

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2022 2:25 PM

**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>; Planning <planning@cityofsanmateo.org>

**Cc:** Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>

**Subject:** Comments for Planning Commission meeting 3/22/2022 - General Plan

Commissioners,

Tonight you review the extensive record that has come to you to use for providing a recommendation to the City Council on the preferred land use and circulation Scenario that should be included in the City's updated General Plan. Having spent 14 years on the Planning Commission, I recognize the very important role you are playing in this General Plan update. I also do not envy you reading and analyzing and evaluating and implementing the 256 page report that has been provided to you for tonight's meeting in making your decisions. I also encourage you to continue to hear the public on this important topic.

**I urge the Planning Commission to support land use alternative A.** It is the only scenario that respects the long public record of San Mateo's support for moderate growth. It is a scenario that, when given the current 3 choices, individual community members have given continuing support. It is the only scenario that has any chance of being sustainable with adequate water supplies for the foreseeable future. And it is the scenario that provides the best fiscal outcome for the city.

On the key issue of water, several attachments in the staff report makes it clear that a lack of future water supply is top of mind for most San Mateans. We know that many factors are driving Northern California into a situation with less and less water available for more and more users. The issue, as referenced in a single paragraph in the staff report, is acknowledged, but essentially deferred - or even dismissed as a city concern - as being something that Cal Water will address in their revised plans in 2025. We all want Cal Water to find solutions, but does it make sense for the city to plan for unnecessary and overambitious development, thus making Cal Water's planning more likely to fail?

From the start of this process, the public has been told that the 3 scenarios are not set in stone, that the final result could be modifications of them, or even a mix and match result. The detailed results of the process, provided in Placeworks' 31 page summary, make it clear that we have just such a situation. I chose to give my survey input at the individual area level, choosing the best description for each particular area, but taking advantage of being able to modify that choice with additional comments. Perhaps that kind of fine grained public input makes the city's job more difficult, but I think if you look at the quoted (and I recognize very abbreviated) comments that people took the time to write, you can see that input is all over the place. For every comment that seems to support one outcome, there is another that goes in a different direction. I urge you to keep the mix and match and heavily modify concept in front of you as you make your recommendations tonight.

If the now aggressive, hurried calendar does not allow you the time you should have to go through each study area and scenario in the detail it deserves, I strongly believe that land use scenario A is your best choice.

Karen Herrel  
long time San Mateo resident