

**Summary of voicemail comments for City Council Special Meeting  
of June 24, 2020.**

Government Code Section  
54957.5  
SB 343  
Agenda: 06/24/2020  
Item #2

The following comments have been submitted via telephone:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment Summary or full comment if brief</b>
Alessandria Carmona	Public Comments- Item #2	Would like the comment be read aloud at the meeting. Opposes the construction project on Linden because it will cause traffic jams. Please use the \$1M for Chestnut, El Camino, Westborough and Hillside Blvd where it is needed. The proposal is a waste of money and resources and unnecessary.
Daniel Jimenez	Public Comments- Item #2	Would like the comment to be read aloud at the meeting. Opposes the Linden Intersect Traffic Plan on Linden and doesn't see any traffic problems at Linden. The project will cause traffic jams on Linden and will not be safe for bicyclists. The funds should be used for school lunches, books and computers because they do not have the proper funding.

**From:** [Daniel Perez](#)  
**To:** All at City Clerk's Office; [jmalmo-laycock@smcgov.org](mailto:jmalmo-laycock@smcgov.org); [sustainability@smcgov.org](mailto:sustainability@smcgov.org); [board@sfbike.org](mailto:board@sfbike.org);  
[REDACTED]  
Item #2 Special Mtg 6/24/20 - Linden Avenue  
**Date:** Saturday, June 20, 2020 9:59:33 PM

---

Honorable Mayor and City Council members:

I respectfully request my comments be read out loud at 6/24/20 meeting.

I urge City Council not approve the proposed Linden Ave intersection road changes. To commence, although it is described as a Traffic Reduction plan, it is very short of a reduction plan. How would narrower streets help traffic move more swiftly? Quite contrary, it would cause traffic jams with more pollutants in air.

Furthermore, how can proposed changes encourage citizens to find more sustainable ways to commute to work, visit libraries, parks, promote fitness, etc.? We as bicyclists currently face many existing hazards and this particular one is unnecessary, given the fact that existing intersections function properly. Furthermore, I am against spending of \$908,970 when there are URGENT community needs.

This plan is a mere Cosmetic Mismanagement of Funds, rather than an urgent traffic hazardous plan for bicyclists and pedestrians, and even our Earth. Instead of promoting getting vehicles off the roads, it only encourages us to not use alternative modes by the creation of a hazardous road.

I understand the need for handicap access, which currently exist at these intersections. What I do not understand are the tripping hazards such as those at Orange Ave (Baden and Commercial Aves). The proposed plan on Linden would be worse and not logical.

In closing, I urge our citizen elected City Council to represent the better needs of our Old Town, bicycling, sustainability communities and Mother Earth in not approving this plan.

I trust community needs take precedence over City organizational wants.

On another note, I find important items such as these being placed on Special Meetings rather than Regular Meetings as disrespectful, especially to Old Town, which historically has been ignored and not respected. I find it highly offensive.

Thank you.

**From:** [Patea, Marie](#)  
**To:** [Luz Jimenez](#); [All Council](#); [info@smcta.com](mailto:info@smcta.com); [Futrell, Mike](#); [San Mateo Daily Journal-A](#); [All at City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Agenda Item #2, Special Meeting 6/24/20  
**Date:** Monday, June 22, 2020 1:37:23 PM

---

Dear Ms. Jimenez,

Thank you for taking the time to send this email. Both City Council and our City Clerk have received your message.

In kindness,  
MP

Marie E. Patea  
Executive Assistant to the City Manager  
City of South San Francisco  
400 Grand Avenue  
South San Francisco, CA 94080  
(650) 829-6666

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

From: Luz Jimenez [REDACTED]  
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 1:31 PM  
To: All Council <[Council@ssf.net](mailto:Council@ssf.net)>; [info@smcta.com](mailto:info@smcta.com); [Futrell, Mike <Mike.Futrell@ssf.net>](mailto:Futrell, Mike <Mike.Futrell@ssf.net>); [San Mateo Daily Journal-A <news@smdailyjournal.com>](mailto:San Mateo Daily Journal-A <news@smdailyjournal.com>)  
Subject: Agenda Item #2, Special Meeting 6/24/20

Please read out loud at Special Meeting 6/24/20.

