts and transit stations, provide opportunities for enhanced architectural elements, such as gateway buildings or plazas. This regional vision also calls for a shift from auto-oriented development to an emphasis on alternate transit modes to offer easy access to corridor destinations and reduce traffic congestion.

There are some cities to which this shared vision does not apply, or in which progress toward the vision has been limited. This apparently is the result of city-specific factors, such as (1) the corridor functions as a downtown “main street” commercial district; (2) land uses along El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway are solely residential or industrial; (3) the local community has determined that automobile traffic is a priority; or (4) the vision for that portion of the corridor has not yet been identified. In these cases, there nonetheless may be opportunities to incorporate some elements of the shared vision—for example, street trees and lighting—to unify the corridor and strengthen the interface between adjacent communities. Opportunities to implement a shared regional vision can be further enhanced through interagency collaboration between cities, Caltrans and/or transit operators, and through a consistent regulatory framework.

Shared Development Trends

Current trends in planning, urban design and transportation have given rise to a clear physical vision of what constitutes a desirable place, and have provided a context for new kinds of community participation and discussion. Over the past 10 to 15 years, urban design has become an integral part of public and private development and improvements, gaining equal footing with such mainstays as land use, housing and circulation. The increased emphasis on urban design principles has been promoted by the American Planning Association, the Congress for the New Urbanism and related organizations, as well as by local residents and communities dissatisfied with the sprawl and general “placelessness” that have resulted from the predominant development approaches of the last 50 years. Communities are placing increased pressure on elected officials to improve overall community appearance and pedestrian amenities, and to maintain or create a sense of place that reflects community goals and aspirations.

Recent trends in urban design, planning and transportation are centered on three basic ideas:

- Establishment of public space
- Creation of place
- Increased use of alternate (nonautomobile) transit modes
A city can be viewed as a network of public spaces that includes streets, community centers/plazas, parks and transit facilities. Streets provide the backbone for the network, while establishing community character and influencing resident and visitor perceptions. Creating places—areas with a distinct identity and purpose—supports the desired community character. Individual places are created by relating buildings to public spaces and by integrating private development into the greater community. For example, place-related planning focuses on the creation of a neighborhood rather than a residential district, or on establishing a boulevard rather than an arterial street. Alternate transit modes contribute to place-making by moving people out of cars into the public sphere, and by linking different places efficiently. Successful creation of places relies on demanding higher design standards and undertaking planning efforts that span whole communities.

Shared Economic Trends

All of the communities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway face the challenge of transforming the corridor from its historic economic function of serving the automobile to a focus on new and varied uses. Market conditions in the retail industry, in particular, make this transition especially difficult, since there is a decreasing pallet of tenants and users who favor the linear land-use pattern—characterized by relatively low density and little or no relationship to adjacent development—that is common along the corridor. In addition, alternate commercial uses—such as office space—that could potentially replace out-moded retail uses along the corridor are not locating in areas with linear land-use patterns; more typically, new office development is located in business parks. Thus, cities must rethink the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor to accommodate new uses, attract new investment and promote new economic vitality.
Shared Issues and Snapshots of Success

By talking with key stakeholders, reviewing multiple public documents provided by cities and counties in the study area, and looking closely at the corridor, the Main Street Silicon Valley consultant team identified 15 shared issues that define the common challenges confronted by all of the study-area communities. These 15 issues can be grouped into four major categories that serve as the organizing themes for the Main Street Silicon Valley project. These four themes and the 15 shared issues are:

- **Current Patterns**
  1. Economic Function
  2. Parcelization
  3. Development Patterns
  4. Building Orientation and Form
- **Mobility**
  5. Street Type and Improvements
  6. Transit
  7. Traffic Operations
  8. Parking
- **Transition to the Future**
  9. Community Identity
  10. Streetscape Design
  11. Transit-Oriented Development
  12. Mixed-Use Development
  13. Neighborhood Preservation and Interface
- **Policies and Process**
  14. Public Policies and Process
  15. Implementation

This section explores these themes and issues in the context of their impact on development, improvement and place-making along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor. For each issue, there is an overview of its significance for communities along the corridor, a discussion of related challenges and opportunities, and an example of a best practice— or “Snapshot of Success”— that shows how a jurisdiction in Silicon Valley has addressed that particular shared issue. Each Snapshot of Success focuses on a positive approach to its corresponding shared issue and does not necessarily provide solutions for other challenges faced by the community.

To create the roster of potential snapshots, members of the Main Street Silicon Valley Policy Advisory and Technical Advisory Committees identified examples of best practices. Next, 15 Snapshots of Success were selected based on the criteria listed below.

- Each snapshot offers lessons that are widely applicable to jurisdictions along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway.
- Combined, the snapshots feature broad geographical representation and show how shared issues along the corridor affect a wide range of locations and communities.
- Snapshots include only projects for which documentation— such as area plans, site-specific plans, or environmental impact reports (EIRs)— is available.

While celebrating the successes in the region, the snapshots presented in this report also illustrate the challenges faced by each project— the hurdles that have been overcome as well as those that remain. Taken together, the snapshots not only show that real progress has been made in improving El
Camino Real/Monterey Highway, but also highlight the kinds of innovation, long-term thinking and commitment needed to create appealing, economically viable places along this corridor.

**CURRENT PATTERNS**

The challenges confronting cities seeking to encourage reinvestment and renewal along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor go beyond merely identifying a new set of uses to occupy space. Potential development must occur in the context of a complex mix of existing building types, parcel sizes, local and State policies, and economic conditions. No revitalization effort can go forward without taking all of these factors into account as part of the bigger picture. As noted earlier, the existing patterns have evolved over a long period of time and give the corridor its unique character. But at the same time, new patterns must emerge for the corridor to better meet local community needs and aspirations.

**Shared Issue #1: Economic Function**

**Description:** Most of the economic activity along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor is retail or service oriented. When this land-use pattern initially developed, the corridor’s parcel configurations and building types were “state of the art.” However, retail industry trends and modes of access have changed dramatically over time, rendering many retail areas along the corridor economically marginal. In addition, commercial uses associated with today’s regional economy—such as office, and research and development—tend to cluster in business parks or along other major streets. As a result, maintaining the economic viability of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway and the stability of its businesses is a challenge for most cities.

Places that are economically stable tend to build on the principles of critical mass and synergism. Uses that are clustered together, in groupings of sufficient size, can be mutually supportive and can often share physical resources such as parking, public spaces and internal circulation.

**Significance:** To remain a viable and vibrant part of any community, business districts and commercial corridors must renew themselves over time. Otherwise, areas become rundown and experience high levels of disinvestment. Therefore, cities must continually seek ways to encourage reinvestment, which may require finding new uses and activities.

Demographic trends around the country are shifting, as “baby boomers” mature and there are fewer young people. This trend is evident in many parts of Silicon Valley where there has been a decline in the number of people in the 18-to-34 age range over the past 10 years. Because people in this age group help fuel the Valley’s economic creativity and vitality, many businesses are concerned that there are not enough places with a “hip and urban” atmosphere to attract more young people. In looking for ways to encourage reinvestment along the corridor, communities should consider using the market momentum for housing to create new residential districts to respond to changing demographics. This can help to both stimulate reinvestment and foster Silicon Valley’s long-term economic sustainability.

**Challenges:** One of the major challenges to long-term economic stability is the changing retail environment. National retail trends have led to tremendous consolidation in the industry, leaving fewer retailers overall. In particular, there are very few stores that occupy smaller retail spaces. Thus, it is increasingly difficult to find appropriate tenants to fill the more marginal spaces along corridors such as El Camino Real/Monterey Highway.
Opportunities: There are five primary economic opportunities for maintaining and enhancing economic stability along the corridor:

- Encourage reinvestment in existing retail centers that are large enough to support new buildings and uses
- Assist service-oriented businesses and smaller retailers that provide important goods and services to improve their building facades and add landscaping
- Redevelop some functionally obsolete retail or office spaces for housing
- Redevelop functionally obsolete space for mixed-use projects that combine housing with a smaller increment of retail, office and/or residential support-service space
- Link renovated and new development with transit opportunities

To the extent that cities want to add new housing along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor, special care should be taken in choosing sites. Connecting new projects with adjacent neighborhoods can facilitate access to parks, schools and other amenities typically found in residential areas. Otherwise, future residents will be living in a small island of housing without feeling that they live in a real “place.” Focusing on pedestrian and transit accessibility can connect new housing to older neighborhoods and provide housing that appeals to residents who are more likely to support their community, be less transient and spend disposable income locally.

California has many cities with streets like El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, corridors where it is necessary to develop strategies for stimulating new investment and moving from a locally focused economy to one that is regionally oriented. Communities that have been the most successful in this process have followed these principles:

- Recognize the power of place
- Focus on assets
- Foster diversity and balance
- Maintain and expand regional connections
- Reinvest and reinvent
- Build long-term value
- Pay attention to the basics
- Balance past, present and future
- Have no small vision

Snapshot of Success: Menlo Center, City of Menlo Park

Completed in 1989, Menlo Center provides an example of successfully rethinking the type and intensity of uses that can succeed along El Camino Real. Located at El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue in central Menlo Park, this moderately scaled building includes 40,000 square feet of office space in two stories above 14,500 square feet of retail with easily accessible underground parking. The property previously contained a typical strip-commercial development of unrelated uses with associated parking.

In the 1980s the City undertook a planning study that resulted in planned development zoning along the downtown portion of El Camino Real and the creation of Design Guidelines for the site. The project required an unusually high degree of developer will and patience, as the details of the site design were processed through the City Council and Planning Commission over a four-year period.

The result is a highly profitable, fully tenanted development that has provided a catalyst for improved development along this portion of El Camino Real. It is clear that this model can be replicated elsewhere along the corridor in areas supported by compatible assets such as proximity to a
downtown, Caltrain station and civic center. Public facilities such as parks, libraries and community centers similarly can be used as a catalyst to support this kind of economic revitalization.

However, cities seeking to replicate this example must think realistically about market support for the new uses and the potential for synergies with existing uses. Menlo Center accommodates walking and driving patrons by virtue of its downtown location and the provision of adequate parking. Also, for Menlo Center, the developer vision and will were atypical. Application of this example to other situations may require that cities have regulatory measures, such as zoning, design guidelines and/or specific plans, in place to expedite the path for less resilient developers. Menlo Center illustrates how good planning and clear design guidelines can allow the market to realize a site’s latent potential.

**Project Status:** Completed

**Project Statistics:** 14,500 square feet of ground-floor retail commercial, with 40,000 square feet of office space on two upper floors, at 0.726 FAR; 275 parking spaces

**Key Concept:** Redeveloping strip-commercial into destination retail and office

**Project Partners:** City of Menlo Park, Menlo Management, Peterson Architects and LCP Associates

**Contacts:**
- Linda Heineck, City of Menlo Park, aaheineck@menlopark.org
- Leon C. Pirofalo, AICP, President of LCP Associates and project manager for Menlo Center (previously Director of Community Development for the City of Menlo Park), 650-941-4975
- Russ Collier, Menlo Management, 650-327-7137
- Bob Peterson, Peterson Architects, 650-327-1161, rcp@PetersonArchitects.com

**Documentation:** El Camino Real/Ravenswood Avenue Block Study Development Guidelines (1987) and El Camino Real/South Pacific Corridor Study (1978), both available from the City of Menlo Park.

**Online Resources:**

**Shared Issue #2: Parcelization**

**Description:** Parcel size (including width and depth), configuration and shape strongly influence development options. In general, parcels along straight segments of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway are small, relatively shallow and rectangular. Parcel depths can be as little as 75 feet, with widths of 25 to 50 feet. Parcels at major bends and curves in the street are typically deeper, larger and
more irregular in shape. In general, the deeper the parcel, the more intensive (denser and/or taller) development can be.

**Significance:** Cities attempting to alter development patterns or add new uses must work with existing parcel sizes and configurations or promote subdivision and parcel assembly through development policies and/or direct acquisition. Shallow frontage parcels are difficult to develop, particularly with mixed-use buildings. The lack of surface land area makes underground parking a costly requirement, reducing short-term redevelopment potential. In addition, new buildings may end up being very close to existing residential properties. Conversely, large, irregular parcels at bends in the road have the land area needed to accommodate higher-quality development, but may not be appropriate locations for this type of development.

**Challenges:** Many new retail development sites along El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway require significant parcel assembly. In many cases, however, these smaller parcels cannot be consolidated to create sufficient “critical mass” to support modern retail facilities. While some may be large enough for housing development, without nearby amenities, these parcels can be undesirable for residential use. Other challenges for parcel assembly and reconfiguration include high land costs, lack of reuse opportunities, insufficient market demand and lack of existing policies to promote parcel assembly or reconfiguration.

**Opportunities:** Because larger properties offer better opportunities for development under contemporary market conditions, it is advantageous for cities to undertake parcel assembly efforts and adopt policies that promote appropriate uses and design. Ideally, parcel assembly efforts and associated policies should be coordinated with a strategy for improving the economics of frontage development. If legally and politically appropriate for a given city, establishing a Redevelopment Project Area offers a mechanism to pursue opportunities for parcel purchase and assembly. If Redevelopment Project Areas are not an option, providing density/intensity incentives, special zoning districts, public-funding priority and/or collaborative partnerships can foster private parcel assembly as a means of implementing the land use, scale, density and quality of development consistent with the local and regional visions for the corridor. Preparing parcel-appropriate development policies provides an opportunity for cities to explore and clarify economic and market issues, feasible land uses, building sizes, parking standards and urban-design requirements.

**Snapshot of Success: El Camino Real/ Chestnut Avenue Plan, City of South San Francisco**

The City of South San Francisco’s El Camino Real/ Chestnut Avenue Area Land Use and Urban Design Plan provides an example of how cities, public agencies and private property owners can work together creatively to combine parcels for new development, without employing eminent domain. The Plan covers approximately 30 acres of underutilized land and outdated commercial uses, including parcels previously used for construction staging for the BART extension to San Francisco International Airport.

To help define the best approach for parcel assembly, the Plan area was divided into subareas based on parcel shapes and prior uses. In the largest subarea, parcels are predominately linear remnants from past rail lines, water lines and widening of El Camino Real. Two smaller subareas consist of outdated retail centers with grocery stores as primary tenants. Revitalization of these centers is handicapped by the individual ownership of small parcels as well as the use of cross access and parking easements within the centers. This older development approach, which typically requires agreements among property owners with differing financial interests, is rarely employed today as it typically cannot satisfy the needs of contemporary retailers or the parameters of city development requirements.
The effort to combine parcels in the El Camino Real/Chestnut Avenue area was initiated by the City of South San Francisco and the area's major property owners. The goal was to combine various properties to form cohesive, regularly shaped parcels for development of higher-intensity commercial and residential uses. Planning discussions involved City staff as well as representatives from the following:

- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)
- SamTrans
- BART
- Kaiser Hospital Corporation
- Ron Price Motors
- Key frontage parcels and the two retail centers

These discussions resulted in an implementation strategy that calls for a master developer for the entire Plan area, or master developers for each subarea, to complete a series of parcel aggregations. This implementation strategy identifies a sequence of public actions and private responsibilities as part of the comprehensive phasing for development. The strategy includes carefully phased development, significant financial incentives and ongoing cooperation between various stakeholders, and serves as a model for other jurisdictions facing parcelization issues.

Even though the Plan area is within South San Francisco's larger El Camino Real Corridor Redevelopment Project Area, the implementation strategy avoids the use of the City's redevelopment or eminent domain powers. Rather, the Plan relies on willing property owners to advance the
necessary parcel aggregation. Land sales, land swaps and access easement relocations between multiple property owners will be necessary to achieve a cohesive development pattern. The project’s implementation strategy includes aggressive and creative incentives for property owners to collaborate with, or sell properties to, the Plan area’s master developer.

Once fully developed, the Plan will create approximately 500 new residential units and up to 190,000 square feet of retail space while retaining Ron Price Motors, a major source of sales-tax revenue for South San Francisco. The Plan coordinates development with a variety of infrastructure improvements, such as new connections between Mission Road and El Camino Real to reduce congestion on Chestnut Avenue; a new connection between El Camino Real and City Hall; closure of roads that have traffic conflicts at intersections with El Camino Real; roadway extensions consistent with the City’s General Plan; and extension of the linear park/bikeway over two miles of the BART right-of-way to connect with Orange Park.

The primary property owner, the SFPUC, recently released a public Request for Proposals (RFP) to identify a master developer to lead parcel aggregation. Because the City, private property owners and transit agencies will benefit from the comprehensive development plan, all are cooperating in the effort. In addition, the South San Francisco City Council determined that the Plan will best be implemented with a strategy of working with the selected master developer and individual property owners. To support the development of the Plan, City assistance will focus on infrastructure improvements and regulatory requirements.

Project Status: Draft Plan being reviewed by the South San Francisco City Council; RFP to identify a master developer has been released by the SFPUC

Project Statistics: 500 residential units with up to 190,000 square feet of retail commercial uses

Key Concept: Combining parcels to create development opportunities

Project Partners: City of South San Francisco, SFPUC, BART, SamTrans and private property owners

Contacts: Mike Lappen, City of South San Francisco, 650-829-6620
Rick Williams, Van Meter Williams Pollack, 415-974-5352

Documentation: El Camino Real/Chestnut Avenue Land Use and Urban Design Plan (Draft dated June 2002)

Online Resources: None

Shared Issue #3: Development Patterns

Description: Existing patterns of land use, density and building orientation vary along the corridor. However, development typically falls into three basic types:

- **Random development** is loosely controlled, with buildings developed only to meet individual parcel or tenant conditions. These often have general commercial zoning that allows housing.
- **Linear development** has consistent land uses, building heights and/or setbacks. Examples include auto rows, office frontages, vestigial storefront districts and strip commercial developments.
- **Node development** is typified by uses coordinated for a specific functional reason. Examples are office, multi-unit residential and/or mixed-use development that complements an adjacent commercial district or transit center.

Significance: Random development patterns predominate along the corridor. Such areas typically are unattractive and have lower property values relative to the other two development patterns. Most cities in the study area have policy goals of replacing existing random development in an effort to
stimulate economic growth, increase housing supply and/or improve the corridor’s appearance. Both random and linear patterns have relatively low density with little or no relationship to adjacent uses. Success in changing or intensifying these development patterns depends on the ability of communities to encourage stronger nodes with land uses clustered in a complementary mix. Nodes generally include a higher percentage of local-serving uses than those found in linear or random patterns. It is also common for nodes to include a housing component.

Challenges: Current parcel configurations, existing policies and high land costs all pose challenges to altering current development patterns. A major obstacle is simply the time and sustained commitment required for change. The corridor’s development patterns did not occur overnight, with most evolving over a 40- to 50-year period. Changing these patterns can take decades of focused policies, actions and capital improvements. This kind of effort is difficult to sustain as shifts occur in local economic and/or political circumstances.

