

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 5:44 PM
To: Christina Horrisberger <chorrisberger@cityofsanmateo.org>; General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>; Julia Klein <jklein@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Re: confusion about GP meeting attachments SMDJ

Thank you Christine for your response. I support any efforts you can make to be sure Curtis Driscoll is understanding what is going on in this process, since he will be filing his column with whatever his takeaways from various meetings will be. He has not even been with the DJ for a year, so lots of info is always totally brand new to him. I remember one comment he made to me about trying to follow the workshop meetings presentations and comments and furiously trying to take notes at the same time. I think it is easy to get a bit overwhelmed in that kind of process.

Thinking back on the meeting I participated in (the first one), there were so many times that the lead consultant, and others running the various parts, apologized for how much info was being thrown at us, and how much there was to take in for such a relatively short time. I think any time someone in charge can imagine themselves likely to have to say something like that, it is a big tip off that way too much is being attempted in way too short a time.

I only attended the first meeting, not the second one on Saturday. Good that you tried to adjust that meeting based on what felt as if it went well (and possibly not) in the first meeting. I did not try to make the second one. Frankly, after some of these frustrating experiences, my definite feeling is "please don't make me do that again!" But of course, when we get to the next step I will still be there.

When is the third workshop going to be held? We could help get the word out.

Thanks again for your response.

Karen Herrel

-----Original Message-----

From: Christina Horrisberger <chorrisberger@cityofsanmateo.org>
To: 'q444frontdoor@aol.com' [REDACTED] General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>; Julia Klein <jklein@cityofsanmateo.org>
Sent: Wed, Apr 28, 2021 4:20 pm
Subject: RE: confusion about GP meeting attachments SMDJ

Hello—

Thank you for your feedback and sorry for the tardy reply. I did see the article. I was unaware when I spoke to Curtis that he was unclear about the process, and only answered his questions. Next time I will make sure to confirm understanding first.

As for your input on the workshop, it is appreciated. Although we received positive feedback from attendees overall, we did hear from some whose impressions were similar to yours. We also recognized things we could have improved upon in the first workshop and made refinements to the second one. Were you at one or both? I am curious to know if you found the changes we made helpful. We clarified our question, provided examples of the types of responses we are seeking, provided more examples of land use types, put more in the presentation to allow more time in the rooms, and simplified the language we used in our presentation. Although we'd only planned to have two of these workshops, we are adding another to ensure anyone who felt rushed or confused has another chance to participate in a workshop in this leg of the process, in addition to having access to the survey.

Christina

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: Thursday, April 22, 2021 4:45 PM

To: General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>; Julia Klein <jklein@cityofsanmateo.org>; Christina Horrisberger <chorrisberger@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: Fwd: confusion about GP meeting attachments SMDJ

Hello Linda, Julia and Christina,

I don't know if you read Curtis Driscoll's article in last weekend's (4/17) San Mateo Daily Journal. It was on the front page and headlined San Mateo Gets Feedback on GP. Unfortunately, as you read the article, Curtis more and more confuses and conflates the material presented for Circulation options A, B, C and the land use scenarios A, B, and C. He gives more details about the circulation options, but ties it to making choices of land use alternatives.

This fairly predictable confusion between the various materials presented, and the choices they might represent, is exactly what I was concerned about when I emailed the city before the meeting (see the thread below). Although Linda's response was that the two sets of materials were independent, that was not mentioned to the attendees and it is clear that at least one person was confused. Unfortunately, that person is a newspaper reporter.

Because I had this concern, I called Curtis this week. We had a very pleasant conversation, and we talked through that he thought there was the connection and then what I was told about it. I forwarded him the thread below. I believe he is a bit clearer on the way the materials have been constructed and presented, and will be able to write more accurately the next time he picks up this issue. Let's hope!

Nevertheless, I am very disappointed that any such confusion was enabled by something as simple as the way the materials were named and how they were presented and explained. If Curtis was confused, how about the rest of the attendees? It was a very fast paced meeting with lots of information thrown at us. And half of the attendees there for the first time. Who knows what others think about circulation versus (or with) land use decisions?

This GP process needs to be as productive as possible, but this does not help. I hope that this can be clarified very soon, and that any future presentation do not allow for this kind of misunderstanding and confusion again.

Thanks.

Karen Herrel

-----Original Message-----

From: General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>

To: [REDACTED] General Plan

<generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>

Sent: Thu, Apr 15, 2021 4:45 pm

Subject: RE: ? about attachments for tonight

Hi Karen,

Correct, we are reviewing the draft land use alternatives and circulation alternatives separately. They are not linked and the discussions for the two topics will be independent. I hope that is helpful.

Thanks,
Linda



Strive San Mateo | General Plan

Planning Division | Community Development Department
330 W. 20th Ave., San Mateo, CA 94403
650-522-7225 | generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org



From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 3:13 PM
To: General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Re: ? about attachments for tonight

Hello Julia, Linda et all,

I have opened and saved/printed off much of what has been provided for tonight. Thank you.

I have a question you could perhaps clarify for me, and everyone, before the group goes into the breakout groups. I have the already set (development) Alternative Scenarios A, B and C. I also have the Circulation Alternatives A, B, and C. I am assuming that the duplication in naming does not indicate that preferring development alternate B, for example, means that a person has to prefer circulation alternative B. In other words, are the two groups linked by their titles, or are they independent? If independent, perhaps the circulation choices could be named using a different means (1, 2, 3 or II, II, III, or even J, K, L or some such)

I didn't want to take the group's time with this question during the meeting itself. .

Thanks.

Karen Herrel

* PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is confidential and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments from your computer. Thank you.