

- **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 100% support Vision Zero and will do my utmost to help get us there. Safe streets, especially for folks with disabilities, is a must if we truly want to be a livable city. We need to re-evaluate our loading, unloading, docking, and delivery systems to ensure our sidewalks remain clear and walkable for pedestrians, parents with strollers, and seniors. Additionally, we should also look into legislation that did not pass in the state legislature to better enforce 'blocking the box' policies that often leave pedestrian crossings unpassable or dangerous. While I do think there are clear legislative strategies we can take to get us to Vision Zero, there is also an element of education involved. Most drivers are unaware of the consequences of box blocking, especially for disabled Seattleites, and every one of my neighbors who I've talked to about this almost immediately rectifies their bad habits after learning about the issue. If we can better educate drivers and motorists and make them more aware of the difficulties pedestrians often face on our busy streets, much regulation and enforcement could be avoided, saving us money and preventing injuries that will make our streets safer.

- **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 support fulfilling the promise made to all constituents after the passage of the Move Seattle Levy and working towards more accountability and transparency to the voters in all voter-approved and voter-funded projects. If specific items are called out in a levy, then they should be fulfilled unless there are serious unforeseen issues. And if one item is reduced by X% then other items should be reduced by the same percentage.

- **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?**

Yes. I do support it, having worked for King County I saw their struggles trying to find qualified transit workers (line workers for trolleys, bus drivers). We need to make sure the next transportation package includes funds to incentivize community colleges and training programs to adequately train our future workforce to maintain a sufficient amount of people operating our transit safely and expertly.

Seattleites expect a high standard of transit services and have generously funded ST3 and other measures to continue to expand the services provided, and it is important we do not overburden Seattle voters and lose the valuable partnership between the people and our public transportation that allows these services to exist. I support expanding transit, but am wary of

undue levies and special districts that could erode the public trust and disproportionately place the funding responsibility on retirees and people living on a fixed income.

- **The Move Seattle levy expires as 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?**

The next Move Seattle levy should continue to address our congestion and traffic issues by expanding alternative transit options, including working to complete a comprehensive Sound Transit and bus system whereby every Seattleite can access affordable public transportation to and from their work, their school, and to see their friends and family. A quarter of Seattleites currently live in transportation deserts where they live further than 10 minutes from reliable transit — no wonder we have so many people and workers opting for cars!

Perhaps the greatest takeaway from the current levy is that the people directly affected by transportation projects and new construction and the neighborhoods around those new developments know best how those projects will affect their neighborhoods and need to be consulted prior to construction. 35th Avenue Northeast is an example of this closed-door policy making where neighbors, community groups, and businesses did not have their voices listened to despite having a better understanding of the consequences of construction on 35th and the backlash ultimately led to a total upheaval of the original plans in the Move Seattle levy. Voters need to get what they voted for and what their taxes paid for, and that requires consultation and partnership with those voters. We do need better protections for bikers, expanded safety measures for pedestrians, better and more accessible public transit, and more affordable alternative options including Paratransit and services specifically designed for disabled Seattleites, and the only way to ensure voters remain generous with their tax dollars and will continue to fund these levies is by being proactive and working with voters and taxpayers and businesses and communities to ensure projects do not negatively affect any of these entities.

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

I support expanding public transit, but the streetcar is expensive and over budget and I fear that if we continue to run millions of dollars over projected costs, we will lose the trust of taxpayers who are already becoming more and more reluctant to approve property tax-based levies and increased funding for transportation projects. If the partnership between the people and our government erodes, we will lose any opportunity to expand our public transit system.

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

The largest consideration regarding finding funding for a light rail tunnel is possibly *waiting*. I am a big supporter of easy and accessible public transportation but there are major issues that are time sensitive. One of these being fixing the Magnolia Bridge, due to its important to mobility, freight traffic, and the safety of our city. Additionally, one has to examine if the digging of a tunnel at such a significant cost will increase/improve ridership in any way.

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

Impact fees should be used to ensure communities affected by new development are not negatively impacted. With new development comes new traffic, heavier utility usage, and the obvious side effects of construction, and it is the responsibility of our local government to ensure those increased impacts are taken into account and that neighborhoods, schools, businesses, and communities can continue to thrive alongside new developments. We're one of the few big cities that doesn't have real impact fees, forcing property owners to foot the bill with higher and higher property taxes.

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

This is an interesting proposal with the potential to add revenue for expanding transit services and investing in strategies to fight climate change and continue to minimize our pollution output. I would need to study the costs and benefits associated with a ridehailing tax or fee to ensure that we are not harming a valuable part of the modernizing gig sector of our growing economy and make sure the tax isn't being unduly passed onto their workers. I also firmly believe in making policy with those who would benefit and those who the burden the costs would fall on. That means actually sitting down with the stakeholders and working with — not against — Uber, Lyft, and the many ordinary people who use their services who'd have to pay the tax.