Honorable Mayor and City Council:

Proposed Linden Avenue "calming" plan is a misuse of Measure A, C/CAG and City funds for a total of \$1 million dollars! Taxpayers approved Measure A funds for traffic relief. Linden is not problematic or hazardous at these intersections. Our two major thoroughfares, Westborough/Chestnut and Hillside and ECR are a justification for use of these funds.

Also, placing this item on a Special Agenda is unjustified and appalling. What is so urgent to a non-existing problem? I am highly offended when Old Town continues to be disrespected by the urgency the City is putting on this proposal by quickly going through systematic process without proper due process.

There is no reason mentioned by City other than "traffic calming." What is traffic calming? It is more of a traffic congestion plan by slowing traffic (more pollution) and not being inviting for bicyclists. It will promote congregating and it will cause traffic jams that do not currently exist on Linden.

The City Council were elected to represent best interest of every citizen and to encourage input. Old Town has always been ignored instead of appreciative of its "old town" roots. Old Town has historical value which has now been destroyed and continues to be disrespected. Our voice is not important, respected nor valued. I invite every City Council member and City Manager to walk the streets of Old Town. Why do we not ever see anyone from City Hall walk around, but then make ill decisions? Not one City Council member lives in Old Town. Would either one of you allow a high rise building with NO setbacks to be built next to your long generational home that has taken your natural sunlight away? Do to others as you would do for yourself.

Miller Ave btwn Linden and Cypress is a precursor to what SSF will become because of lack of attention by City. Graffiti, cyclone fenced junk yard, boarded up empty buildings, weeds shoulder level, etc. If you would not live in

such conditions, what makes Council think it is ok for us? We pay same taxes. What happened to equality and inclusivity? Respect does not costs anything and goes a long way.

Thank you.

<<https://cmo.smcgov.org/census-2020-san-mateo-county/>>

**From:** [daniela quevara](#)  
**To:** [All at City Clerk's Office; mfuttrell@ssf.net](#)  
**Subject:** Item 2 for Wed, June 24th  
**Date:** Monday, June 22, 2020 3:37:55 PM

---

I am writing regarding proposed plan on Linden Ave. I am urging City Council to turn down this proposal.

Measure A funds being proposed on Linden Ave in SSF. As taxpayers, we approved Measure A to be used for traffic relief. There are traffic jams on Chestnut, Westborough and El Camino Real. Before pandemic, there was bumper to bumper traffic on Hillside which I am sure will pick up again.

Who approved these funds to be used for area that poses no current danger to motorists or pedestrians and which there are no traffic jams? The only dangerous intersection on Linden is at Lux, which isn't being addressed. Makes no sense. This will only do opposite effect of creating a traffic jam that doesn't currently exist. I did not approve Measure A funds for this calming project as SSF calls it.

There is also mention of C/CAG transportation funds and city of SSF funds for this project. I am proposing please for these funds to be used elsewhere where there is an urgent need. The community can really use transportation funds at problematic areas and city funds for recreational and youth programs. I urge you all to not approve and consider the imminent needs of community.

Thank you.

**From:** [Daniel Perez](#)  
**To:** [Sandy Wong](#)  
**Cc:** [mchuang@burlingame.org](mailto:mchuang@burlingame.org); [mchuang@burlingame.org](mailto:mchuang@burlingame.org); [Mima Guilles](mailto:Mima_Guilles); [cromero@cityofepa.org](mailto:cromero@cityofepa.org); [cromero@cityofepa.org](mailto:cromero@cityofepa.org); [OOS\\_sustainability](mailto:OOS_sustainability); [Hermes Monzon](mailto:Hermes_Monzon); [Kaki Cheung](mailto:Kaki_Cheung); [Pedro Gonzales](mailto:Pedro_Gonzales); [All at City Clerk's Office](#); [All at City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: URGENT: Agenda Item #2, SSF Special Meeting Wednesday, June 24 - Linden Ave Intersections - REQUEST FOR BICYCLISTS/PEDESTRIAN/COMMUNITY ADVOCACY  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 23, 2020 2:10:08 PM

---

Hi Ms. Wong,

I am following up on email from yesterday. Thank you.