Opportunities: Cities can combine linear and node developments for a varied and attractive streetscape. Linear development that relates directly to street function, combined with street improvements, can offer opportunities to enhance this type of development pattern. For example, a narrow street with reduced traffic speeds and median landscaping can create an environment that supports a linear residential development. Similarly, a street configuration focused on automobile access and visibility can encourage an “auto row.” Improved pedestrian amenities can increase street activity, supporting storefront commercial businesses as well as transit use.

Node development typically relates to adjacent areas or conditions, such as a transit center, downtown commercial district or major cross street. There appear to be many opportunities for node development along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. Many of the cities within the Main Street Silicon Valley study area have downtowns that intersect with El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, and some have revitalization efforts underway. At the same time, improvements to Caltrain station areas are continuing, and city and State policies are encouraging more intensive transit-oriented development.

Snapshot of Success: Avalon on The Alameda, City of San Jose

Avalon on The Alameda is a mixed-use residential and retail commercial project located on The Alameda between Lenzen Avenue and West Julian Street in the City of San Jose. The project

Avalon on the Alameda is an example of a successful “node” development pattern. The project is a mixed residential and retail development located close to transit.
contains 305 apartments and 15,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space. The eight-acre site is located within “The Alameda Neighborhood Business District (NBD)” Redevelopment Project Area on the former J. Lohr Winery property. The project has provided a major boost to the vitality of the surrounding commercial district by expanding and strengthening the storefront commercial environment and adding a significant number of new residents to the area. Located approximately one mile west of downtown San Jose and the Diridon/Cahill Street Caltrain Station, Avalon supports San Jose’s downtown-oriented infill housing strategy.

This development provides an excellent example of changing a development pattern from a random development of loosely controlled buildings meeting individual tenant requirements to a node development of intensified and mixed uses that meet neighborhood and community needs. Aspects of the project applicable to other jurisdictions include: coordination of planning and development with strong local neighborhood organizations, as well as sensitive design related to height, massing, access and site configuration for commercial and residential uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Status:</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Statistics:</td>
<td>305 residential units at approximately 38 dwelling units per acre; 15,000 square feet of ground-floor retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Concept:</td>
<td>Catalyzing neighborhood and business revitalization using infill housing-over-commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Partners:</td>
<td>City of San Jose, Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose, Avalon Communities and Seidel/ Holzman Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Carol Hamilton, Planning Department, City of San Jose, 408-277-4576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation:</td>
<td>Project files available from the City of San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Resources:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.avaloncommunities.com">http://www.avaloncommunities.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.seidelholzman.com">http://www.seidelholzman.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shared Issue #4: Building Orientation and Form

**Description:** The corridor’s older buildings, developed prior to the parking requirements that typify postwar development, abut and face the street. Many such older buildings have been removed to create surface parking for adjacent buildings. Shopping centers have been developed on larger sites, with buildings oriented in a variety of ways and with parking areas located along the frontage. Building types range from one-story shops, restaurants and auto-repair garages, to two-story shopping malls, and 10-story office structures and residential towers. The range of building orientations and forms creates an inconsistent, haphazard appearance in many areas of the corridor. Buildings with large frontage parking lots generally fail to contribute to community identity, create a coherent appearance or relate to the street as a public space.

**Significance:** Buildings located behind parking lots, without a relationship to nearby structures or street frontages, can have a negative effect on community image. They also tend to deter pedestrian activity and can reduce nearby property values as well. In contrast, attractive, interrelated, street-facing buildings can improve aesthetics and add value to the street as a public space, increasing pedestrian activity and encouraging transit use. Most corridor cities have policies to upgrade the appearance of frontage buildings, through either renovations or new development. Several cities have prepared building-design guidelines, primarily for commercial/retail buildings. Few cities, however, have policies that specifically address parcel-by-parcel development and the corresponding range of land uses and building types that are likely to occur.

**Challenges:** National retailers often have requirements for frontage parking lots that constrain building location. Additionally, small parcels make it difficult to accommodate local parking
requirements and to support the “four wall” design (parking behind or under buildings) desired for frontage properties. Unattractive streetscape conditions and/or a lack of curbside parking can also deter development of street-facing buildings.

**Opportunities:** Policies can promote visually compatible, street-facing, side-by-side development. Nonretail development (e.g., residential or office) is less sensitive to parking location and more adaptable to such policies. Larger parcels offer flexibility for site designs that accommodate street-facing buildings in conjunction with surface parking. Design and development standards can be structured to promote shared/mixed-use parking on smaller parcels. Communities have an opportunity to provide more detailed, parcel-by-parcel guidelines that define and encourage specific design and land-use responses in order to implement a larger vision for the corridor.

**Snapshot of Success: Franklin Street Apartments, City of Redwood City**

The Franklin Street Apartments are located on El Camino Real, north of Maple Street, just west of the railroad tracks, in the City of Redwood City. The project contains 206 dwelling units and 10,000 square feet of boutique commercial space, configured in four city-block-like building clusters. Formerly an RMC concrete plant, the 4.5-acre site is within the City’s downtown Redevelopment Project Area, approximately a quarter mile from the Redwood City Caltrain Station. Dwelling units are located above ground-floor parking podiums, with gracious stairs connecting to fronting sidewalks. A ground-floor arcade along El Camino Real provides additional sidewalk width for commercial tenants while accommodating residential space above. Buildings have traditional architectural forms that reflect older commercial and residential buildings in the area. Balconies are built-in; corner turrets frame stair and patio areas; second- and third-floor loggias provide views above and over the railroad to downtown. Franklin Street Apartments is an example of change from an outdated building form to an updated site design of street-facing development with interrelated uses. The development has resulted in enhanced pedestrian activity and community identity.

*Key features of the Franklin Street Apartments include an attractive street frontage, distinctive architectural details and pedestrian-friendly design.*

One key aspect of the project applicable to other jurisdictions is the positive use of different architectural design approaches for different frontage conditions. Additionally, the project demonstrates the potential for receiving financial support through a Transit-Oriented Development Incentive Program grant from the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) administered by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo (C/CAG).
Development of high-density housing (at least 40 dwelling units per acre) located within one-third mile of a transit station qualifies cities for a grant of $1,700 per bedroom. Cities can then use these funds for any transportation project within their jurisdictions.

**Project Status:** Complete

**Project Statistics:** 206 residential units at approximately 46 dwelling units per acre; 10,000 square feet of ground-floor retail

**Key Concept:** Relating new housing to the surrounding street grid through quality architectural design and details

**Project Partners:** City of Redwood City Redevelopment Agency, The Irvine Company and McLarand/Vasquez Architects

**Contacts:** Maureen Riordan, City of Redwood City, 650-780-7236
Irvine Company Apartment Communities, 650-216-6886

**Documentation:** Project files available from the City of Redwood City

**Online Resources:** http://www.rentiac.com/ (select “Redwood City” from pull-down location menu)

**MOBILITY**

El Camino Real/Monterey Highway has historically been a major travel route. Accordingly, its design and surrounding land uses are predominantly intended to accommodate automobile traffic. As the evolution of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway continues, corridor improvements can make travel more efficient by offering people an array of alternatives to driving, such as biking, riding mass transit or walking. To ensure that individuals can conveniently get to their destination using whatever mode best suits their preferences and needs, El Camino Real/Monterey Highway and major adjacent roads can include various travel modes. Street signals and signage can support a mix of automobile and nonautomobile travel by effectively controlling and directing traffic flow. At the same time, adequate parking to accommodate people arriving at the corridor by car can also increase accessibility to alternate transportation modes.

**Shared Issue #5: Street Type and Improvements**

**Description:** In general, El Camino Real/Monterey Highway is a wide, unattractive arterial street with a random, primarily commercial, development pattern. This arrangement, along with differing transportation objectives across jurisdictions, does not allow roadway features (i.e., speed-limit levels, on-street parking, travel-lane widths, landscaping, lighting and sidewalk widths) to consistently accommodate vehicular traffic, pedestrians, transit and bicyclists. Typically, roadway features have focused first on improving traffic flow, and second on increasing pedestrian activity, facilitating alternate modes and encouraging transit use.

Even under these conditions, there is an opportunity to transform some sections of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway into the type of boulevard or parkway described below, significantly improving its appearance, function and utility for local communities as well as for the region.

- **Boulevards** are wide, heavily traveled streets that are attractive and lined with facing buildings. Boulevards typically have generous frontage amenities such as street trees, wide sidewalks and ornamental streetlights. Boulevards also may include medians or traffic islands. Either residential or commercial buildings can face boulevards.

- **Parkways** are wide, heavily traveled and attractive streets without facing buildings. Instead, the side or rear of development usually abuts the right-of-way. Parkways are often designed to visually screen adjacent properties from higher-speed through traffic.
Parkways usually have generous, landscaped medians and deep, densely landscaped frontages with an informal, park-like character.

For other sections of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, the roadway functions as a main street. A main street generally is not an arterial, is narrower than a boulevard or parkway, and is lined by first-floor storefronts with curbside parking. Along other segments, the roadway serves only as a connector between two commercial areas or cities. These segments are generally characterized by a lack of sidewalks and transit facilities, and by limited access.

**Significance:** The existing corridor has no unified character, only a mismatched collection of street and development types. In many areas, for example, existing sidewalks are narrow and/or cluttered with signs, telephone poles, news racks, utility boxes and other appurtenances. These elements give the corridor an unkempt appearance that can deter patronage of frontage businesses and investment in properties. To develop a coherent boulevard or other street type, cities need to first clarify their vision, defining the desirable street type in accordance with adjacent existing and planned uses, then coordinate street improvements and amenities.

**Challenges:** The potential for new street improvements often is limited by street conditions that are out of sync with frontage development—for example, insufficient right-of-way to accommodate curbside parking for street-facing retail or to accommodate dedicated bicycle lanes. Economic conditions that limit development, as well as parcel size and multiple ownership, can also be obstacles. The application of statewide Caltrans standards can further frustrate coordination between the appropriate street type and adjacent land uses.

**Opportunities:** Opportunities to instantly change a basic street type are rare, requiring coordination of frontage development and streetscape improvements. However, such a transformation can be accomplished over time, with design and development policies that encourage incremental efforts. Installation of medians, sidewalks and/or frontage landscaping can be combined with housing development to create an attractive residential boulevard. Increasing building setbacks can provide additional sidewalk and/or landscape areas that could benefit any of the basic street types. Street-facing commercial buildings and pedestrian-friendly street trees and amenities can create an attractive mixed-use boulevard or main street. Cities also can encourage the use of shared driveways, continuous sidewalks, raised medians, landscaping and decorative street lighting to create a more uniform look.

**Snapshot of Success: Downtown Street Improvements on Monterey Road, City of Morgan Hill**

Monterey Road in the City of Morgan Hill is within the Redevelopment Project Area established to revitalize the downtown. As a result of the City’s 1980 Downtown Plan, several street enhancements have been completed or recently started. Landscape improvements along Monterey Road include a raised median, trees at street corners, flowering plants and lighting for trees in the median. Special textured paving has been installed to link the east and west sides of Monterey Road. Weather-protected pedestrian walkways are now provided, along with midblock pedestrian crossings to connect side streets and commercial uses. Pedestrian visibility has been enhanced by using colored striping for the edges of crosswalks. Special sign markings identify downtown entries and businesses. These improvements have resulted in new roadway features that prioritize pedestrian access and have helped transform Monterey Road into a “main street” for Morgan Hill.

The City is now updating its 1980 Downtown Plan to put greater emphasis on east-west connections, public spaces, transit connections and narrower streets. For example, the City is considering narrowing Monterey Road—from four lanes to two—through the downtown area. To further
support pedestrian activities, the City is also considering increasing sidewalk widths, providing outdoor seating for restaurants and coffee shops, and allowing angle parking in front of retail businesses. As the owner of the street right-of-way, the City has control over street improvements. This, coupled with the funding available through Morgan Hill’s Redevelopment Agency tax increment, affords the City a great deal of flexibility in implementing street improvements along the El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway corridor.

The City of Morgan Hill made numerous improvements along Monterey Road—including streetscape enhancements and pedestrian safety features—to create an inviting “main street” in the City’s downtown.

Project Status: Complete
Key Concept: Facilitating street improvement using redevelopment funds and City right-of-way ownership
Project Partners: City of Morgan Hill Redevelopment Agency, and County of Santa Clara Roads & Airports Division
Contact: Garrett Toy, City of Morgan Hill, 408-776-7373
Documentation: Project files available from the City of Morgan Hill
Online Resources: None

Shared Issue #6: Transit

Description: There are a variety of transit options available along the corridor, including bus and rail alternatives. Bus service, including both local and express routes, is provided by VTA in Santa Clara County and by SamTrans in San Mateo County. Caltrain provides rail service extending along a corridor parallel to El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway from San Francisco to Gilroy. Most Caltrain stations are accessible from El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway. In spring 2003, BART was extended further south into San Mateo County, with stations on El Camino Real in South San Francisco and Millbrae. Each of these four transit operators provides a means to connect with each other, through scheduling, fare collection and transfer systems as well as through joint location of bus stops, transit centers and parking facilities. There are designated intermodal transit stations all along the corridor, by which passengers can transfer between bus and rail providers, between different buses, or between different rail services.

There are numerous bus amenities (stops, benches, bus bays and transit shelters) in every city along the El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway corridor. These features often compete for space with travel lanes and sidewalks. Parking for Caltrain and BART is typically available adjacent to or near El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway.
**Significance:** Transit serves multiple functions in a mature region. Beyond just providing mobility to those without automobiles, transit offers travelers an alternative to facing congested freeways, while also contributing to improved air quality. Further, in the case of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, transit serves as a major unifying factor, linking communities along the corridor. Both rail and bus services are important resources that every jurisdiction values and needs.

**Challenges:** The success of transit can be measured in several ways: patronage, service frequency, fare-box recovery, congestion relief or reduced travel times. Yet the challenges for effective transit are many, from funding constraints to multiple and competing operators. Also, the value and benefits of transit to existing and potential users, as well as to decision-makers, is often difficult to articulate, quantify and promote due to the wide array of interests and stakeholders involved.

When developing transit options, a key challenge is to include pedestrian accessibility. Every transit trip includes an associated pedestrian trip, whether from the home or car, within the transit stop or station, or to the ultimate destination. Pedestrian amenities are, therefore, crucial in transit planning.

**Opportunities:** There are various opportunities for transit to succeed along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor. Bus Rapid Transit is underway in both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. Many Bay Area transit operators are participating in TransLink, a shared fare card that makes transit travel easier for users. Employer subsidies for transit use, timed transfers at transit centers, schedule adjustments, equipment upgrades, reliability improvements and similar measures can help overcome some of the challenges described above.

The use of transit centers as transportation hubs also presents unique opportunities. Transit centers can serve as multimodal transfer centers that connect various types of travel: local and rapid buses, local heavy rail, future high-speed rail, air; automobiles and bicycles. These centers can also become focal points as institutional land uses, such as Grand Central Station in New York City or Union Station in Los Angeles. As focal points, transit centers can become a catalyst for transit-oriented development or other unifying elements that link communities.

As congestion levels worsen throughout the Bay Area, transit will be become more important with each passing year, especially in light of the limited potential for roadway projects that increase automobile carrying capacity. Transit along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, because of its length and jurisdictional connectivity, is a true regional opportunity.

**Snapshot of Success:** Line 22 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Line 22 is the backbone of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) bus network, providing bus service from the Eastridge Transit Center in east San Jose to the Menlo Park Caltrain Station. Line 22 carries over 23,000 riders daily and represents 16 percent of VTA’s total bus ridership. Line 22 connects patrons to Caltrain and VTA light rail, as well as to other regional and local bus lines. Like Caltrain, VTA Line 22 is one of the unifying features and community links for significant portions of the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.

The goal of the Line 22 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project is to improve operating efficiency, increase service levels and ridership, and provide high-quality bus service as a reliable alternative to driving. Due to existing constraints such as high traffic volumes and limited opportunities for roadway expansion, BRT along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway will primarily function as an enhanced express service. A variety of anticipated improvements, however, will convert Line 22 into a BRT corridor. These include: adding signal-prioritization equipment (which reduces bus delays at traffic
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lights); enhancing bus stops, bus stations and bus stop locations; improving fare collection techniques (e.g., pre-paid and electronic); providing real-time passenger information systems; offering new services, such as multiple bus, local and express services; and making streetscape and infrastructure improvements. Partial funding for the project comes from the Transportation Funds for Clean Air (TFCA) program.

The Line 22 BRT Project serves as an example of how to promote transit use by improving existing facilities and services as well as how to increase funding opportunities through the participation of multiple agencies. The project also provides a model for future transit options along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.

**Project Status:** Funding secured

**Key Concept:** Using technology and service enhancements to improve bus service across jurisdictions

**Project Partners:** Cities of San Jose, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Palo Alto and Menlo Park; Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority; and DKS Associates

**Contacts:** Jim Jarzab, BRT Program Manager, VTA, 408-321-5747
Chris Augenstein, Principal Planner and CDT Program Manager, VTA, 408-321-5744
Deborah Dagang, DKS Associates, 510-763-2061, dad@dksassociates.com

**Documentation:** Project files available from VTA

**Online Resources:** http://www.vta.org/projects/line22brt.html

**Shared Issue #7: Traffic Operations**

**Description:** Traffic operations typically consist of amenities and safety features to promote efficient movement and coexistence of pedestrians, vehicles, bicyclists and transit modes. Traffic operations along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway are increasingly using advanced technology that integrates traffic signal operations into traffic control centers. Traffic signal equipment is being upgraded so that traffic along the corridor can flow more easily across jurisdictional boundaries. For specific projects, cities, regional agencies and Caltrans have worked together to overcome some of the institutional barriers that have affected traffic operations in the past. For example, several grade-separation projects have been recently constructed or are planned, to make Caltrain operations less
disruptive to other modes along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. Also, technology is facilitating the sharing of traffic control equipment, data and management across jurisdictional boundaries.

One example of new traffic operations technology are the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) now being used along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor. ITS is defined as “the application of advanced, integrated sensor, computer, electronics, communications technologies and management strategies to increase the safety and efficiency of the surface transportation system.” One facet of ITS is closed-circuit video detection cameras, which improve intersection operation by working with the signal-control system and allowing better traffic flow.

**Significance:** Operational elements for streets increase awareness and accessibility; improve traffic flow; and reduce the frequency of accidents, while also providing increased safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. Effective operations along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor are needed, in part, to respond to increased traffic volumes. Sidewalks, crosswalks, wheelchair ramps and audible pedestrian signals designate clear and safe facilities for pedestrian use.

**Challenges:** Challenges include a lack of funding and a disparity in funding priorities between jurisdictions. Additionally, the lack of regional collaborative partnerships between local agencies, Caltrans and transit operators can lead to inconsistent facility designs and less efficient operations.

