

## The Urbanist Seattle City Council Endorsement Questionnaire

- 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 do support Seattle's commitment to Vision Zero. I think we need legislative strategies that calm car traffic to prevent collisions *and* solutions that make it safer for people to walk, bike, and roll. First, I support no right on red and piloting the 'Don't Block the Box' red light cameras in high traffic areas like Downtown and SLU. I support lowering speed limits on arterials. I support legislative solutions that guarantee funds for more bike lanes, ADA accessible sidewalks, pedestrianized roads, and ensuring that protected crosswalk signals prioritize pedestrians and cyclists. I also know that legislative solutions are *not* enough. If the past few years have shown us anything – it is that we can pass the pedestrian and bike master plans, but without financial and institutional support, leadership can slow-roll, delay, and cancel projects. The recent success of the MASS Coalition with events like the Ride for Safe Streets and UPASS rallies have demonstrated that when you tie Vision Zero to the climate movement, people will turn out to fight for a safer, more equitable, less carbon-dependent city. I am a leader in both UAW4121- that led the fight for UPASS and Seattle 500 Women Scientists - a member of the MASS Coalition, and as a person with a history of organizing on these issues, I plan to be an effective legislator and movement builder from my position in city hall. This type of leadership works. Since the Ride for Safe Streets, city council members have revisited the bike master plan and the 35<sup>th</sup> Ave NE street plan. They have also held a hearing demanding more from the Mayor's administration, and we've seen SDOT revisit their plans.

- 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?

Yes, I support the completion of the current bicycle master plan. I believe that council should pass a resolution reiterating urgency, but also consider legislation that requires the BMP to be completed with prioritization for neighborhoods with more traffic fatalities that are under-resourced with protected bicycle infrastructure, particularly communities of color in South Seattle. Politically, we need oversight from council: accessible public hearings with SDOT about the non-transparent processes that are used to make changes to the BMP that have led to less-effective and incomplete bike lanes. Financially, we must prioritize protected bike facilities over neighborhood greenways and bike lanes placed in the door 'death zone'. [Data show that painted bike routes reduce passing distance](#), especially on higher speed arterials and thus are not the answer for safety. We also now have significant data to show that [bike networks improve road safety for all users](#). We should be lowering speed limits citywide, but prioritizing greenways as much as bike lanes is not the way to increase ridership and build a complete network, [as evidenced by cities like Vancouver](#).

- 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?

Until we have a better revenue solution passed to fund bus service and transit access, I support renewing the TBD. In the future, we should consider using a combination of congestion pricing and a more progressive TBD that focuses on luxury or high emission vehicles to support TBD's covered programs. It is worth noting that the TBD was originally passed as a stopgap after a county measure failed to pass to keep bus service intact, but that as prices for diesel and bus service went down it ended up dramatically increasing bus service in Seattle & leading to the expansion of program into ORCA Lift. This expanded service in the city drops off when you leave, and means that our city to county service is non-uniform and serves those who can't afford to live in the city poorly. If we could pass a TBD county-wide, we could have better, more uniform county-wide service and allow for a smaller, less-regressive local fee to support extra late-night bus hours in Seattle, and expanding programs like ORCA Lift.

When it comes to extensions and changes to programs, I support the recently announced plan to fund ORCA cards for 1500 residents of public housing and believe that model should be extended to cover more working and middle class folks. As mentioned, I also support working for more late-night hours to serve people who work late nights and early mornings. Ultimately, my goal is get to free transit, a goal TBD alone could never accomplish.

- 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? (I'm going to answer this out of order, because it makes more logical sense to do so)

Looking at the Move Seattle Levy, I've learned several key lessons. First, you cannot abandon your base when it comes to transportation projects. Cycling, safe streets, and disability advocates have been let down by the implementation of Move Seattle. In order to get another levy passed to fund transportation infrastructure, SDOT and the council needs to work to improve engagement with these groups on how they've met goals of the projects and to explain where and why they've failed to do so. Improved transparency will be key for this. Second, I believe the goals of Move Seattle and its potential were not always communicated clearly. The bulk of the budget was dedicated to "crumbling infrastructure". Projects like rapid ride and the bike- and pedestrian- master plans included many that *depended* on significant additional investments from non-guaranteed federal grants, and these projects were used to build popular support for Move Seattle. This felt like a bait and switch to many who felt too much of Move Seattle's funds went to infrastructure repairs focused on single occupancy vehicle mobility, not new, multimodal transit-oriented things. Finally, I think the planning process should identify when and how the council will provide oversight to SDOT to improve the iterative, data-oriented process of these projects. It will be particularly important to

identify what projects will require federal grants and to be strategic in planning how council can help with funding advocacy to ensure plans are fully funded.

In addition to the lessons learned above, I think there are a few key features the next transportation levy should have. There should be multimodal analysis in all plans. We should be prioritizing bike, bus, and pedestrian improvements aligned to the new and incoming light rail stations. We can use data from bike share, community surveys, bus ridership data, etc to try to map out prioritized improvements. Similarly, the levy should lay out infrastructure plans for pedestrianized or bus/bike/pedestrian only streets. Designing and building these spaces will be important to optimize how they can improve access, safety, small business environments and more and this levy has the opportunity to fund projects that rebuild streets for people *out* of cars. The levy should include environmental considerations not just about expanded transit, but also about building materials to improve sustainable construction. We have to look at cement use (a huge CO2 emitter) in sidewalks and ways to reduce this while still expanding accessible sidewalks. Finally, it should include funding for electrification of the bus fleet.

Do you support the construction of the Center City Connector streetcar and why/why not?

Yes. To start, we've received significant federal grant money to complete this project and if we abandon it, it will damage our ability to receive future grant funding for at minimum any transportation projects, but likely sully the reputation of the city for all infrastructure grants. Second, as we see in any incomplete network -- the completion of the Center City Connector is necessary for it to achieve its ridership goals. It will only be a well-used network when people can get between the high population centers (both live and work) of SLU, Capitol Hill, and Downtown.

- What considerations should inform the discussion around finding additional funding for a light rail tunnel to West Seattle? To Ballard?

I don't support using city or county funds for this. If third-party funding can be quickly identified for this project and that is what leads to getting the light rail to Ballard and West Seattle ASAP, I will get behind the proposal. But I question if its equitable or responsible to fight for funding to change a voter-approved plan when we installed above ground rail in South Seattle communities without concern. We can't stall out on this project with urgent transit needs district wide. I recognize that there are legitimate concerns of displacement for businesses and residents. However, the cost of providing support to the business owners and home-owners at risk of displacement is significantly less than that of tunneling and a new business district around a light-rail station would ultimately provide neighborhoods in Ballard and West Seattle with expanded economic opportunity. Again, the key here is what will get this finished on time without dragging down the budget on other projects.

- For what purposes should impact fees on development be used?

Impact fees on development should be used for transportation projects and affordable housing that go along with development to ensure that when we redevelop an area, it's served well by public transportation and multi-modal access and so that new developments are not exclusively for those with wealth.

- Do you support imposing additional fees on ridesharing services like Uber and Lyft?

Yes. Rideshare causes congestion, increases carbon emissions, increases hazards for pedestrians and cyclists, and does not protect workers. In addition to imposing additional fees, I support the unionization efforts of uber and lyft drivers and more regulation on gig economy "employers". In this campaign, I have held to my values and ride public transit, walk, and bike around the city, taking the occasional carpool with another candidate or my campaign staff. I do not own a car, and have not used campaign funds to underwrite dozens of lyft rides around the city.

- Do you support a congestion pricing program downtown? If so, what considerations should be made when setting up such a program?

