

**Tony Daysog for Alameda City Council candidate**  
Green Party of Alameda County Endorsement Questionnaire

**Tony Daysog**  
**City Council incumbent**  
**City of Alameda**  
<http://www.daysog.com>

1. When choosing between development and preserving/enhancing open spaces, how would you make your decision?

**I am an advocate for preserving open space, having played a helpful hand in preserving Crab Cove in Alameda near and adjacent to the Robert Crown Memorial Park as open space, in the face of a developer's attempt to purchase Crab Cove to pave over for residential use. Until I returned to City Council in November 2012, my saw a City Hall that appeared to favor the developer over local proponents interested in saving the area for open space. Once back on Council, I worked closely with City Hall staff to smooth-over a change in City Hall approach to Crab Cove, such that even as residents gathered enough signatures to palce the question of Crab Cove on the ballot, by that time, City Hall staff and Council colleagues were ready to join with residents ins aving Crab Cove as open space. As an island, we must always work to preserve as much open space as possible.**

2. The East Bay Regional Park District could play an instrumental role in parks and open space at Alameda Point, particularly at the Northwest Territories and Enterprise Park. What role would you like the park district to have?

**I would love to have the EBRP play a leading role in partnership with Alameda City Hall in preserving the northwest area as parkland. I especially am interested in making space available for over-night stays, via picturesque RV camp grounds or Yurt camp grounds with nice view of SF in the near distance. I also look forward to finally having EBRP work with Alameda on a park area near Encinal High School/boat launching area, in a project area I've been involved with for over two decades. Since this area is close to residential, I dont want this area to be a campground. Finally, I want to work with EBRP and Alameda to open up trails around and through Alameda Point: the aprticular project I am interested in is placing wooden-walk way planks, so people can walk around and through the verdant part of Alameda point that is in San Francisco County.**

3. Traffic and parking are important issues for many Alamedans. Considering budget limitations, how would you address these issues?

**With regard to traffic, my landmark legislation over the past four years was starting-up**

**Alameda's Citywide Transit Strategy, in an effort to get not just future residents but existing residents to alter transit behaviour in the way of alt- and mass-transit. We need to coordinate and use more efficiently three different shuttles that operate right now, and combine these with even more shuttles slated in the near future, so that current residents and future resident use shuttles. I also have a history of voting only for development projects that provide serious transit strategies (like Alameda Point Site A which offered \$10M for a new ferry terminal, new BRT line out of Site A, and a shuttle that people only have to wait 7 to eight minutes for on average in the morning); I voted against housing projects that had weak transit strategies (ie Del Monte and 2100 Clement). As for parking, I am open to creating parking permit programs for neighborhoods, as well as alternative parking programs like unbundled parking at Alameda Point Site A.**

4. Alameda has a limited budget for law and code enforcement. Which issues would be your highest and lowest priorities?

**Highest priority with regard to City budget: preserving what I call point-of-contact services for youth and elderly (such as libraries, neighborhood parks, and Mastick Senior Center), followed by essential emergency services such as making sure to have police force and fire department at staffing levels commensurate with a city of Alameda's size and quality. I prioritize "development services" (ie planning services, building code enforcement) behind streets and sidewalk infrastructure maintenance.**

5. How would you pay for repair and replacement of Alameda's aging infrastructure?

**With regard to new development areas (Alameda Point and anything along the northern waterfront), new development must pay for their own infrastructure, as well as contribute paying for city-wide infrastructure that future users will use as well, as they won't just stay in their own homes and neighborhoods in their new development 24/7 but will also venture to Park Street and other points of historic Alameda. With regard to maintaining infrastructure for historic Alameda, we must continue we must continue to budget for current and future infrastructure needs through the CIP process. But we must also create a citizen-committee to ensure that residents help prioritize where CIP infrastructure funds should be deployed, as there is no such committee right now, though I tried to create one but was rebuffed by my Council colleagues. I would continue to rely on the various sources of revenues already-relied on for the CIPs (ie property taxes, sales taxes, etc., etc), and would not create a new source of revenues to fund CIPs even more, or change the rates for existing revenue sources in an effort to generate more revenues for funding CIPs. The issue, as I see it, is not creating new sources of funds for CIPs but rather having a citizen-committee mechanism to ensure adequacy of budgeting for CIPs.**

6. What would you do to reduce displacement in Alameda of people with low and moderate incomes?

**In Alameda, in March 2016, we adopted a landmark ordinance that introduced for the first time rent control, which took the form of giving a rent review board\rent review process the power of binding arbitration to establish a reasonable increase in rent. This is a form of rent control, as there is a governmental control of price-setting. As such, it is subject to Costa-Hawkins. In the 61 cases that have occurred since March, the landmark ordinance has shown to stop the crisis in excessive rent increases that had plagued our city. There are other provisions that protect tenants such as relocation benefit payments that landlords must make to tenants in certain no-cause evictions, set at a rate meant to discourage no-cause evictions. Moreover, when no cause evictions occur, landlords cannot increase rents by 5% from the previous to the new tenants, to disincentivize no-cause evictions.**

**I do not support Berkeley-style rent control, which is different from our mediation-qua-binding arbitration rent control in that the Berkeley-style establishes a hard-and-fast formula that limits rent increases for all in a uniform manner and at too low of a rate to make the delivery of quality housing economic, resulting in a reduction in housing supply. Alameda residents are championing Berkeley-style rent control for Alameda through a ballot initiative, and, similar to Berkeley and Santa Monica, rent increases are limited by formula to roughly 1.5% to 2%, meaning a two-bedroom unit that goes for roughly \$2,500 can't be increased by no more than \$50. Since normal costs (heating, water, garbage, internet, etc) go up combined in excess of \$50, the Berkeley-style rent control makes delivery of housing services uneconomic, resulting in a decline in quality and supply of housing.**

7. Who has endorsed you so far? Who do you expect to endorse you?

**Doug Siden, retiring East Bay Regional Parks trustee.**

8. How much money do you currently have for this race? How much money do you plan to raise? Where will the money come from? Describe sources of financial contributions for your campaign that you would refuse to accept (if any).

**\$500. I plan to raise roughly \$3,000. Mostly from myself.**

Thank you!