

A P P E N D I X G

C O M M E N T S R E C E I V E D O N T H E
D R A F T E I R



From: Olson, Brian@DOC
To: msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org
Cc: OLRA@DOC; OPR State Clearinghouse; Gomez, DarylAnne@DOC
Subject: Strive San Mateo General Plan 2040 and Climate Plan Update
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:42:41 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-z4z5gswd.png](#)
[Outlook-dw5qhtmf.png](#)
[Outlook-xol112ri.png](#)
[Outlook-Banner rea](#)

SCH Number

2022010160

Lead Agency

City of San Mateo

Document Title

Strive San Mateo General Plan 2040 and Climate Plan Update

Document Type

EIR - Draft EIR

Received

8/11/2023



Hello, Manira—

Thank you for providing the City's Draft EIR for the 2040 General Plan for our review. This email conveys the following recommendations from CGS concerning geologic issues within the General Plan documents:

GOV1-1

1. Liquefaction and Landside Hazards

- The Draft EIR discusses liquefaction and landsliding as potential hazards and provides a map of "Liquefaction Potential" and "Slope Failure Potential" based on the ABAG Hazard Viewer Map (Figure 4.6-4). CGS notes the slope failure potential depicted in Figure 4.6-4 represents "rainfall-induced" landsliding, not "earthquake-induced" landsliding, which is a related, but unique seismic hazard. The City should consider providing an additional discussion of this hazard.
- The City should supplement these sections with a discussion of official CGS Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation (EZRI) for both liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides, and consider providing a map of these official zones, which are more extensive than those provided by ABAG.

GOV1-2

- CGS maps and data are available here:

<https://maps-cnra-cadoc.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/cadoc::cgs-seismic-hazards-program-liquefaction-zones-1/about>

<https://maps-cnra-cadoc.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/cadoc::cgs-seismic-hazards-program-landslide-zones-doc-hosted/about>

GOV1-3

<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps>
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>

GOV1-4

- Cities and counties affected by EZRI must regulate certain development projects within them. The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (1990) also requires sellers of real property (and their agents) within a mapped hazard zone to disclose at the time of sale that the property lies within such a zone.

GOV1-5

2. Radon Hazards

- The Draft EIR does not address indoor radon gas hazards; however, part of the City is within an area mapped by CGS with "High Radon Potential".
- The City should provide a discussion of both the health hazards and geologic sources of radon

GOV1-6

GOV1-7

gas, and consider including a map of CGS radon potential zones within the proposed project from CGS Special Report 226, entitled "Radon Potential in San Mateo County, California".

- CGS maps and data are available here:

<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/radon/app/>

<https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/cadoc::cgs-mineral-hazards-indoor-radon-potential-zones/about>

<https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/mineral-hazards/radon>

GOV1-7
cont.

GOV1-8

<!--[if !vml]-->



<!-->



<!--[endif]--> <!--[if !vml]-->



<!--[endif]-->

@CAgeosurvey

FOLLOW US!

Brian Olson, CEG

Senior Engineering Geologist Seismic Hazards Program

<!--[if !vml]--> **14** Years of Public Service <!--[endif]-->

California Geological Survey

320 W. 4th Street, Suite 850, Los Angeles, CA 90013

M: (213) 507-1080

E: Brian.Olson@conservation.ca.gov

"A team is not a group of people who work together.

A team is a group of people who trust each other." – Simon Sinek

ONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

California Department of Transportation



DISTRICT 4
OFFICE OF REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PLANNING
P.O. BOX 23660, MS-10D | OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
www.dot.ca.gov

September 25, 2023

SCH #: 2022010160
GTS #: 04-SM-2022-00533
GTS ID: 25265
Co/Rt/Pm: SM/82/11.696

Manira Sandhir, Planning Manager
City of San Mateo
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403

Re: Strive San Mateo General Plan 2040 and Climate Plan Update – Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Dear Manira Sandhir:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Strive San Mateo General Plan 2040 and Climate Plan Update. We are committed to ensuring that impacts to the State’s multimodal transportation system and to our natural environment are identified and mitigated to support a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system.

GOV2-1

The Local Development Review (LDR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities. The following comments are based on our review of the August 2023 DEIR.

Project Understanding

The proposed project would build off the existing General Plan 2030 to provide a framework for land use, transportation, conservation decisions through the horizon year of 2040. It would also update the buildout projects used in the City’s Climate Action Plan to be consistent with the updated General Plan 2040.

GOV2-2

Travel Demand Analysis

With the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 743, Caltrans is focused on maximizing efficient development patterns, innovative travel demand reduction strategies, and multimodal improvements. For more information on how Caltrans assesses Transportation Impact Studies, please review Caltrans’ Transportation Impact Study Guide ([link](#)).

GOV2-3

The project's Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis and significance determination are undertaken in a manner consistent with the Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) Technical Advisory and the City's Transportation Impact Analysis guidelines. Per the VMT analysis in the DEIR, this project is found to have a less than significant VMT impact, therefore working towards meeting the State's VMT reduction goals.

GOV2-4

Page 4.15-16, "the proposed project is generally consistent with and would not obstruct the transit-related goals and policies in Plan Bay Area as it supports transit facilities and transit-oriented development". Please consider strengthening the language as the General Plan Update could be reinforced with stronger language to advance the stated transportation goals of Plan Bay Area and the State.

GOV2-5

Caltrans encourages policies and programs related to land use and circulation that increase density, improve regional accessibility, and reduce VMT. The City may also consider the following strategies to reduce VMT, in addition to the priority strategies identified in Table 4.7-3:

- Real-time transit information system
- Transit subsidies
- Unbundled parking requirement from housing developments

GOV2-6

For additional TDM options, please refer to the Federal Highway Administration's Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference, Chapter 8 ([link](#)).

Multimodal Transportation Planning

Please review and include the reference to the *Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Plan* (2021) and the *Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan* (2018) in the DEIR. These two plans studied existing conditions for walking and biking along and across the State Transportation Network (STN) in the nine-county Bay Area and developed a list of location-based and prioritized needs.

GOV2-7

Please note that any Complete Streets reference should be updated to reflect Caltrans Director's Policy 37 ([link](#)) that highlights the importance of addressing the needs of non-motorists and prioritizing space-efficient forms of mobility, while also facilitating goods movement in a manner with the least environmental and social impacts. This supersedes Deputy Directive 64-R1, and further builds upon its goals of focusing on the movement of people and goods.

GOV2-8

Integrated Transportation and Land Use Planning

Please review and include the reference to the current California Transportation Plan (CTP) in the DEIR.

GOV2-9

CTP 2050 envisions that the majority of new housing located near existing housing, jobs, and transit, and in close proximity to one another will reduce vehicle travel and greenhouse gas emissions, and be accessible and affordable for all Californians, including disadvantaged and low-income communities. The location, density, and affordability of future housing will dictate much of our future travel patterns, and our ability to achieve the vision outlined in CTP 2050. Caltrans encourages the City to consider and explore the potential of excess state-owned property for affordable housing development, per Executive Order N-06-19.

GOV2-9
Cont.

Equitable Access

If any Caltrans facilities are impacted by the project, those facilities must meet American Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards after project completion. As well, the project must maintain bicycle and pedestrian access during construction. These access considerations support Caltrans' equity mission to provide a safe, sustainable, and equitable transportation network for all users.

GOV2-10

Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Marley Mathews, Transportation Planner, via LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov.

GOV2-11

For future early coordination opportunities or project referrals, please contact LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



YUNSHENG LUO
Branch Chief, Local Development Review
Office of Regional and Community Planning

c: State Clearinghouse



**SAN MATEO
HERITAGE ALLIANCE**

September 25, 2023

Ms. Manira Sandhir, Planning Manager
City of San Mateo, Community Development Department
330 20th Ave.
San Mateo, CA 94403

Dear Ms. Sandhir:

Congratulations on completing the Draft EIR for the San Mateo Draft 2040 General Plan. It is a well written, visually appealing document.

The San Mateo Heritage Alliance appreciates that you have incorporated many of our comments on the General Plan policies to identify historic resources more broadly in San Mateo and use more appropriate terminology for the definition of historic resources.

ORG1-1

The Draft EIR Cultural Resources section, however, is incomplete. The section is therefore inadequate and must be revised and recirculated for public comment for these substantial reasons:

1. 4.4.1.2, Existing Conditions section is missing a description of at least two National Register of Historic Places eligible historic districts—Baywood and Yoshiko Yamanouchi House.
2. The impact discussion is missing an analysis of the project effects on historic districts.
3. The impact conclusion is not supported by the impact analysis.
4. General Plan policies are not reliable mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the significant adverse impacts that may be caused by the project. The City of San Mateo has failed to comply with its General Plan policies regarding historic resources for the past 25+ years.
5. CEQA is not a reliable mitigation measure for the significant adverse impacts that may be caused by the project. The City of San Mateo’s compliance with CEQA has been selective, and most often used to justify demolition and not protection of historic resources.

ORG1-2

ORG1-3

ORG1-4

ORG1-5

ORG1-6

We offer the following comments on the Draft EIR.

4.4 Cultural Resources

4.4.1.2 Existing Conditions

p. 4.4-9, para. 2: The existing conditions section is not complete because it does not include two documented historic districts:

1. The Baywood Historic District is bounded by Alameda de las Pulgas, Crystal Springs Road, Eaton Road, Virginia Avenue, Edinburgh Street, and Notre Dame.
2. The Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District is at 1007 East 5th Avenue.

ORG1-7

The City received the *Baywood Historic Asset Analysis* (Brandi 2022) in April 2022. This report identifies the historic context of the Baywood neighborhood, the boundary of the Baywood Historic District, and the criteria under which the Historic District is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. This report should be referenced in the EIR. In addition, San Mateo Heritage Alliance is submitting an

additional report on the Baywood Historic District that identifies the district boundaries, provides information on each property in the district, and identifies the contributors to the district and the properties that are not contributors.

The Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District has 9 resources on the property including 3 buildings, 3 sites, and 3 structures. This information should be included in the Draft EIR and the effects on the districts from increased adjacent traffic should be analyzed. The effects on the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District is potentially significant due to the increased levels of traffic and pollution.

ORG1-7
cont.

4.4.4.1 Regulatory Framework

The discussions of cultural resource regulations does not include the regulatory framework for historic districts. The treatment of historic districts may be different than the treatment of individual historic properties. It is important to understand the regulatory framework for districts because the City has four historic districts; two identified as part of the 1989 Historic Building Survey, the Baywood Historic District, and the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District.

ORG1-8

CULT 1:

Thank you for acknowledging the potential impact of incompatible new buildings adjacent to historic buildings or districts. The City's practice has been to only address the direct effects of the project on historic resources. The impact of new development on the Downtown Historic District has not been analyzed or mitigated (e.g., Prometheus building at the former Trag's site).

ORG1-9

p. 4.4-11, para. 2 states:

"properties in the EIR Study Area that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the National and California Registers would be categorized as historic resources even if they are not formally landmarked by the City."

This statement cannot be relied upon because the City has not followed these procedures. The City did not include the Baywood or Yamanouchi districts in this EIR. The City disregarded the Baywood historic district report (Brandi 2022) that outlined the boundaries of the district and identified Baywood as an eligible historic district, as well as a memo that indicated the property was a contributor to the district. The City did not treat the property as a historic resource and permitted demolition of the property without conducting the appropriate CEQA review.

ORG1-10

p. 4.4-11:

Policy CD 5.3: Historic Resources Definition. Define historic resources as buildings, structures, sites, and districts that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources, designated resources in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, and resources found to be eligible through documentation in a historic resources report.

The City currently treats contributors to the Downtown Historic District as historic resources. This definition of historic resources only include districts. The City Historic Resources Code, which only applies to the Downtown Historic District currently states:

ORG1-11

27.66.040 CONFORMANCE WITH STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES.

(a) City-wide. All exterior modifications of individually eligible and contributor buildings (e.g., exterior building additions and alterations) shall conform with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Structures, 1990 Edition.

This code implies contributors are treated as historic resources. Will contributors in new districts be required to follow the Secretary of Interior's guidelines for exterior modifications?

Please add "contributors to eligible historic districts" to the definition of historic resources in Policy CD 5.3, to be consistent with how Downtown historic resources are treated. Contributors to historic districts must be protected in order to protect the integrity of the district.

Please provide a reference or more information about the requirements of a historic resources report.

Impacts to Historic Districts

The impact analysis should address the potential for direct and indirect significant effects on eligible historic districts and their contexts, especially for areas that have not yet been fully surveyed. The Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District could be adversely affected by the proposed project, including increased traffic and the reconstruction of the 3rd/4th Avenue Interchange. Please revise the analysis to include an analysis of the impacts on the historic district.

The Aragon and San Mateo Park neighborhoods border El Camino Real development areas. Hayward Park borders the railroad development corridor and El Camino Real development corridor. The analysis is incomplete because it does not consider the potential for direct and indirect impacts on unsurveyed potential historic districts identified in the 1989 *Historic Building Survey*. The impact analysis should be revised to address this new impact.

General Plan policies are not a reliable means of mitigating potential significant adverse impacts to historic resources because the City fails to comply with its own policies.

- The City of San Mateo has for 13 years disregarded its adopted General Plan policies regarding historic resources.
- The City has failed to comply with current General Plan policy C/OS 8.2 Historic Districts. The policy requires the City to "Consider the protections of concentrations of buildings which convey the flavor of local historical periods or provide an atmosphere of exceptional architectural interest or integrity, after additional study." and "In consideration of future historic districts, specific regulations to maintain historic character **shall** be developed." The City continues to disregard this policy by refusing to acknowledge identified eligible historic districts and permitting demolition of historic resources to occur unabated and unaffected by its General Plan policies.
- The City has failed to comply with current General Plan policy C/OS 8.4 Inventory Maintenance. This policy directs the City to "Establish and maintain and inventory architecturally, culturally and historically significant structures and sites." It also warns that "without maintenance, the inventory becomes unreliable and unusable." For 34 years the City has failed to maintain or update the 1989 *Historic Building Survey* resulting in the continual and unabated loss of historic resources.

ORG1-11
cont.

ORG1-12

ORG1-13

Policy CD 5.7: Demolition Alternatives

Please add the requirement to identify demolition alternatives for contributors to a historic district.

ORG1-14

Action CD 5.8: Historic Resources Context Statements, Action CD 5.9: Historic Resources Survey, and Action CD 5.10: Historic Preservation Ordinance

These actions imply they will be conducted sequentially (Prepare neighborhood-specific historic context statements prior to updating the historic resources survey.) Please update the Historic Preservation Ordinance **first** to address the two new eligible historic districts (the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District and Baywood Historic District).

ORG1-15

p. 4.4-13 Significance without mitigation: Less than significant Conclusion.

The conclusion that the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse impact on historical resources is contrary to the discussion of the many ways the proposed project could have significant adverse impacts on historical resources:

- “Implementation of the proposed project could have the potential to directly impact cultural resources by altering land use regulations that govern these properties or surrounding sites.”
- “Potential impacts from future development on, or adjacent to, historical resources could lead to demolition...inappropriate modification...inappropriate new construction... incompatible new buildings.”
- “Development activities under the proposed project therefore have the potential to be incompatible with historical resources, which could be a significant impact.”
- “If new development were to directly impact existing resources, impacts on historical resources could be significant.”

ORG1-16

Based on the above statements from the impact discussion, the conclusion should be amended to read **“the proposed project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change to historical resources.”**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is not a reliable means of mitigating potential significant adverse impacts to historic resources.

CEQA does not prevent demolition of historic resources. The City can make overriding considerations that housing is more important than historic resources. The impact analysis does not support the conclusion of no significant impact with no mitigation. The Draft EIR (p. 4.4-13)states:

“Under CEQA, conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties would normally mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed General Plan is a program level document, it is not possible to determine whether individual projects under the proposed project would be able to conform with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. ... The requirement for subsequent CEQA review, pursuant to state law, would minimize the potential for new development to indirectly affect the significance of existing historical resources to the maximum extent practicable.”

ORG1-17

This statement suggests that some significant impacts may not be mitigated through compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards or through CEQA review. If no additional mitigation is imposed the project could result in significant unavoidable adverse effects. Additional mitigation measures should be presented.

Recirculation is Necessary

The Draft EIR should be recirculated in accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15088.5. Recirculation of an EIR Prior to Certification because the impact analysis is incomplete and new mitigation measures are necessary. The lack of the impact analysis and mitigation measures deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment.

ORG1-18

CULT-4

The proposed project would not, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, result in cumulative cultural resources impacts in the area.

The discussion under this impact does not describe the specific or even a general discussion of the number of historic resources lost through development to date. It is not possible to credibly assess cumulative impacts with no discussion of impacts to date.

The Downtown Historic District has been eroded on all sides:

- The entrance at Third Avenue and El Camino Real
- Prometheus building on Baldwin
- Redevelopment of Donut Delite and Talbots
- The 6-7 story buildings on 3rd and 4th east of the railroad.

ORG1-19

Please provide the number of downtown historic buildings and contributors modified or demolished to date. What is the cumulative impact threshold for losses of historic buildings in the historic districts, especially the Downtown Historic District? Mitigation is necessary for the potentially significant cumulative effects.

I look forward to reviewing the revised Draft EIR with the missing analyses and mitigation measures.

ORG1-20

Sincerely,

San Mateo Heritage Alliance



David D. Bohannon Organization T 650.345.8222
 Sixty 31st Avenue F 650.573.5457
 San Mateo, CA 94403-3404 W ddbo.com

September 25, 2023

[Sent via email: msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org]

Manira Sandhir
 Planning Manager
 City of San Mateo
 Community Development Department
 330 West 20th Avenue
 San Mateo, CA 94403

Re: San Mateo General Plan Update and Draft Environmental Impact Report Comments

Dear Manira:

On behalf of HSC Property Owner LLC, the owners of the Hillsdale Shopping Center and surrounding properties (Owners), we appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the Strive San Mateo General Plan Update (GPU) and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

As you may know, the Owners have embarked on a process to collect community input to reimagine the Hillsdale Shopping Center for its next evolution – from a shopping center into a great neighborhood with retail, homes, supporting commercial development and more. As part of this process, our team has reviewed the GPU and DEIR and supports the City’s goals and efforts in the GPU. In the spirit of collaboration, the Owners wish to submit the following comments for consideration on both the GPU and DEIR. Further, we request that these comments are considered in the implementation of the GPU, i.e. through zoning amendments or otherwise.

ORG2-1

GPU

1. Land Use Policy 6.2 [Hillsdale Shopping Center] – This policy allows redevelopment of the Hillsdale Shopping Center for a “mix of uses, including commercial, retail, office, hotel, and residential uses.” Given the market demand for research and development (R&D) uses, and the fact that R&D uses can provide important job generating uses that have the added benefit of “in office” employment that energizes mixed use areas, we request that this policy explicitly identifies that R&D uses are permitted. We also request that R&D is explicitly allowed in the Mixed Use designations.

2. Land Use Table LU-1 [Land Use Designations] – We note that the new designations identify height limitations by stories rather than building height. We

ORG2-2

request discussion of how these story limitations will be implemented in the implementing zoning. We'd like to ensure that if/when height is codified in feet, that it does not cause any surprises. We note that the actual height can vary depending on preferred ceiling heights for varying uses.

3. Circulation [new policy/action suggestion] – Consistent with efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) articulated in the GPU (for example, Action C 2.3 [Education and Outreach]: “pursue education for developers and employees about programs and strategies to reduce VMT, parking demand, and the resulting benefits” and Policy C 6.7 [Capital Improvement Program]: “Prioritize improvements that increase person throughput in project prioritization to reduce VMT”), we request the City take action to incorporate multi-modal improvements into the Capital Improvement Program so that developer-funded transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements will earn Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) credits based on Multimodal Level of Service criteria. We note that this is consistent with Zoning Code Section 27.13.090 which grants credits for improvements that are identified in the Transportation Improvement Fee Technical Report. This is an important step in implementing the transition from automobile focused improvements to multi-modal improvements.
4. Circulation [new policy/action suggestion] – We recommend that the General Plan reflects and expands policies in transit oriented plans, including the Rail Corridor Plan, that require applicants for new developments within one half mile of a major transit station prepare a parking demand study, rather than impose a specific parking ratio, in recognition of access to mass transit. We recommend that this policy is reflected in the GPU to ensure consistent implementation in transit oriented plans. We also note that this action would be consistent with the intent behind AB 2097, which largely eliminates parking requirements for projects in proximity to major transit.
5. Conservation Open Space Policy 7.2 [Acreage Standards] – This policy is to “[a]quire or accept for dedication two acres of neighborhood and community parks per 1,000 residents.” We note that this standard is highly land consumptive and places a heavy burden on development. If implemented conservatively, it can result in the loss of residential units, which are sorely needed to meet RHNA targets. We have a number of suggestions to make this policy feasible.
 - a. We request that a broad scope of open space is accepted, including plazas, paseos, parklets, trails, courtyards and amenity terraces. We understand that this is consistent with past practice.

- b. We request that developer funded park improvements that are included in the Parks Master Plan continue to receive credits from park fees.
- c. Finally, we recommend that this policy is implemented in consideration of park spaces provided in the same service area. For example, if ample parks have been provided in excess of the intended ratio in one service area, that should be considered in relation to other projects in the same service area.

6. Public Safety Facilities 4.3 [Building Electrification] – This policy is to “[r]equire electrification for new building stock and reduce fossil fuel usage for existing building stock at the time of building alteration.” We suggest that a feasibility standard is considered and that exceptions are allowed for affordable housing, commercial kitchens and R&D uses. An electrification requirement imposed on alterations to existing buildings could inhibit the ability and interest in altering existing uses. We anticipate that the alteration and preservation of existing uses, particularly affordable housing, would be encouraged and suggest that feasibility is considered in relation to an existing building alteration project. We understand that the San Mateo Sustainability and Infrastructure Commission is currently meeting to discuss and collect and discuss stakeholder input on the “Electrify San Mateo – Building for the Future: City of San Mateo Sustainable Buildings Strategy.” In particular, we understand the Commission is seeking input on the impacts of new requirements on existing buildings. Accordingly, we suggest that policy leaves room for stakeholder input and implementation flexibility.

With respect to new uses, a natural gas prohibition on some uses, particularly R&D and commercial kitchens, would pose real limitations on the ability to develop and market such uses. We note that other Bay Area cities have provided for exemptions. For example, Santa Clara exempts “L” occupancies (which includes laboratories), hotel laundries, commercial kitchens as well as other uses where there is “not an all-electric prescriptive compliance pathway”.¹ We recommend similar considerations in adopting electrification requirements.

7. Policy N 2.1 [Noise Regulation] – This policy is to “[r]egulate noise in San Mateo to prohibit noise that is annoying or injurious to community members.” We would like to ensure that there will still be an opportunity to request construction noise exceptions, pursuant to a City process, for limited periods of time.

¹ Santa Clara Code §15.36.040(b).

8. Policy N 2.2: [Minimize Noise Impacts] – This policy is to “[i]ncorporate necessary mitigation measures into new development design to minimize short-term noise impacts. Determine whether new development has the potential to result in a significant noise impact on existing development based on the following standards. Impacts will be analyzed based on long-term operational noise increases at the sensitive receptor property line, or new uses that generate noise levels at the sensitive receptor property line [above 5 dBA, with certain other additional requirements].” We suggest that existing ambient noise levels are considered in the implementation of exterior noise standards. For example, in one such example,² in the event the ambient noise level exceeds the otherwise specified noise standards, an “adjusted ambient noise level” is applied as the noise standard. In cases where the noise standard is adjusted due to a high ambient noise level, the noise standard shall not exceed the “adjusted ambient noise level,” or 70 dB(A), whichever is less. In cases where the ambient noise level is already greater than 70 dB(A), the ambient noise level is applied as the noise standard. We request a similar consideration and adjustments based on existing ambient noise levels.
9. Policy N 2.4: [Traffic Noise] – This policy is to “[r]ecognize projected increases in ambient noise levels resulting from future traffic increases, as shown on Figure N-2. Promote reduced traffic speeds and the installation of noise barriers or other methods to reduce traffic noise along highways and high volume roadways where noise-sensitive land uses (listed in Table N-1) [of the proposed General Plan] are adversely impacted by excessive noise levels (60 dBA [Ldn] or above).” We suggest that feasibility is considered when implementing this policy. There may be some instances when it is not feasible to install noise barriers given right-of-way or property ownership constraints and, therefore, suggest that this policy is implemented to the extent feasible.

