

Wendy Lao

From: Michael Nash <mnash900@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 9:30 AM
To: General Plan
Cc: Eric Rodriguez; Rick Bonilla; Mallory Ellen; Lee Amourance; Robbins Cliff; Loraine Adam; Ramiro Maldonado Jr.; Kohar Kojayan; Julia Klein; Patrice Olds
Subject: Genreal Plan Meeting

Dear General Plan Subcommittee:

First, let me compliment you on the reset of the General Plan process and on the new vision statement. It is a significant improvement.

The new "Vision and Values" document is very good. I particularly liked the Diversity column, yet the Balance, Inclusivity, Prosperity and Resiliency Columns are also clear and powerful in the vision they create.

I would ask for one addition. Please include a reference to education, recreation and cultural activities in the Prosperity section. The City is tending toward denser housing and less vehicular transportation and the belief is that a well designed City will have jobs within walking or biking distance of homes. The theory also includes having retail establishments, services, cultural and recreational facilities also within walking or biking distance. For this reason, the General Plan has a responsibility to support the elements that can deliver an attractive community that is less car dependent. Transportation systems could not support the projected Peninsula population if people had to drive or ride transit to recreational and cultural activities because there are none in their local environment.

Further, as San Mateo begins the development of a rehabilitation strategy for its Parks & Recreational facilities, it would be remiss if the population's needs for recreation in the new land use plan are not factored into the facilities strategy for the City.

I also wanted to applaud the plan to improve the outreach process. However, I am concerned that the process mentioned does not define who the City wants to hear from as it gathers opinions. If there is no clarity as to who the City wants to hear from, how will you ever know when you have done the job?

It would not be difficult to define the population in terms of its characteristics and to tally responses until a significant number of people from each group are recorded.

Here is an example of what I am suggesting. This is not a specific recommendation, only an illustration of the concept. The actual matrix for San Mateo would be different.

Sample Outreach Goal Matrix

AGE/Income	Asian		Caucasian		Hispanic		Other Group		#
	M	F	M	F	M	F	F	F	
Young Low income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200
Middle Income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200
Upper Income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200
Middle Low Income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200
Midle Income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200

Upper Income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200
Older Low Income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200
Midle Income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200
Upper Income	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	200
Total	225	225	225	225	225	225	225	225	1800

With this level of specificity, the Subcommittee members and other organizations could direct their energies toward achieving the outreach goal for each important segment. The City has other dimensions to consider such as neighborhood and non-resident groups, but the principle remains the same. Each group of interest should be defined, priorities set and outreach directed toward polling the people noted.

I will not be able to attend the next General Plan meeting but will watch the video when I return from overseas. I hope you find this helpful.

Regards

Michael Nash
mnash900@yahoo.com
650 400 6274

Michael Nash
mnash900@gmail.com
650 400 6274