

Written Comments for
Regular Public Comment Section
- **Consent Agenda**
- **Non Agenda Items**

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Paulino, Tom \(MYR\)](#); [Mariano, Eileen \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Conine-Nakano, Susanna \(ECN\)](#); ["Paul Yoder"](#); ["Karen Lange"](#); [Erica Smith](#); [Paul Yoder](#); [Karen Lange](#)
Subject: Transmittal of SFBOS Action - Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 58-24 - Opposing California State Senate Bill No. 951 (Wiener) Unless Amended
Date: Friday, February 23, 2024 2:53:22 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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.

Greetings,

IN RE: San Francisco Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 58-24, entitled "Opposing California State Senate Bill No. 951 (Wiener) Unless Amended and Expressing Support for the California Coastal Act and Recognizing the Authority of the California Coastal Commission."

Resolution No. 58-24 directs the Clerk of the Board to forward copies of the enacted matter to the following recipient(s):

- Senator Scott Wiener
- Assembly Member Phil Ting
- Assembly Member Matt Haney
- California State Senate
- California State Assembly
- Del Norte County Board of Supervisors
- Humboldt County Board of Supervisors
- Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
- Sonoma County Board of Supervisors
- Marin County Board of Supervisors
- San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
- Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors
- Monterey County Board of Supervisors
- San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors
- Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
- Ventura County Board of Supervisors
- Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
- Orange County Board of Supervisors
- San Diego County Board of Supervisors

This message serves as your notice that the above transmittals were mailed to the indicated recipients on February 23, 2024. You can review a copy of the transmittal letters by following the links below:

[Clerk of the Board Letter – February 23, 2024 – CA Coastal Counties](#)
[Clerk of the Board Letter – February 23, 2024 – CA Assembly](#)

[Clerk of the Board Letter – February 23, 2024 – CA Senate](#)
[Clerk of the Board Letter – February 23, 2024 – Senator Wiener](#)
[Clerk of the Board Letter – February 23, 2024 – Assembly Member Haney](#)
[Clerk of the Board Letter – February 23, 2024 – Assembly Member Ting](#)

I invite you to review the entire matters on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 240065](#)

John Carroll

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

Emil Lawrence MBA
Paralegal Investigator
Hotel Shores Landing
Second Floor-Unit 14/B
1000 Twin Dolphin Drive
San Carlos/RWC CA 94065
Cell-650-254-4126

February 22, 2024

Board of Directors
Caltrain and Partners
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
1250 San Carlos Avenue
Can Carlos, CA 94065
(Hard & Soft Copy) Board@Caltrain.Com

Re: 02/16/24 Violation of the American Visibilities Act. (ADA) The Act are civil rights. From voting to parking, and bus and train travel, the ADA is a law that protects people with short term disabilities in many areas of public life. Complications to common non-covered conditions can result in eligibility. I am a 77 year old white male, with a limp from a recent broken foot and 'veinsasis, with post COVAD-19 problems. In January 2024, I spent 10 days SFVAMC hospital-in quarantine-for COVAD-19. I am not all there, yet. However, this letter contains an assault-probable cause-for a civil complaint by two Caltrain employees.

PCJPB or Board:

My name is Emil Lawrence. And, although I ride Samtrans 360 days a year, I only ride Caltrain twice a month. I roll to and from San Francisco to deliver books and magazines to the veteran's hospital at Ft. Miley. While living in San Francisco, I did so for thirty years. And, once a month-I now roll-for dinner-with friends-at Tommy's Joint-a restaurant on Geary and O'Farrell. .

I want inform this Board-along with Samtrans about my assault by Caltrain employees, on Friday February 16, 2024 at your San Carlos Station, at 1:40 PM. Although I have never sent the PCJPM letters in the past, as an active Peninsula rider, Samtrans has received over 25 complaint letters in the past. They just do not act on them.

I was standing on the elevated cement platform which is used for baggage carts and wheel chairs, when the 1: 40 PM Caltrain pulled up. I have made this trek dozens of times over the past five years. I asked, Marianne, your very short baggage cart-tenant-assistant to put the ramp plate up. She refused. She told me, "You have to be in a wheel chair." I stated, "What? Caltrain has been assisting me for five years." She then tells me. "You have to get on yourself, we do not assist." So, fuming, I roll my cart down the way I came up, to the next open door. I am standing there-when one of Caltrain's passengers gets out to help me. The short attendant is just standing there. However, I am now on the train. A moment later, a six foot African male shows up. He starts barking, "You have to get off. You were rude to Marianne and this train is not going anywhere with you on it." I said, "I'm on the train, are you now telling me to get off?" He yells, "If you do not get off-yourself-I will call the police." He calls the police and Caltrain sits on the track.

The second part of this letter is coming on March 7, 2024.

Sincerely,

Emil Lawrence

CC: SamTrans Board

Written Public
Comment(s) for **Item No. 6**

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Emily Morris <emilys.morris21@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2024 7:25 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Public comment ahead of Feb 27 meeting, item No 6 (Health)

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing as a San Mateo resident to express my strong support for non-armed, clinician mobile response to people experiencing mental health crises. The Board of Supervisors authorization of the state mandate would be a great starting point.

As a next step, I support each city in the county having non-armed, clinician mobile response teams that the city's '911' call centers can expediently dispatch seven days a week. I urge San Mateo County to fund these programs and take advantage of grants and other opportunities to secure funding.

The ability to consistently send a clinician-led, non-armed response to people experiencing a mental health crisis is critical and potentially lifesaving. Police with guns have no place in a mental health crisis, and I urge you to prioritize a totally non-armed response.

Thank you for your time,
Emily

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Stephanie Reyes <sreyes.bayarea@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 4:56 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: 2/27 Agenda Item 6: 988 mandate and clinician-led mobile response teams

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.

Dear Board Members,

This message is regarding agenda item 6 on the February 27th meeting agenda regarding the proposed contract with Telecare Corporation for Unarmed Mobile Mental Health Crisis Response Services for the state-mandated '988' call center capability to dispatch clinician-led mobile response teams.

I strongly support the shift toward clinician-led mobile response teams. I am concerned that the contract as written lacks a very important capability: 911 call centers cannot dispatch a clinician-led team themselves, as effective programs including Half Moon Bay CARES, CAHOOTS, and Denver STAR do.

I urge you to add this key capability to this contract and all future contracts on such a program.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Reyes
2831 Olivares Lane
San Mateo, CA 94403

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Ann Myers <akdmyers@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 9:04 AM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Agenda item #6

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.

Dear San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to comment on agenda item #6 at the upcoming board meeting, to adopt a resolution authorizing an agreement with Telecare Corporation for Unarmed Mobile Mental Health Crisis Response Services.

My concern is that the mandate is of limited scope, which will make the program less successful. Instead of the provisions laid out in the state mandate, I am advocating for the following:

- That each city in the county have their own non-armed, clinician-led mobile response teams that the city's '911' call centers can dispatch directly
- That these response teams be funded by the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

The biggest advantage over the state mandate of these provisions is a reduction in response times by one-half. Having two teams per city would allow for coverage 7 days a week (as is the model for the Half Moon Bay CARES program).

Thank you,

--Ann Myers
Redwood City
San Mateo County district 4

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Cathy Baird <cathy_baird@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 12:19 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Item 6: Resolution...Unarmed Mobile Mental Health Crisis Response Services

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.

Supervisors:

I appreciate the progress being made in addressing mental health crises in San Mateo County. I am writing to ask that San Mateo County go beyond the coverage mandated by the State of California.

The current state mandate is missing an important feature: **911 call centers cannot dispatch a clinician-led team themselves, as Half Moon Bay CARES, CAHOOTS, and Denver STAR do.**

I ask that the Board of Supervisors pass a resolution that funds non-armed, clinician-led mobile response teams can dispatch in every city in the county. Begin with with Redwood City, Daly City, South San Francisco, and San Mateo who already have police-with-embedded clinician response available 4 days a week. Two teams per city would allow coverage 7 days a week.

Cathy Baird
San Carlos

From: [Yedida Kanfer](#)
To: [CEO BoardFeedback](#); [Dave Pine](#); [Warren Slocum](#); [David Canepa](#); [Noelia Corzo](#); [Ray Mueller](#)
Subject: BOS 2/27 meeting, Agenda #6 - Increase unarmed crisis response services
Date: Sunday, February 25, 2024 10:54:34 PM

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.

Dear San Mateo Board of Supervisors,

My name is Yedida Kanfer, and I live in Foster City. I want to thank you for investing in unarmed 24/7 crisis response throughout San Mateo County. This is a good start, but the County needs to do more.

I have personal experience with mental health crisis - when I was in graduate school, a friend of mine, whom I knew was having a rough time, called me and said she had a knife out and was going to cut herself. It was incredibly scary. Fortunately my school had services for asap help. I can't imagine what it would have been like if I had to wait for even a half an hour - or longer.

The contract that the BOS is considering requires the contract response team to come within 60 or even 90 minutes, which is far too long. The county should increase funding for unarmed crisis response teams based in communities throughout San Mateo County.

Thanks,
Yedida

Written Public
Comment(s) for **Item No. 9**

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Gia <giap2247@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2024 4:53 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Item #9 Accept Resolution to Promote Equity

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am reaching out to express my unequivocal support for Item #9 on the February 27, 2024 agenda. This resolution is pivotal in opposing the establishment of a historic district in the affluent Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo, a move that critically undermines our collective effort towards equity and inclusivity in our community.

The Baywood neighborhood, known for its wealth and exclusivity, stands at a crossroads where the decision to prioritize historical preservation over the urgent need for affordable housing speaks volumes about our commitment to equity. The proposed historic district threatens to block the development of affordable housing options, directly impacting individuals with developmental disabilities who deserve to live independently in the community they call home, close to their essential services and support networks.

It's imperative that we recognize the broader implications of such restrictions, which not only exacerbate the housing crisis but also deepen the socioeconomic divide. By supporting the resolution outlined in Item #9, we send a clear message: our commitment to building an inclusive community where individuals of all income levels and abilities can thrive supersedes the desire to preserve an exclusive neighborhood's aesthetic.

I urge the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its application for a historic district and implore the State Historical Resources Commission to reject it. In doing so, we reaffirm our dedication to equity, ensuring that San Mateo remains a beacon of hope and opportunity for everyone, including our most vulnerable populations.

I may not be able to attend the meeting in person, but I stand firm in my support for this resolution and the positive impact it will have on our community's future. Let us choose progress and inclusivity over preservation that serves only a select few.

Thank you for your time and for considering my perspective on this matter.

Warm regards,

Gia Pham
gia@housingchoices.org
Housing Choices
Communications Coordinator

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Bernie Lau <blau1956@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 3:32 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Item #9 Accept Resolution to Promote Equity

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors, I am reaching out to express my unequivocal support for Item #9 on the February 27, 2024 agenda. This resolution is pivotal in opposing the establishment of a historic district in the affluent Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo, a move that critically undermines our collective effort towards equity and inclusivity in our community. The Baywood neighborhood, known for its wealth and exclusivity, stands at a crossroads where the decision to prioritize historical preservation over the urgent need for affordable housing speaks volumes about our commitment to equity. The proposed historic district threatens to block the development of affordable housing options, directly impacting individuals with developmental disabilities who deserve to live independently in the community they call home, close to their essential services and support networks. It's imperative that we recognize the broader implications of such restrictions, which not only exacerbate the housing crisis but also deepen the socioeconomic divide. By supporting the resolution outlined in Item #9, we send a clear message: our commitment to building an inclusive community where individuals of all income levels and abilities can thrive supersedes the desire to preserve an exclusive neighborhood's aesthetic. I urge the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its application for a historic district and implore the State Historical Resources Commission to reject it. In doing so, we reaffirm our dedication to equity, ensuring that San Mateo remains a beacon of hope and opportunity for everyone, including our most vulnerable populations. I may not be able to attend the meeting in person, but I stand firm in my support for this resolution and the positive impact it will have on our community's future. Let us choose progress and inclusivity over preservation that serves only a select few. Thank you for your time and for considering my perspective on this matter. Warm regards, [Your Name] [Your Address] [Your Contact Information]

Bernadette Lau

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Karen Grove <karenfgrove@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 4:32 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Agenda Item 9 - Applauding the resolution - please support

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I applaud the proposed resolution opposing the designation of the San Mateo Baywood Neighborhood as a historic district and urge you to support it. Historic designation of a “segregated area of white wealth” would not only celebrate our shameful past practices of racial exclusion, it would further cement them in place.

I urge you to support the resolution.

Thank you!

-Karen Grove

Resident of Menlo Park and co-creator of [The Color of Law Menlo Park Edition workshop series](#)

Karen Grove (she/her)

650-868-2732

<https://calendly.com/karen-grove>

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Susan Spiller <susanspiller@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 9:31 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Item #9 Accept Resolution to Promote Equity

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am reaching out to express my unequivocal support for Item #9 on the February 27, 2024 agenda. This resolution is pivotal in opposing the establishment of a historic district in the affluent Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo, a move that critically undermines our collective effort towards equity and inclusivity in our community.

The Baywood neighborhood, known for its wealth and exclusivity, stands at a crossroads where the decision to prioritize historical preservation over the urgent need for affordable housing speaks volumes about our commitment to equity. The proposed historic district threatens to block the development of affordable housing options, directly impacting individuals with developmental disabilities who deserve to live independently in the community they call home, close to their essential services and support networks.

It's imperative that we recognize the broader implications of such restrictions, which not only exacerbate the housing crisis but also deepen the socioeconomic divide. By supporting the resolution outlined in Item #9, we send a clear message: our commitment to building an inclusive community where individuals of all income levels and abilities can thrive supersedes the desire to preserve an exclusive neighborhood's aesthetic.

I urge the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its application for a historic district and implore the State Historical Resources Commission to reject it. In doing so, we reaffirm our dedication to equity, ensuring that San Mateo remains a beacon of hope and opportunity for everyone, including our most vulnerable populations.

I may not be able to attend the meeting in person, but I stand firm in my support for this resolution and the positive impact it will have on our community's future. Let us choose progress and inclusivity over preservation that serves only a select few.

Thank you for your time and for considering my perspective on this matter.

Warm regards,

[Your Name]
[Your Address]
[Your Contact Information]

Sent from my iPad

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Clarissa Kripke <kripkecc@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 7:50 AM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Item #9 Accept Resolution to Promote Equity

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am reaching out to express my unequivocal support for Item #9 on the February 27, 2024 agenda. This resolution is pivotal in opposing the establishment of a historic district in the affluent Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo, a move that critically undermines our collective effort towards equity and inclusivity in our community.

The Baywood neighborhood, known for its wealth and exclusivity, stands at a crossroads where the decision to prioritize historical preservation over the urgent need for affordable housing speaks volumes about our commitment to equity. The proposed historic district threatens to block the development of affordable housing options, directly impacting individuals with developmental disabilities who deserve to live independently in the community they call home, close to their essential services and support networks.

It's imperative that we recognize the broader implications of such restrictions, which not only exacerbate the housing crisis but also deepen the socioeconomic divide. By supporting the resolution outlined in Item #9, we send a clear message: our commitment to building an inclusive community where individuals of all income levels and abilities can thrive supersedes the desire to preserve an exclusive neighborhood's aesthetic.

I urge the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its application for a historic district and implore the State Historical Resources Commission to reject it. In doing so, we reaffirm our dedication to equity, ensuring that San Mateo remains a beacon of hope and opportunity for everyone, including our most vulnerable populations.

I may not be able to attend the meeting in person, but I stand firm in my support for this resolution and the positive impact it will have on our community's future. Let us choose progress and inclusivity over preservation that serves only a select few.

Thank you for your time and for considering my perspective on this matter.

Warm regards,
Clarissa Kripke, MD

Sent from my iPhone

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Tracy Volponi <tvolponi@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 6:47 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS - Baywood Historic District

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.

I support this resolution as noted because it is the right thing to do!!! Thank you for your help!!! – Tracy Volponi

“Adopt a resolution opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the City of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its historic district application for the Baywood neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.”

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Joe Volponi <joevolponi@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 7:18 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS - Opposition to Baywood Historic District

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.

I support this resolution that opposes the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo for the following reasons:

If Baywood becomes a National Historical District, many hidden consequences come with it for both current homeowners and future owners. It severely restricts the improvements a homeowner can make, creates a more bureaucratic approval process and ultimately lengthens the time required and cost to make home improvements. We have enough bureaucracy already in place in our city without adding another layer. Further, it burdens all future owners with the same unreasonable limitations. When a potential buyer realizes that they can't modify the home to meet the changing needs of their family, they will not buy the property. This dramatically impacts the resale value in our neighborhood.

What is particularly concerning is that the proponents of the Historic District Designation push forward with an agenda that affects all residents of Baywood without a vote or even so much as a poll. They never tried to develop consensus and didn't even allow the airing of different points of view. In a democratic society, that approach always engenders a level of distrust. As more people become aware of the Historical District ramifications, they are opposed to it.

An individual's home is often the most valuable asset they own. They need to have the flexibility to make changes to their property to accommodate the specific needs of their family subject to the zoning laws already in place. That was the implied agreement in place when a homeowner purchased the home. It is highly unfair/illegal for a small group to be able to substitute their tastes and preferences for those of the property owner and impose limitations on homes they didn't purchase. Another problem with the Historical District classification is that it makes it harder to bring older homes into compliance with today's building codes. Not all the homes pass today's earthquake structural requirements or energy requirements.

Trying to keep things static in a dynamic environment doesn't make sense. Changes often happen in ways we never foresee. Fifty years ago, few would have imagined that we'd have exponentially more computing power on our cell phones than NASA had in its entirety when it put a man on the moon! Much less that every home would have a computer. Going to work used to mean heading to a physical location outside your home. Now, it often means going to a different room. Today, cars are bigger than ever. 50 years ago, most families drove sedans that were just large enough for their family. Now, trucks and SUVs make up nearly 50% of the vehicles on the road. With all the change we've seen in the past several decades and the impact they've had on the requirements for our homes (i.e., additional rooms for the home office, larger garage needs, increased demand for technology, etc.), isn't it reasonable to think that the requirements for our homes will need to change going forward in ways we can't even imagine today? If the indigenous people that resided here before us had passed a historical designation, we'd all be living in stick and grass huts like the Ohlone!

Baywood does not qualify for the historic designation based on any reasonably objective criteria. While Baywood is a wonderful neighborhood, it isn't associated with events that have made a significant contribution to local or regional history. We don't know the history of every home in Baywood but few, if any, are associated with a person that made a significant contribution to local, California or national history (If one

home is, the owners of those homes have the absolute right to apply individually for an historical designation). There is no need for a blanket designation. Baywood is an eclectic mix of homes of many different styles that were built at different times with many substantially remodeled along the way. Consequently, **as a whole the homes of Baywood don't embody the distinctive characteristics of a certain period or method of construction that represents the work of a master or has high artistic value.**

We know that many of the proponents of the Historical Designation either don't live in Baywood, have already remodeled their homes, or would be exempted from the designation. We certainly don't think it is fair that residents that haven't yet remodeled their homes (even though they made a significant investment just to purchase it with that intent in mind) would be subjected to a revised set of rules that were developed after the game has started! If people had known that restrictions were coming that would preclude them from making the necessary changes to their property to accommodate the needs of their family, they likely wouldn't have moved here.