**Opportunities:** Efforts to optimize traffic operations could include: ITS as a cost-effective means to improve traffic flow (in place of capacity-enhancing road-widening projects); uniform medians, ramps and continuous connected sidewalks; continuous bicycle lanes; and upgraded transit facilities. Alleyways, frontage roads and shared driveway access for multiple parcels are design, rather than technological, strategies to improve operations. The use of both technology and design for better traffic flow across jurisdictional boundaries will aid motorists and reduce the potential for conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Snapshot of Success: San Mateo County Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan**

The San Mateo County Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan—currently under development—will address the needs and deficiencies of traffic operations within San Mateo County, define ITS projects that optimize existing and future transportation facilities, and facilitate cooperation between cities, the County and Caltrans. Because the El Camino Real roadway infrastructure within San Mateo County is essentially built out, ITS management strategies are the most viable option for improving the traffic system. ITS provides a cost-effective way to address safety issues and increase roadway efficiency without having to make expensive infrastructure improvements to increase the roadway’s carrying capacity.

ITS projects planned for El Camino Real include implementation of a Transit Signal Priority System to facilitate transit operations for SamTrans, improvements to traffic signal coordination (timed lights), and improvements for at-grade pedestrian crossings to rail services. These projects will receive funding from the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG).

The benefits of ITS include decreased fuel usage and emissions, shorter travel times, and fewer traffic accidents. In conjunction with identifying system benefits, communities will need to evaluate any potential impacts associated with ITS, such as changes to traffic volumes, traffic speed, air quality or noise. Further, any improvement to north-south traffic flow along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway will need to take into account the effect on east-west connections for automobile traffic, pedestrians, bicyclists and transit vehicles, as well as the effect on other regional networks and facilities.
ITS strategies can beneficially impact all modes of travel, including transit, and provide all travelers with opportunities for safer and better-informed use of the corridor. The San Mateo County ITS Strategic Plan offers insights with respect to opportunities for interjurisdictional cooperation and pooled investments in ITS management strategies along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.

**Project Status:** Funding secured

**Key Concept:** Providing cost-effective regional benefits through Intelligent Transportation Systems

**Project Partners:** Cities of Belmont, Burlingame, Daly City, Menlo Park, Millbrae, Redwood City, San Bruno, San Carlos, San Mateo and South San Francisco; Towns of Atherton and Colma; County of San Mateo; C/CAG and Caltrans

**Contacts:** Sandy Wong, C/CAG, 650-599-1465
Kevin Aguigui, DKS Associates, 510-763-2061, kga@dksassociates.com

**Documentation:** Project files available from C/CAG

**Online Resources:** None

**Shared Issue #8: Parking**

**Description:** Parking is a revenue source for most cities and, in addition, is highly desired by local merchants, particularly retail businesses. Parking includes on-street parking, off-street parking and shared parking. On-street is curb parking within the public right-of-way. Off-street parking refers to parking spaces outside the street right-of-way. Shared parking is parking that is provided for more than one facility without any conflict or encroachment. Different parking requirements and types can be found in a variety of situations along the corridor, depending on the community, the particular land use or activity being served, and the mix of public and private spaces available.

**Significance:** Parking can influence the amount of activity on the street, and can also determine the form and character of development. For example, on-street parking provides convenient access to frontage buildings, buffers pedestrians from passing traffic and helps with traffic calming. However, on-street parking can limit the potential to widen sidewalks and narrow streets, and can interfere with bus stops and driveways. While off-street surface parking lots are inexpensive, they perpetuate lower-density development by occupying land that could be used for other purposes. Street-facing retail businesses tend to suffer without curbside parking or frontage parking.
Underground parking and structured parking are both suitable for residential development, because they provide security as well as shade. Even though these types of parking facilities are expensive, they do add more value to properties by increasing the building space.

Parking within the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor currently competes for space with buildings, sidewalks and travel lanes. Policies and design plans for frontage development and street improvements need to be coordinated to reflect the importance of parking as an urban design element. Ultimately, parking is a very complex issue. On the one hand, the retail uses along the corridor are very sensitive to having sufficient parking to accommodate customers. On the other hand, abundant parking can be expensive and can become a physical barrier to creating good places. This is particularly an issue in areas well-served by transit, where people have an alternative to driving and, therefore, where less parking may be needed.

The real tension around parking, however, is defining how much is enough. Most corridor cities have high parking requirements, which—in some cases—are a barrier to redevelopment and reinvestment. Property owners simply cannot fit all of the required parking and construct a viable new building on their sites. In other cases, city parking requirements may be low, necessitating adding parking to meet lending requirements, to increase rent and/or to increase sales potential. Developing appropriate parking policies to satisfy demand, as well as to facilitate redevelopment and reinvestment, is a critical issue.

**Challenges:** The size of properties can negatively impact the ability to provide parking. When redeveloping smaller parcels that contain older retail facilities, parking requirements often cannot be met on the site. Coupled with the application of Caltrans standards for highway design and access, parking can create a disincentive to redeveloping obsolete retail buildings to accommodate new and more modern uses.

**Opportunities:** Cities can improve parking conditions by creating shared parking, relocating on-street parking to the rear or side of commercial land uses, allowing underutilized segments of on-street parking for bus stop facilities, and relaxing parking requirements in areas close to transit stops. Charging for parking can reduce the parking demand and space requirements by providing an incentive to use transit. Other opportunities include creating larger sites (which can better accommodate parking), narrowing streets, combining access points and undertaking capital improvements.

**Snapshot of Success: Shared Parking at Avalon Residential Towers, City of Mountain View**

The Avalon Residential Towers on the Peninsula are located on El Camino Real in the City of Mountain View and include 211 apartment units in two 11-story towers. The success of this residential development hinges on its ability to share parking with an adjacent office building. The residential project was designed to rely on the use of an existing adjacent parking garage, and the project's density and unit mix were dictated by this garage's constraints. The owner of the apartment complex, Avalon Bay Communities, contracted with DKS Associates to develop a shared parking management plan that would meet the needs of both residential and office tenants without impacting the surrounding streets.

The City of Mountain View has reported that the garage functions efficiently and accommodates the parking demand from both residential and office users. Neither streets nor parking lots in the surrounding area have been negatively impacted by the development of the apartment complex. Although project implementation involved complex negotiations, legal agreements and conditions of approval unique to this site, the shared parking at Avalon Residential Towers is an example of an
innovative approach to supporting more intensive land uses along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.

**Project Status:** Complete

**Project Statistics:** Towers: 211 residential units (90 one-bedroom, 115 two-bedroom, and 6 three-bedroom) at 151 dwelling units per acre. Parking Structure: 751 total parking spaces: 270 spaces exclusively for residents, 239 spaces for office use and 242 shared-parking spaces (first-come, first-served) available to residents during nonbusiness hours. Ratio of parking spaces per residential unit is 2.4, assuming residents make use of all the shared spaces.

**Key Concept:** Reducing project costs and increasing density by sharing parking between uses

**Project Partners:** City of Mountain View, Avalon Bay Communities, Dialog Corporation and DKS Associates

**Contacts:** Mary Fulford, City of Mountain View Zoning Administrator, 650-903-6306, mary.fulford@ci.mtnview.ca.us

Jason Peterson, Senior Community Manager for Avalon Bay Communities, 650-969-7777

Mark Spencer, DKS Associates, 408-292-9411

**Documentation:** Project files available from the City of Mountain View

**Online Resources:** http://www.avalonpeninsula.com

---

**TRANSITION TO THE FUTURE**

The El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor actually predates all of the communities that have now developed along its route. In many cases, the early land uses that evolved in relation to the road had more to do with the travelers’ needs than with those of the local communities. However, the road now plays a much different role than it did originally. Most trips along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway are subregional, perhaps to destinations one or two towns over, with longer
regional trips reserved for Highway 101 or Highway 280. The shift in traffic patterns has resulted in a shift in the type of land uses now attracted to the corridor. Distinct neighborhoods and districts are emerging. In response, communities have an opportunity to make stretches of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway more pedestrian friendly and aesthetically pleasing as well as to create places along the corridor that function as unique destinations.

**Shared Issue #9: Community Identity**

**Description:** Distinctive buildings, streetscapes, gateways and signage all contribute to community identity. These features can be continuous, or concentrated at gateways to highlight special locations, such as entrances to a city, district or special facility. Distinctive buildings can be public or private in nature, traditional or contemporary in design. Distinctive streetscapes are typically created by municipal capital improvement projects, incorporating memorable street trees, streetlights, furnishings and other elements. Signs can offer opportunities to inform, as well as manage transportation and pedestrian movements, using distinctive, community-specific design details. Gateways can be created in a variety of ways, depending upon the context: a landmark sign or civic monument; a special public space, such as a plaza or a park; a special building feature or architectural treatment, such as a tower or atrium; or, an area of special or more intensive development.

**Significance:** A number of cities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway have adopted policies to improve the appearance of the corridor and/or to create gateways at municipal boundaries to differentiate themselves from their corridor neighbors. Most of the cities have downtown commercial districts that intersect or coincide with the corridor, and a number have installed streetscape improvements or created downtown or municipal gateways. Similarly, cities are pursuing gateways to enhance the rail facilities— including Caltrain, BART, and/or the future San-Francisco-to-Los-Angeles bullet train sites—that abut the corridor. These typically consist of plazas in conjunction with transit-oriented development.

**Challenges:** Challenges include the lack of funding for capital improvements and low market demand for new private-sector development. Lack of developable property and/or right-of-way can be challenges as well. In some instances, the process of defining appropriate features of “community identity” can itself be an obstacle, particularly if there are few existing physical or historical precedents.

**Opportunities:** The elements that contribute to community identity are varied, and so are the opportunities to create them. Any new development or construction project offers an opportunity; however, distinctive buildings, streetscapes and other features are more likely to be created if cities have design policies in place to encourage such elements. Opportunities related to highly visible locations and properties, right-of-way conditions, important boundaries, and/or future facilities should be identified in advance. In addition, public funding through redevelopment agencies or other sources can provide incentives for quality design elements.

**Snapshot of Success: Caltrain Station Area, City of San Carlos**

The San Carlos Caltrain Station is located on El Camino Real, directly adjacent to downtown San Carlos. The station was renovated and expanded in 2000 in conjunction with a railroad grade-separation project that extended through San Carlos and the neighboring City of Belmont. The project included new undercrossings, railroad platforms, waiting shelters, architectural lighting and other design elements, as well as expanded SanTrans bus transfer facilities. New construction also included an addition to the original San Carlos Depot, a National Register Historic Landmark Building.
The Depot has been a local landmark since its construction in 1888, and is a rare example of the Richardson Romanesque architectural style applied to a railroad station in California. Its sandstone blocks, slate roof and architectural details are reflected throughout the site, particularly the textured and tinted concrete used for the project’s extensive retaining walls. Similar forms and materials were used for the San Carlos Avenue gateway sign located directly across El Camino Real. This attractive architectural consistency makes downtown San Carlos and the Caltrain Station one of the corridor’s most memorable locations, providing a strong community identity for the City. Aspects of the project applicable to other jurisdictions include expanding the sphere of influence of existing historic resources and focusing on architectural details in the context of a large-scale civil engineering project.

Project Status: Complete
Key Concept: Building on historic forms and materials to create a landmark transit center
Project Partners: City of San Carlos, Peninsula Joint Powers Board, SamTrans, Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Callendar Associates
Contacts: Liz Cullinan, City of San Carlos Planning Director, 650-802-4263
Callendar Associates, 650-375-1313
Documentation: Project files available from the City of San Carlos
Online Resources: None

Shared Issue #10: Streetscape Design

Description: Much of El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway is unattractive and lacking in streetscape amenities such as street trees, frontage landscaping or sidewalks. In general, the corridor is not pedestrian-friendly, with few amenities. The pedestrian crossings that do exist are typically long with poor visibility. Sidewalks are narrow in many locations. Where sidewalks are bordered by surface parking lots, pedestrians are relegated to a thin strip of pavement surrounded by automobiles. Where there is no curbside parking, pedestrians are close to vehicles traveling at speeds up to 45 miles per hour. Highway-style, cobra-head streetlights line the street in many places. In general, the corridor has a generic, utilitarian appearance with little to distinguish one city from another. Corridor cities that have prepared streetscape design policies have four basic goals:

- Improve street appearance
- Enhance the environment for pedestrians
- Establish a distinct identity
- Promote access to transit
Significance: Streetscape design improvements can be incremental, provided by private development and/or constructed as part of large-scale public works projects. In general, cities should focus on the vertical elements that define public space and create identity (such as, street trees, streetlights and furnishings) rather than on elaborate paving schemes. Given the effort and cost involved, it is essential that streetscape design be coordinated with street type and development patterns. For example, parkway street-design elements, such as dense evergreen landscaping and widely spaced streetlights, could be appropriate along a linear residential frontage. However, they would not be appropriate along a retail boulevard where visibility for frontage businesses, parking and access are key considerations.

Challenges: Narrow frontage sidewalks and/or small building setbacks limit the space available for planting street trees, enhancing pedestrian access and providing street amenities. Street segments that do not have center left-turn lanes cannot accommodate medians without changing existing lane configurations. Maintaining traffic capacity and access to frontage properties and businesses can be difficult during construction of streetscape improvements; overhead and subsurface utilities can further complicate construction. Relocating or working around them can add significanly to duration and cost. Portions of the street not within a redevelopment area or special assessment district may not have the necessary funding resources for capital improvements. Additionally, Caltrans design standards for streetscape improvements do not necessarily encourage more than a basic design response to accommodate traffic movement.

Opportunities: Design standards can be adopted to encourage setbacks needed for frontage streetscape improvements, including minimum, uncluttered “through space” for pedestrians. New frontage development can provide streetscape improvements that can be implemented over time to fulfill the larger design vision. Medians can be installed in street segments with at-grade, striped lane dividers. Caltrans’ recent “context-sensitive design” policies may support improvements, such as curbside street trees, that were discouraged in the past. Funding can be provided by redevelopment agencies, business improvement districts, impact fees as well as public and private-sector development projects.

Snapshot of Success: Peninsula Corridor Plan/ "Main Street Colma", Town of Colma

The Town of Colma recently completed its draft “Peninsula Corridor Plan” for the Colma BART station area. The Plan’s goal is “to create a new neighborhood commercial district around the Colma BART station and provide a vision for redevelopment of vacant or underutilized properties along Mission Street (El Camino Real). To achieve this, Mission Street needs to be redesigned as a “main street boulevard.” The Plan is part of a larger effort currently underway, coordinated by SamTrans, Samceda and the County of San Mateo. Outside consultants are facilitating public input and plan development in collaboration with Caltrans.

The Corridor Plan outlines a program for integrating street design with development of frontage properties. A community-oriented planning process evaluated several planning and design options, focusing on the best relationship between building types and street configuration. Concepts within the Plan call for median and parking variations, lane reductions, and other options to promote traffic calming and expand landscape and pedestrian-oriented spaces. The preferred design combines wide medians in residential areas with narrow medians and angle parking along retail-oriented frontages. The Plan identifies street improvements that can be installed incrementally, and proposes an initial re-striping project to test performance of street design recommendations prior to construction.
Even though the draft Corridor Plan for the Colma BART station area has yet to be approved and may change during the public-hearing process, it does provide an example of how streetscape improvements can be implemented incrementally and respect adjacent land uses. Aspects of the project applicable to other locations include the collaboration between multiple public agencies for funding the preparation of the Plan, the community outreach efforts to secure support for the Plan and the land-use-based street design approach.

**Project Status:** Draft plan under review  
**Key Concept:** Tailoring street design to support current and planned adjacent land uses  
**Project Partners:** Town of Colma, Project for Public Spaces (PPS), SamTrans, Samceda and County of San Mateo  
**Contacts:** Malcolm Carpenter, Town of Colma Planning Director, 650-985-2590  
Andrea Ouse, Town of Colma Principal Planner, 650-985-2590  
Fred Kent, Principal, PPS, 212-620-5660  
**Documentation:** Project files available from the Town of Colma  
**Online Resources:** None

**Shared Issue #1: Transit-Oriented Development**

**Description:** Transit-oriented development (TOD) includes dense, mixed-use developments that combine residential, commercial/retail and recreational uses. A key objective of TODs is to provide environments in which people have the option to not drive. This type of development provides convenient access to transit facilities or other services supportive of transit. A concept related to TOD is “livable communities.” The goal of livable communities is to strengthen the link between transit and communities by “improving personal mobility and transportation system performance and the quality of life in communities.”

Transit availability, both rail and bus, has increased along with the demand for these services to provide accessible transportation. TODs along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway are easily
accessible and are within walking distance of Caltrain and BART as well as VTA and SamTrans bus services. Transit stations are located at regular intervals along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. Crosswalks and sidewalks are provided on both sides of the street to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Significance:** TODs provide transit-supportive land uses and encourage people to walk, bicycle and/or ride transit, rather than to depend on the automobile as their only form of mobility.

**Challenges:** Challenges for TODs include city zoning and parking requirements as well as lack of community support and political will. Right-of-way restrictions (for travel lanes, transit and roadway features), high traffic speeds, heavy traffic volumes and infrequent transit service reduce the potential to provide a viable alternative to the car.

**Opportunities:** Cities have a range of opportunities with respect to promoting TOD. These include: encouraging mixed-use developments for new projects; providing continuous and connected sidewalks; promoting clear signage; enhancing and maintaining street furniture (transit shelters, streetlights, bus-stop benches, etc.); encouraging higher-density residential development close to multiple transit modes; requiring transit facilities in conjunction with commercial developments; restricting auto-related uses; and enhancing the interface between existing railroad facilities and the community.

**Snapshot of Success:** New Development near BART/ Caltrain/ SamTrans Station, City of Millbrae

Transit-oriented development capitalizes on the synergy between land use and transit to create places where residents can reduce their dependency on the car as the only mode of transportation. The necessary elements for a successful TOD include: a concentration of land close to transit; uses capable of generating high levels of transit ridership; good pedestrian connections that link transit to these adjacent land uses; and, to the extent feasible, proximity of retail and personal services that reduce the need for people to drive in order to access these services.

The Millbrae BART Specific Plan supports these elements through its comprehensive requirements for TOD around the City’s new intermodal BART/ Caltrain/ SamTrans Station. The Specific Plan grew out of a nine-month planning process in which several workshops were held to develop a concept plan for the station area. Beginning in 1997, the City held additional workshops, attended by several hundred people, and convened stakeholder groups in special study sessions to develop the Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
As the developer of one of the first projects under the Specific Plan, Glenborough-Pauls is currently constructing a TOD on the former King’s Bowl site, located at the southwest corner of El Camino Real and Millbrae Avenue, diagonal from the BART station. The Specific Plan includes a density bonus of 500 rooms for hotel development on this site, provided that the development meets additional conditions concerning setback, height and massing. When a hotel was determined to be financially infeasible, Glenborough-Pauls worked within the Specific Plan to develop luxury residential condominiums on the site. The City of Millbrae required that at least 10 percent of the units be affordable to low- and moderate-income families, with below-market-rate purchase prices of between $120,000 and $140,000.

When completed, the project will consist of 105 condominiums over two levels of parking in three separate buildings. In addition, approximately 6,500 square feet of retail space will be located along El Camino Real in order to promote an active pedestrian environment and provide retail and service uses within walking distance of the station. The Specific Plan requires that the development include significant improvements for pedestrian links between the intermodal transit facility and Millbrae’s historic downtown area. This connectivity will support the City’s efforts to revitalize the downtown by making it more accessible to both residents in the Glenborough-Pauls project as well as transit users.

