

Andrew J. Lewis  
[lewisforseattle@gmail.com](mailto:lewisforseattle@gmail.com)  
206-434-5871

## Urbanist Question Responses

- Do you support Seattle's commitment to Vision Zero, and what legislative strategies would you seek to implement the goal of reducing serious injuries and fatalities on our streets to zero within the next decade? Do you think legislative strategies are sufficient to achieve this goal?
  - I wholeheartedly support Vision Zero. I support block the box legislation, and enforcement mechanisms to make sure violators are cited. I support grade-separated bike lanes to make sure bikers are not faced with the challenges of mixing with vehicle traffic. I support pedestrian improvements to increase available ramps on curves to improve accessibility, and keeping sidewalks in good repair to maintain walking as a viable first-mile last-mile commute.
- Do you support the completion of the current bicycle master plan? If so, what strategies, both political and financial, do you propose to ensure its completion?
  - I do support the current bicycle master plan, and even believe that we could be even more ambitious. We need to reach out early and build coalitions with small business owners to get business districts on board with increased bike infrastructure. I know anecdotally from getting out in the community that an increasingly large number of people are biking to business districts to patronize vendors. Every night I enjoy out at a brewery, be it in Queen Anne, Fremont, Ballard, or beyond, there are tons of bike shares parked outside. We need to prove that biking is a viable transportation link for a new generation of commuters that thinks differently about transportation than the last generation. That business districts benefit, don't suffer, when we invest in safe grade-separated bike infrastructure.

In terms of funding, I believe we should look at putting in bike infrastructure concurrently when we make other infrastructure investments in a neighborhood. If a street needs a new water main, powerline, or a repaving we should use the opportunity to install a grade-separated bike lane where appropriate.

- The current Seattle Transportation Benefit District funding bus services and transit access expires at the end of 2020. Should it be extended and do you envision any changes to the programs it funds?
  - The TBD is one of the best ideas the city has pursued in the last decade. Yes, we need to renew it, and even expand it. The TBD has expanded access to transit that comes every 10 minutes or faster from being accessible to 25% of the city to nearly two-thirds. We need to analyze where that last third of commuters live and how we can expand transit to reach them. Moreover, I want to expand our trolley and battery operated bus infrastructure via the TBD. Metro has a goal of a zero emitting fleet by 2050, lets use the TBD to realize that goal for Seattle-based transit hours even sooner!

- The Move Seattle levy expires at the end of 2024. What features should the next transportation capital project levy have? What lessons do you take away from the way the current levy has gone?

- Nobody should ever over promise and under deliver, which is exactly what the current levy has done. SDOTs planners had noble intentions, and the projects promised by the levy were good ones. However, they do nobody any good if we cannot realistically achieve it with the goals we set.

The next levy needs to realistically cover the costs of what we set out to achieve, and we should be courageous enough to make a generational investment if it is necessary. I don't want to cut corners on a weak levy that does little to address the investments we need to achieve Vision Zero, a grade separated bike network we can be proud of, rapid ride bus infrastructure extending fast and reliable bus service, and most importantly some kind of city commitment to speeding up the construction of light rail to Ballard and West Seattle. Supplemental levy funding could be particularly useful to plan a tunnel underneath the ship canal to avoid displacing our legacy maritime community and guarantee reliable and efficient service.

Moreover, we need to attach performance metrics and auditing standards to make sure levy funds are being spent according to the promise to the voters. We need to be transparent, and through that transparency we can build trust with the people of Seattle to continue these essential levies.

- Do you support the construction of the Center City Connector streetcar and why/why not?
  - I have not supported the Center City Connector. I think it is a redundant transportation service through a corridor that is already well served by transit, and future planned transit. I think, generally, that street cars offer little that far cheaper trolley buses can offer, which are also zero emitting and currently relied on by 20% of Seattle commuters. We spent \$178 million to replace our entire trolleybus fleet for the entire city. The Center City Connector will serve a single mile of transit for tens of millions more.

That said, I think we spend too much time re-litigating transportation policy decisions in Seattle. I fully acknowledge that the decision has been made after several studies, delays, and debates to build the Center City Connector. I respect that process and the decision, and I will not seek to relitigate the Center City Connector if I am elected to the city council. I will make sure the process continues to be transparent and will work to make sure it is effectively and efficiently implemented.

- What considerations should inform the discussion around finding additional funding for a light rail tunnel to West Seattle? To Ballard?
  - Speaking to the Ballard tunnel, I believe it is absolutely essential. Interbay is a legacy industrial lands area supporting thousands of family wage jobs. Protecting and expanding our maritime industry is a key priority for me, and while light rail needs to be expanded through Interbay I want to make sure it is as unobstructive as possible to

traditional industrial lands and uses. We cannot jam a bridge of any size over the ship canal and through Salmon Bay, an economic ecosystem that supports over \$4 billion in economic activity a year. It is a worthy investment to tunnel under the ship canal and avoid causing that kind of damage.

As far as a tunnel in West Seattle, I want to hear more from advocates as well as the industrial community in SODO as to the need. I admit that I am not as familiar with that end of the proposed route.

- For what purposes should impact fees on development be used?
  - Limited, rare, and project specific would be my criteria for impact fees. I support looking at impact fees, for example, to pay for renovations for nearby community centers. Community center renovations and expansions would be capital projects, and as such there would be a discernible beginning and end to the contribution, and they could be drawn to a specific area of benefit for the neighborhood community center. This is the primary area in Seattle where impact fees would be an attractive supplemental funding source.

I am strongly opposed to open-ended impact fee regimes, or paying for government operations through impact fees. They are an unreliable method of raising revenue and in some cases depending on the rate can discourage development. If Seattle ever does use them, we need to use them rarely and sparingly, and always for particular projects.

- Do you support imposing additional fees on ridesharing services like Uber and Lyft?
  - Potentially, but with a nexus toward improving driver benefits, salaries, and protections; and possibly toward programs to help drivers upgrade to vehicles with lower emissions. I do not support any fee on ridesharing that does NOT have a nexus with transportation.
- Do you support a congestion pricing program downtown? If so, what considerations should be made when setting up such a program?
  - At this time I do not support congestion pricing. Until we have a comprehensive grade-separated rail-based transit system, I do not believe we are providing a sufficient alternative to driving to warrant the imposition of a regressive congestion pricing scheme. I do support in the long-run applying such a program once we have realized a more extensive light rail network, and using all the revenue generated to subsidize transit fares. But, as of this writing, that time is far off.
- How do you feel about the current allocation of street space in Seattle? Under what circumstance would you support converting general purpose lanes to other uses?
  - I do support dedicated lanes for bus transit. I still remember growing up in Seattle and taking forever to get anywhere on a metro bus because of the dearth of dedicated lanes. There truly has been a revolution over the last ten years through the leadership of Metro, and the funding and innovations of the TBD, in making our bus service more

efficient and reliable.

- What approaches would you take to ensure that emerging mobility options (bikeshare, rideshare, e-scooter, etc) are implemented in a manner that increases access to our mobility hubs?
  - We need to provide more dedicated spaces to corral bikeshares and scooters so they don't clutter and obstruct sidewalks. We also need to strongly lean on the operator companies to make sure they are diligently working to keep their property standing upright and out of the public thoroughfare. I know from recent trips to DC that scooters are popular and a useful transit option, but I have also seen five of them piled in a tangle on top of each other on a street corner. Part of that is the city providing space to corral them, the other part is encouraging a public culture through education for people to responsibly park their bikeshare after use.

- What lessons did you take away from the head tax vote/debate? Would you support bringing back the head tax?
  - I would not support bringing back the headtax and I did not support the headtax. The bottom-line from the debate over the headtax is that the public lost confidence in the ability of the Seattle City Council to govern, and did not trust the city to adequately spend the money that would have been raised.

I have proposed a robust performance auditing program to restore public confidence and recapture critical revenue for charter services. In the last three years, King County has saved \$127 million through performance auditing, which is a similar number to what the head tax would have raised. By looking carefully at our own resources we can earn back the trust of the public.

Moreover, what we really need is an income tax with high marginal rates, as well as a capital gains tax. I will work with my friend Sen. Joe Nguyen to get permission from Olympia to implement progressive taxes at the city level.

- What responsibilities do you think that corporations doing business in Seattle have to the city, and are they meeting them? If not how would you get them to do so?
  - Corporations have obligations to their shareholders, but they also have obligations to the social contract that allows them to exist and do business. A corporation is not a person, it is a fallacy of personhood created by the laws of the state. They are creatures of government subject to the regulations of government, and certainly have an obligation to participate constructively in civic life.

I have been encouraged by Amazon's partnership with Mary's Place, Plymouth Housing, and other local service providers that has been substantial and praiseworthy. I also admire Microsoft's large \$500 million regional investment in housing made last fall. However, charity alone cannot get us out of the crisis we are facing in housing and other

challenges. We need to engage these companies as civic partners, ask them to help shape a response, and then contribute resources to execute on a regional plan.

- If you had been on council at the time it was considered, would you have voted for Mandatory Housing Affordability, Seattle's version of inclusionary zoning? In what ways did the final approved plan differ from your ideal policy?
  - I would have voted for the MHA. Seattle is a hot housing market, and we have been building a lot over the last two-decades. All of that construction was vested without an in-lieu fee or mandatory on-site housing. It was about time.
- Do you support transit-oriented development? If so, how do you ensure TOD is affordable and doesn't displace communities around new transit infrastructure?
  - I do support transit oriented development. We need to aspire to be a city where single-occupancy vehicles are an out-dated method of transportation. Every site on top of or adjacent to light rail is a generational opportunity to put a large density of housing units that will always have access to reliable grade-separated transit.

I support aspiring to be like Vienna Austria, wherein 60% of the population lives in some kind of public housing. We should be building publicly owned buildings operated by the Seattle Housing Authority on top of transit oriented sites offering units with at-cost rents to pay off the bonding. We could, functionally, create a public option for housing allowing families at 60%-80% AMI to pay into housing where there is no profit motive. We can work with communities around proposed sites to guarantee placements for the displaced and support for local businesses, some of which could even be sited in new publicly owned developments.

- What do you think is the most important strategy or set of strategies Seattle can pursue to make the city affordable to live in? What assumptions about affordability do those strategies rely on?
  - In addition to my comments above about a public option for housing, making sure we are jumping at every opportunity to explore using public land for housing. I support housing at Fort Lawton and the Armoury property in Interbay.
- What would you do as a city council member to address evictions and the displacement they cause, particularly in communities of color?
  - I support a robust rent stabilization fund to make sure nobody who is indigent faces eviction over small sums in controversy. Moreover, I support a robust commitment to maintain existing affordable housing where possible, even on sites where we could get a greater density of units in the alternative.
- Do you support the proposed creation of a city-county authority to address homelessness in Seattle/King County? If so, what steps would you take to support it on city council?
  - I do, so long as it is guided by housing-first principles.

- What causes people to experience homelessness in the City of Seattle?
  - The causes of homelessness are multi-faceted. When I interviewed with Unite Here Local 8, the union that represents hotel and hospitality workers (of which I was ultimately endorsed), they told me that some of their employees are unable to live on their wages, and unable to reasonably commute from more affordable communities. As a result, many of them car camp. These are our bartenders, hotel maids, and retail employees. People we interact with everyday and would never ever imagine they are homeless. Economic inequality and the spiraling cost of living are responsible for a large amount of transitional homelessness.

Then, we have a lot of people who are victims of our inadequate and immoral public health system around substance addiction, mental health, or both. Without an ability to effectively take care of themselves reliably they continue to spiral into chronic homelessness with little effective response beyond triage from first responders and the occasional stay in jail. We know that permanent supportive housing is the best way to get people experiencing chronic homelessness back on the right path. 94% of people housed by Plymouth Housing stay housed. That's a great number, and that is where we need to invest.

- What, specifically, should the city do to address racial disparities in housing opportunity?
  - Again, an expansion of public housing. Built with 30 year bonds, paid off by the rents of the tenants without a profit motive. Further, I support first-in-time rental laws to prevent discrimination on the part of landlord, as well as ban the question legislation around source of income, criminal history, and other irrelevant questions likely to elicit prejudice.
- How would you define "historic character", and in what ways do you feel your definition is inclusive of Seattle's indigenous communities?
  - I live in a historic apartment building called the Delamar which is a nationally registered historic place, so my criteria is related to whether a building is actually historically significant. I do think a consistent neighborhood aesthetic is desirable, and I do think the apartment building I live in with dozens of units is far more attractive than modern buildings, but I also recognize that I shouldn't legislate my tastes to the expense of other people. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder, I don't think it is politically objective... as much as I might wish it is sometimes.
- What approaches would you consider to ensure that multi-generational, affordable housing is located in high-opportunities neighborhoods?
  - I do support increasing the amount of triplexes and fourplexes in certain circumstances. As I have doorbelled all over Queen Anne and Magnolia I have noticed tons of pre-downzone triplexes and fourplexes that most certainly have high aesthetic character. The people I have met in them have been chefs, musicians, nurse practitioners, and teachers, the missing-middle professions in need of those kinds of housing options. I support encouraging more of that kind of development to provide those housing

options.

- What role should Safe Seattle and like-minded groups play in our public discourse?
  - None. Safe Seattle has added nothing to our discourse except lies and fear.
- To what extent has pursuing racial equity been a priority in your work to date? How do you plan to continue that work on city council?
  - I am very proud of the work I have done as an assistant city attorney around some of the most innovative criminal diversion programs in the country. I have worked on the Choose 180 program, a diversion program for young people aged 18-24 where we refer them out of the criminal justice system and into programs with mentors, credible messengers, higher education opportunities and treatment. Out of the 245 people we have sent through that program only 8 have recidivated. That is a great success. I have also worked with Legacy of Equality Leadership and Organizing (LELO) on a relicensing program to get people driving without a license up to date and back on the road, instead of relying on jail and the criminal justice system. These programs are the future of us holding each other accountable as a community, rather than our broken past of over criminalization and mass incarceration.
- What approaches do you feel are most-important to ensuring that programs, policies, and practices are prioritized in historically underserved and underrepresented communities, who may not have the loudest voice in a public forum?
  - Honestly, the group I have encountered in my years of public service who I see systematically ignored in every discussion are people with disabilities. When I served as a Seattle Human Rights Commissioner I was stunned by the staggering number of complaints from citizens with disabilities regarding work discrimination, insufficient infrastructure for wheelchair mobility, inadequate accommodations from landlords, and more. I joined with a coalition of activists to lobby the Seattle City Council to form the People with Disabilities Commission to give an official city platform to advocate in the halls of power for our neighbors with disabilities. I am proud that that commission was created and continues to thrive to this day.

On that note, I will work with one of the most under-valued assets we have as a city, our commissions. They are a great source of information, expertise, community roots, and dedication to public service. I will meet with our volunteer commissioners, garner their feedback, recommend projects, and ask for their recommendations on legislation and projects.

- What are ideas for progressive revenue sources for transportation and housing that do not burden low-income communities?
  - A high-earner income tax with high marginal rates. I actually believe we can get this as a city after last year when the legislature finally passed a progressive real estate excise tax (REET). It will be a lift, but I think we can do it. I have already discussed such legislation with my friend Senator Joe Nguyen.