ORG2-2
cont.

DEIR

1. Project Description and Appendix B [Projects Included in Buildout Projections] – We note that Table 3-1 [Proposed General Plan 2040 Buildout Projections] identifies the “total net change” in development from existing conditions. We request clarification on whether the site capacities assumed in the Buildout Projections reflect total capacity or net new capacity. It is well established under CEQA that using “net new” square footage reflects the true change in conditions

ORG2-3

² Orange Municipal Code, § 8.24.040©.

from existing/prior uses to the ultimate/future use conditions (14 Cal. Code Regs., § 15125, subd. (a)); *Fat v County of Sacramento* (2002) 97 CA4th 1270).

ORG2-3
cont.

2. Wildfire – For the sake of accuracy, we note that Figure 4.18-5, “Potential Evacuation Routes,” does not appear to show that 31st Avenue and 28th Avenue now connect under the Caltrain Tracks as a result of a recent grade separation project. These new road connections may provide additional Potential Evacuation Routes east of the Caltrain tracks.

ORG2-4

We thank you for your time and your consideration and your efforts on the GPU and DEIR.

ORG2-5

Sincerely,



David Bohannon
President & CEO

Cc: City Council (Citycouncil@cityofsanmateo.org)
Planning Commission (PlanningComission@cityofsanmateo.org)
Alex Khojikian (akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org)
Christina Horrisberger (chorrisberger@cityofsanmateo.org)
Zach Dahl (zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org)
Mazarin Vakharia (mvakharia@cityofsanmateo.org)
Chelsea Maclean (chelsea.maclean@hklaw.com)



**SAN MATEO
HERITAGE ALLIANCE**

November 1, 2023

City Council
City of San Mateo
330 W. 20th Ave.
San Mateo, CA 94403

SUBJECT: General Plan Policies Regarding Historic Resources, Historic Districts and Contributors

Dear City Council Members:

In previous submittals and meetings, the San Mateo Heritage Alliance has stressed the importance of continuing to treat buildings that contribute to historic districts (contributors) as historic resources. The current General Plan and Historic Resources Code includes contributors in the definition of historic resources.

We are concerned that subtle words changes in the 2040 General Plan are significantly changing City policy:

1. Changing the definition of historic resources to remove contributors to historic districts.
2. The word contributor in Chapter 10 Glossary has no bearing on policy
3. Changing preservation of historic districts from protecting concentrations of important buildings to protecting concentrations of historic buildings (meaning those buildings already evaluated and designated historic)

We request that the Council revisit the policies in the Community Design and Historic Resources Element and make the following changes:

Policy CD 5.1: Historic Preservation. Actively identify and preserve historic resources and concentrations of historic resources and concentrations of buildings which convey the flavor of local historical periods, are culturally significant, or provide an atmosphere of exceptional architectural interest or integrity, when they meet national, State, or local criteria. Historic resources include individual properties, districts, and sites that maintain San Mateo's sense of place and special identity, and enrich our understanding of the city's history and continuity with the past.

Policy CD 5-3: Historic Resources Definition. Define historic resources as buildings, structures, sites, and districts, and contributors to districts that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources, designated resources in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, and resources found to be eligible through documentation in a historic resources report.

These changes will ensure continued protection of historic districts and the buildings that make the districts special. Additional discussion is included in the attachment. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,


Laurie Hietter
President



ATTACHMENT

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES POLICIES

Definition of Historic Resources Should Include Contributors to Historic Districts

One of the goals of the San Mateo Heritage Alliance is to preserve and protect historic resources and the contributor buildings in historic districts. The City of Redwood City, San Francisco, Portland, and many other cities protect contributors in historic districts. The City’s current policies support protection of contributors in the Downtown and Glazenwood Historic Districts. The General Plan should be clear on this policy.

Only the historic *district* is the *historic resource* subject to CEQA. Contributors do not qualify as historic resources or the consideration provided historic resources. **The City has latitude to designate any important properties as historic resources. The City’s policies in the current General Plan and the Historic Resources Preservation Code currently support the protection of contributors as historic resources, as do many cities.**

The wording changes in the combined Policy CD 5.1 restrict the definition of historic resources and protection to only those resources that are individually eligible for listing on the State or National Register, which is a very high bar to achieve protection. There is no protection at all (even the minimal consideration of a CEQA analysis) for contributor buildings in a district until the point where so many buildings in the district are altered that the historic integrity is lost.

ORG3-2

The current 2030 General Plan defines historic resources as:

C/OS 8.1: Historic Preservation. Preserve, where feasible, historic buildings as follows:

d. Historic building shall mean buildings which are on or individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, or Downtown Historic District contributor buildings as designated in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, or as determined to be eligible through documentation contained in a historic resources report.

The 2040 General Plan revised the definition of historic resources to remove the word “contributor:”

Policy CD 5-3: Historic Resources Definition. Define historic resources as buildings, structures, sites, and districts that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources, designated resources in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, and resources found to be eligible through documentation in a historic resources report.

Deciding to treat contributors as historic resources is a policy decision. The language changes in the 2040 General Plan change the level of protection of buildings in historic districts, which is a significant impact not addressed in the Draft EIR. **A new significant impact is cause for recirculation of the Draft EIR.**



The goal to protect contributors to historic districts is consistent with the 2030 General Plan policy O/S 8.2:

C/OS 8.2: Historic Districts. Consider the protection of concentrations of buildings which convey the flavor of local historical periods or provide an atmosphere of exceptional architectural interest or integrity, after additional study.

ORG3-2
cont.

Definition of Historic District Changes

The Draft 2040 General Plan revised the policy to remove the word “districts,” and substituted “concentrations of historic resources” for “concentrations of buildings.” The policy now has a totally different meaning. The 2030 General Plan policy is to protect a group of important buildings. The new language in Policy CD 5.1/2 only protects groups of buildings that meet the definition of historic resources: those that are on or individually eligible for listing on the State or National Register.

2030 C/OS 8.1: Historic Preservation. Preserve, where feasible, historic buildings as follows:

d. Historic building shall mean buildings which are on or individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, or Downtown Historic District contributor buildings as designated in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, or as determined to be eligible through documentation contained in a historic resources report.

2040 Policy CD 5.2 Historic Resources Preservation. Actively identify and preserve concentrations of historic resources, which convey the flavor of local historical periods, are culturally significant, or provide an atmosphere of exceptional architectural interest or integrity, when they meet national, State, or local criteria.

The definition of Historic Resources in the 2040 General Plan Chapter 10 includes contributors only in Downtown and Glazenwood, and is a narrow definition of historic resources. As stated by Joanna Jansen (Placeworks) at the October 30 City Council meeting, the definitions in the Glossary do not represent the policies.

ORG3-3

2040 Chapter 10 Glossary: Historic Resource. A historic resource is a building, structure, site, or district that has one or more of the following characteristics:

- Listed in or determined to be on or individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources.
- Identified as a Downtown Historic District or Glazenwood Historic District contributor building as designated in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report.
- Determined to be eligible through documentation contained in a historic resources report.

Zoning Code includes Contributors

The City of San Mateo Zoning Code sections 27.66.020 Applicability, 27.66.040 Conformance with Standards and Guidelines and 27.66.060 Demolition all treat contributors as historic resources and in the same way as individually eligible properties.

27.66.020 APPLICABILITY.

(a) Historic Buildings and Downtown Historic District. The provisions of this chapter shall apply to all individually eligible buildings in the City, all individually eligible and contributor buildings within the



Downtown Specific Plan area, and all structures located in the Downtown Historic District, as adopted by resolution of the City Council.

(b) The City Council by resolution may add to the provisions of this chapter any building which it finds meets the criteria of contributing to the historic importance of downtown and the City. Such an action shall be based on National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources criteria and documented in a form consistent with the City of San Mateo Historic Building Survey.

(c) Individually Eligible and Contributor Buildings. For the purposes of this chapter, the terms "individually eligible building" shall mean those buildings as identified in the City of San Mateo General Plan. "Contributor building" shall mean those buildings identified as such and located within the Downtown Historic District as adopted by resolution of the City Council and identified in the City of San Mateo General Plan.

(d) For the purposes of this chapter, the terms "individually eligible building" and "contributor building" and "Downtown Historic District" shall mean those buildings and district identified as such by resolution of the City Council or identified in the City of San Mateo Downtown Specific Plan.

Discussion at 10/2 City Council Meeting

At the City Council Meeting on 10/2 the Council members expressed a lack of understanding about what contributors meant. It was stated that it does not matter if it is in the General Plan or in the implementation language to be addressed later in the ordinance. I strongly disagree. The City currently has a policy to treat contributors as historic resources. The new General Plan dilutes and changes the policy (see above).

We were disappointed staff did not describe what contributors mean and that they have no protection under the current language. That discussion would have allowed the City Council to make an informed decision at the time. **We request the City Council revisit these policies.**

ORG3-3
cont.

Updating the Historic Preservation Ordinance

I understand that the City will be updating the Historic Preservation Ordinance next year but I believe the conversation of historic preservation policy in the General Plan 2040 is very relevant right now and should not be delayed to the implementation phase. The General Plan is the place to define policies.

Updating the City Website Regarding Historic Districts

We understand staff will be updating the City Website with more information about what a historic district contributor is and the ramifications of a property being designated. That is good news for the Baywood community. Many people are looking to the City for clarification of what it means to be in a Historic District. Why can't the City tell us now? Either contributors are protected or they are not. The current plan protects them. The slight changes in the wording in the 2040 General Plan removes the protection.

Demolition Policies

Policy CD 5.7 Demolition Alternatives. Require an applicant to submit alternatives to preserve a historic resource as part of any planning application that proposes full demolition. Implement preservation methods unless health and safety requirements cannot be met or the City Council makes a finding explaining the specific reasons why the social, economic, legal, technical, or other beneficial aspects of the proposed demolition outweigh the unavoidable adverse impacts to the historic resource. If a designated historic resource cannot be preserved, require City approval before the demolition of a historic resource.



**SAN MATEO
HERITAGE ALLIANCE**

What is the definition of demolition for this policy? Leaving one wall is near total demolition. Requiring an alternatives analysis is a good idea. The staff should be empowered to evaluate the alternatives provided by the applicant for veracity, feasibility, and adequacy. There should also be a requirement for mitigation measures. The language should be clarified to add contributors to the definition of historic resources.

ORG3-3
cont.

From: Rowan Paul <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2023 7:33 AM
To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Height limits in San Mateo

Dear City of San Mateo,

I am very concerned about the changed building height limits for new construction.

PUB1-1

Already for our East 5th avenue house. We have lost sunlight due to the new affordable housing building that came up with more floors than was in the original design that was approved. This is very concerning for the town if this continues.

For the 4th Street building that is coming up and others in the future, I am very concerned about the increased density resulting increased traffic. Increased crime increase noise, decrease sunlight for neighborhoods, and generally a lack of correspondingly increasing infrastructure such as parking, policing, file education, electricity, plumbing, etc. That typically does not keep up with the density increase.

PUB1-2

San Mateo is not San Francisco or San Jose. I do not want it to turn into Redwood City which has turned into a personality deficient overcrowded downtown with significantly more crime than San Mateo.

Please keep the buildings below five floors, preferably one to three floors.

PUB1-3

I am welcome to discussion.

Thank you

Rowan Paul, M.D.
Regenerative Orthopaedics and Sports Medicine

Rowan V Paul M.D., INC
RegenCore Method



Head Team Physician San Francisco Ballet
Assistant Professor Geisel Dartmouth School of Medicine

CHINESE PROVERB
The inferior physician treats the disease once it occurs.
The mediocre physician prevents the disease from coming back.
The superior physician prevents the disease from ever occurring.

HIPAA: The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information, including patient information protected by federal and state privacy laws. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution, or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: noreply@konveio.email <noreply@konveio.email>
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2023 12:01 PM
To: General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: [Konveio Inquiry] Land Use map & densities

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

As a resident of Central San Mateo, I am requesting "RESIDENTIAL LOW I" be used on the south side of E. 4th Avenue, both sides of E. 5th Avenue from S. Delaware to S. Amphlett and on the West side of S. Delaware from E. 5th - 9th Avenue. This is more compatible with our current neighborhood and will help protect and preserve our neighborhood and reduce demolition of our single family homes and small duplexes. This will also support the General Plan's vision to "Enhance San Mateo's Neighborhood Fabric and Quality of Life." It will also address the Plan's goal of preservation of historic areas, as these streets are predominantly beautiful pre-war homes and duplexes which include Craftsmen, Spanish Revival, Tudor Revival and Victorian styles of architecture.

PUB2-1

From: Jerry Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2023 11:54 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Do not reclassify 5th and 9th Avenues to Arterials

There are 10,210 vehicles a day on 5th Avenue that's just too much traffic. Whatsmore, the Nelson Nygaard Central Neighborhood Long Term Strategy January 2006, recommended traffic circles on 5th and 9th Avenues. 5th Avenue is currently a narrow Local street and 9th Avenue is a Collector. We need to keep 5th Avenue as a local street from S Delaware to S Amphlett and keep 9th Avenue as a Collector from S Delaware to S Amphlett. It would also be a good idea to reclassify S Humboldt as a local street from 4th Avenue to 9th Avenue. 5th Avenue is a proposed Bike route which conflicts with the new re-classification. It is currently impossible for me to find parking on my own street South Eldorado. I mostly need to park on 5th Ave. Traffic has already been generated, especially along 4th and 5th Avenues due to the new development in downtown San Mateo. Traffic and trucks west of the Railroad should be route through El Camino Real, 92 and 101 the State Highways, not through 4th, 5th, and 9th Avenues. Residential parking is already a nightmare.

PUB3-1

We have requested traffic calming since 1991.

How can 5th Avenue, a proposed bicycle route exist without traffic calming from S Delaware to S Amphlett? This new classification to Arterial is simply a conflict to the General Plan.

Jerry Davis
[REDACTED]

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:

PUB4-1

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.*

PUB4-2

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.

PUB4-3

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

PUB4-3
cont.

From: David Light [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 10:13 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>; Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>; City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Comments on San Mateo General Plan Draft EIR

Dear San Mateo Planning Commission,

I would like to comment on sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Draft General Plan 2040.

PUB5-1

There is a seismic hazard map in Section 4.6 on Geology and Soils showing the risk of soil liquefaction during a major earthquake. In this map of San Mateo the liquefaction risk is divided into two regions, a moderate risk region roughly from the downtown to Hwy 101 and a high risk region from Hwy 101 to the Bay. I am concerned that developers will certainly prefer to locate new multi-story projects on lower risk areas rather than on historic landfill areas that are at higher risk. However, many of our single family and duplex home neighborhoods are currently located on the desirable moderate risk liquefaction areas. These single family home neighborhoods should not be displaced by large developments. San Mateo needs to protect and preserve our charming older homes in single family and duplex neighborhoods that make San Mateo a desirable place to live.

PUB5-2

Section 4.7 on Greenhouse Gas Emissions discusses the need to reduce carbon dioxide from home appliances, cars and trucks. New developments located near Caltrain or SamTrans public transportation stops are routinely allowed to provide less parking spaces in their plans. However, there is a continued lack of cooperation between Caltrain and BART and there is low ridership on SamTrans and Caltrain, so our city planners need to be realistic about the use of public transportation by workers and residents in San Mateo. New building projects must provide adequate parking spaces and include parking with chargers for electric cars as a more realistic solution to greenhouse gas emissions.

PUB5-3

Thank you for considering my comments!

- David Light
[REDACTED]

September 12, 2023

To: Planning Commission

Subject: Comments on San Mateo General Plan Draft EIR

4.1 AESTHETICS

1. San Mateo deserves the best Objective Design Standards since there are many distinct neighborhood zones. Each neighborhood has its own visual and physical character and deserves respect. (Action CD 7.6: Objective Design Standards)

PUB6-1

2. Commercial development adjacent to residential. New infill building designs need to respect existing community character, using established building designs found in San Mateo. Encourage new developments to be compatible and harmonious with building types and architectural styles prevalent in San Mateo especially with the surrounding residential neighborhoods and Downtown Historic District. (Action CD 8.7)

PUB6-2

3. Project Design Review for proposed projects in the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods by a qualified historic preservation architect/consultant. Aesthetics of new illuminated contemporary glass buildings will have an impact on existing older neighborhoods and the Historic Downtown.

PUB6-3

4. Street lighting standards - More green street lamps are needed at dark residential intersections and longer residential blocks. This impacts safety for pedestrians and bicyclists in Equity Priority and underserved neighborhood areas in the Central Neighborhood and North Central Neighborhood.

PUB6-4

5. Title 25 Signs - protect the character of older residential neighborhoods, and prohibit neon commercial signs on new tall buildings facing towards surrounding residential neighborhoods at night. Housing is at the upper levels in new buildings. Prohibit older lighted outdoor billboards advertising alcohol in Equity Priority Neighborhoods along 101 which generate blight. (Policy CD 6.5: US 101 Frontage, Policy CD 6.6: Signage, Policy CD 6.10 Nighttime Lighting)

PUB6-5

6. Neighborhood Beautification - Encourage drought tolerant green landscaping in residential neighborhoods and commercial projects and expand the tree canopies in front yards and plant more street trees through street tree plan. Especially in Equity Priority Neighborhoods.

PUB6-6

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Neighborhood preservation and protections are needed. We need updated surveys in Central, North Central Neighborhoods, and other older neighborhoods as possible Historic Districts. We need protection of pre-war homes and small duplexes for middle and low-income families in Equity Priority Neighborhoods.

PUB6-7

2. Avoid demolition of homes in older neighborhoods. Preserve the visible exteriors from the street of existing Craftsmen, Spanish and Tudor Revival, and Victorian homes in older neighborhoods. Follow the existing patterns in the neighborhoods. The home need to be compatible with the existing neighborhood. Historic Resources - Page 189

PUB6-8

3. New infill building designs need to respect existing community character, using established building designs found in San Mateo. Encourage new developments to be compatible and harmonious with building types and architectural styles prevalent in San Mateo. Policy LU 4.2 - Quality of Downtown Development.

PUB6-9

4. There will be a new Historic District called the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House at 1007 East 5th Avenue. There are 9 resources on the property which include: 3 buildings, 3 sites, and 3 structures. Documentation will be provided for the Draft EIR, for protection from adverse environmental impacts.

PUB6-10

5. Demolition permits should be issued at the same time as building permits, and not before.

PUB6-11

4.11 NOISE - The impact of the build-out results in the unacceptable cumulative traffic noise within the EIR study areas. No mitigation measures are available according to the EIR.

PUB6-12

1. Existing noise contours - the areas along S Amphett/Idaho are in the 65-70 dab range. Since higher sound walls haven't been constructed along Highway 101, can the City plant more trees along the sound wall between Poplar and 3rd Avenue and 5th Avenue and Folkstone. North Central, Central, and Sunnybrae would benefit. Italian Cypress trees will grow to 30 feet and will require little maintenance. Ryland Bay in Bay Meadows has trees planted trees along the sound wall. Page 403.

PUB6-13

2. Temporary construction noise - stagger the projects so the noise, GHG, truck impacts, vibration impacts are not so severe. There will be 17 new projects in Area 4. Five projects have been completed in the Downtown. Can you take the trucks out through state highways through El Camino Real, 92, to 101 to reduce the dust and toxic pollution. There can be up to 90 trucks a day from Windy Hill's Block 21 project. We need to reduce construction impacts in Equity Priority Neighborhoods. Page 408

PUB6-14

3. Place more receptacles and monitors for noise, construction vibrations and water down dust impacts between 3rd, 4th and 5th Avenues in Central and North Central Neighborhoods to monitor adverse environmental impacts with multiple new construction projects. Noise monitors are lacking on the map on page 394.

PUB6-15

4. Reduce the heights to 3 stories in land-use map especially 4th & 5th Avenues and west side of S Delaware in the Central Neighborhood - (Residential Low II). By reducing heights in (Mixed Use High I and Mixed Use High II) in the Downtown, this will reduce the cut-through traffic volumes and the noise impacts in the Central and North Central Neighborhoods.

PUB6-16

4.15 TRANSPORTATION

1. What does the reconstruction of the 3rd/4th Avenue Interchange consist of? When will this occur? We need better lighting for the pedestrians and bicyclists on the overpass at night. Page 486

PUB6-17

2. Bicycle network - Bicycle boulevards include traffic calming and low traffic volumes such as 5th Avenue from S Delaware to S Amphlett. Keep 5th Avenue as a local street versus an Arterial. This is a conflict in the General Plan and needs to be addressed in the General Plan EIR. Page 494, Page 491 Proposed Street Classification Fig 4.15-1.

PUB6-18

3. 42% of GHG emissions in San Mateo originate from vehicular trips generated by San Mateo residents and businesses. Why does San Mateo generate such a high percentage of GHG emissions? We need solutions to increase deficiencies in transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes. Page 495

PUB6-19

4. The proposed project increases the use of roadway facilities in the EIR study study. This increases cut-through traffic volumes, GHG emissions, VMT and noise levels. Why are the current TDM strategies not working well?

PUB6-20

5. Policy C 6.5 states to implement neighborhood traffic calming on residential streets to reduce cut-through traffic volumes to address noise impacts. We need to implement traffic calming on 5th and 9th Avenues from S Delaware to S Amhlett. Do not reclassify these streets to Arterials. Equity Priority Neighborhoods need more traffic calming. Page 500

PUB6-21

6. Policy C 6.6 - Do not put a truck route on 5th Avenue from S Delaware to S Amphlett on 5th Avenue a proposed bike boulevard. Do not put a truck route on S Humboldt from 4th to 9th Avenue. We need to make the streets safer for the bicyclists on 5th and S Humboldt, to and from the 3rd/4th Avenue overpass.

PUB6-22

7. Reduce VMT, GHG emissions, traffic volumes, diesel particulates, and noise on 5th and 9th Avenue with traffic circles and keep the 4-way stop signs. San Mateo Glendale Village has traffic circles and 4-way stop signs. Nelson Nygaard suggested long narrow traffic circles on 9th Avenue in the 2006 Central Neighborhood Long Term Strategy report, along with the TAP studies. Page 501 Equity Priority Neighborhoods

PUB6-23

8. Action - C 3.9 - Currently the Downtown Mall is on B Street from 2nd to 3rd Avenues. Please extend this Pedestrian Mall from 3rd Avenue to 5th Avenue to reduce the traffic volumes. Page 502

PUB6-24

Other Transportation questions in the Draft EIR:

9. Increase Traffic Demand Measures (TDM) measures to reduce vehicle cut-through traffic through residential streets at 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 9th Avenues and reduce traffic noise.

PUB6-25

10. Reduce the heights to 3 stories in land-use map especially 4th & 5th Avenues and west side of S Delaware in the Central Neighborhood - (Residential Low II). By reducing heights in (Mixed Use High I and Mixed Use High II) in the Downtown, this will reduce the cut-through traffic volumes through these streets.

PUB6-26

11. What are the ADT volumes on Peninsula and Poplar Avenues from Delaware to S Humboldt? Are they included in the Draft EIR? It is difficult to locate current ADT traffic volumes information on streets in the Draft EIR. Traffic volumes needs to be listed in the Table of Contents.

PUB6-27

12. What is the percentage of Burlingame traffic that use the Poplar Exit in San Mateo?

PUB6-28

13. What is the percentage of traffic from the Poplar Exit will redirect to 3rd, 4th, and 5th Avenues if the Peninsula Interchange is built? Has that traffic volume been included in the ADT numbers for 3rd, 4th, 5th Avenues and S Humboldt in the Draft EIR for 2040?

PUB6
-29

14. We need a separate study for the 6 grade separations. Why do we need these many separations between 1st Avenue and 9th Avenues, if new developments are suppose to use Caltrain? Why doesn't Peninsula Avenue have a grade separation? Grade separations are designed to move more vehicular traffic and grade separations will increase VMT and diesel particulates in the Equity Priority Neighborhoods. What other mitigations do you propose to reduce these additional adverse environmental impacts?

