

Candidate Name: Giselle Hale

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. I'm a smart growth advocate and our current General Plan follows those principles.

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: Generally, yes. I do think there are rezoning opportunities to open up more opportunities to add to our housing supply.

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 don't believe we are obligated.

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: Yes. This is an important area for addressing sea level rise. I'm very interested in solidifying our mitigation plans to address impending sea level rise following the Office of Sustainability study.

- 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: None come to mind

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

- 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: Yes

- 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: No. But if there was a project that could protect an area to sea level rise, I would want to look at the project.

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: We should strive to meet or exceed this goal.

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, I support the adoption of regulatory tools to meet goals.

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: No, any projects in that area, because they are not near alternative transit options, would need a hefty TDM so as to not compound the current traffic situation. We would also need line of sight on plans to complete the Bloomquist extension and the Woodside/84 project.

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 believe new projects should go through the standard planning process until DTPP2 can be discussed as a community.

I did vote to approve 853 Main, an office project because it will revitalize a part of the Downtown the community and businessowners wanted to see improved and this project makes that possible.

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: We have a General Plan and it's reflective of community input at the time of adoption. It allows for certain sized projects with certain uses. At the time Chair Radcliffe made a good point- the community isn't looking for major deviations from the plan. Councilmember Masur's comments also resonated with me, that we could learn a lot as a community about the natural state of

that parcel by going through the EIR process without any obligation to vote for the project.

I won't comment on the specific plan and how I would vote as I want to reserve the ability to weigh in from the dias as either a Planning Commissioner or Councilmember and not have to recuse myself for having already decided on the merits of the project.

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: