

**Candidate Name: Corrin Rankin**

1. Redwood City has plans to grow significantly over the next few years, and the way in which that growth is directed will shape our city for years to come. The 2010 Redwood City General Plan envisions a revitalized downtown area with housing located near our existing transit hubs and entertainment and retail venues, while conserving our open space areas and protecting the community's quality of life.

Do you agree with our community's vision for building housing in the urban core and not in designated open space areas? If not, how would you describe where you see our city's growth progressing?

**I believe in developing are downtown, but not to the point of where it will decrease the quality of life by over populating the downtown with housing. The City's General Plan allows for up to 2500 housing units within downtown. According to Redwood City's own website, the number of people per household is 3.26 which will equate to 8,150 additional residents downtown. The City makes the assumption that most of these residents will not have vehicles and use public transportation. A simple drive around Redwood City will show that assumption may not hold true.**

**Parking in Downtown Redwood City is already difficult on weekends and during downtown events. Once construction of 900 Crossing begins (formerly Redwood Towers), the current 200 plus parking spaces will no longer be available. 900 Crossing will bring an additional 950 plus parking spaces once completed, but that's at least three years away once constructions begins. There are four large housing developments currently under construction and will be completed prior to completion of 900 Crossing. 201 Marshall Street, 116 residential units, 640 Veterans Blvd 264 residential units, 145 Monroe Street 305 Residential units, and 333 Main Street, 132 residential units. Quality of life will be affected by this influx of residents and vehicles. So far the council has approved 1100 residential units in downtown, (601 Main Street, 196 residential units not under construction yet). I believe at some point we may need to place a moratorium on the new construction to assess how the completed housing affects our open spaces, climate and our quality of life.**

2. According to Redwood City's General Plan EIR, key traffic corridors, including Highway 101, Woodside Road and Whipple Avenue, are already at or near capacity and do not have excess capacity to absorb a significant influx of new cars from development on the salt ponds. Recent plans for improving traffic flow through the Highway 101/Woodside Road interchange did not incorporate any development on the salt ponds. If a development is allowed, the limited 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 on the salt ponds that significantly increases traffic impacts on current Redwood City commuters and nearby industries? Please explain your answer.

**I strongly believe in preserving Redwood City's open space. But I also believe in having a truly functional open space that is actually open to the public for use. When Stanford University wanted to build housing in the area known as the "Dish", many groups fought against it and the area remained**

**open space. Stanford University even improved the access to the area by making improvements to the walking trails for public access.**

**Currently the salts pounds are inaccessible and not functional for public use. I would work with developers to develop and improve the public access and use of the salt ponds area, restoring much of the salts back to its natural state, with most of the land used for open functional open space.**

3. Sustainability and protection of our land, air and water are becoming increasingly important. By concentrating growth in the core of our city, we conserve energy, reduce the emission of greenhouse gases, and maintain our open spaces for the benefit of wildlife, the enjoyment of hikers and other recreational users, and for restoration of Bay tidal marsh. Scientific studies have shown that marshlands can provide valuable protection for residents and businesses from flooding and sea level rise, and provide effective mitigation for global warming by absorbing carbon from the atmosphere.

Moving forward, what are your views on the best way to protect Redwood City's natural resources and mitigate for climate change?

**Keeping our current open space and not over developing the land boarding our open space is an important issue for me. I will also encourage future developers to incorporate more sustainable green design in future their projects.**

4. In 2009, the City Council voted to accept the initial Saltworks development application and begin a lengthy environmental review process even though the project had no clear plan in place for supplying water for the projected residents. Water supply options the developer proposed included a complicated Kern County agricultural water transfer with an expiration date. A desalination plant located on the Redwood Shores Peninsula also surfaced as a potential option.

In the future, should the City Council accept and review a project application for a development that has no clear plan in place for water, or a water supply plan that could increase future costs to Redwood City ratepayers? Please explain your answer.

**The City Council should not accept any huge development project without a clear plan for addressing the water supply issues that will come with it. That said, I am for restoring as much of the salt ponds back to its natural habitat for public uses.**

5. According to the Pacific Institute, San Mateo County already has more property at risk of inundation from sea level rise (estimated to be worth \$24 billion) than any other county in California, and it will cost taxpayers significant amounts of money in coming years just to protect already developed infrastructure. To address the regional adverse impacts of climate change, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) recommends that:

*"...undeveloped areas that are both vulnerable to future flooding and currently sustain significant habitats or species, or possess conditions that make the areas especially suitable for ecosystem enhancement, should be given special consideration for preservation and habitat enhancement and should be encouraged to be used for those purposes." (Bay Plan Climate Change Policy #4)*

Cargill's Redwood City salt ponds are a good example of an undeveloped area (no existing infrastructure) vulnerable to future flooding, and requiring construction of new levees for flood protection. In the 1999 report, *Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals*, regional scientists determined that these salt ponds are especially suitable for ecosystem enhancement, where managed ponds and restored tidal marsh could increase valuable wetlands for waterfowl and expanded habitat for nearby endangered species.

Do you agree with BCDC's policy discouraging building in undeveloped areas vulnerable to future flooding and suitable for ecosystem enhancement? Please explain why or why not.

**I agree with BCDC's policy on discouraging building in undeveloped areas. There is already a considerable amount of flooding that already occurs along the Bayshore Road community during high tides and heavy rains. Nearly ten years ago the flooding even reach the homes near 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue at Broadway. Why contribute ten fold to a problem that already exists in Redwood City.**

6. All of the Redwood City Cargill salt ponds are designated as "Open Space" in the General Plan and are zoned "Tidal Plain". In addition to salt making, parks, public recreation and restoration to tidal marsh are all permitted uses. Commercial/residential development is currently not allowed.

If you were elected to the City Council, would you approve a change in the City's current General Plan and zoning to allow development on the salt ponds? Please explain your answer.

**Lets first restore the land as much as possible first. I think once the land is restored and people see how beautiful the land is, most people would agree in keeping the land undeveloped and preserving the open space.**

Thank you again!

Redwood City Neighbors United  
Council Election Subcommittee

Alice Kaufman  
Gail Raabe  
Julie Abraham