PUB6-
30

15. Central has been an underserved neighborhood and the Equity Priority boundaries should be extended to 9th Avenue (both sides) and include streets from Delaware to S Amphlett. This Draft EIR for 2040 is proposing 5 arterials in the Central Neighborhood with no residential protections. We do not want any parking removed on 5th Avenue or adding more traffic lanes. We need to reduce the traffic noise and volume, decrease the VMT, and the diesel particulates. In 2006, the TAP studies gave us 2250 to 3390 cars on 5th and now this will increase to 10,210 ADT with existing and new projects. Do not reclassify 5th and 9th Avenues, but keep the current street classifications for these 2 streets.

PUB6-
31

16. What is causing traffic to decrease on 3rd and 4th Avenues between S Humboldt and Delaware and increase on 5th Avenue a local street east of S Delaware in these projections? Traffic has increased on S Delaware between 5th and 9th Avenues since 2015, and construction workers are now parking on S Delaware between 7th and 9th Avenues, and 7th Avenue between Delaware and Eldorado. Developers need a parking plan for their construction workers, or park on the vacant lot at Block 21. Page 993

PUB6
-32

17. Neighborhood Traffic Management Program is a living document and needs to be updated to better address cut-through traffic volumes. It needs more flexibility to address the traffic impacts on local, collector and arterials in residential neighborhoods.

PUB6
-33

Thank you.

Best,

Laurie Watanuki

From: Michael [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 3:57 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>; City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>; Killough, Maurine [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Francie Souza [REDACTED] David Light [REDACTED]
Subject: Comments on Draft EIR for Proposed General Plan 2040 Project

Commissioners - I'm writing to comment on the draft General Plan 2040 EIR, specifically sections 4-2 Air Quality, 4-3 Biological Resources, 4-5 Energy, 4-10 Land Use and Planning, and 4-13 Population and Housing.

PUB7-1

Overall, this EIR and the proposed General Plan make a lot of assumptions that people will not drive, and that transportation will be readily available - these are not reasonable current or foreseeable future realities. This EIR and the GP plan for unlikely and extreme levels of growth - 40%! - that will materially worsen air quality, traffic, and other key areas as indicated by "significant and unavoidable" determinations. Why are we planning for such absurd growth levels?

PUB7-2

This EIR and the proposed General Plan focus a lot on per capita statistics. We cannot lose sight of the absolute numbers here, however. Growth/worsening/increases in population

This EIR and the proposed General Plan claim throughout to require balancing jobs and office. Given the massive current imbalance, the focus should be almost entirely on housing. And not luxury, rental-only housing - affordable housing. And existing housing stock should be preserved as it is generally more affordable, and gets replaced (gentrified) by unaffordable housing, of which there is no shortage in San Mateo.

PUB7-3

Furthermore, this report uses a lot of non-committal language - "suggest", "promote", "support", "encourage". These are meaningless without concrete legislation, quantifiable targets that someone is accountable for, and funding to ensure aspirational plans are actually put in place, and impacts are truly understood and mitigated. We've seen way too many examples of pie-in-the-sky desires that never materialize because of language like this. You get your project, developers get rich - what do our neighborhoods get? Blight, noise, pollution, traffic, crime, displacement...the list goes on and on.

PUB7-4

Calls for "decarbonizing housing stock" are rife in this document. We have very serious doubts about rushing the timelines for electrification, given PG&E's inability to support existing demand, as well as significant costs to property owners for conversion if forced. This should be more of a carrot (incentive-based) than stick approach.

PUB7-5

Central will be heavily impacted by the proposed general plan, with distorted zoning categories that effectively eliminate instead of protect our neighborhoods (eg Residential Low I is 1-3 stories and 9 units/acre) - there needs to be a Residential Low 1a - 1-2 stories max category).

Roughly 1/3 of Central is considered an environmental justice/overburdened/equity priority community (Railroad to 101, 4th-5th), 100% is within 4 blocks. Central has a high percentage of rentals, a high concentration of construction projects, lower income residents, higher traffic volumes and accident rates, and is in the 70-80th percentile for air quality. As such, our neighborhood should be considered for any and all mitigation policies and actions tied to those communities listed in this EIR.

PUB7-6

Specifically with regard to 4-2 Air Quality:

Placement of AQ receptors and ongoing monitoring and remediation (page 25) - it is important these are funded, implemented, monitored and enforced. Language needs to be stronger, quantifiable, and should have funding and accountability defined.

PUB7-7

Central's Air Quality 70-80th percentile (page 27)

High (50th percentile) incidence of asthma (page 28)

High concentration of "permitted stationary sources" of pollutants (ie gas stations, diesel generators, body shops, dry cleaners, manufacturing/light industrial/car repair)

PUB7-8

Page 39 - mentions the expected buildout under the proposed project would exceed the Plan Bay Area 2040 regional growth projections for housing by 32 percent and population by 25 percent. Why aren't we scaling this back given population decreases in CA and the Bay Area, coupled with the significant impacts on our neighborhoods?

PUB7-9

Page 43 - calls for human scale design, active use facilities,

GD-6: develop and maintain an active urban fabric that reflects San Mateo's unique visual and architectural character.

PUB7-10

We need high quality, community-accepted, objective design standards and other mechanisms to ensure this happens beyond lip service.

Page 46 CD-3 - Protect heritage trees, street trees, street tree equity. We specifically asked that some trees from Block 21 be protected. Some had to be over 25 years old, and were healthy. Instead, they were all cut down, and now we have a dozen+ tree stumps and a dirt lot. We need to do better.

PUB7-11

Page 49 - VMT grows from 2.7m to 3.5 in 2040, an increase of nearly 30%! Regardless of VMT per capita, this will still worsen traffic and air quality.

PUB7-12

The proposed General Plan results in ~50% growth in air pollutants, ESP COMPARED TO NO PROJECT where they decrease (below). While we realize no project isn't viable, there is a more moderate growth path that maintains or even improves AQ.

PUB7-13

AQ-3-6 are all "significant and unavoidable" impacts. Any way you slice this, air quality gets worse!

Specifically with regard to 4-3 Biological Resources:

Again trees are highlighted - preservation, planting, replacement, street tree equity, etc. As per above, we need to do better.

PUB7-14

Specifically with regard to 4-5 Energy:

The EIR claims decreased usage per capita - but absolute usage will increase dramatically - upwards of 40%.

PUB7-15

Again with "decarbonizing housing stock" - We have very serious doubts about rushing the timelines for electrification, given PG&E's inability to support existing demand, as well as significant costs to property owners for conversion if forced. This should be more of a carrot (incentive-based) than stick approach.

PUB7-16

MTA/ABAG/CCAG etc focus on PDA/TPA - We do not have good transit, and it's not getting better. If anything it's getting worse with BART, CalTrain, and SamTrans ridership woes. Without T - ToD is just "D". Build the T, then let's talk about ToD, otherwise every assumption here is wrong. TDM - great idea in theory but there are numerous developments using TDM already. Where's the data on this - is it really working before we bet heavily on it?

PUB7-17

(Page 26) Goal C-5: Make transit a viable transportation option for the community by supporting frequent, reliable, cost-efficient, and connected service.

Policy C 5.1: Increase Transit Ridership. Support SamTrans and Caltrain in their efforts to increase transit ridership.

PUB7-18

The above is very aspirational. Again w the "supporting" verbiage - need concrete commitments/requirements

Specifically with regard to 4-10 Land Use and Planning:

PUB7-19

GP 2030 is cited a lot in here - is this a typo? Should be 2040?

Measure Y - This paragraph is incomplete, and Y does not allow for off-site development - requires on-site and no in-lieu fees paid. Please fix this so the public is properly and accurately informed.

PUB7-20

Proposed zoning categories are distorted and effectively eliminate single family zoning. Furthermore, categories don't mention state density bonus and state laws that grant additional stories and floor area BY RIGHT. This is not what San Mateans want. They support growth along with preservation of neighborhoods and historic assets. That is why Measure Y was passed, and has been renewed in essence, for 25 years. It is also important to realize that Measure Y helps affordable housing ACTUALLY GET BUILT, instead of allowing developers to pay significantly cheaper in-lieu fees to avoid it. Finally Measure Y stipulates that any zoning over the limits specified by Measure Y will require approval of the voters, which absent a good General Plan that is acceptable to a majority of voters, is unlikely to happen.

PUB7-21

Balance (Page 14) - restatement of same goal of balancing housing and office and housing diversity. This EIR and the proposed General Plan claim throughout to require balancing jobs and office. Given the massive current imbalance, the focus should be almost entirely on housing. And not luxury, rental-only housing - affordable housing. And existing housing stock should be preserved as it is generally more affordably, and gets replaced (gentrified) by unaffordable housing, of which there is no shortage in San Mateo.

PUB7-22

Specifically with regard to 4-13 Population and Housing:

Page 39 - As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR, the expected buildout under the proposed project would exceed the Plan Bay Area 2040 regional growth projections for housing by 32 percent and population by 25 percent. Why are we building so much given all the negative impacts?

PUB7-23

Page 12 - Community benefits - in addition to design standards, quantify and enumerate "community benefit" and get input from community as to what qualifies. "Give to get" from developers.

PUB7-24

Page 13 - Goal LU-13

Goal LU-13: Maintain Development Review and Building Permit processes that are comprehensive and efficient. § Policy LU 13.1: Development Review Process. Review development proposals and building permit applications in an efficient and timely manner while maintaining quality standards in accordance with City codes, policies, and regulations, and in compliance with State requirements.

PUB7-25

With regard to the above - the planning process should be efficient, but should NOT attempt to short-circuit public input, as this commission has suggest/attempted to do.

This EIR suggests that there wouldn't be displacement. The reality is that development almost always means displacement and gentrification. Existing affordable units being replaced by office and luxury housing doesn't help the affordability crisis or the jobs/housing imbalance.

PUB7-26

It's critical we get this right. Thank you for your consideration, and for considering the needs and desires of ALL San Mateans.

PUB7-27

Sincerely, Michael Weinbauer

From: Lisa Taner [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 2:10 PM
To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Failure of Draft General Plan EIR

All,

The enormity of detail in the General Plan Update and process is enough to spin heads, and the average resident would need to play a lot of catch up to understand some of the greater points, much less the finer ones. While staff has done a tremendous amount of work, and there has been an endeavor to work with the community, it is a glaring failure to note the limited options of only 'maximum growth' or 'no growth' as presently reflected in the Draft EIR.

The residents have been clear in their desire to have **moderate** growth in their city, and if this failure was known more widely, there would be a clamoring of upset folks knocking on your doors. There is time to rectify this. Please return to the drawing board and ensure that more options are fleshed out to incorporate the wishes of your taxpayers.

Sincerely,

Lisa Taner

PUB8-1

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:17 AM

To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>

Cc: Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>; City Mgr <citymgr@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: San Mateo General Plan Draft EIR, Project Alternatives

Hi Manira,

Attached please find my letter regarding the San Mateo General Plan Draft EIR. The focus of the letter is the absence of "reasonable" alternatives as required by CEQA.

Although Alex is not directly involved in the EIR process, I have copied him on this email because the lack of reasonable alternatives has a "thumb on the scale" effect regarding Measure Y and the clear preference of voters for moderate growth.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIR.

Keith Weber

San Mateo

September 19, 2023

TO: Manira Sandhir, Planning Manager
CC: Zachary Dahl, Interim Community Development Director
Alex Khojikian, City Manager

FROM: Keith Weber

SUBJECT: San Mateo General Plan Draft EIR, Project Alternatives

Dear Ms. Sandhir,

The Draft EIR (DEIR) for the 2040 Draft General Plan is inadequate and incomplete because it fails to evaluate a “reasonable range” of alternatives as required by CEQA.

PUB9-2

During the public outreach phase of the General Plan, the City identified four feasible alternatives: the “No Project” alternative plus three others (Alternatives A, B, and C), each with incrementally greater growth potential and impacts. All four alternatives met or exceeded the housing and economic growth objectives of the General Plan revision. The City Council chose the alternative with the maximum development potential as their preferred alternative (the “project”).

PUB9-3

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the analysis of a “range of reasonable alternatives to the project which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

The Draft EIR evaluates only two alternatives:

1. No Project
2. Reduced Traffic Noise Alternative, which, according to the EIR, “would accommodate the same amount of proposed development as the proposed project.”

PUB9-4

CEQA considers alternatives to involve changes to the project’s “scope, design, extent,” and “intensity.” But, the DEIR fails to offer alternatives that address these possible changes. Instead, it gives us the same amount of development as the project - an alternative in name only. By disregarding the less impactful alternatives offered to the public and preferred by much of the citizenry, the DEIR provides an all-or-nothing choice between maximum buildout or no project at all. The clear message voters sent to City Hall with the passage of Measure Y is their wish to accommodate moderate growth - to find a compromise between extreme growth and no growth. The DEIR is a tone deaf failure in this regard, presenting the public with only a choice between two extremes.

One of the purposes of an EIR is to identify alternatives to a proposed project and evaluate the comparative merits of feasible alternatives. Instead of providing the public with seriously considered alternatives, the DEIR offers a Sophie’s choice. CEQA requires more and the public deserves better.

In order to satisfy the CEQA requirement that “an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project,” **the feasible alternatives previously identified publicly as Alternatives A and B, must be evaluated and the Draft EIR recirculated** for it to meet the threshold of adequacy demanded by CEQA and expected by the public. The additional alternatives analysis represents significant new information and therefore requires recirculation of the Draft EIR, as explained in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. RECIRCULATION OF AN EIR PRIOR TO CERTIFICATION.

PUB9-5

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2023 2:15 PM
To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: DEIR Comments

Dear Manira,
Please find my comments on the DEIR below.
Thank you.
Lisa

PUB10-1

Response to Draft EIR

The Noise Element in the DEIR does not address the harmful effects of low frequency noise or discuss the mitigation of such. Besides traffic as a source, HVAC heatpump units are a common source of low frequency noise pollution. San Mateo’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) requires the installation of electric appliances or the conversion of gas appliances to electric appliances. Many heat pumps will be located inside and outside of residences and will not only affect inhabitants but neighboring properties. The potential noise problem from the humming of multiples air source heat pumps has prompted an official UK government review (2023) by the Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs. Low Frequency Noise is recognized by the WHO as an environmental problem and states the following in their publication on Community Noise:

PUB10-2

"It should be noted that low frequency noise, for example, from ventilation systems can disturb rest and sleep even at low sound levels"

"For noise with a large proportion of low frequency sounds a still lower guideline (than 30dBA) is recommended"

"When prominent low frequency components are present, noise measures based on A-weighting are inappropriate"

"Since A-weighting underestimates the sound pressure level of noise with low frequency components, a better assessment of health effects would be to use C-weighting"

PUB10-3

"It should be noted that a large proportion of low frequency components in a noise may increase considerably the adverse effects on health"

"The evidence on low frequency noise is sufficiently strong to warrant immediate concern"

Europe, ahead of us in terms of heat pump use, is dealing with the noise complaints associated with them:

German Environment Agency guideline information March 2017

Complaints about low-frequency humming noises have become more frequent in recent years – especially in residential areas. The quiet, constant hum of air source heat pumps, air-conditioning systems or district heating stations in otherwise quiet neighbourhoods is often considered disturbing, even if the noise levels comply with statutory limit values. A guide by the German Environment Agency (UBA) advises all the parties of construction projects to consider the noise emissions of such large facilities in the early planning phase of a project. Once systems which hum are in operation, there are virtually no technical means to eliminating low-frequency noise.

The EIR states that the San Mateo Noise Ordinance will protect people from health impacts however this ordinance is nearly 20 years old and does not even address interior noise in single family homes generated outside the property. It falls short in many other areas especially when compared to other newly adopted ordinances of surrounding Cities and the latest medical studies. The ordinance specifically states the regulations apply to a “reasonable person of normal sensitivities” which excludes those with misophonia or hypercusis, both considered a disability by the ADA. The potential liability of this bias should be reason enough for San Mateo to update their noise ordinance.

PUB10-4

The current ordinance does not account for low frequency/tonal noise or the cumulative impacts from multiple heat pumps. If the EIR contemplates the noise ordinance as a mitigation measure to protect the

health of the community it should consider that the current noise ordinance needs to be updated to address the impacts of the 2040 General Plan.

The EIR states that the “noise in the community has often been cited as a health problem, not in terms of physiological damage” however several studies have shown that community noise is associated with cardiovascular problems. The Internal Journal of Preventive Medicine 2022 article (Foroughharmajda, Asadya, Pereirab, Fuentec), Is enough Attention Paid to the health effects of low-frequency noise in today’s society? It is cited that exposure to lower frequency airborne pressure wave can cause cellular and tissue damage along with widespread vascular involvement.

PUB10-4
cont.

PUB10-5

From: Erika Gomez <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 2:25 PM
To: msandir@cityofsanmateo.org; Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>; Richard Hedges <rhedges@cityofsanmateo.org>; lnash@cityofsanmateo.org; Rob Newsom <rnewsom@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: General PlanGP Draft EIR DO NOT reclassify 9th and 5th avenue

Dear City of San Mateo GP 2040 leads.

We recognize this can sometimes be a thankless job. So let me first say Thank You for considering our neighborhood concerns.

PUB11-1

We looked at the GP2040 and it appears that 9th. Ave and 5th Ave are being proposed as “Arterials”.

In a city that has worked for decades to keep our streets safe for pedestrians, such as the Traffic Action Plans (TAPs) reclassifying 9th Ave to be able to carry from a max of 10,000 cars up to 50,000 cars goes against all the hours our neighborhood, staff and numerous city council members have invested to prevent additional degradation of local street surfaces and safety of our elderly, kids and general population when residents walk to medical appointments, school or work. **Is this long term tradeoff worth whatever short term benefit city administrators anticipate?**

PUB11-2

Has a Health Risk Analysis (HRA) associated with Allowing up to 50,000 cars in our little neighborhood been done? I cannot imagine that it would Not have a long term detrimental effect on our general population’s health.

PUB11-3

This type of drastic change goes against the City’s Vision, Safety and Noise GP goals.

Please let’s stop letting the “car centric” mentality we fought so hard to get away from drive decisions for our community’s future.

I wish you would get the opinions of the mail carriers and package delivery personnel. Recently a car flipped on 7th and El Dorado after nearly hitting people and actually hitting multiple cars, before flipping. I spoke to the delivery personnel at the crash site and they said it is amazing how often they see people speeding and ignoring stop signs in our neighborhood.

PUB11-4

I would like close by sharing a photo of an adult resident riding their electric scooter on 5th and El Dorado. Something we see on 9th and Fremont all the time as well. Why do adults still rides bikes And scooters on the sidewalk during traffic hours? Because they are afraid, even with all the bike lanes in the street.

Thank you,

Erika Powell



PUB11-4
cont.

From: Rowan Paul [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, September 23, 2023 3:20 PM
To: msandir@cityofsanmateo.org; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: lnash@cityofsanmateo.org; Richard Hedges <rhedges@cityofsanmateo.org>; Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Naomi Ture [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Regarding Draft EIR, Draft 2040 General Plan

Dear City Council and planning committees,

My wife and I are dismayed to see yet more proposed erosion of our neighborhood at 5th and Delaware with The Draft 2040 General Plan and Draft EIR.

The definition of Arterial is 10,000 - 50,000 vehicles a day. There has been no collaboration on this reclassification. I oppose this reclassification and strongly feel that 5th avenue remain a neighborhood street given that we have families, neighbours with kids and families that have lived here for decades.

PUB12-1

How do we address this increased cut-through traffic? We need assurances for traffic calming for both 5th and 9th Avenues.

A class III Bike Boulevard is proposed for 5th Avenue which means we need lower traffic volumes for safer streets for pedestrians and bicyclists. Other cities in San Mateo County plant a tree in the center of the intersection to reduce cut-through traffic and improve air quality. I recommended we do that and add speed bumps or rumble strips. We are thankful for new pavement and repainted bike strips. To reclassify as an arterial would be devastating, contradictory and a move in the wrong direction.

PUB12-2

In addition, 4th and 5th Avenues are included in the Equity Priority Neighborhoods. We request that the boundaries of the Equity Priority Neighborhoods be extended to 9th Avenue and include streets from S Delaware to S Amphlett for more residential protections.

PUB12-3

Our 5th avenue neighborhood is a close one where we all know our neighbors. We do NOT want this to turn into a high density housing project with 7 floor new housing developments as you have been building near the tracks, some without concession or requirement for more parking or significant city infrastructure which is frankly ridiculous. Our neighbourhood is already taking a big hit and we WILL not stand for further erosion.

I have attached an example of the damaging effect of traffic on our neighborhood. This is my neighbor's Porsche that was subject to a hit and run RIGHT OUTSIDE his and our houses. Can you imagine if there was a child playing on the sidewalk?

PUB12-4

Again as a reminder, our son got run over by a car at 5th and Clairmont just 2 blocks from our house. NOTHING was done by the city to increase safety at this intersection or in our neighborhood despite token lip service phone call with Lisa Nash and Eric Rodriguez at the time when it happened.

Needless to say, we are sufficiently energized to fight this proposal.

PUB12-5

Please do the right thing for the invested locals.

Thank you.

Rowan Paul, MD

From: Evan Powell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, September 23, 2023 3:33 PM
To: msandir@cityofsanmateo.org
Cc: Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>; Rob Newsom <rnewsom@cityofsanmateo.org>; lnash@cityofsanmateo.org; Richard Hedges <rhedges@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: General Plan Draft EIR Comments - please do NOT reclassify 9th and 5th avenue

Hello

Thank you for your public service.

I am writing to express my opposition to the outrageous proposal that 9th and 5th avenues be reclassified to accept more cut through traffic.

The Central Neighborhood already bears the brunt of the increased development in San Mateo. Countless times we have been reassured that our neighborhood would be protected with Vision Zero and traffic impact funds and so on. And yet we see that noise, pollution, accidents, and so on are all more prevalent in the Central Neighborhood than most other neighborhoods. Last week down the street from our house in Central Neighborhood a family was out walking when they were nearly killed by cut-through traffic, the incident of which is only increasing due to pro-development policies. Please see attached for a photo of the accident - imagine this was your reality, your neighborhood. Would you feel safe?

PUB13-1



In short, if you want support for the sort of increased density that our neighborhood has pioneered, you should prioritize the protection of our neighborhood. You should be prioritizing traffic calming of the sort prevalent in impacted neighborhoods in Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Redwood City, and elsewhere, not seriously considering prioritizing car traffic over residents by reclassifying 9th and 5th avenue. It's outdated thinking AND it runs counters to the assurances we have received for years.

Thank you for your service and best regards,

Evan

--

Evan Powell

From: Chris & Wayne Rango <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, September 24, 2023 3:16 PM
To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: General Plan Draft EIR Comments

I have been a resident of the Central Neighborhood for almost 40 years.
What is being proposed in the General Plan and the Draft EIR is preposterous!

PUB14-1

Specifically, reclassifying 5th Ave, the street I live on, and 9th Ave to become **Arterials** is not in any neighborhood's best interest, let alone mine.

To permit between 10,000 to 50,000 vehicles per day on these two neighborhoods' streets will only ADD an incredible amount of noise that already exists. It will increase greater danger for pedestrians as well as drivers not to mention decreasing our property value.

PUB14-2

This proposal will also allow 8-10 story buildings in my neighborhood! Are you kidding me? I am becoming more and more appalled at the attempts to RUIN our quaint neighborhood.

PUB14-3

Please do not allow this damage to happen.

PUB14-4

Respectfully,
Wayne Rango

From: Dave Santos <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, September 24, 2023 6:02 PM
To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: San Mateo General Plan Draft EIR

The EIR is a tremendous amount of information to digest.

PUB15-1

I want to acknowledge staff contributions to this effort and while there has been a modest attempt to reach out to the community, the report presents limited growth options. Is there not a middle ground of moderate growth as a viable alternative to maximum growth or no growth options?

PUB15-2

Why hasn't a moderate growth option been explored? I believe that is what Measure Y is all about, moderate growth.

I also wonder why the San Mateo Foster City School District was not consulted for input if the San Mateo Union High School District was. Adding 26,000 people to the population will affect the SMFCSD as well as the high school district.

PUB15-3

I think it is wishful thinking to believe that the addition of 26,000 will not have more effect on the environment.

In reviewing the document, input of residents (stakeholders) needs to be considered.

PUB15-4

I would like to recommend a rewrite that lists moderate growth options that are supported by the community along with a specific mechanism to solicit residents input.