Yes. [Congestion pricing can lead to a real reduction in traffic, increased use of transit, and a cleaner environment.](#) The revenue from congestion pricing can fund increased transit and free transit. It is important to consider all the communities this policy might affect, and as such I do worry about the potential for disproportionate impact on low income workers who may drive to work from outside the city and people with disabilities who rely on car transit, but I believe this can be mitigated by improved regional public transit options. As such, I believe that enacting more aggressive congestion pricing in the city should be aligned with better regional bus service (as described in TBD answer) and am optimistic that we're moving in that direction. Further, in cities like London, they provide passes to people with disabilities, reduced rates for people who live in the areas with congestion pricing, discounts to Electric Vehicles and other exemptions and incentives. The recently released study of congestion pricing identified many of these contingencies, and I think the next step is to talk to folks from these communities about how best to structure exemptions or discounts to protect vulnerable communities when we enact a policy. If it is to be an effective strategy to reduce traffic, we must continue to build infrastructure for walking, biking, and public transit.

- 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?

Right now, I think too much of the street space is allocated to single occupancy vehicles. I believe we need to have bus-only lanes and PBLs on more arterials. We should remove parking from arterials as long as we work to ensure adequate parking for people with physical disabilities. We can and should lose some traffic lanes because this is safer for everyone, and increases mobility bikes and buses which will ultimately reduce congestion. The best places to lose a traffic lane or two are often redundant arterials, like the planned Roosevelt-Eastlake Rapid Ride. Reducing the lanes would improve bus and

bike travel, reduce the likelihood that drivers would use Eastlake as a 'thoroughfare', thus helping local drivers by eliminating the 'sense that there is a highway through the middle of the neighborhood.' Unlike main arterials, some major small business & restaurant streets that are primarily destinations more than thoroughfares, should be converted to pedestrian only spaces. In my district, I support pedestrianizing the Ave and think this would be a boon for local businesses and help improve safety for students and other local residents.

- 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?

I support the new SDOT expansion of building bike/scooter parking spots behind stop signs. I think we need to reconsider our contracts with free-floating services for several reasons: prices are skyrocketing and ridership is decreasing, we run the risk of losing a large number of the bikes when scooters appear, we need maximal data-sharing transparency so we can use Lime/Jump data to plan transportation infrastructure. This data could then be used to align safe routes to bus/light rail stops and major business centers with the routes most people are already taking when they don't have a safe cycling/scooter option. I think we have to be cautious when considering rideshare options as solutions for first/last mile. It's clear this works for some people and a shuttle service is likely the most accessible way to accommodate folks, but we can't overincentivize these programs, which may lead to drop off/pick up congestion at mobility hubs- which both endangers pedestrians and cyclists and discourages the most environmentally friendly and economical modes of moving about our city. We will need to study the efficacy of Ride2 and Via to determine if these programs are working as intended and if they should be expanded.

- What lessons did you take away from the head tax vote/debate? Would you support bringing back the head tax?

I continue to believe that the head tax should have passed and that it is a shame we do not have that money to invest in affordable housing. When we do reinvigorate the fight for progressive revenue in Seattle the clearest lessons are (1) We need clear messaging that the majority of Seattleites can get behind (2) We should expect a backlash and be prepared to out-organize. To the first point, we must look at taxing profit instead of revenue in order to build stable, long term progressive revenue streams and alleviate the concerns of businesses that run on thin profit margins, including grocery stores. A tax like a CEO pay inequity tax for companies with high-paid CEOs, can be implemented to focus on generating progressive revenue from large corporations over midsized local businesses. We can message better by focusing on the companies with blatant pay inequities, which will also provide a central organizing principle that doesn't vilify employers themselves but unethical business practices. Regardless of the source of progressive revenue, we must build popular, coalitional support with organized labor and everyday working people so we can fight the allied interests who oppose any tax on

business in Seattle. As a union organizer who has successfully challenged large institutions using organizing, social media, and collective action, I believe I have the collaborative leadership style and movement-building approach to lead a push for new progressive revenue when elected to city council.

- 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 a responsibility to pay taxes, chip in for the auxiliary services including childcare, and provide inclusive and safe work environments for workers. We have successfully won the fight for 15 and sick leave and we must continue to fight for more benefits like childcare, expanded paid family leave, improved healthcare, and free transit.

Employers benefit from single, working parents and two-income households, but right now, only government and working families share in sustaining the economic costs that are incurred when people return to work. Businesses should be cost-sharing things like transportation and family care costs. Further, businesses play a role in shaping our city for tomorrow. From housing to green infrastructure and transit, large employers fueling our region's growth should play a role in funding and advocating for equitable, sustainable regional growth. My campaign supports progressive business taxes, but I also support policies that encourage and/or require businesses to provide more family friendly and environmentally friendly practices.

- 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?

Yes I would have voted for it. I would not have approved the amendment to remove the Ave upzone. I believe we could have used this opportunity to expand zoning reform across more of the city, particularly in my own district where large parts do not have multi-family housing or zoning that can accommodate markets and groceries, making it very challenging for people to get things done without cars and for working- and middle-class people to live there.

- Do you support transit-oriented development? If so, how do you ensure TOD is affordable and doesn't displace communities around new transit infrastructure?

Yes *but* not the only form of development. Being serious about climate change means being serious about transit oriented development, but in too many communities we've seen expensive condos built up around light rail with limited access for working class people. MHA is a first step to ensuring there are affordable units but does not address all displacement concerns, and are often not "deeply affordable" because 60% AMI is the limit -- despite our largest shortfalls being for 30% and 50% AMI units. Second, we need commercial affordability programs to incentivize the building of small commercial spaces

in these new transit-oriented developments so that small businesses can afford to re-open and have access to the expanded customer base that comes with transit projects. Third, we should work with KC Metro, Sound Transit, and WDOT, to use land they own associated with transit projects for social housing so that transit oriented development includes mixed income public housing and isn't just displacing communities around new infrastructure for luxury close-in apartments. This should also include open spaces or plazas that help provide community centers at new transit developments, give access to small businesses like foodtrucks, and provide greenspace and carbon drawdown opportunities.

- 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?

The city needs more progressive revenue to really become more affordable because economic inequality is driving our affordability crisis. If we can tax businesses with enough money to pay their CEOs a million dollar salary, we can begin to fund affordable childcare and public housing. This strategy assumes that affordability is tied to the rising gap between the rich in the poor. Significant data back up this presumption, including a [recent analysis from McKinsey](#) which basically said that homelessness is a symptom to economic prosperity under our current tax regime. However, it is important to note that in cities like Seattle with exclusionary zoning, dwindling housing supply, particularly permanently affordable housing supply, also drives the lack of affordability so we need progressive tax revenue to fund housing *and* zoning reform.

- What would you do as a city council member to address evictions and the displacement they cause, particularly in communities of color?

The doctoral research of sociologist Dr. Tim Thomas (UW) layed bare the racial disparities in eviction rates in our community. His work showed that 1 in 11 black residents experienced eviction in the Seattle area since 2004. Recent legislation has lengthened the notice period, but evictions still occur. The new legislation allows judges to consider mitigating circumstances when tenants fall behind on rent, however, most tenants lose these cases due to failure to show up. Seattle needs to provide legal support to tenants facing eviction and guaranteed right to an attorney. We need rent stabilization policies so that rents don't rise year-to-year at rates far above inflation. We need to pass policies to change applications to prevent people from being punished for past evictions when looking for a new place to live and reconsider first/last/deposit maximum guidelines to help folks afford a new home and prevent entering homelessness when they do face eviction.

- 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?

A regional authority is a tool by which to get the revenue and the bonding capacity to really invest in the amount of affordable housing our region needs. My greatest concern

with the current city-county authority is that its goals continue to focus on shelter and permanent supportive housing, alongside ambiguous public-private partnership. The long-term solution to housing affordability is permanently affordable homes, that are part of the public trust, either operated as a public housing entity or through non-profit partnerships. I believe that if we're going to have a city/county authority to address homelessness, it *needs* to focus on building housing as a main goal. Additionally, it seems like some candidates and elected officials are using the process of creating a city-county authority as an excuse to not act now. We can, and should, do both. I have plans to build progressive revenue to build housing and to improve our diversion and rehousing at the city level now.

- What causes people to experience homelessness in the City of Seattle?

We often see homelessness oversimplified and data show us the complexity of homelessness. There are people experiencing homelessness due to recent eviction stemming from job loss or simply can't afford rising rent prices, LGBTQIA folks, especially teens and young adults, who have been kicked out of their homes, and people struggling with mental health crisis including those struggling with substance use disorder. These different scenarios which common contributor to homelessness, that may have demonstrated that we need multiple solutions to help those in Seattle experience.

- What, specifically, should the city do to address racial disparities in housing opportunity?

This has multiple factors:

(1) Home ownership opportunity. The city must end exclusionary single family zoning to ensure that duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes are available city-wide and build upon MHA transit-oriented development to expand multifamily housing opportunity in areas with high economic opportunity. This will increase the number of affordable homes for working families of color throughout the city and be a step toward reducing segregation in our schools and neighborhoods. We should also ensure that plans for a municipal bank include plans to support low-interest loans and mortgages for people from communities affected by our historic racial covenants.

(2) Prevent displacement: We should consider if programs like in DC, that allow tenants to form a co-operative and buy the property before it is sold to a developer would work in Seattle. In DC, the "[Tenant Right of Purchase Act](#)" has allowed for the formation of co-ops and protected African American communities in the District from displacement. We should expand the budget for the Office of Housing with new progressive taxation to build mixed income public housing. This public housing should be built in public land across the city so families have more options to remain in their family neighborhoods *and* opportunities to live in public housing in high resource neighborhoods. We should provide financial support to homeowners at risk of displacement, to help homeowners of color build and rent ADUs. This can help bring in extra income *or* allow extended families



to live on the same property, preventing displacement. However, up front financial and building support would be needed for this to be effective.

(3) Protect tenants. I detailed this in the question above on tenants rights.

- How would you define “historic character”, and in what ways do you feel your definition is inclusive of Seattle’s indigenous communities?

To start, its both historically inaccurate and a damaging product of a white hegemony to define the “historic character” of our city as the character of single family neighborhoods built with exclusionary racial covenants on land stolen from indigenous people. At Fort Lawton, where we’ve seen a relentless fight to protect land by a largely white homeownership population, a small bit of justice was delivered on this historic character when a portion of the affordable housing units were named to be administered by the United Indians of All Tribes Foundation. We should continue to consider how public housing projects and land use plans can restore land rights to Seattle’s indigenous communities.

Second, I do believe that there is cultural value to building design and style. Especially when we consider moving to form-based zoning as opposed to occupancy based zoning, I’m open to conversations about retaining the architectural character (not historic character) of certain areas. In Capitol Hill, there are great examples of retained building facades with built up housing and density in the back. There’s also plenty of room for craftsman style fourplexes, etc. Finally, when it comes to *form*, we cannot but style over sustainability. There are homebuilding styles like PassiveHaus which due to efficiency standards may not *look* like the average home in a neighborhood. However, perhaps a better ‘character’ to retain in our neighborhoods is one of sustainability, shared greenspaces, and a commitment to community.

- What approaches would you consider to ensure that multi-generational, affordable housing is located in high-opportunities neighborhoods?

I support zoning reform to allow small apartments like fourplexes in all neighborhoods across Seattle -- ending exclusionary single family zoning. I support the current ADU legislation, but also support working with the Office of Housing to set up a dedicated fund to support people at risk of displacement in creating ADUs on their lot to enable multi-generational living, aging in place, and more affordable options in all neighborhoods. Finally, I support raising revenue with a CEO Pay Inequality tax, in addition to regional housing money, to fund green social housing in and around green spaces in high-opportunity neighborhoods. This model of housing, such as what was just approved at Fort Lawton, builds units that lower- and middle- class families can purchase alongside deeply affordable units and permanent supportive housing. This build income diversity into neighborhoods, stabilizes long-term affordability, and Social Housing can also allow for market rate rentals to help fund the upkeep of these dwellings.