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

No. This is another tricky question. I would support this if it is supported by evidence and clear data. Who would be impacted by a congestion price? Amazon coders or the janitors servicing the buildings where they work? We cannot afford to institute another regressive tax that disproportionately affects working people who need to drive to work due to our lack of a fully comprehensive and accessible public transit system. However, we equally cannot afford to wait and do nothing to decrease our carbon emissions and must act quickly to find the best possible solution that works for workers and the environment.

There are also significant political constraints to analyze — we cannot afford another backlash that will stall other priorities, like tackling our homelessness crisis or expanding transit. That means further study on how a congestion price would work to ensure it is not another regressive tax. Price fluctuations during peak and shoulder times, an income-based pricing system so lower income folks are not overly-burdened, and keeping all revenue **transparent** to taxpayers and going only towards transit and not Councilmembers' pet projects.

- **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?**

Converting general purpose lanes for different usage can be beneficial, but it can also be exceedingly disruptive when not done in consultation with the drivers, bus riders, businesses, and families who use those streets. We need to change the process involved in the placement, funding, and construction of new converted lanes to prioritize these community collaborations. If there is an easy and affordable way to convert lanes then there is opportunity for street improvement and increased safety, but this is often not the case. 35th Avenue NE is an example of lane conversion gone wrong and, like I mentioned previously, is an example of the isolated policy making of the current City Council. Neighbors, businesses, and community members from Wedgwood and Viewridge knew the consequences of converting 35th and they tried to get the Council to listen, but were either rebuffed or ignored. That's why I have promised to make policy with all stakeholders involved in any given legislation, and that must include the people directly impacted by proposed changes — including street conversion.

- **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?**

Expanding mobility options is a must for tackling our congestion issues, as well as decreasing carbon emissions and making it easier for workers to get to work, so having access to various types of transportation is critical. Public-private partnerships have helped invigorate new transportation options that make it easier for Seattleites to get around our city and encourage bike usage, lowering our carbon footprint. But it is absolutely critical that we hold private corporations to the same standards and expectations regarding long-term planning and vision that must guide city projects. Bikeshares and other 'emerging mobility options' need to work in tandem with our transit system — expanding placement along bus routes and near light rail stations and at gaps in our systems, especially near geographic areas that are not suited for pedestrians (hills, busy streets, etc.)

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

I absolutely support the concept of finding progressive revenue sources to tackle our homelessness crisis but I did not support the politics that led to the head tax. We need to work on the process behind legislation for that legislation to be effective. Why is it that in a city where a majority of voters support raising taxes on the wealthiest people and businesses, a proposal that sought to do exactly that was so unpopular? I believe it's because the City Council is perceived as un-transparent and unaccountable to the voters who elected them, rather than opening up a more public legislative process. This view may be right or wrong, but the bottom line is that when ordinary people see their government in that way, they are less and less likely to add funds for that government to spend. We need to work to restore real trust and legitimacy by ensuring procedural justice by creating legislation through the same coalition-building process that made other progressive priorities successful, like raising the minimum wage and passing I-1639. When activists, ordinary Seattleites, community groups, and local businesses work together, we will be able to find creative solutions that actually stick.

- **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?**

One of the major responsibilities of these corporations is providing a safe working environment and ensuring good wages for all Seattle workers — and that includes a fair grievance process and the benefits needed to thrive and raise a family in our beautiful city. They must also have a stake in our city as a growing, changing *city* with all the families, neighborhoods, and advocacy groups that come with that, and that means working with city agencies to ensure businesses help the communities where they are located and our city at large. In terms of the relationship between the city and these corporations, there needs to be a strong partnership that works to address our greatest challenges without unilaterally attacking businesses as ‘the enemy.’ These partnerships will help to ensure that workers and families in Seattle are the priority, and businesses can thrive and succeed here and continue to help invigorate our booming economy.

Prioritizing successful coalitions between businesses and workers and other stakeholders is the only way we can provide effective government and continue stimulating our economic growth. I will listen to, be responsive to, and be honest with all of the communities I serve, including the business communities. Working together leads to results — like the passage of I-1639 — ignoring a huge element of our city leads to the chaotic backlash we saw after the passage and repeal of the Head Tax.

- **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?**

If I had been on the Council, I hope I would have made an impact on the final MHA! But that being said, I support and would have supported HALA and MHA as the best possible compromise we could get at that time. These compromises rarely satisfy either side, but they do work and create much more buy-in than unilateral policy decisions. Once elected, I will continue to work with these broader coalitions to address city challenges, and continue addressing our zoning and building regulations to keep up with growth and seriously tackle our affordability crisis.

- **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. I wholeheartedly believe that transit-oriented development will be a critical part of the solution to solve our growth, congestion, and affordability challenges and I will push for measures that work toward these goals. It is critical new development is instituted where it will have the most benefit without harming the communities affected, and in almost every respect TOD fits that demand in terms of maximizing space for limited parking, access to community services, and accessibility to jobs. It is paramount that new development is built along transit hubs and includes affordable and mixed-use housing with accompanying services like childcare and supportive housing to create healthy communities at affordable prices, as well as provide adequate housing for families making 60-80% AMI. When people live near convenient and affordable public transit, they will use those services, increasing overall transit revenue for other

priorities, lowering greenhouse emissions, and fostering a healthier model of community-oriented growth.

I am ready to dive into this issue and increase housing affordability options and will work with neighborhood groups, community activists, and transit stakeholders to ensure we do this in a smart, effective way that does not ignore the voices of all involved.

- **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?**

One of the main strategies that Seattle can pursue is access to low income housing. I support moving low-income and affordable income projects to the front of the line at the Department of Construction and Inspections and allowing alternative construction approaches to the current onerous one experienced by everyone. In this economic climate, affordability means that below median and moderate-income workers can afford to live near their place of work in Seattle. It makes absolutely no sense for those who serve us in the hospitality industry, the trades, our child care, teaching, public safety and health care fields to spend multiple hours a day transporting themselves to and from their workplaces. There are myriad negative consequences to a city being unaffordable to workers and residents: Traffic congestion, stress and unhealthy lifestyles, absence from the civic life of their city, time away from family and friends, and other components that determine quality of life.

King County Assessor John Wilson has already identified many publicly owned, surplus property in the city that can be converted to public housing at little or no cost. This would be a huge step forward in creating adequate affordable housing for all workers. The city has got to stop selling public land to developers for an amount that rarely ever gets translated into affordable housing. I also support increasing housing along transportation routes and near employment centers in consultation with the communities and neighborhoods affected.

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

Displacement, gentrification, and eviction are all sides of the same coin when it comes to discrimination in housing. And that discrimination can really only be enforced when the Office of Housing, Civil Rights and the police conduct joint operations that will stand up in court showing that there is discrimination. This comes down to working together and building partnerships between community activists, developers, landlords, and our government — a co-operation that has been too easily neglected by the current City Council. Evictions that disproportionately affect people of color and poor people can be greatly reduced by assisting those who are behind in rent or utility payments with vouchers and then assisting those folks with case management to get them back on solid financial ground (this also needs to be a major aspect of preventing increased homelessness).

As a City Councilmember I would support initiatives including rental assistance, utility vouchers, and other low-cost financial support that will prevent individuals and families from becoming evicted or otherwise homeless in the first place. These folks may also need to be connected with other existing supportive programs to help them manage their re-housing. The Downtown Emergency Service Center and other private groups who are doing the right work without costing the taxpayer are setting the example, and city programs need to meet similar standards. Being able to avoid homelessness and eviction in the first place would be the goal of these initiatives.

- **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?**

Absolutely. One of my priorities will be to work toward a substantive consolidation of City and Counties government entities addressing human services, housing and mental illness as well as rational programs of addiction response. This common sense approach was achieved in the past with Metro Transit (e.g. the consolidation of county/city bus services), the Public Health agencies (into Seattle/King County Department of Public Health) and with Wastewater Treatment, which occurred in the 1970's.

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

There is, of course, no one cause of homelessness in our city, but a variety of exacerbations and circumstances that can lead to homelessness, including institutional injustice and discrimination, severe wage disparity, housing unaffordability, untreated mental health and addiction issues. The multifaceted roots of our homelessness crisis means we need a more comprehensive response than just repeating platitudes of making Seattle more affordable or 'solving the opioid epidemic.' We need to get real and create an actual plan of tackling the diverse causes of homelessness.

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

While there are remaining concerns held by many of the recent MHA compromise, the objective of using public policy to increase opportunities to expand affordable housing options is a high priority of my candidacy, and that needs to mean housing options in every part of our city and every community. As a city, we should do what is necessary to ensure that below median and moderate income workers and residents have access to quality housing and tackle head on the legacies of Seattle's past discrimination in housing and redlining.