Is an historic district designation something that Baywood really needs? It is an issue that is dividing our community without a lot of upside and potentially significant downside. Individual homeowners purchase homes in Baywood for a variety of reasons but virtually all of them are looking to increase their property values. They should be the ultimate deciders as to what happens to their properties. There is no evidence to suggest that any new construction in Baywood has done anything but improve property values overall. It makes no sense to have a small committee substituting their judgment as to what is good for neighborhood property values for that of the actual investor in the property.

Adopt a resolution opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the City of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its historic district application for the Baywood neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application."

Thank You

Joe Volponi

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: lmaley@pacbell.net
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 6:49 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Resolution

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.

County Supervisors:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the adoption of the resolution to oppose the Baywood Historic District. Moreover, I am deeply dismayed that the County is allocating time and resources to this issue when there are far more pressing matters that demand attention.

The resolution lacks any factual basis, which leads me to believe that its purpose is not rooted in genuine concern. It is disheartening to see the County entertain such a proposition, especially when it appears to be driven solely by political motives. We should strive for better governance than this.

I find it difficult to comprehend that counties like San Francisco and Alameda, known for their rich heritage and steadfast commitment to preservation, would even entertain such an idea. I hope that our San Mateo County Supervisors consider maintaining integrity and priorities when voting on this matter.

Sincerely,

Lisa Maley

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Carmela Wagner <carmela.wagner@nadel.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 7:38 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Resolution opposing establishing of an historic district in Baywood

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.

Thank you for hearing the outcry from your community and those who support a more democratic approach.

The community is engaged in this issue and in me walking the streets of Baywood and speaking with people, there is not only fury but opposition to this until discovery is made and a hard pause/revoking of the paperwork is made from the Office of Historic Preservation.

Our community used to be filled with a unique solidarity and connection to neighbors and this is now creating havoc!

Until the San Mateo Heritage Alliance, Baywood Neighborhood Association, and SMHA can hear the community, we ask that you support your constituents and help us oppose this historic designation.
C

Carmela Wagner

VP | GLOBAL BRAND CONSULTANT

carmela.wagner@nadel.com | 650.845.2120

100 MARINE PKWY – STE 350 REDWOOD CITY – CA - 94065



CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Shirley Melnicoe <shirleymel86@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 8:55 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Item #9 Proposed Resolution Opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood ...

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.

Subject: Proposed Resolution Opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood Neighborhood of the City of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to Withdraw its historic district Application for the Baywood Neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.

Dear Supervisors:

As a resident of the Baywood area of San Mateo, I am appalled that such a resolution is even on the calendar of the County Council for consideration. Please withdraw this proposed resolution from consideration. I am very disappointed with the assumption that efforts to create a Baywood Historic District is a negative. Many of us in this community believe that the preservation of this historic neighborhood is a cultural imperative.

I have always loved old neighborhoods and historic buildings and have lived in a 1906 row house on Capitol Hill in Washington D.C. (where we were the minority) and a 1930's Dutch Colonial also in D.C. I very much appreciated the cultural and historic significance of both neighborhoods. After losing our house in the 1991 Oakland fire, my husband and I chose Baywood, in part because it reminded us of the East Coast. Baywood has a concentration of beautiful homes that exemplify the building styles of the 1920's and 1930's. They are valuable assets that contribute to the character of our city and make it a place where people want to live. It is not a cookie-cutter suburb with look-alike houses but rather a place where people love to walk and appreciate the unique architecture, stately heritage trees, and exceptional gardens. People need to understand that once these beautiful buildings are gone, they are gone forever. Our heritage and our history should be preserved for future generations.

I would like to make several points that undercut the validity of about the proposed resolution:

- The proposed Resolution is full of inaccuracies and misinformation and is perhaps being spearheaded by a small group with the crowd-pleasing name of Less Red Tape. It is led by a contractor, a developer, and a mortgage lender whose latest unscrupulous tactic seems to be use of the “race card” to achieve their goal of allowing unfettered teardowns of historic dwellings. The contractor, by the way, just put his Baywood property on the market so may be less than committed to Baywood’s future.
- The San Mateo Heritage Alliance, the affected non-profit organization, did not even receive the courtesy of any notice whatsoever that this was on the Board’s calendar. Where is the transparency in government?
- The San Mateo Heritage Alliance is following the protocol established by the National Register of Historic Places by submitting documents to the State Historic Preservation Office to determine whether or not Baywood qualifies as a historic district. If it meets the criteria, the property owners in Baywood will have the opportunity to approve or oppose the designation.
- Is this matter even the responsibility or purview of the County to interfere with processes undertaken by the cities in the county? The City of San Mateo has held a session on educating the public about historic districts. They are in the midst of updating the General Plan. Let them do their job. This is not the role of the County government.
- As shown in this message, the Whereas clauses, which are the basis of the Resolution, are full of misinformation. As a County document, this is an embarrassment and reflects negatively on the county’s review processes.
- A Whereas clause boldly states that the Baywood neighborhood in the City of San Mateo is the only "Segregated Area of White Wealth.” The source of this audacious claim is unstated but is implied to be the Bay Area Equity Atlas. Yet, no such information can be found on the website of that organization. This may be just more misinformation disseminated by the Less Red Tape group. Contrary to this racially charged assertion, the 2020 U.S. Census shows the City of San Mateo is only 34% white and 66% people-of-color and does not appear to break it down by neighborhoods. Note that the County of San Mateo has a higher percentage of whites at 36% than the City of San Mateo. All of the lovely neighbors that adjoin my property in Baywood --on either side, in front, and behind -- are non-Caucasian. This is fairly typical of the mix of racial groups in current-day Baywood.
- The Resolution’s reference to racial restrictions in Baywood is highly offensive and inappropriate. The deed to my 1929 house in Baywood does not have a racial restriction. It is questionable whether any deeds in the area actually had such a restriction. Even if they did, they were held to be unenforceable nearly 80 years ago, and Baywood is now highly racially diverse. Moreover, housing discrimination is prohibited by California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act of 1959, the Fair Employment and Housing Act of 1959, and the federal Fair Housing Act of 1968.

- As for curtailing housing and meeting State requirements, the City of San Mateo has achieved that goal and recently achieved State approval.

In summation, the proposed resolution is inappropriate and based on misinformation. **Please withdraw the proposed resolution from consideration.**

Sincerely,

Shirley Melnicoe

Resident of Baywood

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Chris Cooper <cscooper88@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 9:14 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: County BoS Meeting-Chris Cooper, Baywood Owner

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors Baywood Historic District Resolution,

With regard to the proposed resolution regarding the Baywood Historic District, and as a 25 year home owner in Baywood, I'd implore you to consider the following while also to not drag this esteemed and productive board into Ms. Lee's unfounded opinions regarding the care and welfare for Baywood. Please note that:

- The County has no jurisdiction
- The resolution is bad governance to overstep the County's jurisdiction and not contact your constituents
- The resolution promotes false and misleading information
- The district will not restrict housing, additions, ADUs, solar panels, etc.
- People always throw out the race card when they have no valid argument and Baywood does not have a race problem (my family is one of two mixed race families just within our 2 blocks and the remainder of the street is a mix of different races and religions)

I strongly oppose the adoption or any serious consideration of the resolution to oppose the Baywood Historic District. Moreover, I am deeply dismayed that the County is allocating time and resources to this issue when there are far more pressing matters that demand attention.

The resolution lacks any factual basis, which leads me to believe that its purpose is not rooted in genuine concern. It is disheartening to see the County entertain such a proposition, especially when it appears to be driven solely by political motives. We should strive for better governance than this.

We also own a home in Venice, CA, in a historic district and most of Ms. Lee's positions are untrue and not representative of the true meaning of a historic district or the experience of any owner in a California historic district. I find it difficult to comprehend that counties like Los Angeles, San Francisco and Alameda, known for their rich heritage and steadfast commitment to preservation, would even entertain such an idea. I hope that our San Mateo County Supervisors consider maintaining integrity and priorities when voting on this matter.

Respectfully, Chris Cooper

(457 Fairfax Ave., Baywood, San Mateo, CA)

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Lisa Diaz Nash <ldiaznash@cityofsanmateo.org>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 10:30 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Feb. 27, 2024 San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Agenda Item #9

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.

I apologize for not being able to speak with you directly about this matter as I currently am out of the country.

I discovered by happenchance that the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors' February 27th agenda includes Item #9, "Adopt a resolution opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the City of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its historic district application for the Baywood neighborhood, and calling on the State Historic Resources Commission to reject the application."

I would like to provide the following background information on this matter:

1. City of San Mateo staff has not taken a position on a potential Baywood historic district. The City's focus has been on promoting community education about historic resources in general and current processes in place in San Mateo related to historic resources. The City plans to develop a Citywide historic resources ordinance in 2025. Please review the City's [Historic Resources webpage](#). At the bottom, there are links to a relevant February 1 historic resources webinar put on by the City with an outside historic preservation consultant.
2. On November 20, 2023, the San Mateo City Council discussed a request to write a letter to the San Mateo Heritage Alliance opposing the idea of a Baywood historic district and asking that the related application to the State be withdrawn. The Council voted not to agendize this request. There has been no further action by the San Mateo City Council on this matter.

