

## 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 support Vision Zero, and reducing traffic fatalities. A key role for the Council is through the budget, and oversight where funds are spent.**

**An example of a legislative strategy outside of the budget the Council's vote to reduce the default speed limit in Seattle. This reduced the speed limit on residential streets from 25 to 20, and on arterials from 30 to 25 in Center City neighborhoods. A pedestrian hit at 20 miles per hour will survive 9 out of 10 times, but one hit at 30 miles per hour will survive only 5 out of 10 times. People hit at 25 miles per hour are twice as likely to survive as 30 miles per hour, so even small differences in speed limits matter. Continuing to evaluate safety and speeds on individual arterials is a good step. Given that most pedestrian accidents occur in or near urban villages, prioritizing safety improvements there makes sense. Measures to reduce crossing distance help, especially with older people, who are most likely to die in accidents. Longer crosswalk times can help where appropriate (I worked with SDOT to increase the crosswalk time across California Ave SW @ SW Oregon Street, adjacent to the Senior Center of West Seattle). Funding Safe Routes to School are important for young people and we need to find ways to increase investments to improve safety and walkability on those necessary walking routes.**

- 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. An example in District 1, a project is being built by SDOT on SW Avalon Way that will add protected bike lanes, and implement the Bicycle Master Plan. With few access points to the West Seattle peninsula, this is important. I regularly work with West Seattle Bike Connections to address their bike needs, including using the Council's budget proviso tool on the Rapid Ride H project to ensure SDOT considered the input of West Seattle Bike Connections and Seattle Greenways for this important multi-modal project for the working class Delridge neighborhoods.**

**One challenge is the SDOT Director has authority over City streets, and works for the Mayor. The Council has approval over spending, so that is the most likely approach, though Council resolutions stating intent can assist.**

- 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?

**First of all, thank you for asking this question and bringing attention to it. I've expressed my support for extending this funding in a number of other questionnaires, though this is the first one to ask about Seattle Transportation Benefit District funding.**

The Seattle Transportation Benefit District funding for bus service has been a true success story. Access to 10 minute bus service within a 10 minute walk has increased in Seattle from 25% in 2015 to 71% in 2019. To name one example, the C Line now has 35% of service funded by Seattle; it has also increased funding for numerous other West Seattle and South Park routes. We cannot go back, I fully support a ballot measure in 2020 to continue this funding. It's an effective, efficient way to increase access to bus service and the transit network. This kind investment pays dividends for all Seattle neighborhoods, and reduces car traffic Downtown.

One challenge in spending the money has been the capacity of KC Metro's bases. While funding service is the priority, funding could perhaps be extended additionally to allow more low income riders qualify for ORCA LIFT. The allowed maximum income for eligibility is very low.

Though looking increasingly unlikely, it's possible the County could seek a similar measure. If so, it must be timed to allow for a Seattle measure, as in 2014. During a recent meeting of the Regional Transit Committee upon which I serve, I suggested a schedule for the County's regional work.

- 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?

Pavement condition is a constant refrain from commuters on all modes of transportation in District 1. Move Levy funding is behind on construction commitments across all transportation mode commitments - including arterial pavement. We have several arterial segments rated as "failed" as well as "very poor" in West Seattle.

Half of all increased transit ridership for Metro King County is a result of increased investments in the Rapid Ride C alone (yeah!). The 120 is also a system workhorse, planned for conversion to the Rapid Ride H Line in 2021.

The results of increased service on these routes has resulted in a greater number of larger, heavier buses on our arterials; damaging them at a greater rate, with spot repairs falling short to address the needs. *The arrival of heavier RapidRide buses has taxed pavement. Full RapidRide buses have 8,000 times the impact of an SOV on the road.*

Arterial pavement is not "sexy" but, again, it impacts freight mobility, transit, bikers and automobile drivers alike.

The previous levy, Bridging the Gap, dedicated at least 2/3 the funding to infrastructure maintenance. It was lower in the Move Levy (45%). I think more focus on that is needed.

There is no advocacy organization to support addressing our failed arterial segments throughout the city, despite that it impacts all of us, and not only in District 1. I believe that either existing advocacy

groups should work together to address this pressing need, or that a new advocacy group should be formed with representation across interests.

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

No. The question I consider with a potential Center City Streetcar is whether it is a cost-effective use of our limited transportation resources, and whether it would contribute to the long-term success of our transit network. In contrast to developing light rail, and extending our bus network, which are critical to the long-term success of our local and regional transit network, I don't think the Center City Streetcar is a wise investment.

The original transportation purpose of the South Lake Union Streetcar and the First Hill Streetcar were to connect those neighborhoods to our regional light rail system, and they are serving that function. The line in First Hill was built in lieu of a light rail station in First Hill.

The continued cost increases (now 2x the 2015 estimate) have raised the construction cost to \$286 million, leaving a funding gap of \$65 million, with \$75 million federal funding not yet fully secured (in fact we found out in the Q1 2019 capital project update that the funding would likely need to be reauthorized by Congress), \$45 million of the existing funding plan involves bonds funded through the commercial parking tax, which could be used for other transportation improvements.

Operations cost estimates have risen sharply, from an estimated \$16 million in 2017 to \$28 million - a 75% increase in 2 years —this has the potential to cost additional millions every year, which would require a significant subsidy that would leave less funding available for other transportation needs.

Additional funds for construction and operations have not been identified. With the Move Levy reset, multi-modal corridors and bike/pedestrian work have shortfalls compared to projections for move levy spending. Additional spending on a Center City Streetcar would reduce our ability to make good on multimodal and bike/pedestrian projects.

Academic Research shows that streetcars function principally to assist economic development; it's difficult to claim economic development is needed in the heart of downtown. Transportation funds should be used for transportation purposes.

I've heard significant opposition to a Center City Streetcar—unlike for example, expansion of the bus network, and widespread support for light rail. Ensuring passage of a Seattle Transportation Benefit District ballot measure in 2020 is critical, and an expensive Center City Streetcar project that reduces our ability to fund other projects could make passage of a bus service ballot measure more difficult, especially if the measure is, for example, countywide (a similar measure failed in 2014).

The concept of transit “redundancy” is often referenced as a reason to support the Center City Streetcar. That concept has failed to provide outcomes in South Lake Union. Ridership on the C Line,

by contrast, has dramatically increased with additional investments while ridership on the South Lake Union Streetcar has simultaneously decreased.

In my work on the Regional Transit Committee, and through review of the King County Metro 2018 system evaluation, I've seen that additional service is needed to meet KC Metro's service guidelines (which SDOT uses as well). In District 1 alone, the C Line, 21, 37, 50, 56, 60, 125, 131 and 132 all show as needing additional service, including buses in South Park and Delridge. A Center City Streetcar won't help us meet those targets, but additional bus service will.

Also, when the City Council adopted the Move Seattle levy in 2015, they included a provision requiring a Race and Social Justice analysis for the use of any levy proceeds to build or operate streetcars, unlike for other modes.

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

First of all, it is a 100 year decision. Important questions include not just what will be best for those neighborhoods, but also what will make it most likely that expansion will be supported in the future. I am concerned that elevated lines could reduce the likelihood of future support.

The cost estimates we have to date are based on very early design. The current cost estimate for the blue line tunnel in the Alaska Junction is \$700 million above the baseline, and \$500 million for the purple line tunnel through Pigeon Ridge in Delridge.

For previous rail lines, detailed study has shown that tunnels cost less than originally estimated. In Bellevue, early cost estimates for a tunnel in 2009 were in the range of an additional [\\$600 million](#), [\\$700 million](#), to as much as [\\$900 million](#) higher than an above-ground line. After engineering study, the estimate was reduced to under \$300 million, which allowed Bellevue and Sound Transit to [reach an agreement](#) in 2011 on how to split additional costs.

In the Roosevelt neighborhood, study reduced the estimated cost of a tunnel as well, compared to an elevated line. In both cases, the Sound Transit Board approved a tunnel, when above-ground rail had been originally planned.

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

I have been working with Councilmember O'Brien to implement transportation impact fees. We plan to vote on a Comprehensive Plan "project list," in order to allow us to enact a transportation impact fee program. I have also worked with Seattle Public Utilities to implement a kind of impact fee called a "system development charge" (SDCs) SDCs are one-time charges on developers to buy into or access the utility system. These fees only pay for the infrastructure associated with the impacts of the project; they cannot be used for infrastructure backlog.

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

**A congestion fee for TNCs was included for analysis in the Bloomberg grant application the SDOT submitted. I support consideration of this approach. Any fees collected must be used for transportation improvements that provide alternatives that help us meet our carbon reduction goals. I am concerned about TNCs having a detrimental impact on public transit use, as they have in other cities. I know that myself personally, my primary use of TNCs is when I've missed the bus. Seattle is one of the few cities with increasing transit use; but we can't take it for granted.**

**Use and convenience of TNCs may erode public support for the transit funding so necessary to Seattle's future and to meeting climate action goals. Given the high number of immigrants and people of color, and their struggles to earn a living, and treatment from the companies, their wellbeing must also be accounted for (I supported their right to organize).**

**The legal situation isn't fully clear. While a tax would likely be legal, it appears unlikely that it could be limited geographically.**

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

**I included funding to study congestion pricing as proposed by Councilmember O'Brien in the budget balancing package I proposed as Chair of the Budget Committee in 2017.**

**At this point I'm not prepared to support it--we don't yet have a proposal with clearly articulated goals.**

**Analysis of geographic impacts is needed first (the White Paper notes this is a best practice). Given the tolling on the SR99 tunnel, congestion fees on Seattle streets would more likely fall on those who live on the west side of Seattle, such as West Seattle.**

**Any proposal needs clear, easily understandable goals, in particular how it would reduce carbon emissions, and how that fits in with Seattle's overall climate action plan, since it requires approval in a public vote.**

**If passed, any revenue must be used for projects that reduce carbon emissions.**

**It appears likely a public vote would be necessary, and there may be a role for the Washington State Transportation Commission as well.**

- **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?**

**First of all, under City law the Director of SDOT has authority over City streets, so Council jurisdiction is limited.**

**I support SDOT's plan to add street bike parking in the areas adjacent to stop signs and that won't block the views of drivers or cyclists.**

**One key upcoming issue is regarding the proliferation of e-vehicles, and where they will go; they go fast enough that it's unlikely they are safe for pedestrians on sidewalks, especially children and seniors. Expanding bike lines to include these modes may prove a good idea.**

**While I don't support the Center City Streetcar, adding a bus lane in its place would be a good step. I have made this request to SDOT. I am a strong supporter of the Delridge Multimodal Corridor project, that adds bus and bicycle lanes. The Avalon project, which I have been actively involved in shepherding, is adding a dedicated bike lane (critical given the limited access points on the peninsula), and extending the bus lane.**

- **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?**

**Safety is important. That's why I sponsored an amendment requiring SDOT to do a report on sidewalk safety; the Council later adopted a request for a broader report on e-vehicles.**

**Maintenance of our public transportation system is important; in some cities, use of public transit and its funding is falling as these options and Uber/Lyft grow. We can't lose transit funding.. West Seattle and South Park are relatively isolated from the rest of Seattle, so preserving public transportation is critical, especially access to the employment centers of Downtown and South Lake Union.**

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

**I co-sponsored the head tax legislation. In hindsight, explaining the proposal--and the need for affordable housing--more clearly to the public could have helped. Concrete examples especially.**

**Perhaps additional outreach to the business community could have helped, but the invitation to the Chamber to participate was declined. Councilmember Gonzalez and I did a "road show," taking the proposal to several neighborhood chambers. We also needed to ensure that small businesses understood that the lack of a progressive tax results in their paying a disproportionate amount of taxes. A small "highroad business" coalition organized, but it was late in the game.**

**In this context, two things are very interesting developments in the year since the passage and repeal of the EHT. The first is the fact that nearly \$700 million private philanthropy for housing and homelessness has been announced for our region by several very large businesses that evidently came to the realization that they weren't doing enough. Secondly, it's very interesting that Salesforce.com has designated Seattle as its HQ2. The Salesforce CEO was the leading proponent of a tax similar to the EHT in San Francisco that will raise \$300 million a year. His arrival in Seattle may shape the dynamic of any future public conversation about a progressive tax.**

**Also, in discussions with smaller tech companies, I feel that their positions weren't necessarily represented by the Chamber.**

- **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?**

**Economic development has brought significant prosperity to Seattle. However, that has resulted in a crisis of affordability for many. Given our limited taxing options, the EHT, limited to only to businesses with large revenue, seemed like the fairest approach. The proposal was \$.13/hour on only the largest 2% of businesses, compare that to the increase of the minimum wage for all employers – an increase that amounted to \$5.50/hour.**

