

From: noreply@konveio.email <noreply@konveio.email>
Sent: Sunday, October 1, 2023 8:07 PM
To: General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: [Konveio Inquiry] This plan needs to be rewritten and revised

SanMateoCinderella [REDACTED] sent a message using the contact form at <https://strivesanmateo.konveio.com/contact>.

The city needs to put a beneficial pause on the General Plan & Draft EIR. We the People of the City of San Mateo have not had an ample opportunity to review and comment on this drastic change to our city. The magnitude of these plans is an assault on our way of life, liberty, pursuit of happiness, public health and safety.

The bulk of these plans have been put through during the unprecedented Covid-19 public health emergency. As many people were distracted by fearing for their lives, safety, family and businesses, we did not have the opportunity to thoroughly analyze and provide input on 1,000-page documents which have major ramifications to the city and its residents.

We the People of the City of San Mateo should not have to bear the burden of Sacramento and San Francisco's mismanagement. The common theme appears to be just sardine pack everyone into San Mateo and figure it out from there. There have been no plans to require the major tech companies to move some of their offices to neighboring cities in order to help alleviate traffic congestion in the Bay Area, given they are one of the leading causes of this traffic as the jobs are all concentrated in one area. It is easier for these trillion-dollar corporations to help the environment and shorten the commute times by spreading out their offices, instead of requiring the residents of San Mateo to accept lower environmental quality and thus lowering the quality of life. The city has failed to consider and advocate for this less harmful alternative and instead is assaulting our way of life and drastically changing the fabric of San Mateo.

During the 9/12/2023 Planning Commission meeting, one of the commissioners themselves said "I still have a lot of questions...air quality and noise impacts are being flagged as significant and unavoidable". The Environmental Impact Report, has looked at things such as air quality, pollution, noise, etc. Another commissioner claims "the greenhouse gas emissions will be lower by adopting the General Plan update", the public needs to verify these outrageous claims that contradict logic and common sense.

A consultant from ECORP Consulting confirms that "the updated plan does increase population and traffic, and that the plan allows for more population increase than the old plan", and a commissioner confirms. In addition, the consultants struggled to explain the logical contradictions and admitted that without modeling the existing plan they can't say whether the environmental impact would be the same as in the updated plan. Furthermore, the consultants admitted that "my assumption is that this (new) general plan is really looking to maximize the benefits of getting people out of cars". Since this seems to be the core principle, the entire assumptions and math need to be revisited.

During the same 9/12/2023 Planning commission comment period after returning from break, a commissioner said "I don't have any comments". A 1,000-page document and a commissioner doesn't comment at all on a plan that would fundamentally change the entire landscape of San Mateo? Then right after a commissioner says "I don't consider myself an expert in EIR (environmental impact reports), so I wouldn't, I don't feel confident enough to get into too many weeds with things where I just don't have much reason to disagree with what was written". This is precisely why we need to place a beneficial pause on such plans, since even the commissioners do not have the proper knowledge to weigh the impacts to the residents of San Mateo.

Thus, again these are major drastic changes to the city and its residents. To not give the public more time to educate themselves coming out of a historic pandemic is a travesty and breach of public trust. We are constantly told that the State of California has passed laws requiring densification of housing development. However, what we are not told and omitted from the conversation is this key sentence: "The city or county is not required to waive or reduce development standards that would cause a public health or safety problem, cause an environmental problem, harm historical property, or would be contrary to law", as stated in the California density bonus law.

The city has been forced to try and pass an \$8 increase to help fund and fix the crumbling infrastructure which led to major flooding recently. The city's budget does not have the capacity to

help support such population increase. Will the city be forced to raise taxes to help fund emergency services on already burdened residents or risk creating dangerous conditions of public property?

Like Gulliver tied down by thousands of little strings, we lose our freedom one regulation at a time