

From: [Diane Papan](#)
To: [Ellen Wang](#)
Cc: [Patrice Olds](#)
Subject: Re: GPS, study area
Date: Monday, August 19, 2019 8:07:21 AM

Thank you for your communication.

I am copying our City Clerk to ensure that it is made a part of the record on this matter.

With best regards,

Diane Papan

From: Ellen Wang [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2019 7:26 PM
To: Diane Papan <dpapan@cityofsanmateo.org>; Joe Goethals <jgoethals@cityofsanmateo.org>;
Maureen Freschet <mfreschet@cityofsanmateo.org>; Eric Rodriguez
<erodriguez@cityofsanmateo.org>; Rick Bonilla <RBonilla@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: GPS, study area

Dear City Council members,
This is for tomorrow night's meeting.

Look at the big picture

Add up the housing projects, which include affordable housing, that were recently built, are in the process of being built, or in the planning stage and you will find that San Mateo is meeting its fair share.

For some it seems too much too fast and others too little too slow.

I say SLOW DOWN the process of building more housing, analyze the affects now and into the future.

There are many consequences created by rapidly adding housing to a city.

More housing more people: more school age children in crowded public schools which create a poorer education.

More housing more people: waiting longer for an appointment with a doctor or at the emergency room. I had to wait several months to see a specialist.

More housing more people: going to the movies or a concert. Parks and fitness centers are crowded. A favorite restaurant can no longer be a last minute decision.

More housing more people: creates a need for more police and firemen.

More housing more people: as everyone has experienced creates traffic gridlock and crowded parking lots, spilling over onto streets, making driving challenging and hazardous.

More housing in areas that were once zoned for office buildings, retail or industrial uses will take away opportunities to work or use these services or products. Autobody shops and mechanics that I use near 20th and Palm come to mind.

City council members, please consider all the above (the quality of education, health care, leisure activities, public services, local travel and convenience), when too rapidly approving more

housing.

11 study areas outreach

I received lots of emails regarding General Plan/2040 meetings.

I received no postcards or phone calls. I saw no posters or flyers.

1% (1200/105,000) of San Mateo resident participation is sad and appalling. "A majority of participants were self described residents." I should hope so!!

However how many were in each of the 11 study areas?

Please reach out in more ways than just emails when these 11 areas are studied.

Participation of residents in these areas is especially important.

Range of housing units number requirements

City staff: 8,000-12,000

Housing Leadership Council: 23,900-25,300.

I had a career in finance/accounting and was a financial reporting manager of a national savings and loan. Numbers can easily be changed based on facts, estimates and assumptions.

Here are some questions you should be asking.

What is the source of the facts used? Are the estimates reasonably objective? Are some important variables left out?

The biggest assumption here is historical trend of unmet housing needs. Will it continue? For how long into the future?

Then to create an estimate, how far back in time was used (or should be used) to provide a rate for this trend? one year? 5 years average? 10 years average ? Since we are setting goals for 2040, should it be a 20 year average rate?

Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,

Ellen Wang