**Project Status:** Under construction

**Project Statistics:** 105 residential units at 47 dwelling units per acre; 6,500 square feet of ground-floor retail

**Key Concept:** Achieving quality development around transit using a Specific Plan

**Project Partners:** City of Millbrae and Glenborough-Pauls

**Contacts:** Ralph Petty, City of Millbrae, r petty@ci.millbrae.ca.us

Tim Ridner, Glenborough-Pauls, 650-365-7400, tim.ridner@glbpauls.com

**Documentation:** Millbrae BART Specific Plan available from the City of Millbrae

**Online Resources:**
- http://askmerrill.ml.com/res_article/1,2271,18726,00.html

**Shared Issue #12: Mixed-Use Development**

**Description:** Mixed-use development incorporates a combination of economic and physical-design factors. It is typically configured in one of three ways:

- Vertical
- Horizontal, front to back
- Horizontal, side to side

Vertical mixed-use typically is first-floor commercial space with office and/ or residential units above. A horizontal, front-to-back configuration typically includes a commercial retail frontage with office or residential development behind. A horizontal, side-to-side configuration can be any form of development alternating along the frontage, either on a single property or on adjacent properties.

**Significance:** Mixed-use development creates variety, generally increases land values, and promotes pedestrian activity and transit use. Each of the three configurations requires different parcel arrangements, unique design approaches, varied patterns of development and appropriate street types. Vertical mixed-use is the most urban (i.e., most intensive) of these configurations and can be constructed on relatively small parcels if underground parking is provided. Horizontal mixed-use
configured front to back generally requires deeper parcels and is more suburban in character, depending on density and parking layout. Horizontal mixed-use configured side to side can be urban or suburban, and can be developed on large or small, single or multiple parcels.

**Challenges:** Visual/streetscape conditions may deter high-quality development. Development on smaller parcels can be constrained by adjacent uses incompatible with mixed-use, particularly with respect to the residential component. Mixed-use development generally requires some form of structured parking, which can be prohibitively expensive. Financing is more complicated for mixed-use development, often making it difficult without public-sector assistance.

**Opportunities:** Cities see the corridor as a place that can potentially accommodate more intensive development to meet housing needs without the community resistance that would be expected in other locations. Large sites can accommodate all of the different types of mixed-use development. Mixed-use with residential or office over commercial can be accommodated on smaller sites. Including housing within the development can also generate demand for first-floor commercial and residential support uses.

**Snapshot of Success: School House Station, City of Daly City**

Mixed-use development has become more sought after and more financially viable in recent years. Cities and developers have identified mixed-use projects as a key to building better neighborhoods. As developers complete more such projects, the oft-cited challenges of financing mixed-use development have become less persistent. Still, understanding the market for commercial tenants in a mixed-use project can present an additional layer of challenges once the project is built.

In 1997, Mercy Housing California completed construction of School House Station, a mixed-use project at the “top of the hill” in Daly City, where El Camino Real becomes Mission Street. As leasing agent and property manager, Mercy Housing drew from a waiting list of low-income residential tenants, and the residential portion of the property was fully leased upon opening. But the initial strategy of identifying credit tenants to occupy the commercial space fell apart when construction of a nearby shopping plaza absorbed these businesses. As a result, Mercy Housing shifted its strategy from targeting credit tenants to attracting “mom and pop” businesses. However, the commercial space was slow to lease, because—in anticipation of credit tenants—the space had not yet been finished. This discouraged small businesses that could not envision their business in the unfinished, undivided space, could not wait up to five months for the tenant improvements and/ or could not afford the tenant improvements.

Ultimately, Mercy Housing had to finish the space and divide it into four smaller spaces— from 900 to 1,400 square feet—that were quickly leased to local businesses. As a housing provider, Mercy Housing was not well prepared to manage or broker commercial leases. The affordable housing
subsidies made this project viable; the addition of leasable commercial space did not subsidize the housing and, in fact, proved to be a financial hurdle. Such tenanting challenges are not insurmountable, however, as Mercy Housing’s experience demonstrates. Communities need to carefully assess a location’s market potential prior to requiring a commercial component. In situations like School House Station—where ground-floor commercial uses are desired but do not add to the project’s short-term viability—developers (with the help of cities) need to be flexible in tenanting the commercial space, regarding it as an amenity that will ultimately add value to communities and increase residential property values.

Project Status: Complete
Project Statistics: 47 residential units at 120 dwelling units per acre; 13,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space
Key Concept: Combining affordable housing and creative commercial tenanting
Project Partners: City of Daly City and Mercy Housing California
Contacts: Howard Lee, City of Daly City, 650-991-8033
Sheela Bhatt, Housing Project Manager, Mercy Housing, 415-355-7100
Ramie Dare, Commercial Project Manager, Mercy Housing, 415-355-7100
James E. Roberts, General Contractor, Obayashi Corporation, 925-820-0600
Bob Garrison, Leasing Agent, 650-755-2969
Documentation: Project files available from the City of Daly City
Online Resources: http://www.donaldmacdonaldarchitects.com/bldg_images/schoolhouse/schoolhouse.html
http://www.hlcsmc.org/housing_detail.php?sid=197
http://www.mercyhousing.org

Shared Issue #13: Neighborhood Preservation and Interface

Description: Single-family residential areas abut frontage parcels in most of the cities along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor. Proximity to incompatible frontage uses, lack of privacy and the noise levels associated with parking and service areas can result in lower property values and a greater percentage of rental houses. Additionally, high traffic speeds on El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, lack of pedestrian crossings, voids created by parking lots and unattractive streetscape create a pedestrian barrier. This tends to cut off neighborhoods on one side of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway from commercial businesses and/or districts on the other side.

Significance: Without the support of adjacent single-family-residential neighborhoods, new infill frontage development envisioned by many for the corridor may experience political resistance. New, more intensive development needs to be planned to minimize the impacts on adjacent properties. Ideally, new frontage development should add value to existing neighborhoods in the form of improved access to shops, transit connections, services and amenities, which will, in turn, increase property values and encourage residential investment.

Challenges: Properties that are not candidates for new development or renovation are unlikely to provide site improvements that make them better neighbors. Traffic capacity requirements and/or funding constraints discourage improved pedestrian crossings and frontage streetscape improvements.

Opportunities: New development and/or major property renovations can create buffers along rear property lines, and service facilities can be relocated or screened. Street-improvement projects can create medians that offer pedestrian refuges, and can even reduce lanes to calm traffic and encourage pedestrian crossings. Design standards can promote neighborhood-oriented frontage development.
Snapshot of Success: El Camino Real Master Schematic Design Plan and South El Camino Real Design Guidelines, City of Palo Alto

Together, the El Camino Real Master Schematic Design Plan and the South El Camino Real Design Guidelines reflect a concerted effort to improve the appearance and pedestrian environment of the El Camino Real corridor, particularly as the street relates to adjacent residential neighborhoods. The Schematic Design Plan is the result of a community planning process that incorporated significant participation from Caltrans, which also granted funds for the project. This cooperative planning approach is one reason for the Plan’s success and is consistent with Caltrans’s Context-Sensitive Design efforts. In Palo Alto as in many corridor cities, El Camino Real splits neighborhoods and, in some areas, separates residential areas from local schools and parks. For the Schematic Design Plan, a number of design options were evaluated, with a focus on narrowing the roadway from six to four travel lanes to calm traffic, improving pedestrian crossings, and providing median landscaping.

The South El Camino Real Design Guidelines focus on frontage development in the portion of the corridor flanked by residential neighborhoods. Neighborhood preservation is emphasized in the Guidelines as part of the “Transition Zone” policies for infill residential development, which require stepping down building density and height as well as altering architectural design to complement adjacent single-family residential neighborhoods.

The experiences of and approaches to working with Caltrans vary among communities and developers across San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The evolution of Palo Alto’s El Camino Real Master Schematic Design Plan and South El Camino Real Design Guidelines over the past several years demonstrates how municipalities can develop a mutually beneficial relationship with Caltrans. Aspects of Palo Alto’s projects applicable to other jurisdictions include Caltrans participation in concept design, detailed recommendations for street tree planting and architectural design guidelines for those areas within the corridor adjacent to residential neighborhoods.

This illustration from Palo Alto’s South El Camino Real Design Guidelines shows how development in the “Transition Zone” can complement existing residential neighborhoods.

Project Status: Draft Schematic Design Plan and Design Guidelines both under review

Key Concept: Combining street and development design criteria to promote neighborhood compatibility

Project Partners: City of Palo Alto, Caltrans, Community Design+Architecture, Van Meter Williams Pollack, and Kendall Planning and Design

Contacts: Steve Emslie, Palo Alto Director of Community Development, 650-329-2354
POLICIES AND PROCESS

Local policymakers and community members—both within and across jurisdictions—ultimately will need to come together to successfully reinvent El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. At the same time, a powerful mix of public and private initiatives will be needed to ensure a desirable outcome for all communities along the corridor.

Shared Issue #14: Public Policies and Process

Description: Public policies and process provide the framework for implementing local and regional visions for Main Street Silicon Valley. Policies, in both content and form, vary from community to community. For the 20 cities, two counties and five transportation agencies with a stake in the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor, this framework ranges from General Plan policies, which address broad community issues, to design guidelines for development and improvements. While all of the cities, counties and agencies have more information available, the following table indicates the types of information provided for this study. Review of these documents suggests that there is some correlation between the presence of more specific public policies for El Camino Real/Monterey Highway and revitalization efforts along the corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>General Plan and Zoning</th>
<th>Transportation Studies</th>
<th>Housing Studies</th>
<th>Design Guidelines</th>
<th>Specific Plans and Area Studies</th>
<th>Retail Studies</th>
<th>Parking Studies</th>
<th>Redevelopment Area Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo Co.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. San Francisco</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Co.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information Received from Cities, Counties and Agencies in Study Area
(Communities are listed here geographically, moving north to south along the corridor)
In addition to identifying technical requirements and specifications, public policies define the approval process for improvement and development. Typically, communities encourage public participation and citizen involvement to shape the local vision. Communities also can adopt policies to provide incentives for public/private partnerships that promote implementation of that vision.

**Significance:** California is in transition from an emphasis on suburban, automobile-oriented land uses and street design to an emphasis on more urban design forms. The El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor is no exception. The trend is toward an intensification of development with a mix of uses and multimodal transportation facilities. Economic and environmental constraints, as well as public demand for high quality of life, have motivated this shift. As a result, communities have adopted various policy and regulatory measures to guide future improvements and developments toward urbanization. Because these measures typically control allowed uses, building siting, height and design—as well as access and parking—policies and regulations impact both the physical form and the communities' visions.

**Challenges:** Ensuring consistency between the regulatory frameworks for jurisdictions with approval authority along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway is a significant challenge. These agencies first need to agree on their vision for this corridor, then make the necessary regulatory changes. Economic competition, parochial perspectives, citizen demand, available resources and jurisdictional authority all can hinder cooperation between agencies. Even when these hurdles are overcome, updating policies and processes is time-consuming, politically charged and typically not a priority for public agencies due to competition for limited funding.

**Opportunities:** By examining current public policies and processes, a community can identify inconsistencies between its regulatory framework and its vision for development. Such an analysis could highlight the need for change. Updating policies and processes provides an opportunity to include improvement and development incentives to better implement the community's vision as well as to create opportunities for public participation and support.

**Snapshot of Success: Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)**

The VTA Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program recommends best practices for the integration of transportation, land-use planning, community design and decision-making in Santa Clara County. The CDT Program was developed in partnership with VTA Member Agencies using an extensive community outreach strategy. Implementation is further supported by VTA through financial incentives for jurisdictions adopting the program. Although the resulting CDT “best practices” manual is written to address the land-use and transportation choices of Santa Clara County in particular, other jurisdictions can benefit from the policies and principles contained in the manual as well as from the process used in its development.

The CDT manual identifies critical transportation corridors—including El Camino Real/Monterey Highway—and recommends policies that cities can implement to promote transit- and pedestrian-friendly environments. The CDT manual serves as a policy, technical, and design guide for city and regional planners, and highlights the importance of well designed, amenity-rich, compact development near transit as well as the benefits of offering multiple transportation options. The manual also emphasizes the importance of good design in improving the pedestrian environment and creating a sense of place.

Through generous use of photosimulations and illustrations, the CDT manual shows how land-use and design principles can make a positive difference in the community. Recommended densities and...
development scenarios in the CDT manual are flexible, stressing that these policies should be applied where appropriate and should coexist with existing city regulations.

Public participation was crucial to the process of developing the CDT manual. This process consisted of the following stages:

- **Initial public input.** Public participation in the process was initiated with targeted outreach to public works and planning directors from each of the jurisdictions within Santa Clara County. This outreach provided the forum for feedback on preliminary proposals for policies and design guidelines. In addition, VTA convened community members, elected officials, agency staff, and representatives of advocacy and affinity groups for a series of workshops on issues such as street function and building design.

- **Drafts of the CDT manual for internal and public review.** Based on this extensive public input, staff prepared drafts of the CDT manual for review by the CDT Task Force and VTA’s advisory and standing committees, as well as by representatives of all Member Agencies. The recommended changes were incorporated into a revised draft that was then approved for public review at a workshop held for the VTA Board of Directors.

- **Final public review.** Over a six-month period, VTA staff worked closely with a broad range of stakeholders to solicit review on the revised CDT manual: elected officials, planning commissioners, transportation commissioners, design review boards, staff from each jurisdiction in the county, and representatives from numerous community-based organizations.

At the conclusion of the last round of public review, the VTA Board approved the final version of the CDT manual. Thus far, both the CDT Program and the CDT manual have received widespread community support.
Shared Issue #15: Implementation

Description: Implementing projects consistent with public policies, community input and a long-range vision for El Camino Real/Monterey requires the support of a broad spectrum of stakeholders. Multiple jurisdictions, private developers, residents, businesses, community organizations and local officials have a role in defining the outcome of specific projects. Communication, mutual understanding and stable goals are crucial to successful implementation of both the individual projects and a regional vision for El Camino Real/Monterey Highway.

Implementation of individual projects and a regional vision is more effective when stakeholders are involved early in the approval process. Because a long time may pass between policy development (for example, creation of a General Plan policy) and the approval of individual projects, representatives of the various stakeholders may not necessarily be knowledgeable or supportive of existing public policies. In addition, changing economic, regulatory and/or environmental conditions can alter stakeholder interests. Also, large quasi-public corporations, such as Pacific Gas & Electric, have requirements that may be inconsistent with the interests of other stakeholders. The implementation process is often a complex series of negotiations that require broad inclusion and buy-in. Prior to solidifying a specific project, the steps for success include the following:

- Discussing existing local and regional policies and processes with project proponents
- Contacting local, regional, State and federal agencies with a stake in the project
- Soliciting input from local residents, businesses, community leaders and adjacent jurisdictions
- Collaborating with project proponents, other agencies and potentially affected interests
- Defining a mutually beneficial project consistent with the requirements and vision of all

Significance: The ups and downs of the economic cycle provide a limited window of opportunity for implementing projects. Moreover, project proponents—including developers—have limited time and financial resources to invest. At the same time, increasingly complex regulatory processes are leading to a longer, more uncertain approval process, threatening the viability of projects. Keeping expectations realistic, providing timely responses and maintaining commitments are three valuable contributions that public agencies can make toward implementation. Public agencies can only make these contributions effectively when the interests of the local community and other jurisdictions are included early in the process and reflected in the project.

Challenges: Involvement of various interests in the implementation process can result in time delays that negatively impact project costs and feasibility. Competing priorities and increasing regulatory requirements can also add to delays. If public agencies do not have sufficient staff and funding, the
focus necessary for timely collaboration and response is compromised. Political will is necessary to allocate adequate resources to process projects that support the local and regional vision for El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway.

Opportunities: The renewed interest of cities, counties and transportation agencies in revitalizing the El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway corridor is highly conducive to the collaborative efforts needed to implement land-development and street-improvement projects. There is great potential for reducing regulatory inconsistencies, improving communication, streamlining processes and attracting private investment. Establishing partnerships between stakeholders and providing opportunities for all interests to participate in the initial stages can expedite the approval and implementation of projects that will support local and regional objectives for El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway.

Snapshot of Success: Rerouting of El Camino Real/ The Alameda, City of Santa Clara

The City of Santa Clara, Santa Clara University (SCU) and Caltrans worked together to successfully reroute a portion of El Camino Real— known as The Alameda— between Benton and Newhall Streets in the City of Santa Clara. The project involved both widening The Alameda and relocating the street from its historic location, where it bisected the SCU campus, to its new location along the eastern edge of the campus (see map). The historic right-of-way within the campus was abandoned to SCU and converted to a landscaped mall. The relocated Alameda now serves as the front entrance to SCU and has catalyzed new public and private development along its frontages.

The impetus for rerouting The Alameda was provided by a broad set of concerns. Over time, The Alameda’s historic right-of-way had became insufficient for transportation and surrounding uses, resulting in a street that posed safety hazards and was inconvenient for through traffic. However, SCU’s gradual expansion on both sides of The Alameda precluded any widening at that location. In response, the City and SCU developed a concept for the relocation of The Alameda using old industrial property— owned by SCU— located east of the campus and west of the Southern Pacific railroad. The City and SCU approached Caltrans about the concept. Although supportive, Caltrans did not prioritize the project for funding. After years of negotiation, and with State legislation to appropriate the necessary funds, a construction agreement was reached: SCU and the City dedicated the right-of-way for the new alignment, the City funded all utility costs and median landscaping.
Caltrans funded the road construction, and SCU contributed funding in exchange for the vacated right-of-way from The Alameda.

Benefits from rerouting The Alameda have gone well beyond increased safety and traffic capacity. On the west side of the new alignment, SCU has created a new front entrance and provided an elaborate landscaping treatment. On the east side, a mixed-use development of retail, hotel and office space has been constructed adjacent to the Santa Clara Caltrain Station. The City has built its new police administration building and a housing shelter north of the station. In addition, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority has constructed a new transit center in front of the station with additional parking and bus transfer stops. The City is currently processing a development proposal for 300 high-density apartments to front on The Alameda.

The rerouting of The Alameda is an example of collaboration between multiple agencies with different missions for the implementation of a mutually beneficial project. It demonstrates the value of cooperation, particularly in terms of sharing financial obligations to make a project economically feasible.

**Project Status:** Complete

**Key Concept:** Using collaboration and early stakeholder involvement to increase project feasibility

**Project Partners:** City of Santa Clara, Santa Clara University and Caltrans

**Contacts:**
- Geoff Goodfellow, Director of Planning and Inspection, City of Santa Clara, ggoodfellow@ci.santa-clara.ca.us
- Robert Warren, Vice President for Administration and Finance, Santa Clara University, 408-554-4300

**Documentation:** Final EIR/ EIS for “State Route 82 Widening and Realignment in the Vicinity of Santa Clara University” and project files available from the City of Santa Clara

**Online Resources:** None
Models for Moving Forward

This section provides four analytical models as tools to help the public-sector and private investors address key aspects of 7 of the 15 Shared Issues affecting the revitalization of the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor, as described in the preceding section. The four models—“A Place-Based Retail Analysis”; “Regional Implications for Local Transportation-Improvement Decisions”; “Parcel Assembly for Transit-Oriented Development”; and “Multijurisdictional Partnerships with Caltrans”—aim to help communities define the problem, secure background information, identify solutions and formulate appropriate policies. The seven shared issues encompassed by these models were identified by the Main Street Silicon Valley Policy Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee as being the most prominent challenges to development and redevelopment. Although these models focus on issues of special concern to the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor, they are intended to be more broadly applicable to other “in-town” urban highways throughout California. Additionally, these models can be used to begin addressing the development and street improvement challenges faced by cities for other similar highway corridors in the Bay Area.

The four models and their associated Shared Issues are:

• **Model 1 - Economics: A Place-Based Retail Analysis.** In addressing Economic Function (Shared Issue #1 in the prior section), this model adds physical and spatial functions to the traditional supply-and-demand framework used for retail market analyses. This model provides a tool for defining the type and amount of retail uses that can successfully be located along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.

• **Model 2 - Transportation: Regional Implications for Local Transportation-Improvement Decisions.** To meet the challenges associated with Street Type and Improvements (Shared Issue #5) and Traffic Operations (Shared Issue #7), this model offers a means of including the potential interjurisdictional and regional implications of local street improvements and traffic operations into the decision-making process.

• **Model 3 - Land Development: Parcel Assembly for Transit-Oriented Development.** For Parcelization (Shared Issue #2) and Transit-Oriented Development (Shared Issue #11), this model addresses the challenges associated with transit-oriented development (TOD) on parcels of difficult sizes and configurations. This model evaluates options for private-sector parcel assembly in combination with design and use criteria for development to improve the economic viability and aesthetics along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway.

• **Model 4 - Policies and Process: Multijurisdictional Partnerships with Caltrans.** This model identifies strategic approaches for developing local and regional partnerships with Caltrans in order to address the challenges associated with Streetscape Design (Shared Issue #10) and Public Policies and Process (Shared Issue #14). This model includes an assessment of options to streamline development review and, thereby, promote private-sector investment, in concert with retaining local streetscape-design opportunities.

Each of the models follows a similar structure. Each begins with a discussion of why the issues covered in the model matter to cities, counties and the broader region, followed by an outline for a plan of action and a description of the steps required to implement the model. Finally, each model summarizes the potential benefits that can be realized by its use in regional efforts to revitalize the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.
Model 1 - Economics: A Place-Based Retail Analysis

Why This Matters

The retail function along the El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway corridor is critical for three reasons. First, it provides a wide range of goods and services to people who live and work along the corridor. Second, retail stores are an important source of sales-tax revenues for local municipalities. And, third, many of these stores provide a sense of local community character and identity. National retail trends have been evolving toward larger centers and single users over the past decades, leaving the corridor’s commercial land uses in danger of becoming marginalized and obsolete.

In cities seeking to reinvigorate their retail activities, staff and policymakers are often at a loss for how to do this, and the analytical tools they use to address the problem often fall short. The place-based retail analysis proposed in this model will offer a new approach to assessing retail market potential along the corridor. This approach could result in the public sector adopting more effective land-use controls and the private sector creating developments that both are financially successful and contribute to a strong sense of place.

While some new retail development along El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway will be free-standing (i.e. in single-use retail buildings), the more challenging retail projects will be mixed-use developments where retail uses are on the ground floor with either housing or office uses located in the building’s upper stories. This analytical model is designed to help cities and developers identify those retailers that would be most successful in such projects. Even though the model focuses on retail development and its appropriate locations along the corridor, the analysis can also provide information as to appropriate locations for housing and, possibly to a lesser extent, office uses, developed either singularly or in conjunction with the retail uses.

Creating a Plan of Action

A key component of encouraging successful retail development is integrating the physical/spatial function of retail with its market function. Staff, policymakers and developers will benefit from understanding the physical, in addition to market, functions of retail at the regional, community, local and site-specific levels. For the purposes of this model, “region-serving retail” is synonymous with destination retail, drawing clientele from outside the local municipality. “Community-serving retail” draws users from several neighborhoods, while “local-serving” and “neighborhood-serving retail” uses are generally accessible by foot and draw from within one mile of the center.

A System of Nodes and Linking Segments

The function of retail along El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway is best understood as a system of nodes and linking segments. Nodes are areas of intensified, pedestrian-oriented development with a mix of uses that may provide goods and services for a continuum of neighborhood and community users. Nodes typically have between 5,000 and 120,000 square feet of retail space. They may include a mix of convenience uses oriented toward nearby neighborhood residents, as well as destination retail uses that may include entertainment venues and restaurants oriented toward residents of the broader community. Larger nodes with more space devoted to retail and office uses may benefit from shared parking facilities and public open space.

Along portions of the corridor where some of the frontage is undeveloped or underdeveloped, identifying opportunities for new nodes will support regional goals for “smart growth.” As cities continue to define and redefine land-use policies for El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway, they must
consider where these nodes should be located, what size or scale they should be, and how new retail development could impact existing retail concentrations, including existing downtowns. In cities where a new node could potentially compete with a downtown, every effort should be made to limit the new project to including primarily local-serving retail and service uses that would not detract from downtown stores. For more discussion of identifying development opportunities, see Model 3, "Parcel Assembly for Transit-Oriented Development," later in this section.

In contrast to nodes, linking segments generally serve a larger population area—usually the broader community or region—and tend to offer more service uses, auto-oriented uses or retail centers designed for either single or multiple users. Linking segments typically are characterized by linear development patterns. Along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, linking segments are often comprised of smaller parcels with fragmented ownership patterns.

Historically, linking segments—as opposed to downtown areas along the corridor—were the dominant location for retail development in the decades following World War II. More recently, national and regional retail trends—particularly growing competition from “big-box” retailers—have threatened the economic vitality of linking segments. At the same time that big-box uses have posed challenges for retail establishments located along the linking segments of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, node locations, which typified the development pattern in the earliest days of the automobile, appear to be gaining momentum as upscale retail centers. This trend, combined with continued population growth in corridor communities, provides a strong incentive for higher-density housing. As a result, El Camino Real/Monterey Highway is transitioning toward being a neighborhood street, and its role as access to community- and region-serving retail uses is decreasing.

Regionally, the overall prospects for retail are improving. The corridor provides several advantages for local- and community-serving retail as well as for some region-serving retail. The median income for households within one mile of the corridor is over $74,000, about 50 percent above the state average.\footnote{U.S. Census Bureau; 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Summary File 3; calculated by Wells Lawson using American Factfinder \url{http://factfinder.census.gov/} and GIS shapefiles from \url{http://www.esri.com/data/download/census2000_tigerline/}; (January 30, 2004).} Per capita retail sales are almost 30 percent higher than the state average and 11 percent higher than the Bay Area average.\footnote{U.S. Census Bureau; U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts; calculated by Wells Lawson from \url{http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06085.html}; (January 30, 2004).} Yet, the amount of shopping-center space per person in the Bay Area trails that in other California regions. Coupled with above-average per capita sales, the prospects for retail are generally strong. San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties average about $646 per square foot of retail sales per person, nearly double that of other California regions. Although the bulk of this demand will likely be met by larger commercial centers, high traffic volumes as well as good local and regional access along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway make this corridor attractive to tenants and developers. Its proximity to a number of city centers and new housing construction present an opportunity for additional local-, community- and region-serving retail.

Corridor communities need to work together to develop retail that contributes to and capitalizes on the existing system of linking segments and nodes. New types of retail along the corridor can profit from the trend toward local-serving nodes and can revitalize linking segments that provide complementary goods and services. In nodes where new or existing residential development creates demand, a mix of local-serving retail and personal services can enhance neighborhood character, allowing each neighborhood to develop its own identity and capitalize on potential synergies with existing and future development. Because overall demand is finite, the amount and type of retail in linking segments and nodes should be coordinated so that retailers are profitable and consumers
have access to necessary goods and services. Both local and regional markets must be studied to ensure a compatible mix of retailers and to define a distinct retail concept.

Although nodes focus retail activity so that it both is sustainable and contributes to a sense of place, most land available for retail development along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway is located in the linking segments between the nodes. Linking segments, therefore, play an important role in increasing the range of goods and services available to consumers and businesses in the community and region. Although this means that many of these services must be accessed by car, street-design solutions can ensure that access by other modes, such as transit, bicycle or walking, is not compromised.

Community Challenges for Successful Retail Projects
For communities looking to revitalize development along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, retail-based strategies can drive reinvestment. However, retail poses a number of challenges for developers.

- Development trends along the corridor suggest that an increasing proportion of new retail space will be needed to support local residents. Although residents spend more locally than do office workers, overall revenue produced by local-serving retail is still less than community- or region-serving retail located elsewhere.

- Areas lacking a critical mass of customers or sufficient generators of foot traffic can struggle to be profitable, despite their value to the neighborhood. It may be difficult for developers to lease this space, even when rents are low. Developers may therefore build projects with limited retail and, consequently, contribute to the failure of nearby retail by reducing the associated induced demand and synergy for these nearby retail uses. Retail “pioneers” face a difficult path waiting for the right ingredients to fall into place.

- In areas experiencing substantial changes in the composition of residents and workers, it may be difficult for developers to anticipate the type or amount of retail that can be supported by future development.
• City parking requirements may not account for increased pedestrian and transit access, and smaller parcels along the corridor may limit the ability to meet retail parking requirements.

These challenges demonstrate the dynamic relationship between supply, demand and physical context in the retail market. The development of Menlo Center in Menlo Park provides an example of how several of these challenges can be addressed by evaluating physical opportunities in the programming and design of a site. In the absence of prior momentum for retail and pedestrian activity at the Menlo Center site, the developers carefully thought through tenanting requirements for the ground-level space, which is dominated by two larger users, Cafe Borrone and Kepler's Books and Magazines. The developer determined that sufficient demand for the cafe could be generated from the nearby downtown and civic center as well as from the wide draw of Kepler’s Books, a regional institution for many years. The physical connections to surrounding development, the site design and the right retail mix were essential to turning this intersection on El Camino Real into a distinct place for the community. In other words, consideration of the site’s physical qualities and its relationship with nearby development and amenities made it possible to capture demand beyond that which may have been apparent in a standard supply-and-demand market analysis. Additionally, parking and access were creatively integrated into the building structure without compromising the pedestrian-oriented nature of the plaza.

A Place-Based Retail Analysis

Typically, evaluation of retail opportunities rests solely on the interaction of supply-side features (e.g., existing competition) and demand-side trends (e.g., demographics and buying power). A place-based retail analysis represents a new paradigm in that it integrates physical opportunities into the retail market analysis (see diagram below). By including the physical context for retail development, it allows cities, developers and other stakeholders to determine the type and amount of retail uses that can best benefit the community.

Framework for Integrating “Place” into Retail Analyses

Successful retail development is sustained and expanded through the right combination of place, demand and supply. Much development along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway is characteristic of a two-dimensional view of retail market analysis, where interaction with place has been incidental to the relationship between supply and demand. The result has been a failure to take advantage of opportunities for high-quality development that draws on the unique characteristics and assets of a place and that, in turn, add value to the place. Ultimately, the goal should be to attract the right
tenants to the right place. An iterative analysis examining the role of place, supply and demand will maximize the potential value of retail development for the corridor and point out where alternate uses could be more successful.

This place-based retail analysis can be used by cities and developers for specific projects, area studies, specific plans or any other efforts to identify optimal retail uses for a site or district. City planners and policymakers seeking to revitalize portions of the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor in their communities can use this model as the basis for an effective revitalization plan. In addition to improving the odds of success for retail, the model integrates physical goals for improving the sense of place along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway and promotes better connections between communities and the street.

The model described below (and summarized in the following table) outlines an iterative process that focuses the study of a project at three levels and identifies the effort required for the analysis. Some smaller development projects may require only the first level of “quick and easy” analysis, while larger district or area plans will likely involve additional levels of analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>ANALYTICAL APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>• Small (&lt;3,000 square feet) • Conversion of existing building or construction about to begin • Evaluation of prospective tenant</td>
<td>• “First cut” assessment of place, supply and demand • Quick and easy • Do-it-yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>• Medium to large space (&gt;3,000 square feet) • District strategy</td>
<td>• Detailed analysis • Dedicated staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>• Long-term district strategy or implementation</td>
<td>• Ongoing data monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level I**
The first level is designed to provide a general understanding of the project context and goals, the scale of the project, its physically associated uses, as well as sources of demand, existing competition and market opportunities. At this point, it is also important to identify the physical opportunities of the site and the surrounding development context. Questions to ask in this “first cut” include:

**Place**

What are parcel sizes and the existing building stock? Many development sites along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor, particularly in the linking segments between nodes, are comprised of small and/or shallow lots with fragmented ownership patterns. Retailers that function well on these parcels include small-appliance repair stores, dry cleaners, gift stores and convenience stores. Incorporating nearby historic structures can help to define a node, as with the British Bankers Club bar and restaurant (a structure that originally housed Menlo Park’s old city hall) adjacent to Menlo Center.

Is parcel assembly necessary? Parcel assembly can help make small and shallow sites more feasible for today’s retail tenants. Working with an architect early in the process to develop a site-design strategy also can help a project’s feasibility.

What potential synergies exist with surrounding development? An understanding of the surrounding land uses within a short walk—including civic destinations, open space, office uses and
residential uses—can help identify physical opportunities that may exist. A visual survey at the street level also helps identify potential connections between uses.

How can site design, street improvements and architecture contribute to a sense of place in this area? Public investment in infrastructure such as street improvements, bicycle lanes and parking can add to the sense of place in an area and spur private investment in quality architecture and site design. Amenities such as wider sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, benches, landscaping, bicycle racks and public art can help create an environment that is more attractive to consumers and, in turn, to retail tenants.

Where are opportunities for new nodes and for reviving existing nodes? Nodes are ideally situated at the intersection of major transportation routes and transit stations, and close to moderate- and high-density housing or high employment density. Additional criteria for nodes include nearby concentrations of local-serving or destination retail, as well as areas with major civic or cultural amenities.

Supply

What types of retail already exist within a 1 to 1½ mile radius? An examination of existing retail can suggest opportunities for associated retail. For example, a number of viable dry cleaners in an area may indicate an opportunity for other convenience retail such as movie-rental or take-out-food establishments.

What retail uses are competitive? Where are there opportunities? A review of local and regional business patterns can reveal retail uses that are growing in the larger economy, but may be locally underrepresented, indicating opportunities for those uses.

What retail projects are in the development pipeline? An understanding of the type of retail uses that are planned for an area can suggest which retailers will be present in the neighborhood in the future and may compete in the market place.

Demand

What are area demographics? Basic demographic indicators—such as median household income, educational attainment, age-cohorts, family structure and car ownership—can be used to develop a rough market profile and to identify comparable retail environments.

What is the land-use distribution? A survey of existing land can provide a rough market profile. For example, a district that includes “Class-A” office space and condominiums may make certain retail types, such as restaurants, more feasible as a result of two sources of demand.

Is there an opportunity to capture new demand? “Exogenous” changes—such as changes in technology, national or regional trends, or major land-uses—may create opportunities for retail beyond what existing demographic or survey data suggest.

What is the relationship between new development and retail demand? In communities along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway where new retail development will be part of a mixed-use project, the actual amount of space could be very small, and supported by only a few hundred units (i.e. units in the project and in the adjacent residential neighborhood). It is important to remember that these local-serving uses can succeed in a small trade area.

Level II
With the initial groundwork laid by Level I, outstanding questions and specific opportunities can be examined in greater detail through a more focused review of supply, demand and place. Starting with place, more detail on the surrounding land-use pattern and pipeline development can identify vacant and/or underutilized lots or storefronts, nearby amenities and attractions, access constraints, and potential physical or use changes. The place-based analysis can evaluate the character and scale of planned and existing development, determining the type and amount of retail that would contribute to and/or capitalize on the existing physical characteristics of the place.

Having identified opportunities related to place and supply, the analysis then can identify specific retailers. At this point, more formal market research addressing pipeline projects and existing competition, along with a more detailed review of area demographics, can define the immediate market. In addition, other sources of demand (employment, visitors, tourists, etc) can be taken into account. More advanced methods for understanding demand should be employed in this stage, including: intercept surveys of consumers and merchants; leakage or void analyses to measure the buying power spent outside the locale and the potential for additional retail development if sales were captured locally; estimates of household buying power; population and employment projections (shift-share analysis); and occupational outlook and income-distribution changes.

**Level III**
The last level of analysis evaluates potential tenants and their needs. The physical assessment should identify synergies between nearby development and the land-use program of the project itself. A more in-depth demand assessment will provide a much clearer, more targeted consumer profile (encompassing both local and regional consumers). Key informant interviews and case studies of comparable districts can also be used to develop an appropriate tenant mix and overall retail concept.

**Making It Happen**
Using a place-based retail analysis model can provide a powerful first step for strengthening neighborhoods along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. Cities can initially benefit from including the Level I analysis as part of a broader planning process, rather than on a case-by-case basis for individual retail developments. An integrated planning strategy will give cities a basis for potential policy changes, such as revised parking standards and mixed-use zoning districts, to support future retail strategies. Retail analysis as a prelude to policy changes helps cities to set up general parameters for retail tenanting, without necessarily identifying particular retailers. Developers also can use this strategy as a basis to attract actual tenants. In addition, the place-based analysis offers a guide for individual communities to:

- initiate a planning process;
- look for models and case studies;
- get to know the existing and potential retailers;
- define implementation strategies and appropriate land use controls;
- reach out to developers; and,
- work with retail brokers.

**Complementary Measures**
A place-based retail analysis could be required for any planning process or for any major new development along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. In preparation, cities could provide a description of the place-based process and a template or checklist for project evaluation. An example of such a checklist is provided in Appendix C of this report. Cities, in cooperation with businesses, can also consider additional complementary measures to support local retail strategies. The list below provides examples of some potential complementary measures.
• **Business Improvement Districts (BIDs).** Establish Business Improvement Districts to implement physical improvements that create a sense of place, making the area more attractive to consumers and retailers.

• **Leasing assistance.** Maintain relationships with retailers in and around the community to facilitate leasing retail space, strengthening opportunities for local businesses and improving the mix of retailers in an area.

• **Retail tax incentives.** Support “pioneer retailers”— retail uses prior to the presence of a critical mass of residential development— by providing tax incentives such as a sales-tax refunds or credits in the initial year or two of new retail projects.

• **Capital improvements.** Focus city-sponsored capital improvement projects, such as streetscape enhancements, plazas, and provisions for public art, along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway to help make it an attractive place for shopping on foot.

• **Assistance with tenant/ owner improvements.** Offer small retailers that are hesitant to move into new retail space— due to the time, money and/ or effort required to complete tenant improvements— short-term assistance with design and construction costs for tenant improvements, recovering these costs after the retailers begin to generate revenue.

• **Shared parking.** Encourage parking facilities such as parking “plazas,” districts or structures to support a combination of uses with different peak parking demands.

• **Marketing and promotional activities.** Support businesses in new nodes through community and regional promotional activities.

**Potential Benefits**

Whether in a node or in a linking segment, retail is a powerful ingredient for creating places where people want to live, work and shop. High-quality places can increase an area’s economic activity and can yield economic and social benefits. Local-serving retail reinforces the connection between the public and private realms at the neighborhood level. A proper mix of community- and region-serving retail can use private investment to enhance community character and identity. El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway represents an untapped opportunity to achieve both retail development and placemaking goals Planning that embraces place as a path toward more highly valued retail development cultivates, rather than undermines, the value of El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway as a regional and community resource. The resulting high-quality environments can create increased land values, especially for residential uses that benefit from the addition of walkable retail/ service amenities, increased sales-tax revenue, higher employment densities and increased small-business opportunities. Indirect benefits include reduced crime, increased and improved public open space, improved access to goods and services, and positive impacts on complementary uses in the community.

In the final analysis, it is essential to recognize retail as a means to positive physical change along the entire corridor. Communities evaluating the costs and benefits of retail development should consider these fiscal, economic and social benefits when weighing development tradeoffs such as tax-base opportunities from alternate land uses, local employment generation, traffic and associated infrastructure demands, land utilization for community needs, demands on public services, and risks associated with structural or spatial shifts in the retail industry, itself.
Model 2 - Transportation: Regional Implications for Local Transportation-Improvement Decisions

Why This Matters

El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway in most places is a wide arterial street with a random—primarily commercial—development pattern. This arrangement, along with differing approaches to development and streetscape design across jurisdictions, does not allow roadway features to consistently accommodate vehicular traffic, pedestrians, transit, and bicyclists.

Finding cost-effective solutions to traffic congestion is a nationwide concern, and there is a growing trend toward the use of technology to solve transportation problems. Jurisdictions along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway are increasingly using advanced technology to integrate traffic-signal operations into traffic-control centers. Traffic-signal equipment is being upgraded so that traffic along the corridor can flow more easily across city and county boundaries. In addition, the increased use of advanced technology along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway may mean that costly and disruptive physical improvements, such as adding lanes or turn pockets, may be avoided due to the use of Intelligent Transportation Systems.

In several instances, cities, regional agencies and Caltrans have worked together on projects to overcome some of the institutional barriers to improved traffic operations. Such collaboration forms the basis for this analysis and is essential for improvements to regional facilities, such as El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, that affect local commuters as well as regional travelers. At the same time, there is a great need to consider local traffic and streetscape design in a regional context, as the impact of local policy and project decisions do not stop at city or county boundaries.

The Problem: Local actions to address traffic issues can have unintended impacts on regional mobility.

The Solution: Include regional and interjurisdictional implications in the local decision-making process.

While this approach appears to be simple, significant challenges remain. The application of Caltrans standards in local communities can pose difficulties as can differing reporting requirements, analytical methodologies, funding constraints and priorities across jurisdictions. The impact of these challenges is magnified when considering the associated effects that street types, improvements and traffic operations have on land use and economic interests all along the corridor. A transportation decision-making model that adds regional and interjurisdictional implications to transportation technical analyses will provide a means to identify improvements that optimize traffic operations across city and county boundaries while reflecting local priorities and needs.

Creating a Plan of Action

A transportation model can go beyond a traditional capacity analysis and outline a framework for local communities to make informed decisions regarding El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, and also provide a mechanism for local, regional and State agencies to work together to achieve common goals. As projects come forward, decisions need to consider both local and regional needs. El Camino Real/Monterey Highway serves a multitude of purposes, whether in the context of transportation, land use or economic interests. Although some cities already recognize this, such a perspective can be expanded to include other jurisdictions in order to broaden the factors considered in project traffic studies. The following framework can provide a tool to assist the decision-making process.
Review of Local Policies
Local agencies have many tools to begin the transportation decision-making process, including General Plans, Specific Plans and Neighborhood Plans. However, these documents are typically adopted at different times and often serve different purposes. Thus, examining the various facets of the local decision-making framework is the first analytical step. This allows the project in question to move ahead with a solid baseline understanding of local tradeoffs. To build upon information from these documents, other agencies and stakeholders often can provide additional data to enhance multimodal opportunities for the project to positively affect bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users.

Interjurisdictional Coordination
Even projects not situated near a jurisdictional border will benefit from information provided by other cities or counties. Comparison of plans for signal timing, streetscape design, bicycle routes, pedestrian access and trails from multiple jurisdictions can improve the local decision-making process. For example, one city may not be aware of a neighboring city’s plans. But, when informed, the two cities could work together to optimize the project. If the goal is consistency with plans from multiple jurisdictions, the result can make the trip across borders seamless for the traveler.

Regional Planning
Factoring the regional context into local decision-making can maximize a project’s benefit to travelers on El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. Every city should consider the regional picture, even if Caltrans, SamTrans, VTA, Caltrain, BART or another regional transportation agency is not directly engaged in the planning process. Although there are numerous regional transportation standards, plans and programs, local agencies typically only consider their county’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) standards. The CMP provides a regional regulatory framework and plays an important role in transportation planning. However, not all cities use this framework in conjunction with other regional transportation plans for decision-making. Capital improvements identified by Caltrans/California Transportation Commission (State Transportation Improvement Program), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (Regional Transportation Improvement Program), counties (VTA’s Valley Transportation Plan 2020, SamTrans’ Strategic Plan and both counties’ work programs), sales tax measures (Measure A/B) and other local municipalities (the Capital Improvement Programs of neighboring cities) should be investigated to create a complete regional picture.

Innovations in Transportation Improvements
Using regional collaboration for decisions will increase the potential for more creative transportation improvements. Transportation projects along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway face a number of constraints, such as limited opportunities for capacity-enhancement (i.e., street widening) or significant funding constraints. Even in the rare cases along the corridor with no constraints and available right-of-way, environmental factors tend to limit improvement options. Alternatives that can improve the transportation system under these conditions include:

- **Transportation Demand Management (TDM).** TDM includes various services and programs to affect the behavior of motorists and encourage them to use alternatives to driving alone. TDM strategies focus on reduction of vehicle trips, especially commuter trips during peak travel periods.

- **Transportation Systems Management (TSM).** TSM programs are designed to improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system by more effective use of facilities and/or resources. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) is an example of TSM. ITS encompasses a broad range of wireless and wireline communications-based information, control and electronics technologies. When integrated into the transportation system
infrastructure, and into vehicles themselves, these technologies help monitor and manage traffic flow; reduce congestion; provide alternate routes to travelers; enhance productivity; and save lives, time and money. ITS provides the tools for skilled transportation professionals to collect, analyze and archive data about the performance of the system during the hours of peak use. Having this data increases the traffic operators' ability to respond to incidents, adverse weather or other constricting events.

- **Context-Sensitive Design (CSD)/Context-Sensitive Solutions (CSS).** This collaborative, interdisciplinary approach involves all stakeholders designing transportation improvements so that they fit the physical setting and preserve scenic, aesthetic, historic and environmental resources, while maintaining safety and mobility. CSD/CSS is an approach that considers the context for proposed transportation-improvement projects.

Integrating technology with programs that optimize the use of existing transportation systems can positively address the challenges along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, providing a forum to promote interjurisdictional cooperation as well as a means to spread both costs and benefits across city and county lines.

**Making It Happen**

The goal of this model is to improve local decision-making and facilitate partnerships with adjacent cities, regional interests and State agencies in implementing mutually beneficial and achievable approaches to transportation improvement. Although making this happen requires efforts at all three levels—local, interjurisdictional and regional—the majority of responsibility falls on individual cities.

**Local Efforts**

Each city can use its General Plan, as well as Specific, Neighborhood, and Community Plans to identify key transportation policies for the corridor. These plans typically cover the use and function of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. Updates to these plans can provide a linkage to corresponding plans from other jurisdictions. For example, plans for a city's traffic-signal system can be enhanced by including what lies upstream and downstream. More specific approaches to aid local decision-making include:

- **Enhanced Reporting and Analysis Requirements.** Cities typically follow the Congestion Management Program traffic-impact analysis guidelines, which define the minimum analysis and reporting requirements for traffic studies. Only a few cities go beyond these guidelines with more specific, localized requirements. Cities in Santa Clara County typically follow the VTA Congestion Management Program Guidelines for Traffic Impact Analysis, with several cities requiring additional elements to satisfy local criteria. In San Mateo County, several cities have unique traffic study guidelines tailored to meet their individual needs. Each city along the corridor, however, could benefit from expanding its reporting and analysis to require more detail on a project's upstream and downstream effects by including the plans of adjacent communities (Neighborhood, Specific and General Plans). Compiling this information as a “Regional Context” section of traffic-impact studies would provide local decision-makers with a broader perspective on a project's potential effects.

- **Decision Tree (or Checklist) for Regional Analysis.** Local cities could work with county and Caltrans officials to establish a common decision tree or checklist to specify the elements that should be addressed within traffic studies. Today, existing requirements are inconsistent, with differing methodologies for San Mateo County, Santa Clara County and Caltrans. Adopting one set of rules, for the purposes of regional traffic analysis, would
allow comparisons and uniform reporting. The checklist could also identify information that should be cross-referenced between jurisdictions.

• **Regional Context Discussion within the General Plan Circulation Element.** The General Plan of each city could include a discussion of consistency with neighboring and regional transportation plans, as well as an explanation of any differences. For example, the discussion could indicate how bicycle lanes connect and pedestrian trails align, and how street classification and operations are coordinated across jurisdictional boundaries.

• **Exemptions to Significance Thresholds for Regional Improvements.** Local cities could adopt intersection Level of Service (LOS) exemptions for local streets if regional benefits associated with a project can be quantified. For example, if the local operating standard for an intersection is LOS D and a project causes the operation of an intersection to worsen to LOS E or F, the city could find that it is not a significant impact provided that the improvement to the upstream and/or downstream operation of a regional transportation system is demonstrated. Improvements to regional facilities could be include a better Level of Service, improved air or noise quality, or reductions in vehicle miles or vehicle hours traveled. In other words, a local project with localized impacts, but with regional benefits, would not be penalized.

• **Consideration for Retail, Multimodal and Transit-Oriented Development.** Local cities can weigh transportation decisions in conjunction with opportunities identified in "A Place-Based Retail Analysis" (Model 1 above) and "Parcel Assembly for Transit-Oriented Development" (Model 3). Transportation decisions could thereby increase compatibility between the roadway function and adjacent land uses. For example, a proposal for retail uses considered alongside the desired roadway function may lead to a strategy for shared parking. Transportation-improvement decisions cannot be isolated from decisions with respect to land use, urban design, pedestrian mobility and/or transit access or from the functional requirements associated with transitions between one street type and another, or between one city and another.

**Interjurisdictional Efforts**
San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties' Congestion Management Programs (CMPs) include an analysis of street improvements and traffic operations for Routes of Regional Significance, such as El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. This means that member agencies in both counties consider common CMP standards and impact thresholds. Interjurisdictional efforts also can include joint funding from neighboring cities for transportation projects that improve regional mobility. Coordination between adjacent cities does not have to be limited to vehicular circulation, however. Coordinated street-operation, bicycle and pedestrian planning would improve the safety and experience for these travelers, especially at city or county borders. Landscaping can also provide a unifying vision for the corridor if coordinated with neighboring cities.

**Regional Efforts**
Achieving collaboration in transportation projects affecting El Camino Real/Monterey Highway requires participation not just by cities, but also by county, regional and State agencies. Whether it is sharing data, participating in joint task forces or preparing grant applications for funding, additional collaborative efforts will serve the region more effectively, while benefiting local travelers. Current regional efforts to improve transportation in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties include Policy Advisory and Technical Advisory Committees for specific studies (San Mateo County ITS Master Plan, Silicon Valley SMART Corridor, Peninsula Corridor Gateway Study, Downtown East Valley Transportation Plan, and others) with staff provided by various cities, agencies, and counties. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) provides the Bay Area's overall
long-term transportation strategy for important transportation assets—including El Camino Real/Monterey Highway—in a regional context, with linkages to multimodal decision-making so that bicyclists, pedestrians and transit patrons are considered.

**Potential Benefits**

To weigh local policy decisions alongside regional policies, joint funding agreements and other cooperative planning efforts, local decision-makers need sufficient information on the relative benefits of transportation-improvement alternatives. For example, if it is demonstrated that a local traffic-operations decision can positively affect the entire corridor and that regional benefits will result from this local initiative, then this initiative can arguably be prioritized for implementation. Key benefits of regionally oriented decision-making in transportation projects along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor include: improved local traffic operations; improved regional transit; reduced environmental impacts; increased opportunities for local funding; and support for a unifying vision. Each of these is described in detail below.

**Improved Local Traffic Operations**

Implementation of this model will foster improvements along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway that affect local commuters as well as regional travelers. Improving traffic operations along stretches of the corridor will benefit local traffic via easier use of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway itself and through more efficient east-west crossings of the corridor. In addition, helping traffic or transit operations along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway will have regional benefits for Highways 101 and 280 as well as for Middlefield Road and other major parallel streets.

The technology that drives the improved systems can feed data into regional transportation management centers that define performance at the city and county levels. That data, tracking real-time traffic volumes, speeds, and incidents, will help keep the system moving. Traffic signals can respond to real-time traffic conditions, metering lights can regulate flow onto freeways based on congestion levels, emergency-response teams can clear incidents more quickly, and motorists can receive credible information to make decisions about how, when and where to travel.

**Improved Transit Operations**

Regional collaboration on transportation issues will benefit transit operations along the corridor. Local buses as well as Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) will flow more easily along the corridor with system-wide improvements. In fact, bus-transit enhancements cannot be fully achieved unless corridor improvements are implemented across city and county boundaries. Improved access to transit centers, hubs and stations will benefit a broad population of travelers, and help decrease reliance on single-occupant automobile trips. Technology and data from traffic sensors can enable more reliable timing of transit vehicles, giving patrons more accurate information about arrival and departure times. Local and regional agencies should also consider how the added benefits of enhanced transit services will affect pedestrian and bicyclist mobility and/or parking around the transit nodes. Often, pedestrian/biking amenities compete with parking for space.

**Reduced Environmental Impacts**

Air quality improvements and reduced noise can both be attained if vehicles can avoid unnecessary stops and starts along the corridor. Using technology to improve traffic flow and travel times for extended stretches will be a superior environmental alternative, making coordinated traffic-signal timing improvements eligible for Congestion Management and Air Quality grants.

**Increased Opportunities for Local Funding**

The competition for transportation funds is intense. Projects with regional, multimodal and/or multijurisdictional benefits often score higher and receive priority funding. Given the current climate
of scarce financial resources, regional cooperation is more important than ever. This model is designed to promote partnering and joint planning efforts that can result in funding priority for regionally oriented projects.

**Support for a Unifying Vision**
Whether through street trees, bicycle amenities, pedestrian features or other visual enhancements, regional projects can link the corridor and add a sense of place and purpose. The trip for the motorist, bicyclist, pedestrian or transit rider does not have to be a series of disjointed connections. Rather, the transition from one town to the next and from one county to the next should be seamless. This analytical model aims to help each city retain its unique character and, at the same time, contribute to a regional vision that improves the travel experience along the corridor.

**Model 3 - Land Development: Parcel Assembly for Transit-Oriented Development**

**Why This Matters**
The El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor's proximity to existing rail stations, along with plans by both VTA and SamTrans to improve bus service, supports an emphasis on transit-oriented development (TOD). However, opportunities for TODs are constrained by existing conditions, particularly the small parcels in the corridor, and by community concerns over density, height and traffic. Additionally, defining the appropriate mix of uses and residential-unit types needed to support transit use can impact the success of TOD efforts. As noted in "A Place-Based Retail Analysis" (Model 1 above), it is particularly important that commercial space within TOD projects be appropriate. Cities and developers are grappling with the right formula for TOD land use, product type, density and location. Even with the right menu, the limited availability of appropriate parcels for development compounds the challenges.

Given the Bay Area's chronic housing shortage, any additional housing, including affordable housing, can be regarded as beneficial. To better identify opportunities under current land-use and development conditions along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, a more expansive definition, applicable to TODs on the linking segments, as well as a more focused development program is needed. This approach must match the development program, geographic location and underlying market conditions with on-the-ground parcelization and local land-use patterns. For some portions of the corridor, existing conditions already support TOD. In most locations, however, additional public-sector efforts are needed.

**Creating a Plan of Action**

**Transit-Oriented Development: Refining the Definition**
Basic assumptions for TOD are that it is located close to fixed-rail transit and that it has a significantly higher development density than its surroundings or than typical suburban development. The reasons higher density is encouraged are: (1) to maximize the number of residents and/or workers within walking distance of transit, (2) to enhance “value capture” of the large public investments in transit facilities and (3) to recoup the high land costs often associated with TOD locations. Development with a low building-to-site ratio—such as big-box retail or auto-related services—is generally not regarded as transit-oriented.

Higher-density development alone does not guarantee transit use, however. As noted by Belzer and Autler in Transit-Oriented Development: Moving from Rhetoric to Reality (Brookings Institution, 2002), what
is often referred to as transit-oriented development may instead simply be transit-adjacent development that does not necessarily result in high levels of transit use. For example, concentrating high-density residential development without regard to surrounding commerce may promote transit use for commuting, but require automobile use for all other trips. In addition, higher-density residential units need to be designed for the demographic groups that use transit. While mid-rise office buildings may support value-capture objectives for TODs, they do not effectively promote transit use.

The basic goal of TOD for the purposes of this model is simple: to reduce overall automobile use by increasing walking, bicycling, transit use and/or any combination thereof. This requires more than just concentrating development adjacent to major rail stations, because most car trips are not commute trips. For TODs to positively impact congestion and contribute to the corridor’s quality of life, the number of local as well as commute trips must be significantly reduced.

Walking is the first step in transit use, and “walkability”—useful and convenient destinations, pleasant pathways and streetscapes that encourage walking—can be considered the most basic ingredient for successful transit-oriented development. Better land use, density, building form, streetscape design and other aspects of environmental design result naturally from using walkability as basic TOD criteria. However, planning TODs around walkability requires an understanding of the surrounding development context. For example, TODs are often required to incorporate first-floor commercial space, ostensibly to improve walkability and reduce local trips. This commercial space may not necessarily serve adjacent residential units. In some cases, such commercial space may compete with established commercial districts or shopping centers that are already within walking distance. “A Place-Based Retail Analysis” (Model 1 above) provides an analytical tool to assess the viability of commercial space in TOD.

As Belzer and Autler note, it also makes sense to target TODs to demographic groups that have the greatest likelihood of using transit. Senior housing is a popular form of infill development, with low car ownership and trip generation. However, seniors typically do not make commute trips. They tend to benefit most from nearby local services and bus service rather than from fixed-rail transit.

**TOD in the Corridor: Adapting to Existing Land-Use and Parcel Conditions**

The range of land-use and development conditions in the corridor can confound a rigid policy approach intended to encourage TOD. Such an approach may also not be particularly desirable or realistic. For planning purposes, focusing TOD on walkability allows the corridor to be divided into two basic areas: (1) nodes—typically downtown commercial districts within walking distance of a fixed-rail transit center, and (2) linking segments—typically commercial areas that are between nodes and that are not within walking distance of a fixed-rail transit center. These terms are the same as those used in “A Place-Based Retail Analysis” above, and they generally correspond to the same geographic areas. For example, node areas along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway that are defined for either a TOD or place-based retail analysis would include downtown Menlo Park and downtown Belmont; linking segment areas for either analysis would include El Camino Real in Redwood City, from Woodside Road south to Atherton, and The Alameda in San Jose.

As shown on the Transit-Oriented Development Opportunities maps on the following pages, there are 32 potential areas for TOD nodes in the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor. These are areas within a half-mile or 10-minute walk of BART, Caltrain or light-rail stations (i.e., nodes are one-mile diameter overall). In addition, areas proximate to high-use bus stops can potentially function as nodes. To date, however, rail stations have been the focus for most TOD interests because they
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can typically support more dense development that takes advantage of proximity to downtown commercial services, the presence of established redevelopment districts and streetscape or other improvement efforts. In a number of these areas, relatively large industrial sites formerly associated with rail-related shipping have been or are planned for redevelopment. Parcelization constraints and land-assembly challenges for nodes are not as daunting as in the linking segments where the capacity to absorb TOD is limited by existing development—shops, offices, and respective tenants and property owners—and the single-family neighborhoods that typically border them.

The corridor’s linking segments are just as important to El Camino Real/Monterey Highway’s revitalization as are the nodes. However, linking segments present a much greater challenge. For approximately 50 percent of the 45-mile stretch of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway between Daly City and San Jose, the segment areas tend to need the most improvement to property and streetscape. Small parcels and fragmented commercial uses typify these areas, and they are usually outside of Redevelopment Project Areas. To be effective and marketable, TODs located in the linking segments must offer a level of convenience that rivals, or is complementary to, node/downtown locations. Although linking segments may not be within walking distance of fixed-rail transit or major bus transfer stations, they may be within walking distance of nodes, existing shopping centers or other facilities. Alternate transportation modes, including BRT, shuttles, jitneys, taxis, and bicycle lanes, can provide the necessary connections.

For TOD efforts to be most successful, street type and development type should be matched, as previously noted in this report. Most node areas are appropriate for a more urban, pedestrian-intensive street-design approach, similar to that employed in a downtown commercial district. Conditions in the linking segments are more variable. For example, if a relatively long, consistent frontage can be dedicated to residential-only development, a more landscape-intensive, parkway street type could be employed. The portion of El Camino Real from north San Mateo through Burlingame is an example, with curbside planting strips and front-lawn setback areas. In mixed-use areas, a hybrid boulevard/parkway street design that maintains visibility of at-grade commercial businesses but provides screening of upper-story residential units could be appropriate. An example is El Camino Real in Mountain View and Sunnyvale, where medians and frontage street trees screen residential space from the roadway somewhat, but full-width sidewalks and minimal on-site frontage landscaping maintains visibility for businesses.

TODs within El Camino Real/Monterey Highway’s linking segments face the added challenge of land-use compatibility. They often need to fit between an adjacent commercial-strip-development—which may include furniture stores, auto dealers and bowling alleys—and single-family neighborhoods to the rear. Some cities have prepared development guidelines to reduce the impacts on TODs from the busy frontage street and, at the same time, buffer adjacent residential neighborhoods. However, guidelines such as these are the exception rather than the rule.

**Development Programs: Implementing TOD on Small Parcels**

Small frontage parcels seriously constrain TOD in the corridor, even when walkable features such as an improved streetscape and proximity to transit and supporting commercial services exist. Parcel assembly is considered the single biggest obstacle to development. Land values along the corridor tend to be relatively high, despite often unattractive physical conditions, making parcel assembly even more challenging. TOD projects that could be considered are described below.

- **Rental Housing.** Due to the economics associated with property management, small properties cannot accommodate the number of units required for rental projects. Projects
from 50 to 100 units on 1.5 acres are commonly cited as the minimum. A 75-unit project at a density of 50 units per acre with three- to four-story wood frame construction above a concrete parking podium could fit on 1.5 acres of land. If parcels have a depth of 100 feet, 650 feet of frontage would be required. Assuming typical parcel widths of 150 feet, up to five individual properties would need to be assembled.

**Ownership Housing.** Ownership housing does not have the same property management requirements as rental housing, and it is feasible to develop a project with fewer units. For example, a 25-unit project developed at a density of 50 units per acre would require only a half acre of land. Using the same parcel sizes assumed for rental housing, only two properties would have to be assembled for development. Lower-density ownership housing, such as a townhouse project, can be feasible on small parcels assembled for development. However, these types of projects are typically at a density of 15 units per acre. A 25-unit development would require parcel assembly of 1.6 acres, similar to a rental project. Land costs are generally too high to support such a small number of units without assistance from local housing programs.

**Mixed-Use Developments.** Both ownership and rental housing can be developed above first-floor commercial space. Parking requirements for commercial uses can, however, limit space for project amenities or can make projects infeasible altogether. Even with these constraints, cities continue to promote first-floor commercial space in order to: (1) maintain or generate additional sales-tax revenue; (2) provide an active frontage; (3) screen a ground-level parking garage; or (4) provide a walkable, transit-oriented development.

The examples of development programs outlined below are prototypes based on recently developed projects and discussions with local developers. They provide a general indication of potential for TOD projects in the segment areas of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. All are assumed to have building forms and architectural designs that are sensitive to adjacent neighborhoods and that promote walkability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Size in Acres</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Parking Stalls</th>
<th>Story Construction</th>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>Yards</th>
<th>Sidewalk Widening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Site</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>225'</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>900 +/-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Three-story</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>@ 1.8/dwelling unit avg.; mixed surface</td>
<td>wood frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>concrete podium</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Sized Site</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>150'</td>
<td>375'</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>900 +/-</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Three-story</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>@ 1.8/dwelling unit avg.; mixed surface</td>
<td>steel and wood frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>concrete podium</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Site</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>300'</td>
<td>400'</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,000 +/-</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Three- story</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>@ 1.8/dwelling unit avg.; all structure</td>
<td>wood frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 12' side and rear street/4' front setback for sidewalk widening with first-floor commercial on one frontage
• 145 1-2-3 bedroom condominium or rental units/1,000 square feet +/- (52/acre)
• 260 residential parking stalls @ 1.8/ dwelling unit avg.; all structure
• 54 commercial parking stalls @ 4'/1,000 sq. ft. of commercial; all surface
• Up to 13,500 square feet first-floor commercial

Making It Happen

While TOD in the corridor’s downtown and transit nodes seems to have some momentum, focusing on these areas alone will not promote similar development in El Camino Real/Monterey Highway’s linking segments. Even small changes in the land-use mix of the overall corridor could offer dramatic benefits. If just 15 percent of the 45 miles of corridor in San Mateo County and north Santa Clara County featured TOD at 45 residential units per acre, on 100-foot-deep properties, approximately 7,500 dwelling units would result. The potential effect on housing supply, transit use, viability of commercial businesses, and the corridor’s contribution to Silicon Valley and the Peninsula would be significant. Making it happen, however, may rest on the collective ability of local jurisdictions and private developers to assemble parcels.

Policy Options for Parcel Assembly

Policy incentives for parcel assembly—typically density bonuses and/or reductions in required parking—are not perceived as effective by local developers. Density bonuses are only valuable for densities that the market and construction costs will support, and for properties large enough to take advantage of them. All it takes is one holdout among several property owners to make a project infeasible regardless of incentives. Also, density bonuses are typically already factored into land costs for most properties.

A reduction in parking requirements can be an incentive. However, developers note that parking supply is determined by demand and that policies constraining parking supply often make projects less marketable. Because such parking policies do not limit car ownership, adjacent neighborhood streets and commercial parking lots can be impacted by overflow parking. Until transit service along the corridor is significantly improved, there is limited potential for housing with restrictions on car ownership. Parking reductions may promote affordability and/or transit use, but they do not seem to offer an incentive for parcel assembly.

Effective policy incentives offer enough additional profit to overcome the difficulties associated with assembling properties. According to developers, this generally means an incentive that supports an upgrade from one construction type to another—e.g., from three to four stories of stick-built construction at 50 units per acre to six to eight stories of steel-frame construction at 100 units per acre. This may be feasible on regularly shaped, relatively deep, 200-foot or more parcels, where rear setbacks can sufficiently address neighborhood concerns. It is not likely that incentive formulas alone will be sufficient, at least not in the near and medium term.

Ideally, development policies, capital improvements and parcel assembly should be coordinated in a strategy that promotes TOD along the corridor. Providing a clear regulatory framework in the municipal code eliminates the potential for future interpretations that often fall short of the original intent. Land use, development configuration and street design need to be examined holistically with an eye toward more fine-grained parameters for both residential and commercial uses. Although “general commercial” zoning designations are common along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, few Redevelopment Project Areas or special districts are targeted to the corridor. To encourage parcel assembly for TOD, particularly in the linking segments, cities could consider the following strategies:
• **Revise General Plans.** Within general plans, El Camino Real/Monterey Highway could be established as a discrete planning area, with policies to promote TOD and clarify the appropriate role and location of—and relationship between—residential and commercial uses. Mapping existing destinations, including concentrations of neighborhood commercial services and transit facilities in adjacent cities, would help define walkability and limit requirements for first-floor commercial space to locations that would contribute to that walkability.

• **Focus Design Guidelines.** Development standards and design guidelines can be tailored to address frontage-property conditions along the linking segments of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. Guidelines for both commercial and residential development should address side-to-side mixed-use relationships, neighborhood buffering and streetscape improvements, as well as density, height, building-form and parking requirements. Preparing development standards also provides an opportunity to establish a locally supported vision for the corridor. These new guidelines can be codified through Precise Plans or as “form-based zoning” for added enforcement. As an adjunct to these design guidelines, El Camino Real/Monterey Highway projects implementing private-sector parcel assembly could receive city processing assistance or a shortened approval process.

• **Refine Zoning-District Uses.** A strategy to encourage TOD and promote parcel assembly could be to differentiate commercial and residential uses by their location within a node or linking segment on El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. For example, zoning districts for node areas could provide opportunities for concentrations of restaurants, cafes, specialty and other destination retail uses, whereas zoning for linking segments could focus on neighborhood services, with specific portions reserved for auto-oriented businesses. In most cities, this basic approach would be consistent with existing zoning designations, requiring only more narrowly defined, location-specific definitions for uses.

• **Coordinate Regional Efforts.** Local cities, transit agencies and housing authorities in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties could collectively capitalize on corridor opportunities through pooling housing resources, equalizing development fees, sharing development guidelines and linking transportation plans with land-use, development and street-design plans. Securing multijurisdictional planning and development-related grants for corridor TOD and parcel-assembly efforts could also be explored.

• **Evaluate Redevelopment Project Areas.** Small parcels, fragmented ownership and, in some cases, inexplicably high land costs make parcel assembly the biggest challenge for a serious corridor TOD strategy. Relying solely on public-sector policy incentives to encourage private-sector development may not be adequate to result in substantial progress. Although housing funds may be used toward low- and moderate-income units outside of a Redevelopment Project Area to promote TOD, there is no ability to purchase and hold properties for later sale, whether using eminent domain or not. Cities should evaluate the feasibility of adding territory to existing Redevelopment Project Areas that abut the corridor or establishing new corridor redevelopment areas. Redevelopment efforts could be limited to stringently defined development and design standards, and focus on difficult-to-develop properties. A key issue for either approach, however, are the costs associated with below-market-rate unit and prevailing-wage requirements for projects in Redevelopment Project Areas.
• **Establish County or Regional Agency(ies).** Though unlikely as a near-term strategy, establishing a regional or county agency, such as C/CAG in San Mateo County, to coordinate land acquisition, TODs and transportation improvements may be a viable long-term approach. This could allow cities to combine affordable-housing efforts and pool funding, particularly redevelopment set-aside funds. This idea may warrant exploration, subject to prerequisites for the changes in State law that may be required.

**Potential Benefits**

A coordinated TOD and parcel-assembly strategy would focus corridor investment on issues that currently threaten the region’s economic development—the housing shortage, chronic traffic congestion and perceived declines in local livability. Thousands of dwellings could be developed that would be mixed in type, close to transit and services, and supportive of nearby commercial development. TOD can complement transit-improvement plans, helping to build the ridership needed to sustain service levels. Shifting emphasis to “walkable” forms of development would help reduce automobile use and over time support emergence of a variety of alternative transportation modes.

Done well, TODs on consolidated properties will improve the appearance of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway. TOD could enhance neighborhoods with uses, buildings and streetscape improvements more compatible than those existing today. These changes can bolster the case for context-sensitive improvements, emphasizing “placemaking,” in addition to traffic flow, in the corridor.

Lastly, a highly publicized effort by local communities to coordinate TOD efforts is a logical starting point for an overall corridor-improvement strategy. Undertaken with enthusiasm similar to that shown for creating the transit network linking the corridor today, such an effort would encourage communities to look beyond their borders to better address the challenges and opportunities they share.

**Model 4 - Policies and Process:**

**Multijurisdictional Partnerships with Caltrans**

**Why This Matters**

With the shortage of both public and private-sector funds, the time and money needed for project approval are increasingly critical criteria for new development, redevelopment and investment. Developers and public agencies need timely responses and consistency as incentives to private investment and public improvements in the corridor. Where El Camino Real/Monterey Highway is State-owned, Caltrans has jurisdictional authority for the street right-of-way and for access to the street itself. As the State agency responsible for safety and operations of the highway, Caltrans issues permits for projects falling within its jurisdiction, thus adding another layer to the preconstruction process already required by local communities. This additional level of review can impact a project’s overall cost and lead time, and contribute to uncertainty of project approval. Street standards and street design for El Camino Real/Monterey Highway typically are those approved by Caltrans for highways throughout the state, without consideration for local street function or adjacent land uses. Consequently, the streetscape is often sterile, prioritizing vehicular traffic over community- and neighborhood-design elements.
**The Problem:** Properties along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor are less competitive for reinvestment dollars and have fewer opportunities for distinctive streetscape design than similar properties not located on State-owned highways.

**The Solution:** Streamline the development-review process and broaden streetscape design opportunities to level the playing field for properties along the corridor.

Partnerships between local jurisdictions and Caltrans can make development review both more efficient and more responsive to local conditions. Bearing in mind the goal of promoting investment in the corridor and supporting individual community identity, this analysis assesses several strategic alternatives for their potential as a plan of action and provides a framework for identifying issues that should be addressed through a partnership with Caltrans.

**Creating a Plan of Action**

To define a plan of action for streamlining development review and broadening design alternatives along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, it is necessary to identify opportunities and constraints for change. It is clear from discussions with representatives of Caltrans, local communities and developers that support for improving the process is widespread. The challenge, however, is to identify an approach that meets the needs of the various players, as summarized below.

- **Caltrans.** As the agency responsible for State highways, Caltrans focuses on street safety and operational efficiency to meet projected traffic demands. Typically, the Caltrans approval process seeks to apply consistent standards and meet State and federal criteria.

- **Local Communities.** As the jurisdictions responsible for land use and zoning, local communities are interested in meeting the needs of their constituents. This typically results in streetscapes and land uses that vary across communities, requiring local control of urban design, public amenities and economic development.

- **Developers.** As the primary source of land and street improvements, developers require consistent and timely responses from both Caltrans and local communities in order to make design and investment decisions.

**Advantages of a Memorandum of Understanding**

An examination of several alternatives for addressing the requirements summarized above indicates that a multijurisdictional Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is the ideal approach for streamlining development review and broadening design alternatives. This approach also received the most support from representatives of local communities and Caltrans who were interviewed for this analysis. Recent progress on current MOU negotiations between Caltrans and the City of Palo Alto for El Camino Real streetscape design and median-island planting suggests that the application of this model on a larger scale is feasible.

Even though individual projects would still require Caltrans review and approval, the processing time for those consistent with an MOU would be shortened significantly. This approach could incorporate mutually agreeable streetscape designs that consider the local land-use context and community-identity objectives. An MOU has the added advantage of minimizing requirements, and the associated costs, for environmental assessments and detailed improvement plans. If local jurisdictions were to combine their MOU efforts based on logically determined subregions along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, the impact on local financial and staff resources can be shared. In addition, multijurisdictional collaboration would be relatively cost effective for Caltrans and other regional agencies participating in the process.
Alternatives to an MOU

In certain unique cases, alternatives to an MOU could result in shorter development-review times and broader design options. These alternatives include transferring street right-of-way ownership, securing pre-approval of detailed plans for large-scale improvement projects and preparing multijurisdictional precise plans.

Transferring ownership of the street right-of-way from Caltrans to either individual communities or multiple jurisdictions under a Joint Powers Authority is possible in sections that may or may not correspond with jurisdictional boundaries. For example, from Caltrans's perspective, Highway 92 could form a logical boundary, which is not coterminous with the boundaries of the City of San Mateo. Although this alternative would result in local control of the streetscape and eliminate the need for Caltrans permits, it would also transfer maintenance and liability costs to local government. Given the current fiscal condition of communities in the region, most local government representatives indicated that this option is not financially feasible unless the State were to also transfer sufficient funds to offset cost increases.

A true pre-approval for multijurisdictional improvements from Caltrans is simply a large-scale encroachment permit, with the same requirements as permits for individual projects to ensure that all of the environmental, safety and operational issues are covered. If local jurisdictions, either individually or collectively, were to pursue an effort of this magnitude as an incentive for development and improvements along linking segments of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, detailed plans with close to construction-level detail would likely be a prerequisite. Given the cost to prepare such plans, the feasibility of this alternative on a large scale is limited. Additionally, it is unlikely that the ultimate development proposals would be consistent with these plans.

Another strategy for smoothing the approval process with Caltrans would be to prepare Precise Plans to encompass several jurisdictions, while keeping individual community identity intact. Typically, Precise Plans are codified by cities and include a zoning-level environmental assessment. Provided that the planning process would include the cities and Caltrans as equal partners, this approach received some support from city and Caltrans representatives. Although this approach would shorten the processing time for projects consistent with the plan, Caltrans review and approval would still be required prior to construction. Given the fact that Caltrans would still need to review individual development proposals, this approach does not provide any advantages beyond the Memorandum of Understanding. The added cost for local governments to prepare Precise Plans does not seem to be the best use of limited public dollars.

Based on the response to these alternate approaches, a Memorandum of Understanding seems to have the broadest potential to streamline the development review process and offer some variation in street-design alternatives, while, at the same time, meet the varying requirements of Caltrans, local communities and developers.

Making It Happen

Transforming El Camino Real/Monterey Highway to support multimodal transportation alternatives while respecting local community identity and design goals are key incentives for cities to formulate an MOU with Caltrans. Creating such an agreement, however, will require leadership and commitment from cities, counties and transportation agencies. In San Mateo County, C/CAG is already in a position to facilitate and provide technical assistance for such an effort.