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Daniel Perez [REDACTED]  
**To:** "mchuang@hillsborough.net" <mchuang@hillsborough.net>; Mima Guilles <mguilles@smcgov.org>; "info@smcta.com" <info@smcta.com>; "mchuang@burlingame.org" <mchuang@burlingame.org>; Carole Groom <cgroom@smcgov.org>; "dhorsley@smc.org" <dhorsley@smc.org>; "cromero@cityofepa.org" <cromero@cityofepa.org>; "rmedina@sanbruno.ca.gov" <rmedina@sanbruno.ca.gov>; "news@smdailyjournal.com" <news@smdailyjournal.com>; Davina Hurt <dhurt@belmont.gov>; Sandy Wong <slwong@smcgov.org>  
**Cc:** Everything South City <everythingsouthcity@gmail.com> [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; OOS\_sustainability <sustainability@smcgov.org>; [REDACTED]; Mikaela Hiatt <mhiatt@smcgov.org>; Kaki Cheung <kcheung1@smcgov.org>; "eunejune.kim@ssf.net" <eunejune.kim@ssf.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 22, 2020, 02:06:40 PM PDT  
**Subject:** Re: URGENT: Agenda Item #2, SSF Special Meeting Wednesday, June 24 - Linden Ave Intersections - REQUEST FOR BICYCLISTS/PEDESTRIAN/COMMUNITY ADVOCACY

Ms. Wong,

Thank you for your response. I would like to receive copies or to be able to view application proposals submitted by City of SSF for this project. How would I go about this?

The City of SSF does not go into details on reason or urgency of this project. I am trying to understand the urgency by being proposed at a Special Meeting. There definitely exists traffic congestion and hazards at our major thoroughfares of Westborough/Chesnut/El Camino Real and Hillside Boulevard, as well as Airport Blvd.

We approved Measure A funds for traffic relief and assuming C/CAG has guidelines and promotes vehicles off roads and bicycle safety.

How does community become aware of C/CAG meetings and proposals from individual cities for community input? Although I am not suggesting this is done behind doors, but it would be nice for community to be able to provide input.

Another question at the moment, since it is urgent by the Special Meeting this Wednesday, what is reason C/CAG approved this proposal?

Thank you!

On Monday, June 22, 2020, 01:54:44 PM PDT, Sandy Wong <slwong@smcgov.org>

wrote:

Dear Mr. Perez,

Thank you for your message.

C/CAG received the project proposal from the City of SSF in response to a call for projects under the Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA Article 3) program. TDA Article 3 fund is provided to San Mateo County from MTC and is administered by C/CAG. Said fund is dedicated to bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects, and has specific guidelines and requirements. Through the competitive call for projects process C/CAG issued, the City of SSF and other city project sponsors submitted specific project applications. All submitted project applications are reviewed and evaluated by the C/CAG BPAC Committee. High scored projects were forwarded to the C/CAG Board for review and approval for TDA Article 3 funding. We appreciate your input, but would encourage you to work with SSF staff on this matter.

Regards,

Sandy Wong  
Executive Director of C/CAG

**From:** Daniel Perez [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 22, 2020 12:38 AM  
**To:** mchuang@hillsborough.net; Sandy Wong <slwong@smcgov.org>; Mima Guilles <mguilles@smcgov.org>; info@smcta.com; mchuang@burlingame.org; Carole Groom <cgroom@smcgov.org>; dhorsley@smc.org; cromero@cityofepa.org; rmedina@sanbruno.ca.gov; news@smdailyjournal.com  
**Cc:** Everything South City <everythingsouthcity@gmail.com>; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; OOS\_sustainability <sustainability@smcgov.org>; OOS\_sustainability <sustainability@smcgov.org>; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** URGENT: Agenda Item #2, SSF Special Meeting Wednesday, June 24 - Linden Ave Intersections - REQUEST FOR BICYCLISTS/PEDESTRIAN/COMMUNITY ADVOCACY

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.**

---

Chair Chuang, Vice Chair Hurt, and Executive Director Wong:  
SMC County Transportation Authority Board of Directors:  
e

I hope this email finds you all well and healthy.

I write in regards to proposed SSF City Council item this Wednesday, June 24, Special Agenda Item #2. There was little notice to community as this proposal has been

scheduled at a Special Meeting and thus the short notice to C/CAG Board regarding my concerns.

Besides my concerns addressed below, I noticed that \$400,000 is being proposed for this project which I find unnecessary and misuse of C/CAG funds that may be used for other traffic related issues in South San Francisco. There is an existing bottleneck situation on Chestnut and El Camino and on Westborough Boulevard.

