

# Sierra Club – Alameda Election November 2012

## Questionnaire for City Council – Tony Daysog Response

### General Approach

As a Councilmember, we will be counting on you to help Alameda develop environmentally, equitably, and economically while preserving our natural and cultural heritage. As long as economic growth equates to material growth requiring materials from outside of the local area, such as large homes and automobiles and other possessions, there will be a tension between economic development and environmental stewardship. What guidelines do you use to achieve sustainable and equitable economic development and preservation of our natural and cultural heritage?

**RESPONSE:** Getting Alameda Point going is one of the key aspects of my campaign for City Council, along with helping solve our cities unfunded liabilities and bridging City Hall and the larger community. I am committed to redeveloping Alameda Point as a transit-oriented mixed-use development that is sustainable on a number of fronts, including stewardship of natural environmental resources, fiscal sustainability, sustainable with respect to improved carbon-foot print, and sustainable with respect to balancing wide-range of career track jobs and housing for all income segments. To this end, one of the critical matters that I will pursue, if elected to City Council, is de jure or de facto modifying of “Measure A” for Alameda Point, as well as for Webster Street north of Buena Vista Avenue. As Councilmember, I will lead the public in an effort to modify Measure A with respect to these important areas. As a professional urban planner and someone with a Master’s degree in City Planning from UC Berkeley, I am uniquely qualified to lead our community in this dialogue. In pursuing Alameda Point, I am committed to pursuing Alameda point with larger needs and constraints of the City as a whole in mind. When I was on City Council and even before as early as 1995, I championed Bayport, which was needed to create a tax base to jump start redevelopment: now, we need a mix of housing for all incomes, not just “McMansions.” In addition to transit-oriented land-uses, we need to provide incentives to new industries to hire local residents, or encourage local Alameda Point residents to work locally, so more and more people either walk, bike or take the bus to their local place of employment – get people out of their cars on long SOV commutes that pollute the air and harm the natural environments. At Alameda Point, we also need to take a look at parking regulations to see how we can incentivize households to get them to take alternative forms of transit and depend less on the auto: my home is 100 feet away from the Webster Street transit corridor and does not have parking – I get along well taking the bus to work, or car-sharing with my significant other. With respect to equitable redevelopment, on top of the 25 percent affordable housing set-aside, we need to attract quality industries that provide a wide range of careers and pay-scales, so that young adults hired by a quality industry can move-up the ladder of success over time. Right now, the industries at Alameda Point are mostly warehouse-oriented entities that place a premium on low-cost space, i.e. businesses such as the winery, distillery, athletics merchandise wholesaler, the storage facility, Antiques By the Bay that, while quality and valued, don’t offer the breadth of occupations and income earning potential needed to allow young adults to move up a career ladder and earn enough to adequately live in the high-cost San Francisco Bay Area. Moreover, these quality warehouse-oriented businesses are the exceptions to the hundreds of industrial/commercial acres that remain in deteriorated, substandard condition. So, what will guide my approach to Alameda Point is: (1) redeveloping Alameda Point with needs and constraints of the

community in mind; (2) redeveloping Alameda Point in a way that meets life-cycle needs of residents; (3) focusing economic development on re-using existing facilities, with special attention to industries/sectors that provide career pathways for workers, i.e. not dead-end jobs.

---

### **Toxics and Environmental Restoration**

1. Alameda Point is a Superfund site and the Navy plans to leave some contaminated materials in place and impose deed restrictions, some in perpetuity, on the land when it is transferred. The toxics at Alameda Point pose potential hazards to both people and other living things. Do you think existing cleanup standards are adequate? Do they protect other living things as well as humans? Is it advisable for Alameda to permit the construction of housing, such as Shinsei Gardens, above soil containing fuel or chlorinated hydrocarbon vapors? Is it advisable for the City to accept deed restrictions that require the City to enforce restrictions on digging into soil in perpetuity where residual “marsh crust” (heavy asphalt like hydrocarbons from town gas plants in the 1800s and early 1900s) is found?

**RESPONSE:** The City of Alameda and the ARRA need to work more closely with the Restoration Advisory Board. A RAB member recently pointed out certain features on a map presented by the Navy to the RAB, features that do not align with land uses and activities envisioned by the City/ARRA. If there is a need to improve clean-up standards, that’s a discussion the City/ARRA Governing Board ought to have with the RAB, Navy personnel over-seeing clean-up, appropriate persons from the EPA, and appropriate persons from the DTSC: such discussions should occur regularly in any event. Is it advisable to accept deed restrictions, you ask: such restrictions are in place.

---

### **Regional Development**

2. Is it important that Alameda consider regional issues when developing Alameda Point, such as regional jobs housing balance, housing for those who cannot afford to pay market rate rents, and regional transportation systems? What would you or your major supporters like to see developed at Alameda Point?

**RESPONSE:** While Alameda is an island, it is not an entity unto itself: we depend on and have much to contribute to the region. Thus, we need transit-oriented development to get more and more people out of SOV commutes and into mass transit, to improve regional air quality and improve traffic on our highways. We also need TOD to husband our land resources wisely, so we don’t develop every possible square inch of land, that we set-aside areas for passive and active open space for people and other species, endangered or not. The City of Pleasanton decision underscores that cities can no longer simply build homes without thinking through questions pertaining to jobs-housing balance: redeveloping Alameda Point as a transit-oriented mixed-use community offers a way to pay for the improvements needed to attract quality industries that provide a wide breadth of industries to employ future Alameda Point residents, as

well as other residents, to move people away from SOV commutes from Alameda to Silicon Valley or Bishop Ranch in San Ramon. Moreover, at Alameda Point, creating lofts will allow people to live and work in place. Having residential on top of commercial (office/retail) also achieves that. Alameda Point also needs new rental stock for families that are priced out of the market, as well as homeownership opportunities for low- and/or moderate-income first-time home buyers. The 25 percent 2002 affordable housing agreement that I joined Mayor Appezato in crafting is a critical step in this regard: but we need to take it further by specifying **\*\*how\*\*** we are going to achieve the 25 percent target. For example, we need to strategize a FHA low-down strategy for first-time home-buyers, as well as devise strategies that encourage interested seniors to sell their homes to qualified first-time home buyers as a way to get bonus points to move into top notch units at future Alameda Point senior residences, i.e. kind of like a reverse mortgage program.

3. What modes of transportation should the City support to develop in Alameda and the region?  
Possible modes include auto, motorcycle, bus, ferry, BART, bicycle and walking. Which modes do you see increasing their share of trips in the future?

**RESPONSE:** We need to get more people to take alternative modes of transit, such as bus and BART. A healthy percentage of residents in the workforce live in easy walking distance of bus lines, and work in places that can be accessed by bus or BART; yet many of these residents take their cars and drive on an SOV basis to work. We need to change that, by making sure we have a transit strategy not just for Alameda Point but all of the island.

4. How would you create major transportation hubs with high-density housing, especially low-income housing? Do you support Alameda's revised housing element, the first one certified by the State in nearly two decades?

**RESPONSE:** I support the recently adopted Housing Element, though if elected to Council, I will seek to tweek the multi-family housing overlay so that more of these housing are along Webster Street (north of Pacific Avenue) and Park Street (north of Pacific Avenue). Putting multi-family units in central Alameda away from bus nodes (such as the northern waterfront) reduces the likelihood of making the high-density housing-transit connection: people there will simply drive on a SOV basis. If you're going to do multi-family overlay, cluster it along known transit corridors, as well as cluster it at planned multi-modal transit nodes (such as at Alameda Point).

5. What are the biggest barriers to green job development in low-income communities and how would you overcome these barriers?

**RESPONSE:** According to Van Jones, one of the biggest impediments to green job development in low-income communities is that schools there are not doing well enough in preparing low-income persons for emerging green-tech jobs. In addition, making sure people have access to formal and informal networks that let people know about job training and apprenticeship opportunities is key. But we also need to have industry work closely with community college, universities, and workforce development boards, so that we identify and prepare for careers within the emerging green tech economy, not just dead-end jobs. In terms of what we, as local government can do, certainly we need to be able to process permits for green-economy businesses on a streamlined, fast-track basis, so they can get up and going. Affordable financing is always a key issue for any business, and I suppose this is as well for green industries.

---

### **Resource Management (Water, Materials, Energy)**

6. Alameda has an outstanding solid waste recycling program and has worked well with CASA to implement it. What do you think can be done to improve our solid waste recycling program and do you think the City will meet the County's landfill waste reduction goal?

**RESPONSE:** We need to divert more solid waste away from landfill. As it is, we're diverting almost 70 percent of our waste – and we have targets to increase the diversion rate even more, to almost 80 percent by 2014, and almost 90 percent by 2020. I clearly understand that “zero waste” is a philosophy and design framework that promotes not only reuse, recycling, and conservation programs, but also, and more importantly, this emphasizes sustainability by considering the entire life-cycle of products, processes, and systems. This comprehensive, systems approach promotes waste prevention by: Having products and packaging designed for the environment, Reducing the materials used in products and packaging, Using less toxic, more benign materials in production and manufacturing, Providing longer product lives by developing more durable products, and Having products that are repairable and easily disassembled at the end of their useful life.

In spring 2009, the City of Alameda began a planning process to identify the policies, programs, and facilities that will be needed to achieve zero waste. The Zero Waste Implementation Plan is the beginning of a long-term systematic effort to: Reduce the overall solid waste generated within the city - Reduce the quantity of solid waste generated per person within the city Increase the quantity of recyclable and compostable materials diverted from landfills - Support state and federal efforts to build the environmental and social costs into the price of products and packaging and require manufacturers to take back products at the end of their useful life.

7. Do you support AMP's sale of excess recycled energy credits to fund energy conservation programs in Alameda?

**RESPONSE:** Nothing leads me to believe there's anything wrong here but I'm open to hearing what residents have to say.

---

### **Fauna, Flora, Open Space and Recreational Land Management**

8. According to the 1996 Community Reuse Plan, the runway area at Alameda Point is slated to become (1) a national wildlife refuge and (2) California Public Trust land (Northwest Territories) for open space and recreation. After the US Fish and Wildlife Service refused the Navy's terms for accepting the land to create the Alameda National Wildlife Refuge, the Veterans Administration expressed a willingness to take over the parcel and manage the least tern colony, while it runs a medical clinic and columbarium. The VA would be responsible for maintaining the runway area as a wildlife refuge. It is possible that the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) would manage that refuge site. Do you support the section of the reuse plan that calls for creating a wildlife refuge?

**RESPONSE:** I have always supported the establishment of a wildlife refuge at Alameda Point and, if elected to city Council, I will continue to support the wildlife refuge as articulated to me in the past by local Audubon Society and Sierra Club members. I understand that the Veterans Administration is proposing a facility near or perhaps even on site originally set-aside for endangered species – the California Least Tern and California Brown Pelican. I also understand the US Fish and Wildlife Service refused to accept the runway area to create a refuge. But even so, it is my firm belief that this site should must remain a wildlife preserve for the Least Tern and Brown Pelicans. The VA proposal also fails to provide assurance that any residual contamination that is transferred with the property will be properly remediated. NAS Alameda is big enough for us to accommodate the VA facility elsewhere, but not at expense of prior and right commitments we made with regard to the ANWR. Oh, yeah: I voted for the Re-use Plan back in 1996 – don't see any need to change that now.

9. Do you believe it's appropriate for the city to require EBRPD to give Measure WW funds to the city before the park district creates and manages a regional park on the Northwest Territories?

**RESPONSE:** No, the EBRPD's has faithfully worked with the City – it's not fair to stick them with a \$3 million bill now. We never talked about then back when I was on; I don't see why we need to stick them with the bill now. We can come up with other ways to finance stuff.

10. Enterprise Park, located next to the USS Hornet and Breakwater Beach, includes active soccer fields, a dormant campground, a shuttered recreation building, and unused volleyball, basketball and tennis area. What would you do to help create the regional park at this location as called for in the base reuse plan?

**RESPONSE:** I have no problems with planning that area, since I already helped EBRP in determining appropriate uses before. I am very sure we all agree that there will be no RV Park or overnight camping accommodations, since this would attract n'er do well: keep it a day-time active regional park to be used by kids and young at heart. But absolutely no RV park or camping ground because that'll unnecessarily invite some persons with bad intentions -- a very few never do-well who unfortunately spoil it for all: you wouldn't want THAT in your neighborhood, right. So what makes you think putting a night-time RV park and camp ground next to an existing neighborhood is okay? The EBRP has abandoned the RV Park/camp ground idea long ago – and they for sure don't want to revisit that controversy. Because the EBRP has faithfully worked with the community and city, they shouldn't be stuck with this \$3 million tab.