Respectfully,
Lisa Diaz Nash

Lisa Diaz Nash
Mayor
Council Member, District 1
City of San Mateo
ldiaznash@cityofsanmateo.org
650.224.4498

* PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is confidential and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments from your computer. Thank you.

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Tyler Elliott <tylercal@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 9:35 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: I support the resolution to oppose the Baywood Historic District

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.

To the Board of Supervisors,

I'm glad to see the agenda item for a resolution to oppose the establishment of a historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the City of San Mateo. The push for this historic district has been done in a dishonest, disingenuous, and non-democratic way. I fully support the adoption of this resolution.

The San Mateo Heritage Alliance continues to produce falsehoods and make outlandish claims, e.g. in their recent mailer's "FAQ" - "The designation results in no new restrictions." This and many other claims are just down right false according to the informational session put on by the city of San Mateo and planning department several weeks ago. In this session, they said the designation, if accepted by the state, would automatically require CEQA restrictions to be enforced on all permitted projects in the district and that the city would have no power to not enforce these rules.

Please stop SMHA in any way you can.

Thank you,
Tyler Elliott
San Mateo Baywood neighborhood resident and homeowner

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Max Mautner <max.mautner@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 9:05 AM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Re: San Mateo Baywood comment on historic district

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.

Thank you for considering [a statement](#) against establishing a historic designation in the Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo.

The Baywood neighborhood specifically was established & built up in an era where race-based legal prohibitions governed who could become residents of the neighborhood.

While it is a visually beautiful & high resource neighborhood, it does not deserve the honor of being frozen in time.

Nor does its current residents deserve to be shouldered with the cost burden of adhering to stricter prohibitions on what they might do to their own property.

I have signed the [Less Red Tape](#) petition, along with 287 others.

Yours truly,
Max Mautner
San Mateo, CA

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Nancy Weller <nweller625@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 7:13 AM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Historic District Resolution

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.

County Board of Supervisors:

I doubt Ms. Corzo or Mr. Slocum are fully informed on the intent or the legalities of designating a Baywood Historic District or they would not have sponsored a resolution that is filled with all kinds of misinformation and insulting allegations of racial bias.

Did Ms. Corzo or Mr. Slocum speak with any representative of the Heritage Alliance to understand why they were proposing a Baywood Historic District? Why not?

Why was the San Mateo City Council and Mayor not notified or consulted about a resolution affecting the city of San Mateo?

Why is this resolution being presented without the affected constituents notified of Ms. Corzo's and Mr. Slocum's intent? It seems as if it is trying to be slipped through "under the radar."

Who actually drafted this resolution? I seriously doubt it was Ms. Corzo or Mr. Slocum if they are people of integrity.

I will leave it to other supporters of the Heritage Alliance to address the MANY falsehoods. I urge you to read the recent factual letter and FAQ document mailed to Baywood property owners by the Heritage Alliance.

****I would like to specifically address the terrible racial/segregation accusations in this resolution. These are insulting insinuations that are outright lies and misrepresentation of our neighborhood and the reason for a historic district. Playing the Race Card in an attempt to mischaracterize a historic designation is a new low. I live on the corner of Virginia and Fordham. Next door to me live a family of Japanese heritage; across the street live a family of Chinese heritage, down the block an African American family bought a home last summer after renting on our street for a couple of years; also on my block an Indian and a Thai family. We celebrate together at our block parties and neighborhood gatherings. All these ethnicities are homeowners within one block of Baywood! Whoever dug so low as to try to imply that Baywood residents and the Heritage Alliance are racist is either desperate or sadly misinformed. **Implying that a historic district designation has the intent of racism is an outrageous red herring.**

I urge all supervisors to veto this resolution.

Sincerely,
Nancy Weller

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Stephen Weller <stephenweller92@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 7:13 AM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Heritage Status

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.

I have read a proposed "resolution" from the action items to be taken up at a county Supervisor meeting today. The accusation of racial prejudice in the attempt to declare the Baywood Area on San Mateo a Heritage District is outrageous.

We live in the Baywood; our neighborhood is peopled by homeowners of very diverse ethnicities. There is NO racial exclusivity intent in the effort to declare the Baywood Area a Heritage District, any more than successfully developing two other neighborhoods in San Mateo in the past. There are multiple untruths within the "resolution" that must not be endorsed by our elected Supervisors.

Please remove the resolution and "return to sender".

Stephen Weller, MD

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Jean Garcia <jeanbeangarcia@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 6:28 AM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Fw: Please support Resolution Against Baywood Historic District

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.

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

From: Jean Garcia <jeanbeangarcia@yahoo.com>
To: dpine@smcgov.org <dpine@smcgov.org>; ncorzo@smcgov.org <ncorzo@smcgov.org>; rmueller@smcgov.org <rmueller@smcgov.org>; wslocum@smcgov.org <wslocum@smcgov.org>; dcanepa@smcgov.org <dcanepa@smcgov.org>
Cc: mcallagy@smcgov.org <mcallagy@smcgov.org>; jnibbelin@smcgov.org <jnibbelin@smcgov.org>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 at 04:57:53 PM PST
Subject: Please support Resolution Against Baywood Historic District

Dear President Slocum and Members of the County Board of Supervisors,

SMHA has bypassed a neighborhood vote by Baywood homeowners and bypassed the City of San Mateo and submitted an application directly to the State Office of Historic Preservation which has a history of rubber stamping applications.

Informational meetings hosted by the SMHA were conducted by their paid consultants so that conveniently none of the down sides of historical designation were presented to the attendees. No one who has actually lived in a historic district and tried to do home improvements was represented. Because of this, most of the residents who attended those meetings and came away in favor of historical designation are older, have completed the renovations they intend to make and see historic designation as a way of preventing any duplexes or fourplexes being built in their neighborhood.

Baywood is a very expensive area and young families do not want the additional expense, problems and limitations that a historic designation will place on their property.

Baywood has not been a home to any famous person nor has any event of historical significance taken place in Baywood. There are 42+ unique styles of architecture and none of the architects are known outside the area. Historically speaking, Baywood was designed as a segregated neighborhood. I don't think in this era of DEI that this is something we should be historically commemorating or re-encouraging. I find it interesting that a few neighbors took it upon themselves to protest a property renovation by an African American family.

My parents moved to Baywood in the late 60's and my husband and I continue to live in the family home. Our home was built in 1934 and is lovely but has issues as many older homes do. We have tried to maintain the home and preserve its unique features but would like to correct a design flaw that has caused leaks in our living room for 40 years. Despite multiple attempts and lots of money spent trying to correct it, we are still living with leaks. This flaw is in the facade will likely be impossible to change under a historic designation. Moreover, before any historic district nomination the City of San Mateo told us we could not make any changes to help this situation.

My sister lived in a historic district in Racine, WI and gave up trying to do any improvements to her beautiful home and moved because the extreme difficulties she encountered.

SMHA is a small group of people trying to impose their will on others by foregoing any democratic process. I encourage you to help us preserve our property rights by adopting your resolution against this Baywood historic designation.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jean Garcia
Baywood resident
244 Parrott Dr.

From: [Ruthmary Cradler](#)
To: [CEO BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: Brd Agenda item 24-129, Feb 27, 2024 Historic District
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 9:39:27 AM

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.

Dear Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

I am one of your citizens who actually reads through your agendas and notices that you send out to us.

I cannot help but notice that on the upcoming February 27th meeting of the Board, the agenda items related to county business, as appropriate. But then....**Agenda Item, 24-129** practically leaps off the page. This proposes that you the COUNTY BOARD, take it upon yourselves to dictate what a neighborhood WITHIN A CITY MUNICIPALITY can or cannot do. This is completely inappropriate for the County Board.

I then read the attached resolution, 2 0240227, and was shocked to see that it is a hit piece factual inaccuracies, and negative innuendos. When you read the document, even without knowing more details, you should be able to see through it.

- One Whereas clause simply states that the Baywood neighborhood is a “Segregated Area of White Wealth”, yet there is no substantiation of this claim. A simple drive through of the neighborhood would show you otherwise.
- There has been no outreach to the community of District 2, that the author of this proposed resolution supposedly represents.
- The County Board has no authority to designate any district, neighborhood or building as historic. That is determined by a stringent set of criteria set by the National Register of Historic Places.
- The Whereas clauses, which are the basis of the Resolution, are full of misinformation. As a County document, this is an embarrassment. Is there no review process before documents such as this are presented to you?

This proposed resolution is inappropriate and based on misinformation and will lead to negative ramifications for the Board. **Please withdraw the proposed resolution from consideration.**

Thank you.

Ruthmary Cradler

Resident of San Mateo Park

Ruthmary Cradler
777 Bromfield Road
San Mateo, CA 94402
650-344-7046

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Ralph Garcia <Rg2bear@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 9:57 AM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Cc: Dave Pine; Noelia Corzo; Ray Mueller; Warren Slocum; David Canepa; Michael Callagy; John Nibbelin
Subject: Please support Resolution Against Baywood Historic District

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.

Dear President Slocum and Members of the County Board of Supervisors,

SMHA is a small group of people trying to impose their will on others by foregoing any democratic process. I encourage you to help us preserve our property rights by adopting your resolution against this Baywood historic designation.

Informational meetings hosted by the SMHA were conducted by their paid consultants (a cottage industry unto itself) so that conveniently none of the down sides of historical designation were presented to the attendees. Naturally the few attendees attending these meetings were not immediately alarmed.

Baywood is a very expensive area and young families do not want the additional expense, problems and limitations that a historic designation will place on their property. I encountered a real estate agent on Sunday trying to explain to a young prospective buying couple what the designation might mean. The open house featured a home that clearly needs MAJOR renovation or to be totally knocked down. The couple looked very unsure. Needless to say, a historic designation will reduce the pool of potential buyers.

Baywood has never been home to any famous person nor has any event of historical significance taken place in Baywood. There are 42+ unique styles of architecture and none of the architects are known outside the area. Historically speaking, Baywood was designed as a segregated neighborhood. I don't think in this era of DEI that this is something we should be historically commemorating or re-encouraging and a historic designation will indirectly do this. **A neighbor who happens to be African-American has already been harrassed by his neighbors. These neighbors did not wish to have him change his home in any way. The home was so small as to be useless to a growing family. This harrassment caused two years of delays and costs for him. In other words....MORE RED TAPE.**

Please adopt your astute resolution!

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Ralph Garcia, Jr.
22 year Baywood resident
244 Parrott Dr.

RG2 has sent this message.

From: [jill.valladares](#)
To: [CEO BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: BoS Meeting Tuesday February 27, 2024 Agenda item #9
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 10:04:13 AM

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors Baywood Historic District Resolution,

I write to you today about an urgent matter that has dire consequences for the residents of the Historic Baywood community. I ask you all to have an open mind and carefully review all the facts concerning the future of our beloved Baywood neighborhood.

The resolution should be opposed because:

The County has No Jurisdiction
The Resolution is Bad Governance
Contains False and Misleading Information
Goes Against County Historic Preservation Policies
Housing would Not be restricted, additions, solar panels, ADU's ...
The Historic Restrictive Covenants are Not Relevant; Baywood is Diverse
City of San Mateo has been Aware of the Historic Status and Nomination and Recently Held
The Resolution Hurts Seniors and Fixed-Income Residents of the Baywood Historic District

My family and I moved into our Baywood dream home 38 years ago. We were a young family with two small children and we were welcomed and embraced. Please keep the legacy and true spirit of Baywood and oppose the proposed Baywood Historic District Resolution

I adamantly oppose the adoption of the resolution to oppose the Baywood Historic District.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mrs. Jill Valladares

374 Fairfax Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94402-2272

From: annakuhre2@icloud.com
To: [CEO BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: In Support of the Resolution Against The Baywood Historic District - #9
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 10:36:06 AM

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.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <annakuhre2@icloud.com>
Date: Thu, Feb 22, 2024 at 9:43 AM
Subject: In support of the Resolution Against the Baywood Historic District
To: <dpine@smcgov.org>, <ncorzo@smcgov.org>, <rmueller@smcgov.org>, <wslocum@smcgov.org>, <dcanepa@smcgov.org>
Cc: mcallagy@smcgov.org <mcallagy@smcgov.org>, wagstaffe steve <swagstaffe@smcgov.org>, <jnibbelin@smcgov.org>

President Slocum and Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

The San Mateo Heritage Alliance SMHA (a non-elected group) has presented their application to the Office of Historic Preservation for the upscale neighborhood of Baywood in San Mateo, for Historic Designation. They are already interfering in the San Mateo Park neighborhood planning process, with hopes of going city wide.

Please do not allow:

1. Please do not allow a small 8 person group of over-zealous board members SMHA to dictate their values on all of San Mateo residents. Please do not allow **The Blanket Historic Designation** to be used to embolden the separation of classes, or decimate family property rights or personal freedoms. Please respect the values and principles that individual home ownership represents.

2. Historic districting was never meant to be used as a weapon against your neighbor, neighborhoods or homeowners. Please help us eliminate the east/west mentality that has existed in San Mateo for many years. Please do not allow the further delineation of Baywood from our family of neighborhoods in San Mateo.

3. Please do not allow the weaponization of historic preservation to spread across San Mateo. While this effort was started in the Baywood neighborhood, the SMHA stated intent is to target many more neighborhoods. This was most recently demonstrated in San Mateo Park. How would you like strangers coming into your neighborhood and dictating the rules?

4. Please help us to tie up all of these loop holes and **use your legal authority as our elected officials to** submit an Objection Resolution Letter to The State Office of Historic Preservation and The State Historic Resource Commission.

The San Mateo Heritage Alliance SMHA failed procedures are:

1. Failed to conduct a survey of the 444 Baywood property owners effected.
2. Failed to select a fair option where-by non-supporters can be exempted from this “eligible“ historic classification.
3. Failed to present the pros and cons. Their consultants only hosted promotional presentations in favor.
4. Failed to build consensus in the Baywood community.
5. Failed to disclose to the Baywood residents that there is

only a 45 day commentary period...not a Real vote!

6. Failed to respect and recognize the will and values of their neighbors.

7. Failed to respect the property rights of their neighbors by applying for a **blanket designation**. This is not Democratic!

Please help us. Thank you very much.

Regards, Anna Kuhre

Baywood Resident

Former Public Works Commissioner

President Emerita SMUHA

annakuhre2@icloud.com

+1-650-773-3669

Anna Kuhre

annakuhre2@icloud.com

+1-650-773-3669

From: [Rita Armstrong](#)
To: [CEO BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: Board Feedback for Tuesday Feb 27 Meeting
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:02:33 AM

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.

This is a strenuous objection to your inclusion of the motion against the Baywood Historic District at **your** meeting tomorrow night. I emphasize "your" because you obviously don't want any public opinion or discussion. The Heritage Alliance and the mayor were not notified of this matter. What kind of governance is that? You know the answer to that question. The Heritage Alliance has conducted its business transparently with full compliance with the rules governing eligibility of a historic district. Why can't you be equally transparent and forthright? I feel like I live in a Trumpian banana republic.

Further, the resolution contains false and misleading information: housing would not be restricted, Baywood is diverse (Come visit!), the resolution hurts Baywood seniors and fixed income residents, and the City of San Mateo has been aware of the historic status and nomination.

Regardless of the outcome of the historical designation, the process must be fair, open, and collegial. You are fulfilling none of these obligations.

Can't wait to vote.

Rita Armstrong
650-918-9199 (mobile)

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Frank Elliott <fcelliot@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:25 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback; Noelia Corzo; Ray Mueller; Warren Slocum; David Canepa; Michael Callagy; John Nibbelin
Subject: Please support Resolution Against Baywood Historic District

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.

Dear President Slocum and Members of the County Board of Supervisors,

Please adopt the proposed resolution opposing establishing an historic district in Baywood.

San Mateo Heritage Alliance is not doing anything illegal, but what is going on is not in the spirit of protecting truly historic resources. They have bypassed the residents of Baywood (we do not get a vote), bypassed the City of San Mateo, and are trying to bypass you Supervisors. A small group of people have more authority in this matter than our elected officials. There is a lack of agreement surrounding the impact of the designation, and there has been no open forum to discuss the benefits and drawbacks.

From what we have learned, any neighborhood with homes older than 50 years old, can likely be stamped as "historic." We think that could be potentially applied to 50% of the Bay Area. Consultants are engaged, cookie cutter submissions are developed, and the OHP has accepted 100% for the last five years.

This is bigger than Baywood. I urge you to adopt this resolution... this is far bigger than San Mateo County... it applies to the entire State. We may not stop it, but ask that you add to our voice of 285 petition signers, and help us. Thank you.
[Link to Petition](#)

Frank Elliott
419 Jackson Street
27 year resident of Baywood

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Joe Godfrey <joegodfrey99@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:21 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Resolution Opposing Establishing the Baywood Historic District

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.

Hello,

I'm writing to express my concern about the process being undertaken to make Baywood a Historic District. I knew there was a conversation happening, but never had anyone from the Heritage Alliance or any other group contacted me directly to share the details of what this would mean, nor to explicitly query our support or opposition to the idea.

Since finding out a couple weeks ago that a proposal had been created and submitted without my knowledge, I began asking others in the neighborhood if they had heard what was happening and each said they had not. None had been informed about how the process would work, nor had their opinion documented. None knew that an application had been submitted. Very few understand what the impacts (positive or negative) would be.

I've reached out to the San Mateo Heritage Alliance, and their responses left me more frustrated than before. They claim "hundreds" of supporters, but provide no documentation. They claim that all but one family they spoke to on Cornell (my street) are supporters, and this is verifiably false. Almost no one on Cornell had any idea what was happening, and everyone I've spoken to recently is opposed.

I have asked the SMHA to gauge true public sentiment through a vote or survey, and they have refused. I've asked them to provide more clarity to residents of Baywood about how the process works and they sent a mailer that falsely implies that there will be something approximating a vote.

Not asking for people's opinions until AFTER the state determines that we are a historic district is beyond unreasonable. Especially since over 50% would have to proactively oppose, with everyone else assumed to be a Yes. That is an unreasonable burden to place on a community that is largely unaware of the pros and cons that a historic district would bring.

To be clear - I'm not advocating for or against the Historic District. I believe that we as a community should decide whether this makes sense for us, based on what the majority of residents want. It should not be decided by a small group (on either side).

The Heritage Foundation is claiming broad support, but provides no documentation or evidence to back that up. They are facing a backlash and ascribing it to "misinformation". But from my perspective the backlash is being driven primarily out of anger and frustration that a small number of people are trying to push through a change that affects everyone without gauging their true support.

Residents of Baywood deserve to be fully informed about where we already are in the process, and given the chance to stop it if more people oppose than support it. The application should be revoked unless and until the San Mateo Heritage Foundation can prove broad support - through a vote, a petition, or some other DOCUMENTED means. Simply saying "we went door to door and most people we talked to supported it" is dubious at best and should be insufficient to warrant a change as impactful as this.

Please do everything in your power to get this application revoked so that the San Mateo Heritage Alliance will be motivated to truly and fully engage in the debate and garner documented support for their plans.

Joe Godfrey

Proud Baywood and San Mateo resident since 2012

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Cathy Baird <cathy_baird@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:36 AM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Item 9: resolution opposing establishment of a historic district in Baywood - SUPPORT

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.

Supervisors:

I support the resolution opposing establishment of a historic district in the Baywood district of San Mateo.

Individual homeowners can apply for historic status if they want to. Those who don't want to or can't apply for historic status should not be bound by district status.

Cathy Baird
San Carlos

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Robert Whitehair <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 1:47 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Please support the resolution to stop the creation of the Baywood historic district.

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.

San Mateo County Supervisors ,

I am writing to support the resolution to oppose designating the District 1 Baywood neighborhood a historic district. That district wishes to secede from the rest of San Mateo. That is unacceptable.

The worst part of the proposal for the Heritage District, is that once a district is created, the district can amend the boundaries, to take in other areas of the City.

Robert Whitehair
robertwhitehair2@gmail.com

San Mateo, California 94402

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Keith Weber <keithmax2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 1:20 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Agenda Item #9, Resolution

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am greatly disturbed by Item #9 (Resolution) on the 2/27/24 agenda. I respectfully request that the Board remove this item from the agenda and take no action on it for the following reasons:

1. It is outside the Board's jurisdiction.
2. It is a mean spirited political hit piece based not on fact, but on fabrications, falsehoods and innuendo.
3. It paints positive neighborhood pride and respect for City/County history as divisive negatives.
4. It runs counter to San Mateo County policies that support preservation of historic resources.
5. Although Supervisor Corzo may have brought this item to the Board, it closely mimics the misinformation on disgraced City Council member Amourence Lee's website.

Please remove this item from the agenda. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Keith Weber

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Richard Delaney <Rich@westcoastmhp.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:48 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Proposed resolution opposing the Baywood Historic District.

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.

From: Richard Delaney <Rich@westcoastmhp.com>
Date: February 25, 2024 at 5:58:09 PM PST
To: "To: Dave Pine" <dpine@smcgov.org>, Noelia Coezo <ncorzo@smcgov.org>, Ray Mueller <rmueller@smcgov.org>, Warren Slocum <wslocum@smcgov.org>, dcanepa@smcgov.org, "Cc: mcallagy@smcgov.org" <mcallagy@smcgov.org>, wagstaffe steve <swagstaffe@smcgov.org>, jnibbelin@smcgov.org
Subject: Proposed resolution opposing the Baywood Historic District. DRAFT

I have read the proposed resolution opposing the Baywood Historic District and urge you to approve the resolution. . The creation of a Baywood Historic District is poor public policy and contrary to major city, state, and county goals.

I live in Baywood and have for 20 years. I was never contacted to see if I was in favor of the district and neither was anybody I know. It was created by a small group of people who want to control their neighbors and oppose change in the homes of others.

Please vote to approve the resolution Tuesday.

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Andrew Ryan <andrewr@nam-shub.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 2:25 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback; Dave Pine; Noelia Corzo; Ray Mueller; Warren Slocum; David Canepa; Michael Callagy; John Nibbelin
Subject: I support "Adopt a resolution opposing establishing of an historic district in Baywood."

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.

I am a homeowner in the proposed Baywood historic district and I would like to register my strong support for the Board of Supervisors resolution to oppose the establishment of a historic district in Baywood, San Mateo.

Preserving some of our history is important, but let's be clear: the proposed Baywood historic district designation has nothing to do with history.

Rather, this designation is about establishing PERMANENT CONTROL BY AN UNELECTED MINORITY OVER HOUSING POLICY AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN in the Baywood neighborhood.

The "history" claimed by the San Mateo Heritage Alliance and their hired architectural historians, Page & Turnbull, is entirely "invented history." It claims that Baywood's role as a "Commuter Suburb" and a "Streetcar Suburb" justify placing serious permanent restrictions on 444 of the permanent residences of over 1,000 people and over \$1 billion dollars in real estate. All to satisfy a few people's egos about how they think the front of your house should look.

No professor or serious academic would ever study Baywood's history. Why? Because there isn't any history worth studying. Consider the facts, which even the San Mateo Heritage Alliance does not deny:

- No one important ever lived or did anything important in Baywood.
- No important historical events ever took place in Baywood.
- No architects or builders of national distinction ever worked in Baywood.

Not coincidentally, architectural historians such as Page & Turnbull collect large fees from organizations like the San Mateo to prepare and defend these applications. Shocker: the same people inventing bogus history around historic districts also have a financial incentive to do so. Connect the dots here. Follow the money.

Supervisors: if you think this is just a local San Mateo issue, we assure you it is not. The historic preservationists are coming for neighborhoods all through our County and looking to assert control wherever they can. Preservationists are taking advantage of lax evaluation standards at the state level and a legal loophole that lets them apply directly to the state, usurping the power of City and County authorities. We must fix these problems at the State level, but until that happens, we must oppose the creation of bogus historic districts such as this one in any way that we can.

I also wrote about this in more detail in the San Mateo Daily Journal: https://www.smdailyjournal.com/opinion/guest_perspectives/hijacking-history-in-baywood/article_15cefeb2-cadc-11ee-a2b2-3f63672cbba4.html

Andrew Ryan

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Robin Wall <rhwall@rocketmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 2:13 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: RESOLUTION OPPOSING ESTABLISHMENT OF HISTORIC DISTRICT N BAYWOOD

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.

I support the resolution because the Heritage Alliance has initiated this effort without clear communication and intention. As a Baywood resident, it is my understanding that just a few people started this campaign to make Baywood historic, for reasons still unknown to me. There isn't anything historic about Baywood, not its history, and not its architecture. It is a beautiful neighborhood, but it does not exactly stand up to truly historic places in our state, much less our country. The process with which this effort transpired is unclear. Why we as residents have to object to paperwork filed by the Heritage Alliance in order to hear the concrete consequences of this action, seems backwards. Was the Heritage Alliance forced to file this paperwork? Why, and by whom? When this began, I initially had no opinion on the subject. As this has progressed, and as I've learned more, I oppose our neighborhood being designated as historic. The opinions of the neighborhood should matter to the leadership. The residents should be informed of all of the consequences of this decision.

Thank you,
respectfully submitted,
Robin Wall
507 Cornell Avenue
rhwall@rocketmail.com

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Elizabeth B <elizabethbours18@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 2:53 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Supporting Item 9

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.

Dear San Mateo Board of Supervisors,

As the youth of San Mateo County, we'd like to voice our strong support for the opposition of the Baywood Historic District. We believe that this initiative carries troubling implications that echo the historical injustices embedded in California's land use policies, particularly concerning exclusionary zoning.

We share the concern that designating Baywood as a historic district may hinder the city's ability to comply with state laws aimed at promoting fair housing practices, such as the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) law. This could inadvertently exacerbate existing disparities and impede progress toward achieving racial equity and fair housing choices. As youth, we find this especially troubling as these policies will exacerbate the current housing unaffordability within the city and county. Especially as San Mateo County has recently been named the singular county in the country that requires an incredible salary of 500,000 to afford the average home([SFGate](#)). The designation would serve as an additional policy preventing future generations of San Mateo County from staying within the area.

To prevent those harms, we strongly encourage San Mateo to prevent these undue restrictions and to reject the designation of Baywood as a historic district. To stop the progress of this Historic District is a step towards ensuring San Mateo County remains supporting its entire community.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Bours
Daniel El Kaim
Aki Dayag

From: [Eleanore Dogan](#)
To: [Dave Pine](#); [Noelia Corzo](#); [Ray Mueller](#); [Warren Slocum](#); [David Canepa](#); [Michael Callagy](#); [Stephen Wagstaffe](#); [John Nibbelin](#); [CEO_BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: WRT Agenda Item: Adopt a resolution to Oppose Baywood Historic District
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 3:17:05 PM

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.

Dear San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

I support the resolution to **OPPOSE** the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo because:

Wholy Undemocratic

- The fact that an individual or small minority of people can purchase an Historic Architect's review of a neighborhood, nominate that neighborhood directly to the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and have that designation restrict property rights without any input or express consent from the Owners is **RIDICULOUS and un-democratic**. I have literally had to vote on fees that were less than \$100 in annual impact. Yet something that could result in thousands or tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands in economic impact to me, could be done to Owners without their awareness?? This is a **SHAMEFUL** loophole that the San Mateo Heritage Alliance (SMHA) with financial support from the Baywood Neighborhood Association (BNA), a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit, have exploited because they knew they couldn't get anywhere close to a majority Owner support.

- In the draft application submitted in November 2023, SMHA nominated 444 Homes. Most Owners are just now starting to become aware of the SMHA/BNA effort and the issues. And as they find out, they are seething mad. And yet, this could be approved by the OHP as early as Summer 2024?!? SMHA/BNA clearly tried to get this done without Owner awareness.

Bypasses the City/County

- Historic Designations should be City or County-Level Decisions. Did you know that most times, representatives of the State Office of Historic Preservation don't even visit the 'historic' locations?

This article is a great representation of how many Owners feel about this issue:

https://www.smdailyjournal.com/opinion/guest_perspectives/hijacking-history-in-baywood/article_15cefeb2-cadc-11ee-a2b2-3f63672cbba4.html

Your Action

Please formally notify the State Office of Historic Preservation that this nomination is **NOT SUPPORTED** by the affected community and they should halt further consideration of the nomination of Baywood to the Historic Register.

Sincerely,

Eleanore Dogan

Owner 339 Parrott Dr, San Mateo, CA 94402

From: [Steven Russell](#)
To: [CEO BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: Support the resolution to stop the creation of the Baywood historic district.
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 3:33:18 PM

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.

San Mateo County Supervisors ,

I am writing to support the resolution to oppose designating the District 1 Baywood neighborhood a historic district.

Specifically, opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the city of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its Historic District application for the Baywood neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.

Historic designation will significantly impact the rights of property owners by increasing red tape, limiting design choices, increasing costs to maintain and update homes, and making it more difficult to sell properties. It will also limit the ability provide much needed new homes to San Mateo. Historic districts are a permanent designation, without exemption or exception, that will cast a shadow over the Baywood neighborhood.

We cannot allow a small group of unelected individuals from the Baywood Neighborhood Association and San Mateo Heritage Alliance to usurp our property rights without the approval of the Baywood property owners, and the City and County of San Mateo.

Creating a Baywood Historic District perpetuates the neighborhood's history of exclusion by arbitrarily increasing the cost of homeownership and shifting the responsibility of housing onto other neighborhoods. Baywood's development in the 1920s and 30s featured housing covenants explicitly prohibiting people of color from buying homes. Over time, the neighborhood has evolved into one of the City of San Mateo's most expensive areas, becoming one of the City's most segregated zones of white wealth. State law (AB 686) requires all communities to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by combatting housing discrimination, eliminating racial bias, undoing historic patterns of segregation, and lifting barriers that restrict access. The Baywood Historic District undermines County efforts to foster inclusive communities and to achieve racial equity and fair housing choices.

Please support the resolution and help stop the creation of the Baywood historic district without delay!

Steven Russell
stevenwrussell@gmail.com
104 Oakwood Drive

Pacifica, California 94061

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Tom Lease <eltomdom@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 3:59 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: County Supes or County Snoops?

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.

Dear Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

Full disclosure I am still upset at a mailer I got last week from Noelia and 4 others that labels Nicole Fernandez, Cliff Robbins, Jerry Hill, Maureen Freschet, and Sarah Fields as "Trump Supporters" Sick and shameful and I encourage everyone on that slate to disavow or retract that slander.

I also not happy that a County Board of Supervisors has decided to take a position in a City of San Mateo issue that has zero relation to anything with the County.

Our former Mayor of San Mateo Amourence Lee recently started a dirty rumor on Facebook that Maureen Freschet is a Trump supporter and Amorence Lee is also labeling anyone and everyone who cares about historical architecture as a racist.

The language in your proclamation is straight out of Amourlence Lee playbook and it seems you are doing the bidding a disgraced city official grievances as a body of the county and that is troubling.

I hope you will remove your efforts in the City of San Mateo Historical Preservation efforts and Stay in Your Lane.

If I am wrong and it is the responsibility of the County to take positions in the historical districts of a city I will definitely apologize for my mistake.

Tom Lease
San Mateo, CA

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Lisa Vande Voorde <fitstart@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 3:55 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: 2/27/24 Board Agenda Item 9, Resolution to Oppose Historic District

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.

Dear San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

Subject: Proposed Resolution Opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood Neighborhood of the City of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to Withdraw its historic district Application for the Baywood Neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.

This resolution should be summarily **REJECTED** for the following reasons:

- This is a local issue in the purview of the City of San Mateo; this is outside the jurisdiction of the County. **The County does NOT have jurisdiction over City of San Mateo planning issues.**
- **There is ZERO precedent for the County to take a position on a Historic District nomination.** The City of San Mateo has three historic districts (Downtown, Glazenwood and the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House), and the County did not weigh in, vote, or attempt to stop the process for those historic districts.
- **You are taking action on an issue without proper notice.** Neither the City of San Mateo nor the San Mateo Heritage Alliance was ever officially given notice that this resolution was pending. Taking action without notification to affected parties is NOT how our government should do business, nor is it legal.
- **Eleven of twelve of your WHEREAS clauses are patently FALSE.** I can't go into each one here due to the deadline to get my comments to you, but surely others have written or will speak to the veracity of those clauses. But certainly will speak to the SIX of the twelve clauses that refer to racial discrimination and bias that have NO PLACE in this conversation. Baywood is composed of ALL people, white AND those of color, including black, Hispanic, and Asian American. To throw out the race card is WRONG, has NO BASIS in fact, and to do so only denigrates true racism that is all too prevalent in our society. These WHEREAS clauses are specious claims that do not lend ANY credibility to this resolution.

With so many falsehoods, I question the motivation of those who are backing this resolution. It can only be politically-motivated, and I sincerely hope that our Board of Supervisors is above that. That this resolution is even before you is shameful. With all the issues facing the County of San Mateo, this is what you choose to focus on? You can do better, and you should do better.

I ask that you summarily withdraw this resolution, and/or vote against it, and get on with the business for which you were elected. Political theater has no place in government.

Yours truly,

Lisa Vande Voorde
City of San Mateo Resident since 1986

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: SMC AAPI Alliance <smcaapialliance@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 3:54 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Public Comment: Regarding Baywood neighborhood's historic designation

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.

Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

The San Mateo County Asian American and Pacific Islander Alliance respectfully requests your support for the resolution opposing the establishment of a historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo.

Like many other neighborhoods across the United States, the Baywood neighborhood was unfortunately founded upon racial exclusion. The deeds for Baywood properties contained restrictions prohibiting any “person of African, Japanese, Chinese, Hindu, Indian, Korean, or Mongolian descent or person not wholly of the Caucasian race” from purchasing, owning, leasing or occupying property unless they were “kept thereon by Caucasian occupants strictly in the capacity of domestic servants, gardeners or chauffeurs.”

For generations non-white families were locked out of Baywood while home prices skyrocketed, resulting in a present day neighborhood where home prices range from \$2.5-\$4M and only 0.8% of residents are Black. Baywood is San Mateo’s only segregated area of white wealth, as classified by the Bay Area Equity Atlas, and ranks in the Top 20 of most segregated areas of white wealth in the Bay Area.

The San Mateo Heritage Alliance has submitted an application to the California Office of Historic Preservation to have the Baywood neighborhood designated a historic district. Their stated goal is to exempt the neighborhood from laws like SB 9 that enable missing middle housing in single family neighborhoods.

Blocking more affordable missing middle housing will exacerbate the segregation in the Baywood neighborhood. In addition, the rules and regulations that accompany historic designation can result in increased repair and remodeling costs and increased property values, pricing out current and potential residents and further fueling gentrification. In this way, the legacy of exclusionary zoning persists, even with the seemingly benign goals of preserving historic architecture and blocking duplexes.

Using historic designation to block housing also makes it difficult to comply with state law on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, which requires local jurisdictions like San Mateo to combat housing discrimination, eliminate racial bias, undo historic patterns of segregation, and foster inclusive communities to achieve racial equity, fair housing choice, and opportunity for all Californians. Instead of preserving affluent neighborhoods, we must support zoning changes that allow new multi-family housing in traditionally exclusive neighborhoods to reverse land use policies that excluded minority communities. That is why we encourage the Board of Supervisors to pass a resolution opposing the establishment of a historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of San Mateo.

Respectfully,
The Executive Board of the San Mateo County Asian American and Pacific Islander Alliance

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Manisha Shahani <manisha.shahani@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 3:48 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Resolution Opposing Establishing of Historic District in Baywood

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.

To whom it may concern,

I support the resolution - I am a resident/homeowner on Cornell ave. Thank you,

Manisha Shahani

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Shelly DeC <shellydec@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 4:42 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Adopt the proposed resolution opposing establishing an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood.

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.

This email is about Agenda item 9: Adopt a resolution opposing the establishment of a historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the City of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its historic district application for the Baywood neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.

Dear President Slocum and Members of the County Board of Supervisors,

Please adopt the proposed resolution opposing establishing a historic district in the Baywood neighborhood.

San Mateo Heritage Alliance (SMHA), a small organization whose board has very few members who live in Baywood, submitted an application to the state on behalf of the whole neighborhood (444 homes) to have it designated as a historic district without due process; I did not vote for SMHA, I was never asked what I thought, nor given materials to review. I did request the president of the alliance to have a neighborhood meeting to discuss the pros and cons of a Baywood Historic District and then have the neighborhood vote and was told, "No".

We live in a democracy where we vote to make decisions. For a handful of people to unilaterally decide to apply without the knowledge of the group affected is un-American. The people living in the neighborhood were bypassed, the City of San Mateo was bypassed, and now the Board of Supervisors is being bypassed.

Thank you for your consideration,

Shelly DeCorte

419 Jackson Street, San Mateo, CA, 94402

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Barbara Ruck Pavicic <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 4:39 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Oppose creation of Baywood historic district.

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.

San Mateo County Supervisors ,

Dear Supervisors, I am writing to support the resolution opposing designating the District 1 Baywood neighborhood a historic district. I've lived here for over 30 years and this is the first time I've written a letter to the County Supervisors.

Specifically, I ask you and the other Supervisors to oppose the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the city of San Mateo, urge the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its Historic District application for the Baywood neighborhood, and call on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.

Historic designation will significantly impact the rights of property owners by limiting design choices, increasing costs to maintain and update homes, and making it more difficult to sell properties. It will also limit the ability to provide much needed new homes to San Mateo. Historic districts are a permanent designation, without exemption or exception, that will cast a shadow over the Baywood neighborhood.