As in any partnership, it is necessary that each participant contribute to achieving mutually held goals. For El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, cities and local transportation agencies will need to take the lead on planning and design processes, and assume ultimate responsibility for implementing
improvements consistent with the MOU. For the partnership to work, the cities’ investment in the corridor will need a similar commitment from Caltrans. Expeditious permit processing for improvement plans consistent with an MOU and maintenance services commensurate with the corridor’s regional significance are important contributions that Caltrans can offer. Local jurisdictions and Caltrans both need to prioritize El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway for a successful partnership and MOU.

Potential steps for developing an MOU are summarized below.

- **Establish Logical Subregions.** Because the character and land uses vary widely along the 70 miles of El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, dividing the corridor into manageable subregions should be the first task. Subregions of the corridor should respect existing jurisdictional boundaries and include cities with a desire to pursue a multijurisdictional MOU with Caltrans. Listed below is an example of how the corridor could be divided into six subareas, based on preliminary discussions with staff from several cities. (Because the Monterey Highway right-of-way is owned by Morgan Hill and Gilroy in those jurisdictions, there is no reason for either city to pursue an MOU with Caltrans.)

1. Daly City/ Colma/ South San Francisco
2. San Bruno/ Millbrae/ Burlingame
3. San Mateo/ Belmont/ San Carlos/ Redwood City
4. Atherton/ Menlo Park/ Palo Alto
5. Los Altos/ Mountain View/ Sunnyvale/ Santa Clara
6. San Jose

Staff representing SamTrans and San Mateo County should participate with the staff from cities located in San Mateo County. Similarly, VTA and Santa Clara County staff should be included in discussions with staff from cities in Santa Clara County.

- **Define a Streetscape Vision.** Once individual cities agree to participate in developing an MOU with Caltrans, each of the subregions would need to determine the vision for its section of the El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway corridor. This effort typically requires an extensive planning process that involves local residents, businesses and users of the transportation facilities. This planning process is critical to define local priorities for the corridor. Cities also need to individually and collectively identify desired and planned land uses. Local land uses dictate appropriate roadway operations, use and design. With this information, a streetscape vision can be identified for each subregion, thereby forming the basis for conceptual design plans and MOU negotiations.

- **Prepare Conceptual Streetscape Design Plans.** Using the results of the planning process, conceptual design plans need to be prepared. These plans help identify the issues that will require negotiation. Translating the local vision into specific roadway improvements, then comparing these improvements to existing conditions and Caltrans standards, provides the parameters of the MOU. Changes inconsistent with Caltrans standards are the starting point.

As an example, the negotiations currently underway between Caltrans and the City of Palo Alto use a matrix, similar to the one that follows, to succinctly communicate the MOU issues.


### Example of Roadway-Improvement Matrix

**for Caltrans and El Camino Real/ Monterey Highway Cities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Desired Improvements</th>
<th>Location/Application</th>
<th>Caltrans Requirements</th>
<th>Actions/Responsibility</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 travel lanes of 12 feet each, with 10-foot parking and 7-foot attached sidewalks along both sides of 300-foot blocks</td>
<td>4 travel lanes of 11 feet each, with left-turn pockets, 20-foot raised, planted medians, 9-foot parking, 5-foot planting strip and 7-foot detached sidewalks along both sides of 300-foot blocks</td>
<td>From B Street to X Street (or) Design applies to residential street frontages</td>
<td>Minimum travel-lane width of 12 feet</td>
<td>Public Works Director of Middle Town and Transportation/Design Consultants to work with Caltrans for mutually acceptable design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Define Roles for Participants.** From inception to acceptance, a successful multijurisdictional MOU requires participation by each of the affected cities, counties, local transportation agencies and Caltrans staff. In addition, transportation consultants, urban-design consultants and regional facilitators should play a key role in reaching consensus. Funding is available from private foundations as well as from agencies with an interest in linking land use and transportation, such as the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The overall effort can be initiated by an independent regional agency, such as Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network, but the ultimate results will be determined by the cities and Caltrans. To participate, cities would need to prioritize the effort and provide at least in-kind staff support. Typically, Public Works Directors would take the lead.

### Potential Benefits

The direct and indirect benefits associated with acceptance of an MOU offer dear incentives for both Caltrans and local jurisdictions. Negotiated alternatives to street design and standards will result in greater local control of streetscape design, streamlined processing for improvements consistent with the MOU and better communication with developers as to the prerequisites for construction. The result will be a more level playing field between properties along the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway and similar properties not fronting on a State highway. Multijurisdictional collaboration for change offers sufficient incentives for cooperation with Caltrans in implementing context-sensitive design concepts, as articulated in the July 2002 publication from Caltrans, *Main Streets: Flexibility in Design and Operations*. By emulating the MOU approach identified in this analytical model, local communities throughout the state with highways that have “main street” characteristics can work toward similar benefits with regard to streamlined approval and increased design options.
Conclusion and Next Steps

This report has aimed to provide a thorough and candid portrayal of El Camino Real/Monterey Highway—as it currently is, and as it could be. With focused effort, the economic and aesthetic revitalization of the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor is within reach of the communities that constitute it. The analytic models presented in the preceding section show that there are ways of tackling the most significant issues facing the corridor. Yet, these models also make clear that it will take new ways of thinking and of working together across agencies and jurisdictions.

What can cities, counties and the key transportation agencies serving El Camino Real/Monterey Highway do next in utilizing these models as well as the broader “placemaking” principles described in this report? The Main Street Silicon Valley Technical Advisory Committee and Policy Advisory Committee recommend the following ways that jurisdictions along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway can work together on improving the corridor with regard to economic vitality, quality of street and building design, and support for a diverse mix of auto-oriented and non-auto-oriented uses.

- Implement a partnership between Caltrans and multiple jurisdictions to expedite the review of improvement/development plans and to support local street-design options.
- Prepare a place-based retail analysis for multiple jurisdictions to define the appropriate location and mix for retail uses along the corridor.
- Provide a web-based regional clearinghouse for street improvements impacting the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.
- Develop a list of funding resources for planning, designing and constructing development and improvement projects.
- Prepare a “pattern book” for potential design guidelines appropriate for development and improvements along the corridor.
- Coordinate with the Grande Boulevard project and the City/County Association of Governments’ (C/CAG’s) T-Plus Grant in San Mateo County.
- Assist cities in defining a vision for the El Camino Real/Monterey Highway corridor.

Creating a true “Main Street Silicon Valley” will depend on regional collaboration that is sustained and responsive, and inclusive of the region’s many perspectives and interest that comprise the region. By bringing together individuals from across the public and private sectors—and from communities all along El Camino Real/Monterey Highway, the Main Street Silicon Valley has provided a foundation for the types of regional collaboration that will be needed to create and realize a new vision for this historic and still-crucial roadway.
Appendices

Appendix A: Definitions of Shared Issues

**Building Orientation and Form:** The execution of architecture and site design that support pedestrian activities, transit use and community revitalization

**Community Identity:** The identification of community-design elements and guidelines that promote a sense of place, including gateways, signage and architectural features

**Development Patterns:** The encouragement of appropriate density and intensity based on proximity to transit, site context and community identity/image

**Economic Function:** The ability of a local economy to respond to changing conditions at the regional and national scales without suffering from significant loss in the number of businesses or jobs

**Implementation:** The process and collaboration necessary to realize local and regional objectives through the approval of individual land-development and street-improvement projects

**Mixed-Use Development:** The integration of different uses vertically and/or horizontally on the same site or adjacent sites

**Neighborhood Preservation and Interface:** The management of land-use conflicts through control of traffic, parking, noise, defensible space and privacy measures

**Parcelfication:** The creation of developable sites, including implementation through redevelopment project areas, business improvement districts and special districts

**Parking:** The requirements and strategies for on-street, off-street and shared parking facilities, as well as for proximity and siting

**Public Policies and Process:** The effects of local laws and regulations (such as General Plans, Zoning Ordinances, Specific Plans, Encroachment Permits) on land use, development and design, including the impact of State/federal policies, cross-sector and cross-jurisdictional partnerships, and community participation

**Street Type and Improvements:** The provision of physical design and safety features for pedestrians, traffic, bicyclists and transit, including sidewalks and medians

**Streetscape Design:** The incorporation of street elements that focus on pedestrian scale and neighborhood rehabilitation/revitalization through public amenities, landscaping, underground utilities, pocket parks, plazas and sidewalks/pathways

**Traffic Operations:** The management of the flow of traffic, pedestrians, bicyclists and transit, including efforts to meet ITS and ADA requirements

**Transit:** The accommodation of bus services, Bus Rapid Transit, commuter rail and high-speed rail, including incentives for alternate transportation modes and coordination between regional service providers and local communities

**Transit-Oriented Development:** The integration of neighborhoods to include jobs, a variety of housing types/affordability, services, retail, recreation, active street uses, access to transit and pedestrian connections
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Jessica von Borck, City of Mountain View
John Weis, San Jose Redevelopment Agency

City, County and Transit Agency Staff

Atherton: Duncan Jones, James Robinson and Lisa Costa Sanders
Belmont: Ray Davis, Carlos DeMello, Craig Ewing, Brian Froelich and Dia Swan
Burlingame: Maureen Brooks and Margaret Monroe
Caltrans: Bijan Ahmadyade, Roland Au-Yeung, Jean Finney, Melissa Harmuth-Joshi, Keyhan Moghbel, Lyle Oehler, Mike Thomas and Carolyn Trunnell
Colma: Andrea Ouse
Daly City: Howard Lee, Tatum Motherhead and Mo Sharma
Gilroy: Karen Abrams, Melissa Durkin, Bill Lindsteadt, Gregg Polubinsky and Wendie Rooney
Los Altos: Abby Veeser and James Walgren
Menlo Park: Linda Heineck and Dave Johnson
Millbrae: Ralph Petty
Morgan Hill: Garrett Toy
Mountain View: Ellis Berns and Jessica von Borck
Palo Alto: Susan Arpan, Steve Emslie and Virginia Warheit
Redwood City: Mike Church, Bruce Liedstrand, Susan Moeller, Pat Webb and Jean Young
SamTrans/Caltrain: Corinne Goodrich and Beth Thomas
San Bruno: Aaron Aknin, George Foscardo, Mark Sullivan and Grant Wilson
San Carlos: Leslie Parks
San Jose: Ben Tripousis
San Mateo: Stephen Scott and Diana Whitecar
(City, County and Transit Agency Staff—continued)

San Mateo County: Mark Duino
Santa Clara: Ronald Garrett, Geoff Goodfellow, Carol McCarthy and Steve Yoshino
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority: Chris Augenstein
South San Francisco: Steve Carlson, Mike Lappen, Barry Nagel and Tom Sparks
Sunnyvale: Karen Davis, Barbara Keegan, Trudy Ryan and Connie Verceles

Main Street Silicon Valley Project Consultant Team

Carol Anne Painter, LEAD Consulting, Project Manager
Dena Belzer, Strategic Economics, Economist
Bethany Blank-Sebra, Information Specialist
Steven Bliss, Technical Writer
Terry Bottomley, Bottomley Associates, Urban Design & City Planning, Urban Designer
Mark Spencer, DKS Associates, Traffic Engineer

The Consultant Team would like to thank Patricia Camacho of DKS Associates, Gina Chavez of Bottomley Associates and Wells Lawson of Strategic Economics for their significant contributions to this project and its reports.

Joint Venture Staff

Russell Hancock, President & CEO
Jason Arias, Office and Program Assistant
Lisa Bruner, Executive Assistant
Linda Holroyd, Director of Marketing and Business Development

Economic Development Roundtable (EDRT) Liaisons

Susan Arpan, City of Palo Alto
Ellis Berns, City of Mountain View
Leslie Parks, City of San Carlos
Garrett Toy, City of Morgan Hill
Connie Verceles, City of Sunnyvale
Diana Whitecar, City of San Mateo
Pat Webb, City of Redwood City
## Appendix C: Sample Checklist for a Place-Based Retail Analysis

### Place Analysis: Criteria for Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>INCLUDED Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage or Dwelling Units (estimate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-Use Pattern (in district and surrounding area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity/ Concentration of Surrounding Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Housing Character (multi vs. single-family)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Density (if possible within .5 mile radius)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height/ Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or Underutilized Lots and Storefronts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities or Attractions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Cultural Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/ Medical Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Streetscape/ Pedestrian Amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/ Recreational Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/ Walking Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Physical Change or Change in Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Supply Analysis: Criteria for Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>INCLUDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Type (e.g. local-serving retail)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality (note foot traffic, talk to owner/manager)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Uses (interaction of uses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/ Regional/ Chain/ Local Retailers (percentage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Levels and Vacancies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Turnover/ Shifts in Tenancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Inquiries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Local Brokers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitive Supply (distance, square footage and general retail mix)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Shopping Centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niche Retail Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Neighborhood Centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand Analysis: Criteria for Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>INCLUDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Demographics (primary/ secondary trade areas and change)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household (HH) and Per Capita Median Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age and Distribution of Age Cohorts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and Ethnic Make-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer, Lessee, Consumer Profiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Sources of Demand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime Population (employment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors/ Tourists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount and Type of Unmet Consumer Demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Consultant Team Qualifications

Carol Anne Painter, Project Manager
Carol Anne Painter is President of LEAD Consulting, Inc., a San Jose-based firm specializing in planning services for commercial and residential development entitlement, due diligence for property acquisition, and project management. LEAD Consulting also offers expert witness and contract planning services. Carol Anne has over 25 years of experience in both the public and private sectors. Major projects include the Evergreen Specific Plan, campus developments for Cisco Systems and Hewlett-Packard, the Santana Row mixed-use project in San Jose and project management for Terra Bay in South San Francisco. In the past six years, Carol Anne has worked with developers to secure approval for over 1,500 market-rate and affordable housing units and more than 100 acres of commercial development in cities such as Watsonville, Richmond and Hayward. Carol Anne has a Master of Urban and Regional Planning from the University of Southern California.

Dena Belzer, Economist
Dena Belzer, Principal of Strategic Economics, specializes in connecting regional economic and demographic growth trends to real estate development activity and local policy initiatives. Dena’s work draws on a traditional urban economics framework and innovative analytical techniques to provide strategies for addressing growth and development-related issues. Dena is an expert on transit-oriented development, mixed-use districts and local-serving retail attraction strategies. She also serves as a core partner on the National Center for Transit-Oriented Development. Dena received a Master of City Planning from University of California, Berkeley, and a B.A in psychology from Pitzer College. She is currently President of the Board of Community Economics Inc., a nonprofit organization specializing in affordable housing finance.

Bethany Blank-Sebra, Information Specialist
Bethany Blank-Sebra is an independent consultant, specializing in information retrieval and marketing services in the Bay Area. Her experience includes providing public communications and information for several affordable housing developments on behalf of San Jose’s Department of Housing. Prior to coordinating the information retrieval for the 20 cities, four transportation agencies and two counties encompassed by the Main Street Silicon Valley project, Bethany received her bachelor's degree in marketing from Brigham Young University. She currently works as a Marketing Programs Associate for GRIC Communications, Inc.

Steven Bliss, Technical Writer
Steven Bliss is an independent writer, editor and researcher, providing editorial and consulting services to nonprofit and public-sector clients in northern California, Washington, D.C. and New York. Steven has authored or contributed to major studies, white papers and policy briefs on urban development, regionalism, housing, welfare reform, education and youth development. Over the past three years, he has edited several Joint Venture publications, including the Index of Silicon Valley (2002 and 2003 editions); the 2002 Workforce Study; and Preparing for the Next Silicon Valley: Opportunities and Choices. Steven graduated from Northwestern University and has a master's degree in literature from University of California, Santa Cruz.

Terry Bottomley, Urban Designer
Terry Bottomley is Principal of Bottomley Associates Urban Design & City Planning, based in Oakland, California. He has over 20 years of experience preparing land-use and development master plans, development standards and design guidelines, and concept design and construction drawings for streets and public spaces. Recent work in Silicon Valley includes three neighborhood improvement plans for San Jose’s Strong Neighborhoods Initiative and the Bayfront Area Visioning Study for Redwood City. He is currently working with the City of Palo Alto on a design plan for the Charleston/Arastradero corridor. From 1988 to 1999, Terry was managing principal at Freedman Tung & Bottomley Urban Design in San Francisco.

Mark Spencer, Traffic Engineer
Mark Spencer is a Principal of DKS Associates, one of the largest transportation engineering and planning firms in the United States. He is a registered Traffic Engineer in California with over 14 years of experience and manages the DKS San Jose office. Mark specializes in regional traffic analysis for environmental studies and development and has managed transportation studies for projects throughout the Bay Area. He has worked extensively with agencies along El Camino Real. Recent projects include the San Jose Airport Master Plan EIR/EIS, the Valparaiso Avenue Corridor Study in Menlo Park and Atherton, the Santa Clara County Fairgrounds Revitalization Plan, and the Park Station Transportation Study in South San Francisco.
**JOINT VENTURE: SILICON VALLEY NETWORK** is a regional, nonpartisan voice and a civic catalyst for solutions to problems that impact all sectors of the community. Joint Venture brings together established and emerging leaders from business, labor, government, education, nonprofits, and the broader community to build a sustainable region that competes globally. We work to promote economic prosperity and improve the quality of life in the region, making Silicon Valley a better place to live and work. Joint Venture welcomes your participation in its various activities, which are described in detail at www.jointventure.org

**Joint Venture Board of Directors**

**Co-Chairs**
Rebecca Guerra, Extreme Networks
Martha Kanter, Foothill-De Anza Community College District

**Directors**
Frank Benest, City of Palo Alto
Greg Belanger, Comerica Bank
Peter Campagna, Intuit
Jim Cunneen, San Jose Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce
Ann DeBusk, Founder, American Leadership Forum - Silicon Valley
Gordon Earle, Stanford University
Magda Escobar, Plugged In
Hon. Liz Figueroa, California State Senator, District 10
Vintage Foster, Silicon Valley San Jose Business Journal
Dale Fuller, Borland Software
Hon. Rose Jacobs Gibson, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Peter Giles, The Tech Museum of Innovation
Deirdre Hanford, Synopsys
Kevin Healy, PricewaterhouseCoopers
Gary Hooper, Genencor International
Mark Jensen, Deloitte & Touche
Harry Kellogg, Silicon Valley Bank
W. Keith Kennedy, Retired CEO, Watkins-Johnson
Paul Locatelli, Santa Clara University
Joseph Parisi, Therma
Dan Perez, former Executive Vice President, Solectron
Paul Roche, McKinsey & Company
Neil Struthers, Building & Construction Trades Council
Hon. John Vasconcellos, California State Senate
Colleen B. Wilcox, Santa Clara County Office of Education
Linda Williams, Planned Parenthood Mar Monte

**President & CEO**
Russell Hancock

**Directors Emeriti**
Hon. Susan Hammer
Jay T. Harris
J. Michael Patterson
Lew Platt