- What role should Safe Seattle and like-minded groups play in our public discourse?

Groups like Safe Seattle has trafficked in lies, misinformation, hate speech, doxxing of political opponents, and more. These tactics harm the most vulnerable people living in Seattle -- people living unsheltered, people with substance use disorder and severe mental illness. They rely on propaganda and misrepresent data to push an exclusionary, hateful agenda. Our public discourse has space for an array of ideologies, but it should not give platforms to groups like this. There is a difference between free speech and platforming hate speech and lies. For years, our media has treated the existence of human-caused climate change like a 'both sides' issue -- platforming groups like Safe Seattle does the same thing. I chose not to attend the Speak Out Seattle forums because their group had sent our campaign emails filled with misinformation and fear-mongering photos of tent encampments and members of their group have affiliated with Safe Seattle. [You can see my statement on this here.](#)

- 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?

As a white woman, my role in pursuing racial equity is to continuously turn towards the leadership of POC, especially women of color and indigenous women, and to interrupt and dismantle white supremacy. It is simply not enough to acknowledge privilege, we must actively work to dismantle systems of oppression. My organizing with my union UAW4121 has centered both racial and gender equity at UW, including organizing members against the first travel ban, assisting in the creation of the Washington Immigrant Solidarity Network, and I am currently in bargaining with UW admin to ensure the new WA paid family leave act, which excludes almost all international students as written, is available to all members. I recruited and organized fellow democratic PCOs last year to support of slate of young, progressive leaders to the board of the King County Democrats, including the chair Shasti Conrad, the first woman of color to chair the KCDems. I have also worked inside of science to change the underlying culture of toxic and discriminatory culture, such as serving as a founding member of Scientists Advocating for Representation, Justice, and Equity. I am also a leader in Seattle 500 Women Scientists, an organization working to build inclusive practices within scientific institutions. We have held fundraisers for NWIRP, attended rallies against family separation policy and attended the vigil for Charleena Lyles.

As a councilmember, I will hire and appoint people of color to commissions, ensure POC are paid for their work on equity and racial justice, listen to affected communities and continue to center marginalized voices, and require evidence based anti-racism education for my staff. I will fight for health benefits like doulas for my staff and other city employees to combat maternal health disparities for women of color. I plan to develop programs with frontline workers to professionalize childcare and other care work careers, which are disproportionately held by immigrant women and women of color. I will

continue to call out white supremacy and racism in the institutions, as I have at UW, and ensure policies are created through a lens of equity and racial justice.

- 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?

First of all, I support the continued use of the racial equity toolkit in *all* our city's projects and plans. However, I think we need more tools to ensure that not only are we considering underserved communities but we are *hearing* from them. I think we should consider a plan that would provide resources to local district councils or groups, but only if they have representative diversity -- in age, ability, race, homeowner status, and socioeconomics. These councils should be provided with anti-racism and anti-harassment training resources to ensure fair and equitable discourse and should be supported with stipends and childcare to facilitate increased district council diversity. This program could allow for more public forums to have a representative voice of the community and encourage more integrated community conversation. I also think it is critical for councilmembers and their staff to make time to go to the community for input, not wait for people to come to them.

- What are ideas for progressive revenue sources for transportation and housing that do not burden low-income communities?

Currently I am working with tax policy experts to determine how to generate progressive revenue in Seattle in a way that protects workers and reduces inequality. We have zeroed in on policies that tax businesses proportionally to their wage gap between their C-suite executives and lowest-paid employees. This "CEO Inequality Tax" would generate revenue in a way that scales for businesses that have unfair wage policies and incentivizes better treatment and pay for low-income workers. It would raise critical funds for housing and transportation. I also support impact fees designed not to hamper development but to help fund the growth associated with new development, especially when it comes to affordable housing and transportation infrastructure. We need to structure developer impact fees in such a way that it doesn't add an MHA 'double whammy', but that it creates more equitable development, provides more opportunity for small businesses in new development, ensures transportation adaptation, and helps secure housing affordability.