Sincerely,

Dave Santos

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 3:26 PM
 To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>
 Cc: Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>
 Subject: DEIR for proposed San Mateo 2040 Genreal Plan - comments

Dear Ms. Sandhir,

As a former San Mateo Planning Commissioner (14 years total, 1970's and 1990's) I am familiar with large EIR's. I've reviewed them by the inch and the pound! This current one for the proposed General Plan (over 1000 pages) is well beyond what most everyone - me included - will want to review and comment on, page by page. Instead I am focusing on two issues.

PUB16-1

Noise is a significant issue in San Mateo. Much of the noise we experience is related to traffic (another significant issue) . I reviewed the noise studies and am puzzled that a better range of locations and a better choice of duration and times of day and days of the week were not used. It is usually most helpful to start "at home", with what we know best, so I looked very closely at the noise study on the upper part of West Hillsdale Blvd. The proposed General Plan will allow for greatly intensified development in the W. Hillsdale Blvd/Campus Drive area. Any such increase will certainly funnel much larger volumes of traffic onto Hillsdale Blvd (and likely 31st Ave.) toward the east of the area, especially since the alternative, State Route 92, is so frequently congested. So what evaluation does the DEIR give us? Fifteen minutes on a late Friday morning in mid November on the flat (therefore quieter) part at 931 W. Hillsdale. May I point out that this timing avoids the morning and afternoon commutes - both for CSM, other local schools and the regular workforce. Using a Friday, in a time when work from home was common, especially toward the end of the week, also creates an understatement of the existing conditions. and using a flat spot, when much of Hillsdale has steep roadway (in excess of 14%) also avoids revealing the effect of increased engine noise going uphill and the combined engine/tire noise from increased speed going both uphill and downhill. The measurement did manage to capture *one* of the buses that now use this route *every 20 minutes - from 6AM to 11PM!*, but missed the common noisy situation of 2 buses passing each other. All in all, a pretty useless baseline evaluation for this location. I can only wonder what people who live near the other areas the DEIR evaluated would think of where/when/how those measurements were taken.

PUB16-2

Project Alternatives are very poorly chosen for a project this all encompassing. The community has been discussing a range of alternative development intensities (often called A, B and C for land use) which would result in a range of impacts. Those impacts are not necessarily a smooth continuum as development increases. In many community situations there is an as of now unidentified "tipping point" where impacts become much greater and require much stronger alternate mitigations, as opposed to "more of the same". Ignoring the community understanding of the proposed General Plan in favor of a less than adequate "alternative" of reduced noise (largely through reduced traffic) is not responsive to the CEQA guidelines for requirements in the DEIR. This "alternative" suggests "enhanced" TDM mitigations like subsidies for transit passes, e-bikes, ride

PUB16-3

sharing and bicycles. Those tools, and many others, should be an automatic part of our city process. employed *right now*, aside from any connection to a new General Plan. Even back before 2000, project approvals included conditions for TDM measures, across properties and area boundaries. How does this kind of already existing approach rise to the level of the basis for a project alternative? It doesn't.

PUB16-3
cont.

Of course the alternatives also make mention of ;the environmentally superior choice. This is given lip service by saying it aligns with the only alternative "studied", thus skirting any real discussion. It probably would have been omitted altogether if not for the clear requirement in CEQA guidelines.

PUB16-4

The bottom line for me is that you have a DEIR which does not meet legal requirements and which relies on inadequate studies.

PUB16-5

This document needs a major overhaul prior to certification. .

Karen Herrel
West Hillsdale Blvd.
San Mateo

From: Maxine Turner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 4:14 PM
To: Manira Sandhir <msandhir@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: DEIR comments

Dear Ms. Sandhir - The purpose of CEQA is to give decision-makers adequate information upon which to base decisions that minimize negative impacts to the community. The Draft EIR (DEIR) for the 2040 Draft General Plan is so filled with vague statements about future actions as to be useless. Words like “suggest, promote and encourage” are meaningless. This DEIR does not give policy makers the data to evaluate the long-term impacts of their proposed GP Project. It is an insult to the residents and businesses in San Mateo who will have no idea of the true fiscal and environmental impacts of the proposed Project nor of viable alternatives that will lessen these impacts. The consultants can and must do better.

PUB17-1

Staff knows that the City Council can still approve a project with “significant impacts” by making statements of overriding consideration. But misleading the public and decision-makers by avoiding discussion about the true impacts is unconscionable. This adds to the mistrust of government and threatens our fragile democracy. This DEIR must be rewritten and recirculated.

PUB17-2

THE DEIR IS INADEQUATE AND INCOMPLETE BECAUSE IT FAILS TO:

1 - Identify which program level environmental effects City staff intends to utilize as having been addressed as “specifically and comprehensively as is reasonably possible” in this program EIR so that later activities may qualify for a streamlined environmental review process or may be exempt from environmental review. The DEIR does not provide the supporting data for the “no significant impact” conclusions related to land use and zoning, traffic, air quality, noise, infrastructure capacity and water availability, public services and hydrology. If the consultants have given these details to the City this data must be included for public review and the DEIR recirculated.

PUB17-3

2 - Evaluate a “reasonable range” of alternatives as required by CEQA. The GP land use map chosen by the City Council as the “Project” was the highest level of development considered during the public input phase. This high-development project results in Significant and Unavoidable (SU) impacts in Air Quality, Noise, and Wildfire even with mitigations. The DEIR does not adequately evaluate other alternatives that can lessen these and other impacts to less than significant levels. Alternatives A and B were considered during the public input phase of the GP UPDATE with much public support and these should be evaluated for potentially less impacts in the EIR. A highest development level ‘Project’ or no project is not adequate.

PUB17-4

3 - Note specifically in the Land Use Regulations Measure Y paragraph that General Plan 2030 is Measure Y, approved by the voters in 2020, and a vote of San Mateo residents will be required to approve any changes to Measure Y heights and densities in the Project General Plan 2040. Identify specifically where land use changes increase the heights or densities allowed under Measure Y. The DEIR paragraph on Measure Y is inaccurate, incomplete and missing information on the Strive website and must be rewritten. Measure Y is of vital interest to a majority of the voters in San Mateo and needs to be clearly and accurately described in the DEIR.

PUB17-5

Rewrite the Measure Y paragraph to also note that it better supports affordable housing than the state density bonus law. The Measure Y General Plan 2030 requires that 10% of new residential development be for affordable units built on-site at the same time as the market rate units are constructed. Note how many affordable units have been built in San Mateo under Measure Y. It does not allow off-site or in-lieu fee payments that can sit in a pot for years. The state density bonus law only requires 10% affordable units yet gives the developer 2 extra floors of height for doing what is already required in San Mateo. Also note that the Measure Y density allowances result in a larger number of 2-3 bedroom family sized units than the higher density bonus units have resulted in.

PUB17-5
cont.

4- Justify how the conclusion of LU-2 *“The proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect”* was determined. Clearly, GP 2040 land uses conflict with Measure Y unless a mitigation is added to phase the high-development land use changes in the Project to after Measure Y ends in 2030. Staff notes that the current RHNA cycle housing requirements can be met under Measure Y. Projections for the next RHNA cycle will most likely be reduced. Much impact language throughout the DEIR notes that build-out will not occur all at once so this mitigation will not significantly impact GP 2040 policies.

PUB17-6

5 - Identify the conflicts between the Project’s high-level of development land uses in the Downtown with the goals of pedestrian oriented and preserving historic and cultural resources. Compare the likely wind and shadow impacts of higher heights, including density bonuses, to existing plan heights on outdoor seating and walking.

PUB17-7

6 - Identify the true potential heights with the density bonus increases in heights. Maximum height potential MUST include the density bonus heights.

PUB17-8

6 - Identify specifically what increased service needs (fire, police, parks, recreation, and libraries) will be required by the high level of new development and how funding will be provided. These service impacts are one of the “Standards of Significance” that the “no significant impact” was based on. More importantly, identify at what level of new development (population or structures) WHEN new “staffing, facilities and equipment” will be needed. *Policy LU 12.1 states: “Retain and grow existing businesses and attract new businesses that can generate and diversify the City’s tax revenue and increase job opportunities to ensure the City has adequate resources for infrastructure improvements and essential City services, such as police, fire, parks, recreation, and libraries.”* If new staffing and equipment does not exist to maintain a less than significant impact, will project approvals be delayed until adequate staffing, equipment and facilities are in place? Perhaps this should be added as a mitigation.

PUB17-9

For example, fire services currently closely meet the standard set by the National Fire Protection Association that there be one firefighter for every 1,000 population. At what specific new level of project development and population growth would new facilities, staffing and equipment be required? How tall can buildings be to be served by existing fire trucks? The “no significant impact” conclusion in the DEIR only refers to the construction impacts of new facilities, not the lack of services which negatively impact the community. *“PS-1 The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in*

order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection services.”

The same is true for police services. “SMPD has identified that its staffing level has decreased since 2020, and an increase in population would result in a need for increased staffing. Physical expansion of SMPD facilities may be needed to accommodate increases in staffing and maintain response times. The SMPD has indicated that existing stations would be inadequate to accommodate future needs; due to this, a new police substation or substantial adjustments, expansions, or renovations to the existing police headquarters facility have been identified as needed.” If new staffing and equipment does not exist to maintain a less than significant impact, will project approvals be delayed until adequate staffing, equipment and facilities are in place? Perhaps this should be added as a mitigation.

PUB17-9
cont.

Current services are adequately funded by existing revenues. The DEIR makes clear that the large increase in population and structures will require more funding for services. There is no data about how much revenue will be lost or gained by the Project land use changes. How much sales tax revenue will be lost by upzoning downtown and El Camino Real small businesses for housing or office? How much property tax increase stays with the city as opposed to sales, hotel, business and other taxes? This is fundamental information needed by decision makers prior to approving the High-Development 2040 General Plan.

PUB17-10

The DEIR does not provide the public nor decision-makers with the data they need to approve the Project. There is no information about how water will be provided, traffic impacts reduced, the jobs/housing balance maintained, and displacement of affordable housing and small businesses avoided. Every resident, voter and taxpayer in San Mateo understands the Project high-level of development will negatively impact their lives. This DEIR does not meet legal requirements and it must be revised and recirculated.

PUB17-11

Thank you,
Maxine Turner



Zachary Dahl, AICP
Interim Director
Community Development Department
330 W. 20th Ave., San Mateo, CA 94403
650-522-7207 | zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org

From: Naomi Ture [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 11:18 PM
To: msandir@cityofsanmateo.org; lnash@cityofsanmateo.org; Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>; Rob Newsom <rnewsom@cityofsanmateo.org>; Richard Hedges <rhedges@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: I am your neighbor - Please read - General Plan Draft EIR Comments

Dear Manira, Mayor Lisa and Councilmembers Rob, Zachary, Alex, Lisa and Rich,

I write with high hopes that our planning manager and city council will listen to the neighborhood voices, over the developer voices.

I write to oppose Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, and to request that you **protect the tree-lined neighborhood that we love**. My home is at 614 E 5th Avenue. We moved here because it is a friendly, safe, tree-lined street with a bike lane. It's filled with families and folks who have lived here for decades and are proud of this neighborhood. Many people use our street to live, bike, and to walk to downtown San Mateo and the park.

PUB18-1

This is my request - Please protect our neighborhood by including the following boundaries in the Equity Priority Neighborhood: 5th to 9th Avenue and S Delaware to S Amphlett and provide us with the following residential protections:

PUB18-2

- Please install the traffic calming measures including speed humps on 5th Avenue that you promised us after multiple people have been hit by cars.
- Do not allow 5th and 9th to become classified as arterials (this is the opposite of what you promised)
- Keep 5th Avenue as a local street and 9th Avenue as a collector
- Install the proposed class III Bike Boulevard on 5th Avenue
- Please ensure that height limitations within the boundaries of our neighborhood are 2 stories
- Please ensure height limitations right outside our neighborhood are 4-6 stories.
- Please stop ignoring the citizens and pleasing the developers by allowing them to construct 8-10 story structures.
- Please make it harder for developers to construct massive structures near our neighborhood without implementing what the citizens demand - safety, ample parking, and height limitations.

PUB18-3

PUB18-4

PUB18-5

PUB18-6

The planning commission and city have shown in recent years that you are **working against neighborhoods and in collaboration with developers**, to create 8-12 story structures next to a neighborhood of single-story single-family homes. You are ignoring our pleas and **exacerbating problems such as overcrowding, parking issues, traffic, safety and dangerous roadway conditions**.