The traffic had become horrific on Chestnut and Westborough (Chestnut converts into Westborough at El Camino Real) and also on Hillside Boulevard (McLellan to Airport Boulevard) before the pandemic. These two roads (Westborough/Chestnut and Hillside Boulevard) are major thoroughfares that run through South San Francisco.

I find it puzzling why \$400,000 of C/CAG monies would be dedicated to what I consider unnecessary on Linden Avenue. The information on SSF website does not state a reason other than "traffic calming." Quite contrary, it would lead to more backups on Linden Ave. Besides, there are no bumper to bumper nor hazardous traffic issues on Linden Ave.

Besides the unnecessary use of much needed funds elsewhere, it would become a very hazardous situation for bicyclists. Bicyclists would be forced to swerve in front of vehicles and pedestrians and instead of calming a non-existing problem on Linden, it would only serve the opposite, it would cause backups that exist elsewhere, such as roads mentioned above and on Airport Boulevard.

I urge C/CAG Board to intervene with the use of \$400,000 of these funds for the proposed Linden Ave calming plan that SSF City Council has in mind.

In terms of Measure A funds, I believe funds are for use to "improve transit and relieve traffic congestion". This proposed project does not fall into this category. It would not improve transit and there is no traffic congestion on Linden to relieve. It would do the exact opposite, cause a traffic jam by narrowing of roads at intersections along Linden and it would pose a hazardous situation for bicyclists and motorists.

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Daniel Perez [REDACTED]

**To:** "[jmalmo-laycock@smcgov.org](mailto:jmalmo-laycock@smcgov.org)" <[jmalmo-laycock@smcgov.org](mailto:jmalmo-laycock@smcgov.org)>; "[sustainability@smcgov.org](mailto:sustainability@smcgov.org)" <[sustainability@smcgov.org](mailto:sustainability@smcgov.org)>; "[board@sfbike.org](mailto:board@sfbike.org)" <[board@sfbike.org](mailto:board@sfbike.org)>; [REDACTED]

**Cc:** Daniel Perez [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Saturday, June 20, 2020, 08:32:39 PM PDT

**Subject:** Agenda Item #2, SSF Special Meeting Wednesday, June 24 - Linden Ave Intersections - REQUEST FOR BICYCLISTS/PEDESTRIAN/COMMUNITY ADVOCACY

Good evening,

I am writing for your support in advocating for bicyclists by submitting comments to SSF City Council members in regards to subject proposed plan. This plan makes it extremely dangerous to both bicyclists and pedestrians in that it will narrow street at intersections along Linden Avenue (in my opinion, without a need).



Furthermore, how can proposed change encourage citizens to find more sustainable ways to commute to work, visit libraries, parks, promote fitness, etc.? We as bicyclists are already facing many existing dangerous situations and this particular one is one that is so unnecessary, given the fact that intersections function properly as they are. Even though I am personally against spending of \$908,970 unnecessarily (see no need and \$1 m is better spent on urgent community needs), I am equally concerned for bicyclists and pedestrian safety and our Earth. It does not promote getting vehicles off the roads and what is best for our Earth.

I kindly request and urge for advocacy in contacting our SSF City Council in providing comments to email below and typing Agenda Item #2 6/24/20 Special Meeting on Subject Line. I also invite Friends of Old Town and Change SSF to spread word and invite community input. These protruding sidewalks (i.e. Chestnut and Baden etc. are a tripping hazard and makes it very dangerous for not only pedestrians, but bicyclists as well.)

The City Council is introducing this item as Traffic Calming; however, it is very short of calming traffic. I also find these types of Agenda Items being introduced in Special Meetings opposed to regular City Council meetings insulting, wherein it provides little to no time for citizens and neighborhoods become aware or time for commenting.

Email: [all-cc@ssf.net](mailto:all-cc@ssf.net)

Subject: Item #2, Special Meeting Agenda 6/24/20

<https://everythingsouthcity.com/2020/06/downtown-parking-reduction-traffic-calming-special-meeting-wed-june-24th/>

Thank you!!

**From:** [O Perez](#)  
**To:** [All at City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 2, Special Meeting 6/24/20  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 23, 2020 11:28:23 PM

---

Honorable Mayor Garbarino, Vice Mayor Addiego and City Council members.

I kindly request my comments be read out loud and be made public.

I recently became aware of a Special Meeting proposal that puzzles me on its urgency and importance so as to be considered at a Special meeting rather than at a Regular meeting.

Speaking about urgency, at a cost of \$1 million dollars, there currently exists an urgency at Chestnut, El Camino and Westborough áreas as well as Hillside Boulevard.

I noticed Measure A funds and C/CAG funds are budgeted in this plan, however, these funds should be intended for traffic relief and for areas that pose dangerous situations for motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists whom are doing good by seeking sustainable modes of transportation. The design will only create a hazardous situation for all.

The allocation of \$429,000 of general funds are better suited for what are true urgent community needs, such as youth and recreational centers, and daycare centers throughout SSF. There is also an urgent need to clean up Old Town by power washing streets, return of Mad Vac to clean alleys, and daily street sweepers on Linden.

I strongly oppose this proposal for reasons above and also for its “calming” purpose as there is no traffic to be calmed. Quite contrary, it will cause a backup which will lead to additional air pollution.

I trust my concerns will be taken into consideration in regards to this project and that these funds be used instead for urgent and current community needs.

I also request that only items of true urgency or emergency be placed as Special meeting items in the future so as to allow sufficient and proper community input.

Thank you .

**From:** [Evan Klein](#)  
**To:** [All at City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda #2, Special Meeting, Wednesday 6/24 Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 24, 2020 12:27:38 PM

---

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am a resident of South San Francisco and have lived on Springwood Way since 2000. I oppose the bulb out curb ramps as part of the Linden Avenue traffic calming improvements. Removing a right turn at an intersection means that ALL traffic must stop when pedestrians are crossing in the direction of traffic. It also means that bicycles must merge into the traffic lane. I believe both consequences will create traffic jams and cause more problems than benefits. Since there are so many new residential units downtown, there is a high likelihood of more pedestrian traffic. I urge you to either (1) drop this portion of the work from the plan, or (2) table this portion of the work until after the COVID crisis to see the real effect of increased pedestrian traffic.

Sincerely,  
Evan Klein

**From:** [Daniel Perez](#)  
**To:** [Avila, Cindy](#); [All at City Clerk's Office](#); [REDACTED] [sustainability@smcgov.org](mailto:sustainability@smcgov.org); [board@sfbike.org](mailto:board@sfbike.org);  
[board@sfbike.org](mailto:board@sfbike.org)  
**Cc:** [Dan P](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Item #2 Special Mtg 6/24/20 - Linden Avenue  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 24, 2020 4:44:19 PM

---

Please add comment to today's meeting:

In response to Mr. Kim's letter.

I would like to see hazardous intersection at Lux/Linden take precedence over proposed improvement plan. Stop sign at Lux is not planned until 2021. This intersection poses a danger to bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists every day.

Thank you!

On Monday, June 22, 2020, 02:00:25 PM PDT, Avila, Cindy <cindy.avila@ssf.net> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Thank you for contacting the City of South San Francisco and submitting your public comment, it will be included for the June 24th Special City Council meeting.

Sincerely,  
Cindy

Cindy Avila  
Assistant City Clerk  
City of South San Francisco | City Clerk's Office  
400 Grand Avenue | South San Francisco, CA 94080

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

From: Daniel Perez [REDACTED]  
Sent: Saturday, June 20, 2020 9:59 PM  
To: All at City Clerk's Office <[All-CC@ssf.net](mailto:All-CC@ssf.net)>; [jmalmo-laycock@smcgov.org](mailto:jmalmo-laycock@smcgov.org);  
[sustainability@smcgov.org](mailto:sustainability@smcgov.org); [board@sfbike.org](mailto:board@sfbike.org); [REDACTED]  
Pedro Gonzales [REDACTED] Everything South City  
<[everythingsouthcity@gmail.com](mailto:everythingsouthcity@gmail.com)>  
Subject: Item #2 Special Mtg 6/24/20 - Linden Avenue

Honorable Mayor and City Council members:

I respectfully request my comments be read out loud at 6/24/20 meeting.

I urge City Council not approve the proposed Linden Ave intersection road changes. To commence, although it is described as a Traffic Reduction plan, it is very short of a reduction plan. How would narrower streets help traffic move more swiftly? Quite contrary, it would cause traffic jams with more pollutants in air.

Furthermore, how can proposed changes encourage citizens to find more sustainable ways to commute to work, visit libraries, parks, promote fitness, etc.? We as bicyclists currently face many

existing hazards and this particular one is unnecessary, given the fact that existing intersections function properly. Furthermore, I am against spending of \$908,970 when there are URGENT community needs.

This plan is a mere Cosmetic Mismanagement of Funds, rather than an urgent traffic hazardous plan for bicyclists and pedestrians, and even our Earth. Instead of promoting getting vehicles off the roads, it only encourages us to not use alternative modes by the creation of a hazardous road.

I understand the need for handicap access, which currently exist at these intersections. What I do not understand are the tripping hazards such as those at Orange Ave (Baden and Commercial Aves). The proposed plan on Linden would be worse and not logical.

In closing, I urge our citizen elected City Council to represent the better needs of our Old Town, bicycling, sustainability communities and Mother Earth in not approving this plan.

I trust community needs take precedence over City organizational wants.

On another note, I find important items such as these being placed on Special Meetings rather than Regular Meetings as disrespectful, especially to Old Town, which historically has been ignored and not respected. I find it highly offensive.

Thank you.

<<https://cmo.smcgov.org/census-2020-san-mateo-county/>>

**From:** [Luz Jimenez](#)  
**To:** [Patea, Marie](#); [All at City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda Item #2, Special Meeting 6/24/20  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 24, 2020 5:26:13 PM

---

Please include comment below as well at tonight's meeting.

Where was community meeting and with whom was community meeting on Feb 18th, referenced by Director of Public Works Eunejune Kim regarding this topic? He eludes to agreement by community, although residents had no idea nor did we receive proper notification. Priority should be on Stop sign needed at Lux/Linden where we all face dangers.

Thank you.

On Monday, June 22, 2020, 01:37:26 PM PDT, Patea, Marie <marie.patea@ssf.net> wrote:

Dear Ms. Jimenez,

Thank you for taking the time to send this email. Both City Council and our City Clerk have received your message.

In kindness,  
MP

Marie E. Patea  
Executive Assistant to the City Manager  
City of South San Francisco  
400 Grand Avenue  
South San Francisco, CA 94080  
(650) 829-6666

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

From: Luz Jimenez [REDACTED]  
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 1:31 PM  
To: All Council <[Council@ssf.net](mailto:Council@ssf.net)>; [info@smcta.com](mailto:info@smcta.com); Futrell, Mike <[Mike.Futrell@ssf.net](mailto:Mike.Futrell@ssf.net)>; San Mateo Daily Journal-A <[news@smdailyjournal.com](mailto:news@smdailyjournal.com)>  
Subject: Agenda Item #2, Special Meeting 6/24/20

Please read out loud at Special Meeting 6/24/20.

Honorable Mayor and City Council:

Proposed Linden Avenue "calming" plan is a misuse of Measure A, C/CAG and City funds for a total of \$1 million dollars! Taxpayers approved Measure A funds for traffic relief. Linden is not problematic or hazardous at these intersections. Our two major thoroughfares, Westborough/Chestnut and Hillside and ECR are a justification for use of these funds.

Also, placing this item on a Special Agenda is unjustified and appalling. What is so urgent to a non-existing problem? I am highly offended when Old Town continues to be disrespected by the urgency the City is putting on this proposal by quickly going through systematic process without proper due process.

There is no reason mentioned by City other than “traffic calming.” What is traffic calming? It is more of a traffic congestion plan by slowing traffic (more pollution) and not being inviting for bicyclists. It will promote congregating and it will cause traffic jams that do not currently exist on Linden.

The City Council were elected to represent best interest of every citizen and to encourage input. Old Town has always been ignored instead of appreciative of its “old town” roots. Old Town has historical value which has now been destroyed and continues to be disrespected. Our voice is not important, respected nor valued. I invite every City Council member and City Manager to walk the streets of Old Town. Why do we not ever see anyone from City Hall walk around, but then make ill decisions? Not one City Council member lives in Old Town. Would either one of you allow a high rise building with NO setbacks to be built next to your long generational home that has taken your natural sunlight away? Do to others as you would do for yourself.

Miller Ave btwn Linden and Cypress is a precursor to what SSF will become because of lack of attention by City. Graffiti, cyclone fenced junk yard, boarded up empty buildings, weeds shoulder level, etc. If you would not live in such conditions, what makes Council think it is ok for us? We pay same taxes. What happened to equality and inclusivity? Respect does not costs anything and goes a long way.

Thank you.

<<https://cmo.smcgov.org/census-2020-san-mateo-county/>

>