In my engagement and communication with District 7 residents, I am just beginning to see the wealth of progressive thinking on this issue. Like most daunting challenges, the answers are out there, as long as we value listening over personal agendas. Regardless of how fantastic I believe my personal ideas are, the most important step a City Councilmember can take to minimize inequity and racism in housing policy is to create that policy arm in arm with those communities most historically impacted. Partnerships that bring stakeholders to the table and prioritize such

a simple thing like *listening*, have the ability to empower vulnerable communities and make real, long-lasting progress.

I also support converting city, county, 'regional' and state land to below median and moderate income use — an option recently permitted by state law — with the goal of developing public/private collaborative partnerships with the economic sectors and non-profits to develop quality housing, and to develop low cost programs to prevent folks from being forced out of this housing and removing one element of subjectivity that can sometimes allow for discriminatory biases in rental and housing.

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

It is obviously difficult to comprehensively define historic character in a city that has as much diversity as Seattle, and often seems to come down to a “you know it when you see it” attitude. But sites that preserve our many cultures or mark the history of our diversity clearly merit the distinction of historic character. This definition absolutely includes sites of value to indigenous communities and must be taken into account when we determine the ‘historic character’ of any given site. I've said this in a number of other responses, but this ultimately breaks down to communication and collaboration. If we work with indigenous communities when determining the historic character of a place in our city we can minimize backlash and unintended bias or discrimination, while also preserving sites of historic character and value to those same communities.

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

Fundamentally what this comes down to is better planning for our housing crisis. Thus far the City Council has approved mostly reactionary, piecemeal Band-Aid solutions that don't offer a comprehensive vision for managing our city's rapid growth. New development, especially affordable housing, needs to be built around transportation hubs and near services and community resources such as community centers, grocery stores, child care providers and human services providers. Low income housing built in transit deserts and food deserts and without access to the services every community needs is not true affordable housing and could not provide for the multi-generational needs required in any diverse neighborhood — like assisted senior living facilities as well as high quality childcare and Pre-K. I will work with neighborhoods and the communities directly affected to better plan our affordable housing developments so as not to have rows and rows of inadequate but cheap housing and rather create comprehensive communities that include access to high quality food, transit, education facilities including childcare and college, as well as near jobs and businesses so that folks can live, go to school, raise a family, and retire in the communities where they work.

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

Everyone has the right to speak their mind, especially when it does come from a sincere place of worry regarding our city. But that does not mean everyone's opinions get to dictate policy. The mantra of my campaign is to *listen, listen, and listen some more*, and I will always listen to my constituents whether I agree with them or not, and that includes folks with Safe Seattle and other similar groups. But that said, I will never agree with everyone in my district and if a group does not have the ability to compromise or adjust their views to evidence and data-backed policies and instead sticks to a rigid ideology, their voice will obviously be less amenable to the coalition-building, community-oriented style of policymaking I will make a priority.

- **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?**

Striving for racial equity has always played a role in my work in the police department. The single biggest and most successful instance was working with the Racial Disparity Project, the ACLU, the Defender Association, the UW and others to create the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion program to greatly reduce the disproportionate charging of minority men for low level, non-violent drug crimes. I worked on several recruitment initiatives while at the city to increase the representation of women and people of color in the police ranks. I was a very vocal supporter of the statewide Initiative 940 that required training of all police in crisis intervention, de-escalation as well as changing the language where a truly criminal police officer could be charged with a crime.

- **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?**

Giving the public the ability to have their voices heard is very important to me. This is why I have pledged to hold office hours and regular discussions with my constituents when I am elected to sit down and talk with members of our community about the issues that matter most to all of us. Not everyone will agree with me, but they will absolutely be listened to and their voices will be a fundamental aspect of my legislative decision making. Having an understanding of past policies combined with current public opinions will allow me to critically look at the affects of certain programs, policies, and practices so that everyone can benefit.

This also means going to my constituents. So many people cannot come to City Hall during the daytime — parents, workers, students — especially from underrepresented communities that also all too often face additional socioeconomic barriers, that holding the minimal hours of a 9-5 job just doesn't cut it as true representation. I will hold coffee hours, community halls (like town halls), and open my schedule on weekends and evenings so that I can hear from every community in our district.

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

This is not just about raising revenue. Even if we find a thousand new, creative, progressive revenue sources, if that's where reform ends then we will still have a regressive tax system propped up by poor and middle class families and seniors and retirees. We need to fundamentally re-structure our revenue system so it reflects our progressive values we're so known for across the country. Let's look into collecting revenue from the highest earners' capital gains and other sources that don't overburden workers and their families. In the city with the wealthiest people and companies in the world, I don't think it's unreasonable to expect everyone to chip in their fair share to make our city work for all. I am also a supporter of a statewide income tax as a way of alleviating some of the burden from regressive sales and property taxes, and will lobby the legislature to make this a priority.