

Candidate Name: Diana Reddy

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: I am running on a platform of environmental, economic, and housing justice. My interest in building adequate affordable housing will not be met by building on the salt ponds. I support building along existing transit corridors. For what it's worth – I was endorsed by Sierra Club – partially, I'm sure, because of my position on building on the salt ponds.

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: Current developments have been built without adequate community benefits. I will only support developments when adequate community benefits are included, regardless of what is currently listed in the General Plan. I will not support commercial developments without the housing and other benefits to support them.

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: The Harbor View proposal is an example of how residents trusted the process behind the General Plan, but that process was circumvented by developers not interested in Redwood City and city council members, who (in my opinion) put those developers above the needs of the residents and Redwood City's future.

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: No. City Council members are leaders in our community, and, I believe, have made a covenant with the community to be clear about their values and to govern by those values. Accepting the application, etc., would be against those values for me and against my promise to support a platform of environmental justice.

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: No. In addition to Sea Level Rise being real(!), I am very concerned about protecting the residents in the mobile home parks, which are the last bastions of affordable housing for many of our residents. Those residents are at risk during King Tides and flooding from Redwood Creek. When our city council supports development and not residents, those residents are at risk of losing their homes, which are attractive to developers with their eye on bayside properties.

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 – except that we are losing light industrial, and the idea of relocating on the bay side is interesting to me.

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: I do.

- 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: I would.

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: To be honest, understanding traffic relief and planning is not currently one of my strengths. It happens that I have scheduled a meeting with a friend whose expertise is traffic. I can better respond once I more fully understand the ramifications of this question. In fact, I’m happy to have this question, because I intend to ask it of him. I can add that I truly want to be able to ask hard questions and support the point of view of people I trust – people whose point of view is coming from their values and not their self interest. I look forward to seeking advice from and supporting the views of RCNU in the future – whether I am elected or not.

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: A couple of years ago I participated in the Redwood City piece of a Berkeley Urban Displacement Study. The conclusion of that study was: Should the City succeed in its

economic development goals, there will be a mismatch between housing supply and job growth that goes against the core of sustainable development. The over 2000 units of housing were not built for our residents, many of whom have been displaced and are now commuting long distances to continue to work here. I do not support commercial development without the housing to support it. Our community desperately needs affordable housing to support diversity and residents essential to a sustainable community.

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: No. Explained above.

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: I don't recall that any of my sentiments on the subject were ever made in public, but, in the spirit of full disclosure, I was an early supporter of the Cargill project. Cargill had donated tens of thousands of acres of former salt ponds to communities on the east side, the project would have included the largest privately owned wetlands in the State – something I had come to understand would be the most effective mitigation against Sea Level Rise, and affordable housing was promised – something I already knew we were going to desperately need. Well, it became clear to me that the City Council would not approve any affordable housing east of 101, and commercial building and market rate housing were being built with little regard for sustainability. I came to realize that my own environmental values needed to be checked. I support responsible development, which does not include the construction of more than one million square feet of office space, which is larger than our entire downtown.

If elected, I can be trusted to base my decisions on my values, not my self interest.