Creating a Baywood Historic District perpetuates the neighborhood's history of exclusion by arbitrarily increasing the cost of homeownership and shifting the responsibility of housing onto other neighborhoods. Baywood's development in the 1920s and 30s featured housing covenants explicitly prohibiting people of color from buying homes. Over time, the neighborhood has evolved into one of the City of San Mateo's most expensive areas, becoming one of the City's most segregated zones of white wealth. State law (AB 686) requires all communities to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by combatting housing discrimination, eliminating racial bias, undoing historic patterns of segregation, and lifting barriers that restrict access. The Baywood Historic District undermines County efforts to foster inclusive communities and to achieve racial equity and fair housing choices.

We can not allow a SMALL group of unelected individuals from the Baywood Neighborhood Association and the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to usurp other people's property rights and subvert the expansion of city housing without the approval of the Baywood property owners, the City and County of San Mateo.

Please support the resolution and help stop the creation of the Baywood historic district without delay!

Sincerely, Barbara Ruck Pavičić

Barbara Ruck Pavicic

bpavicic@gmail.com

San Mateo, California 94402

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Rebecca Wysong <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 4:36 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Please support the resolution to stop the creation of the Baywood historic district.

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.

San Mateo County Supervisors ,

I am a Baywood resident and city planner, writing to support the resolution to oppose designating the District 1 Baywood neighborhood a historic district.

Specifically, opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the city of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its Historic District application for the Baywood neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.

Historic designation will significantly impact the rights of property owners by increasing red tape, limiting design choices, increasing costs to maintain and update homes, and making it more difficult to sell properties. It will also limit the ability provide much needed new homes to San Mateo. Historic districts are a permanent designation, without exemption or exception, that will cast a shadow over the Baywood neighborhood.

We cannot allow a small group of unelected individuals from the Baywood Neighborhood Association and San Mateo Heritage Alliance to usurp our property rights without the approval of the Baywood property owners, and the City and County of San Mateo.

Creating a Baywood Historic District perpetuates the neighborhood's history of exclusion by arbitrarily increasing the cost of homeownership and shifting the responsibility of housing onto other neighborhoods. Baywood's development in the 1920s and 30s featured housing covenants explicitly prohibiting people of color from buying homes. Over time, the neighborhood has evolved into one of the City of San Mateo's most expensive areas, becoming one of the City's most segregated zones of white wealth. State law (AB 686) requires all communities to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by combatting housing discrimination, eliminating racial bias, undoing historic patterns of segregation, and lifting

barriers that restrict access. The Baywood Historic District undermines County efforts to foster inclusive communities and to achieve racial equity and fair housing choices.

Please support the resolution and help stop the creation of the Baywood historic district without delay!

Rebecca Wysong
rebecca.wysong@gmail.com

San Mateo, California 94402

CEO_BoardFeedback

From: Shirley Liu <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 4:24 PM
To: CEO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Please support the resolution to stop the creation of the Baywood historic district.

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.

San Mateo County Supervisors ,

I am writing to support the resolution to oppose designating the District 1 Baywood neighborhood a historic district.

Specifically, opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the city of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its Historic District application for the Baywood neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.

Historic designation will significantly impact the rights of property owners by increasing red tape, limiting design choices, increasing costs to maintain and update homes, and making it more difficult to sell properties. It will also limit the ability provide much needed new homes to San Mateo. Historic districts are a permanent designation, without exemption or exception, that will cast a shadow over the Baywood neighborhood.

We cannot allow a small group of unelected individuals from the Baywood Neighborhood Association and San Mateo Heritage Alliance to usurp our property rights without the approval of the Baywood property owners, and the City and County of San Mateo.

Creating a Baywood Historic District perpetuates the neighborhood's history of exclusion by arbitrarily increasing the cost of homeownership and shifting the responsibility of housing onto other neighborhoods. Baywood's development in the 1920s and 30s featured housing covenants explicitly prohibiting people of color from buying homes. Over time, the neighborhood has evolved into one of the City of San Mateo's most expensive areas, becoming one of the City's most segregated zones of white wealth. State law (AB 686) requires all communities to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by combatting housing discrimination, eliminating racial bias, undoing historic patterns of segregation, and lifting

barriers that restrict access. The Baywood Historic District undermines County efforts to foster inclusive communities and to achieve racial equity and fair housing choices.

Please support the resolution and help stop the creation of the Baywood historic district without delay!

Shirley Liu

rabbit121208@yahoo.com

321 Commercial Ave #15

South San Francisco, California 94080

February 26, 2024

TO:

County of San Mateo Board of Supervisors: Dave Pine; Ray Mueller; David J. Canepa; Noelia Corzo; and Warren Slocum

RE:

February 27, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting

Agenda Item 9: Resolution opposing the establishment of an historic district in the Baywood neighborhood of the City of San Mateo, urging the San Mateo Heritage Alliance to withdraw its historic district application for the Baywood neighborhood, and calling on the State Historical Resources Commission to reject the application.

Historic District designation by the [California] State Historic Preservation Officer and the State Historical Resources Commission is an *honorific designation only*.

The *City of San Mateo* can choose (or not) to craft rules and adopt standards to recognize the importance of, and to protect the identified structures, landscapes and homes within the Baywood neighborhood as recognized by the State Historical Resources Commission.

This proposed Resolution *is not within* the jurisdiction of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors.

Please vote to *not support* this Resolution.

Sincerely,

Dianne R. Whitaker, AIA

Dianne Whitaker Architect

Former County of San Mateo Coastsides Design Review Committee Member (9 Years)

Former City of San Mateo Planning Commissioner (9 years)

30-year Resident of San Mateo's North Central Neighborhood

Written Public Comment(s)
for **Item No. 37**

From: [Cindy McCool](#)
To: [CEO BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: Attn Ray Mueller agenda for 2/27/2024 AT&T eliminating land lines
Date: Saturday, February 24, 2024 3:49:03 PM

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.

Hello Mr. Supervisor!

I just wanted to add my 2 cents to the issue regarding AT&T eliminating land lines in my area: Montara .

When the power goes out, which it does frequently, without my land line I cannot call 911 as cell service does not work here when there is no electricity. I have to drive ½ mile to Hwy to get a signal that is sufficient to call 911 or anyone. In the most recent power outage, my husband 77 years old and an invalid, was sleeping in his reclining chair. The power had been out for 2.5 days but our solar battery was working so we had power & signal. At 2:30 PG&E power flickered back on and my husband reclined his chair to sleep. You see, he'd been sleeping sitting up for 2.5 days because he was fearful that the solar battery wouldn't operate his chair. So the power didn't stay on, but flickered off while he as in full recline. When he woke due to a nature call the chair wouldn't work and the solar battery was exhausted. He tipped the chair forward and slid out onto the floor thinking he could get on his hands & knees and lever himself up by pushing on the chair. He couldn't and woke me up. We struggled for 20 minutes, he weighs over 300 lbs, I'm @ 140 and cannot help him, until we called 911 and the fire department came and two beefy firemen got him off the floor into a chair. All this took place in the dark at around 0500. When the sun came up my solar panels worked and re-charged the battery but we were without power for another day and a half, total 3.5 days without power. If I hadn't had my land line I would have had to pull the emergency release for the garage door, drive half a mile to Hwy 1 and call 911. All the while my husband would be lying on the floor in a dark room. Did I mention that this little episode caused many contusions on his diabetic legs that we are still trying to heal? Well they did.

Bottom line, please don't let AT&T take away my emergency land line. In the future we might have underground fiber optic lines that are not subject to falling trees and weather, but I don't know if we will live that long. Oh, forgot to mention I'm soon to be 80 and there is just so much I can do and losing a land line isn't an option for me.

Thank you for taking the time to read my story. Your help is much appreciated.

Cindy McCool
Life Artist
PO Box 370891
Montara, CA 94037

cindy@mccoolmgt.com

650-867-0037 (text) because even with electricity my incoming messages go straight to VM and while I'm home I can only use cell to text

From: [Phil Erskine](#)
To: [CEO BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: AT&T Wanting to Disconnect Landlines
Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 10:07:40 AM

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.

Hello, San Mateo Board of Supervisors,

Hello, San Mateo Board of Supervisors,

I've been reading a lot about how AT&T wants to discontinue the landlines and sell the copper. We all saw what happened last **Thursday, February 22nd, 2024** when AT&T had a massive outage with their wireless service. Think about the latest storms we had on the San Mateo Coast three weeks ago, power outages that lasted three days or longer for some folks, PG&E raising their rates by 37% within January and February of this year, \$35.00 for the first bill, second for \$14.00 for a fire management fee and still we were without power for three days on the San Mateo Coast (Half Moon Bay), no internet, no cell service, nothing. Still, the landline worked, and I could dial PG&E; you can't do that with wireless, right? So, if you allow AT&T to discontinue their landlines, how do we communicate "smoke signals"? I'm sorry, I didn't pass my test, oh, I know, "Morse Code" I failed that test too. What it comes down to is what if we have some catastrophic disaster where all communications are knocked out completely, with no AM radio, cell service, no power, nothing? The only thing that will work is our landline.

So, what can the supervisors do; they can go to Clovis or Ukiah, where the CPUC holds their secret meeting, making it difficult for folks driving four hours to protest and CPUC who are in bed with the governor since he appointed them, the same people that rubber-stamped the increase on the PG&E bill; this needs to be stopped on the landline and use some common sense if any politician has any.

Thank you for your time
Phil Erskine
perskine50@gmail.com