

Candidate Name: Jason Galisatus

Q1: Redwood City's General Plan directs future growth to a revitalized downtown and along existing transit corridors, while conserving open space and protecting our quality of life. It also sets limits on the intensity of development within various land-use categories.

a) Do you agree with our community's current vision for building in the urbanized core of our City and not in areas that the General Plan designates as open space, such as the Redwood City salt ponds? Please explain your answer.

A: Yes. Redwood City has underutilized lands around transit that could successfully accommodate greater density. From this standpoint, our Downtown is an ever-evolving success story, in that the Downtown Precise Plan promoted compact infill development within an urban core centered around high-quality transit. This type of development is appropriate. Development that encroaches on land designated as open space is neither appropriate nor needed.

b) Do you agree with the land-use mix and development intensity within the current General Plan? Please identify changes you would like to see, if any.

A: I would like to see certain updates to our General Plan including updates to the live/work zoning along El Camino Real, the expansion of the Mixed Use Corridor zoning along Veterans Boulevard, expansion of open space zoning in the downtown core, and mixed-use zoning designation to reimagine Sequoia Station.

Q2: In considering the current Harbor View proposal, a council member argued that the City has an obligation to grant the developer "due process" by studying the project – eg. allowing the project to move forward with required environmental studies and initiation of a General Plan Amendment. California law, however, allows a city to deny outright, without further studies, any development proposal that is not in conformance with its General Plan.

In your opinion, what obligation does the City have to process an application and conduct environmental studies for a development project that is not consistent with its General Plan and current zoning?

A: I prefer that the General Plan amendments be taken as part of a broader, more comprehensive discussion. However, if a project came before council that had the potential to enhance the community it should not be categorically ruled out for consideration. While it may not be a legal obligation, the Council has an obligation to the community to see what the project has to offer the City.

Q3: In 2009, the City Council voted to accept the initial Saltworks development application and begin a lengthy (and divisive) environmental review process to fill in restorable wetlands on the Cargill salt ponds, which have long been designated as "Open Space" in the General Plan and are zoned "Tidal Plain".

If elected and a future development proposal for any portion of the salt ponds comes before you:

a) would you be inclined to accept the application and vote to initiate environmental studies and a General Plan Amendment process? Please explain why or why not.

A: I would not be inclined to support an amendment to the General Plan for development of the salt ponds. The salt ponds play a critical role in mitigating sea level rise and flooding impacts in the Harbor Village Mobile Home Park as well as in the Friendly Acres neighborhood, provide open space and recreational opportunities for the community, and are a critical natural habitat for wildlife in the Bay and the marshlands. Further, its proximity to heavy industrial uses make the site inappropriate for any use other than open space.

b) are there any circumstances that you believe would justify a Council decision to approve a development on the salt ponds? Please explain your answer.

A: Some of the fondest memories I have from my childhood are biking and rollerblading on the Bay Trail with my family. Just minutes from our home we could experience the beauty of nature and its restorative effects on the mind and body. I also remember taking a boat out into the Bay with the Marine Science Institute and learning about the Bay, the namesake of our region, and being inspired by the wildlife.

I believe future generations of Redwood City residents should be afforded this experience.

I see no circumstance that would justify a Council decision to approve development on the salt ponds. The harm to our environment is simply intolerable for Redwood City, our region, our ecosystem, and for future generations to come. The salt ponds should be restored as wetlands.

Q4: Redwood City's 2013 Climate Action Plan states that "while the City has taken significant action on climate change in the past 7 years, it becomes increasingly important to begin climate adaptation planning as well", and suggests developing recommendations for adaptation measures based on the 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy, which includes measures for increasing, protecting and restoring wetlands as well as avoiding or limiting development in areas subject to sea level rise.

a) If elected, would you encourage Council/City staff to work with other agencies to increase areas of tidal marsh for flood protection in Redwood City?

A: Yes. I having extensive experience working at the County and federal levels and would bring these experiences and relationships to bear.

b) If elected, would you be in favor of the City including adaptive measures for restoring and increasing tidal marsh in its Climate Action Plan?

A: Redwood City has the opportunity to be a part of the largest wetlands restoration project in the West. We should take advantage of this opportunity and continue to lead the way in environmental conservation.

c) If elected, would you consider approving future development in areas subject to sea level rise beyond what is currently allowed by the General Plan? Please explain your answer.

A: Because the Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment conducted by the County found that 40% of all of Redwood City stands to be affected by sea level rise, the City should remain open to considering amendments.

Q5: The July 2016 Redwood City Climate Action Plan and Environmental Initiatives Update states that “if the current trend continues unchanged, the City’s 2020 [greenhouse gas] reduction goal will not be met”. This conclusion was based on GHG

inventories that ended in 2013, before the recent boom in office development and corresponding traffic increases.

a) Do you believe that it is important for Redwood City to strive to meet its community-wide goal of a 15% decrease in GHG over 2005 levels by 2020, and/or to meet California’s goal of a 40% reduction in GHG over 1990 levels by 2030?

A: Yes. Following the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Climate Agreement, cities, states, and private entities must make an even stronger effort to achieve GHG reduction targets.

b) If elected, would you support adoption of local codes, ordinances and/or programs, as some other cities have enacted, that would help achieve those goals? A: Yes.

Q6: The current Highway 101/Woodside Road interchange improvement plan did not incorporate any increased traffic from potential development east of Hwy 101 beyond what is accounted for in the General Plan. If substantial new development there is allowed, the expected traffic relief for current commuters and Seaport industries from these improvements could be short-lived, or traffic through the interchange could end up worse than current conditions.

If elected, would you approve a development project east of Highway 101 if it would significantly increase traffic impacts on current Redwood City commuters and nearby industries? Please explain your answer.

A: Fiscal Year 2017/2018 was the most productive in the history of the Port, with 49% increase in cargo from previous years. Traffic impacts along the interchange must be mitigated along with the development of new projects in order to protect port industries and reduce congestion.

Q7: Despite significant housing construction in the last several years, the worsening jobs/housing imbalance in Redwood City contributes to our housing affordability crisis, adds to commute times and greenhouse gas emissions, and creates increased pressure to develop on open space lands.

a) Do you believe the City's Downtown Precise Plan should be reopened to allow for additional office space development? Why or why not?

A: I prefer mixed-use projects in the downtown core, and often office space finances other desired uses and allows the project pencil, since the per square foot price for office is much higher than for housing or for retail.

If additional office is considered in a second downtown precise plan I would like to see a housing linkage requirement, so that housing is built commensurate with office. I would categorically oppose first floor office space and would support and strongly enforce a requirement that any new office space must include first floor retail in the downtown core.

b) Do you agree with the recent 4-2 City Council decision to proceed with the study of the Harbor View project proposal to amend the General Plan to allow for construction of more than 1 million square feet of office space and thousands of additional workers east of Highway 101? Why or why not?

A: I do agree with the decision to advance the study. I see the Harbor View as distinct from the Cargill project, in that it does not propose changing an open space designation and does not propose filling in the Bay. Under current zoning, an indoor cannabis cultivation center could be allowed, and I believe the project should have been studied to see what alternative to light industrial would be possible, as well as to learn more and have further discussion on the developer's plans to mitigate its impacts on transportation and housing as well as to secure a project labor agreement to examine the potential to bring high-quality union jobs to the area for working families.

As the developer continues to assess the proposed project, I would like to see a project that is smaller in scale with density closer to what the zoning allows, with greater investment in transportation improvements, that adds to our housing supply, and that includes a project labor agreement. This is an ongoing discussion I would like to continue to have with Harbor View, and denying studying the project would have denied the opportunity to have this important discussion.

Q8: In addition to publishing this questionnaire, RCNU will be informing voters about candidates' past Council and Planning Commission votes as well as public comments that candidates have made at City Council/Planning Commission meetings or to the media that are related to the topics covered in this questionnaire. If you have any comments you would like to make regarding your past actions or public statements, please take this opportunity to discuss them below.

A: