

**STATEMENT by Jean and Jim Sweeney 6/1/02 522-1579**

**1. Overturning Measure A will not bring more affordable homes. Affordable homes have to be subsidized by the developer. The amount of money needed to subsidize a home depends on the difference between the affordable price and the selling price. It has been running between \$170,000 to \$250,000. The money comes from the future tax increment money generated in a redevelopment project which directs some of the tax revenues for affordable housing.**

**By a vote of the city council a couple of years ago, the council acted to commit those future taxes to finance the cost of infrastructure for the homeless collaborative at Alameda Point. The cost of infrastructure is somewhere around \$170 million dollars which will be paid for over many years out of that affordable housing fund.**

**2. Overturning Measure A will not bring more transit. We are already one of the most densely populated cities in the east bay and we don't have adequate bus transportation. MTC does not have Alameda on their radar screen. There seems to only be money for BART and Alameda will never get BART or a bridge or another tube. MTC has other big projects that come before Alameda like an underground subway in SF Chinatown and BART to Warm Springs and other places. We will be paying for BART to the SF Airport for the next 40 years and all that time we will get little for busses in Alameda.**

**3. Overturning Measure A at Alameda Point to get more open space is a misnomer. The footprint of the building may take up less space on a lot but unless that open space is zoned open space, that lot will be infilled with even more dense development and then were are you? Just how much open space is there in Jack London Square where all the tall residential towers are being built. Any extra land with a tall building would be used for parking everyones three automobiles.**

**Alameda Point Community Partners have committed over 100 acres of parks and open space in their plan. Additionally about half of the former air station will be a bird sanctuary and the golf course. Alameda Community Partners will have a park within 1/4 of a mile of everyone out there, well under the goal of 3/8<sup>th</sup> for the rest of the community.**

**4. Overturning Measure A at Alameda Point is just the camel's nose under the tent. The plan is to then overturn Measure A for the whole city. Our Victorians will never be safe in that event.**

**5. Overturning Measure A at Alameda Point will bring more**

density, and traffic. It will cost the city for schools, fire, police and city services. Where will the money come from? How will Alameda and Oakland handle the traffic jams? I am reminded of the famed urbanist, Peter Calthorp's who designed a multifamily housing development at Laguna West outside of Sacramento which was planned without transit. They just thought that it would come and it never did and now the place is overrun with cars. In fact, many of the homes have a 4 car garage!!

6. Overturning Measure A will destroy our quality of life the one thing that people cite as the leading reason they come to live in our town. It would be very easy to alter the small town quality so revered by those who live here. We are not Hillsborough, we're a community of volunteers who care about each other. There is a timeless quality that we could lose if we start warehousing people in high rises.

7. Overturning Measure A to get more affordable housing is not necessary. We are already getting more than our fair share of housing. In the works are 375 units of housing for the Northern Waterfront plus maybe 100 more on the Beltline and 134 from the Dutra and Fox and 44 on AAAAStorage along Clement and the Estuary near Walnut and Oak street. Plus the 152 homes already being built at the K & B site. Added to this is the approved 584 units at Catellus. Alameda Point plans 1660 but the City has proposed a revised general plan which provides for 1928 homes. That totals 3,428 housing units. All of these projects are providing a percentage of homes for every economic category. The ABAG needs assessment says that Alameda needs to provide 2,162 homes for the next 5 year plan 2001-2006. What we are planning is overkill. What we need are less houses not more.

8. Overturning Measure A would violate the housing goals to maintain and enhance the quality of life of the city: Provide for housing development that is consistent with the goals and policies of City's General Plan Land Use and Open Space and Conservation Elements without jeopardizing the qualities that make Alameda a desirable place to live.

I am attaching two articles whose thoughts about "smart growth" mirror my own.