PUB18-7

The planning commission and city promised to work with our neighborhood to install traffic calming after cars are repeatedly hitting pedestrians. You have not added even one speed hump to 5th Avenue.

PUB18-8

The planning commission and the city promised to work with our neighborhood regarding 8-12 story high rises. Instead, **the city is working WITH developers and AGAINST residents to build as many high rises as it can fit near our neighborhood** without regard for parking, traffic and safety issues.

PUB18-9

Please listen to the people who live and work here now. **Please protect us, your neighbors, over the developers. Please tell me exactly how you will protect my beloved neighborhood.**

PUB18-10

Thank you,

Naomi Ture

Naomi Ture



Filmmaker @ [Fanny](#) | [Pick of the Litter](#) | [Batkid Begins](#)

From: Naomi Ture <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 11:29 PM
To: msandir@cityofsanmateo.org; lnash@cityofsanmateo.org; Zachary Dahl <zdahl@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>; Rob Newsom <rnewsom@cityofsanmateo.org>; Richard Hedges <rhedges@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Protect Central Neighborhood - General Plan Draft EIR Comments

I just took this photo yesterday, of a dad riding his 2 kids along our tree-lined 5th Avenue. Please protect our neighborhood.

PUB19-1

Picture removed

In order to assure us that you have no intention of altering 5th and 9th, do not reclassify 5th and 9th Avenues as arterials.

PUB19-2

In addition, please assure us that you will slow down development, not the opposite (i.e. Kiku Crossing) so that we can prevent increases in air pollution, noise, traffic, safety issues and wildfire risk.

PUB19-3

Thank you,
Naomi Ture

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.

PUB20-1

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.

PUB20-2

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.

PUB20-3

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.

PUB20-4

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.

PUB20-5

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.

PUB20-6

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

PUB20-6
cont.

Somer Smith

From: Meg Spicer, DC, QME [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 8, 2023 7:08 PM
To: City Council (San Mateo); General Plan
Subject: survey on building heights

- I am a resident of San Mateo. Own a storefront business in San Mateo PUB 21-1
- I am discouraged (dismayed, troubled, etc) I couldn't participate in the building heights survey.
- District 5 (our district) is far more impacted by taller buildings than other districts PUB 21-2
- I support residential building heights of 2 stories.
- I do not support buildings that are predominantly non-residential exceeding 5 stories or Measure Y limits in height.
- I also advocate for the preservation of single-family home neighborhoods, along with small businesses and retail. PUB 21-3
- I do not support additional housing units beyond what is required by the State PUB 21-4
- The DEIR should have looked at a moderated option, not just the maximum development. PUB 21-5
- I am concerned about how services and infrastructure for all the new development will be paid for. PUB 21-6

Thank you,
Margaret Spicer

Somer Smith

From: (null) (null) [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 8:51 AM
To: General Plan
Subject: Survey on building heights

- I am a resident of San Mateo. PUB 22-1
- I am discouraged (dismayed, troubled, etc) I couldn't participate in the building heights survey
- District 5 (our district) is far more impacted by taller buildings than other districts
- I support residential building heights of _____ stories. PUB 22-2
- I do not support buildings that are predominantly non-residential exceeding 5 stories or Measure Y limits in height.
- I also advocate for the preservation of single-family home neighborhoods, along with small businesses and retail. PUB 22-3
- I do not support additional housing units beyond what is required by the State PUB 22-4
- The DEIR should have looked at a moderated option, not just the maximum development. PUB 22-5
- I am concerned about how services and infrastructure for all the new development will be paid for PUB 22-6

Sent from my iPhone

Somer Smith

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 7:36 PM
To: City Council (San Mateo)
Cc: General Plan
Subject: Building Heights and 2040 General Plan

Dear Councilmembers,

I have the following comments regarding building heights and the 2040 General Plan:

PUB23-1

Building heights and density:

District 5 is disproportionately affected by the growth proposed in the General Plan yet very few neighbors received the survey regarding building heights. I believe that the survey sampling will not reflect the views of residents. I favor increasing building heights over Measure Y limits only for residential buildings (or Mixed use with over 80% residential). I support a maximum of 8-stories for a residential building (including any density bonus height) and only if required to meet RHNA housing numbers. The General Plan included over 21,410 new dwelling units and RHNA requirements are closer to 15,000 dwelling units. This is a 40% buffer and given the latest State population projections the next cycle should be less than 8,000 dwelling units. I am inclined to only support a ballot measure to increase building heights that place a threshold on the dwelling units built, such as 15,000.

PUB23-2

GP and DEIR

The DEIR evaluated only a maximum project or no project. Given that there are “Unavoidable” Significant Noise and Air quality impacts associated with greater health risks, it would have made sense to study a more moderate alternative. It also seems completely inconsistent that these significant impacts are caused by traffic, but traffic itself is not a significant impact. Policy LU 6.1 Rail Corridor Plan speaks of “maintaining and improving the quality of life for those who already live and work in the area” but the increase of noise and air quality impacts indicated by the DEIR are in complete contradiction to this statement. I suspect that future traffic congestion and inadequate parking will also reduce the quality of life among residents.

PUB23-3

PUB23-4

Sincerely,
Lisa Maley

San Mateo Planning Commission Public Hearing (9/12/23)

- Maurine Killough asserts that San Mateo deserves the best objective design standards since there are many distinct neighborhood zones and each neighborhood has its own visual and physical character and deserves respect. Killough also points out that, with regard to commercial development adjacent to residential new infill building, designs need to respect existing community character using established designs found in San Mateo. Killough requests the City encourage new developments to be compatible and harmonious with building types and architecture styles prevalent in San Mateo especially with the surrounding residential neighborhoods and downtown historic district. Killough also requests the City consider a project design review for proposed projects in the downtown and surrounding neighborhoods by a qualified historic preservation architect consultant. Killough asserts that aesthetics of new illuminated contemporary glass buildings will have an impact on existing older neighborhoods and the historic downtown and points out that a consultant could creatively bridge the design look between existing historic architecture and new buildings. Killough expresses concerns regarding street lighting standards and asserts that more green street lamps are needed at dark residential intersections and longer residential blocks, as this impacts safety for pedestrians and cyclists in the equity priority and underserved neighborhood areas in Central and North Central neighborhoods. Killough requests the City protect the character of older residential neighborhoods and prohibit neon commercial signs on the new tall buildings facing towards surrounding residential neighborhoods at night, as housing is at the upper level in these buildings, and prohibit older lighted outdoor billboards advertising alcohol and equity priority neighborhoods along 101 which generate blight. Killough also requests the City encourage drought tolerant green landscaping in residential neighborhoods and commercial projects and expand the tree canopies and front yards and plant more street trees through Street Tree Plan especially in equity priority neighborhoods.
- David Light refers to the seismic hazard map in Chapter 4.6, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR that shows the risk of soil liquefaction during major earthquakes, which is broadly divided between a moderate risk region roughly from downtown to Highway 101 and a high-risk region east of 101 to the Bay. Light expresses concern that developers are going to prefer to locate their multi-story projects in low-risk areas rather than on historic landfill areas that are in the higher risk liquefaction areas. Light points out that there are many single-family and duplex home neighborhoods that are currently located in these desirable moderate risk areas and these neighborhoods should not be displaced by large developments. Light asserts that San Mateo needs to protect and preserve charming older homes in single-family and duplex neighborhoods that make San Mateo the desirable place that it is to live. Light refers to Chapter 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR discusses the need to reduce carbon dioxide from cars and trucks. Light notes that new developments located near Caltrain or SamTrans public transportation stops are routinely allowed to provide less than adequate parking spaces in their plans; however, there's continued lack of cooperation between Caltrain and BART with low ridership decreasing on SamTrans and Caltrain. Light asserts that city planners need to be realistic about the use of public transportation and that new building projects should provide adequate parking spaces and include parking with chargers for electric cars as a more realistic solution to greenhouse gas emissions. Light asserts that electric cars are much quieter than traditional internal combustion

PH1-1

PH1-2

engine cars. Light also requests more neighborhood preservation and protection, updated surveys in Central and North Central neighborhoods and older neighborhoods as potential historic districts, protection of historic pre-war homes and small duplexes for middle and low-income families in the equity priority neighborhoods, avoidance of demolition of homes in older neighborhoods (especially on the east side of San Mateo), and preservation of the street level exteriors of existing Craftsman Spanish and Tudor Revival and Victorian homes. Light asserts that new construction should be compatible with the existing neighborhoods and respect existing community character. Light requests the City encourage new developments to be compatible and harmonious with building styles and Architectural Styles prevalent in San Mateo.

PH1-2
cont.

- Laurie Watanuki states that the impact of the buildout results in unacceptable cumulative traffic noise within the EIR study area and notes that no mitigation measures are available, according to the EIR. Watanuki points out that temporary construction noise can be reduced by staggering the projects and that taking the trucks out through the state highways (El Camino Real, 92, 101) would reduce the toxic dust pollution. Watanuki argues for reduced construction impacts in the equity priority neighborhoods and reduced heights of three stories in the land use map along 4th and 5th Avenue and the west side of South Delaware in the central neighborhood, as well as reduced heights of Mixed Use High I and Mixed Use High II in Downtown. Watanuki notes that bicycle boulevards are described in the Draft EIR and it says to include traffic calming on low traffic volumes. Watanuki also notes that 5th Avenue as described as a traffic boulevard from Delaware to South Amphlett. Watanuki requests the City keep 5th Avenue as a local street, versus having it reclassified as an arterial. Watanuki asserts that this conflict is in the General Plan and needs to be addressed. Watanuki points out that Central neighborhood has been an underserved neighborhood an equity priority boundary should be extended to 9th Avenue include streets from Amphlett to Delaware. Watanuki points out that the General Plan policy states to implement traffic calming on residential streets to reduce the cut through traffic and traffic noise. Watanuki requests the City install traffic circles on 9th Avenue and 5th Avenue from Delaware to South Amphlett, to keep the four-way stop signs, to not reclassify these streets to arterials, to do not put a truck route on 5th Avenue from South Delaware to South Amphlett on 5th Avenue (since it's going to be a proposed bike boulevard), and to not put a truck route on South Humboldt between 4th and 9th. Watanuki asserts that the City needs to make these streets safer for the bicyclists. Watanuki states that the neighborhood traffic management program is a living document and asserts that it needs to be updated to better address the cut through traffic volumes and provide more flexibility to address traffic impacts on local streets collectors and arterials in residential neighborhoods. Watanuki questions the ADT volumes on Peninsula and Popular Avenues from Delaware to South Humboldt and whether this is included in the Draft EIR. Watanuki also questions the percentage of Burlingame traffic that uses the Popular exit in San Mateo. Watanuki requests the City perform a separate study for the six grade separations and questions why there are so many grade separations between 1st and 9th and why Peninsula Avenue doesn't have grade separations.
- Ken Abreu points out that there is a ballot measure next year to amend Measure Y and questions whether the passing of this ballot measure would affect the City's ability to meet the RHNA, the General Plan itself, or the Draft EIR.

PH1-3

PH1-4

- Michael Weinhauer expresses concerns about the accessibility of the Draft EIR and notes that it's very technical and includes a lot of acronyms. Weinhauer asserts that the Draft EIR does not adequately address issues and makes unreasonable assumptions that people will not drive and alternative modes of transportation would be readily available. Weinhauer also asserts that the General Plan and Draft EIR plans for extreme levels of growth (about 40 percent) that would worsen air quality, traffic, noise, and other key areas and questions why the City is planning for absurd growth levels. Weinhauer also points out that the General Plan and EIR focused on per capita statistics and asserts that we should not lose sight of absolute numbers. Weinhauer notes that the General Plan and EIR claims to require balancing jobs and offices and asserts that given the massive imbalance, it should be focused on housing (not only luxury and rental-only housing, but also affordable housing) and existing housing stocks should be preserved, as it gets gentrified and replaced with unaffordable housing, which there is no shortage of in San Mateo. Weinhauer asserts that the non-committal language used in the Draft EIR are meaningless without concrete legislation, quantifiable targets that someone is accountable for, and funding to ensure aspirational plans are actually put into place and impacts are truly understood and mitigated. Weinhauer points out that the Draft EIR calls for decarbonizing housing stock but there are serious doubts around PG&E's abilities to export to support the existing demand, much less doubling that demand and the significant costs to property owners.

