

From: Francie Souza [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2023 6:58 PM
To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>; City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>; General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Comments on General Plan

I am a resident of San Mateo and have additional comments on the General Plan, as outlined below:

4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

My comments relate to **POLICE** under Public Services in the General Plan.

It was noted that the SMPD staffing ratios of 1.07 sworn officers to 1,000 residents is below the national staffing average of 2.0 sworn personnel per 1,000 residents and expansion of SMPD facilities may be needed to accommodate increases in staffing to maintain response times. It was noted that the “proposed project” would increase demand on police protection services, but growth would occur incrementally, therefore minimizing the impact.

The EIR states...Payment of police protection impact fees and special taxes, consistency with the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions and compliance with the regulations would ensure that the SMPD is involved as future development is allowed under the proposed project. Though SMPD has indicated that existing stations would be inadequate to accommodate future needs, it has not yet developed any specific plans to construct new facilities. Therefore, it would be speculative to assess the physical effects of those future construction projects and the project’s potential contribution to those effects. Pursuant to Section 15145 of the State CEQA Guidelines, if a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, no further evaluation is required. *This doesn’t seem wise.*

With additional comments, it was concluded that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to police protection services and cumulative impacts would be less than significant and no further evaluation is required.

My request is that we do evaluate our police services more carefully **now** and determine how we can move toward proactively planning for this increase in demand that will naturally happen with the growth outlined in our state mandated housing plan. The approach in the General Plan seems to “kick the can down the road”. Already, police are stretched when it comes to proactively monitoring firework displays and other safety issues that have to be prioritized “out” for more serious issues.

Transportation, section 4.15-8

It appears on the map that 5th Avenue and 9th Avenue are designated as “Arterials”. As defined, Arterial streets are ‘signalized’ with higher capacity to accommodate traffic volumes offering continuous movement with coordinated and interconnected signal systems.

5th Avenue and 9th Avenue are neighborhood streets, with traffic circles on 5th to slow traffic and both streets serve as local streets in the Central Neighborhood, which include primarily single family/duplex homes. 5th Avenue is also proposed as a bicycle boulevard with traffic calming from S. Delaware to S.

Amphlett, so the Arterial designation is a conflict with the General Plan.

Delaware is also designated as an Arterial street in the Draft EIR, but also runs through the Sunnybrae neighborhood, including the area around Sunnybrae Elementary School which has a 15mph speed zone.

These Arterial street designations need to be reconsidered in order to protect our neighborhoods, the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists and children in school zones. The reclassification will also increase pollution in the Central Neighborhood which conflicts with our goal of neighborhoods free of environmental health hazards. Please do not reclassify 5th and 9th Avenues to Arterials.

Thank you for considering,

Frances Souza