**In local economic Dick Conway's study, [Washington State and Local Tax System: Dysfunction and Reform](#), he noted,**

**"a high-tech job creates two or three other jobs in the economy through the multiplier process. These workers and their families place demands on the public sector for schools, roads, and safety. If the added costs of these public goods and services were to fall disproportionately on low and middle-income households, as they do now under Washington's sales-based tax system, those households would in effect be subsidizing the high-tech companies and their employees".**

**Washington is one of the few states without an income tax; a corporate income tax would be the fairest way to tax businesses.**

- **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 voted to approve the citywide MHA upzone this March. I believe that the City needs to do more to prevent a net loss of affordable housing as our population grows, and tying development capacity to replacement of or payments toward affordable housing is one important strategy.**

**Based on a racial equity assessment of displacement, I am championing a policy that would promote the development of additional affordable housing in areas at high displacement risk that has disproportionately impacted communities of color. The goal of this policy is to ensure that developers that build housing that threatens naturally-occurring affordable housing stock either a. replace removed housing units in their new developments or b. pay more into the MHA fund so that the City has greater capacity to build replacement affordable housing.**

**That said, per my efforts to pass anti-displacement legislation, I am concerned about the loss of naturally-occurring affordable housing, specifically in areas of high-displacement risk. Relying on our MHA tool is inadequate to solely counter the impact of market-rate development in the City.**

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

**Focusing growth around major bus and rail makes sense. Upon my request, the Office of Planning and Community Development has begun neighborhood planning with the West Seattle Junction and Delridge neighborhoods in preparation for Transit-Oriented Development once the Sound Transit 3 alignment is decided. My support for RSL zoning in the Alaska Junction was predicated on the forthcoming station-area planning process for transit-oriented development.**

**I advocated for additional bus service for the Admiral neighborhood, because, as an Urban Village identified for growth, my office's analysis determined it was underserved.**

**Including TOD for affordable housing was a key finding in Sound Transit's Race and Social Justice analysis of siting a station in Delridge.**

**The replacement housing obligation law referenced in the previous answer will address displacement, as will the affordability requirement that exist under state law for use of surplus Sound Transit property for TOD. Finally, community preferences to allow residents to return to new affordable units in TOD projects will help address displacement impacts.**

- 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?

**A number of strategies are needed, with a focus on housing and on employment. I believe supply-side strategies, whether for housing or jobs, is not enough. We need better laws from renters and workers and we need regulations on employers and builders that create new revenue so that we can reduce reliance on regressive taxation.**

**I also believe that we should use our bonding authority to rightsize our annual NOFA's for each of the final four years of the levy, just like I led the City to do in 2018 – despite the opposition of the Mayor, the City Budget Director, and the Council Budget Chair. I am, today, working on implementation of SHB 1406, adopted by the state legislature, which allows for dedicating some existing state sales tax revenue to finance municipal bonds for affordable housing. Seattle needs to double its spending to build affordable housing, as does King County, and individual King County jurisdictions.**

**I have taken a number of actions as a Councilmember:**

- supported an increase in the size of the housing levy
- sponsored a \$29 million bond sale to directly fund affordable housing
- supported Mandatory Housing Affordability
- HALA Strategy P1: I was the prime sponsor of increased funding for preservation in the Housing Levy.
- HALA Strategy T1 I led efforts to “combat displacement by increasing funding rental and operating subsidies for extremely low-income households,” with significant added funds for Rapid Rehousing Program and Permanent Supportive Housing when I was acting budget chair.



- HALA Strategy T1 - I championed and was prime sponsor for “legislation supporting fair access to rental housing for people with past criminal records.”
- I sponsored “first in time” legislation for rental applications, to combat discrimination in rental housing, and ensure fairness and equal access to housing
- Last year, I also advocated for using the portion of King County’s hotel-motel tax authority to be dedicated toward affordable housing, and worked successfully with King County Councilmembers, who adopted \$184 million in additional funding.

For access to good jobs, I have:

- In 2016, I sponsored (with Councilmember González) & the Council passed Seattle’s Secure Scheduling Ordinance.
- In 2016, I led the effort to successfully increase funding for the Office of Labor Standards (OLS), to improve staffing for enforcement & support for community-based outreach & education.
- In 2016, I secured funding for the Ironworkers’ Local 86 pre-apprenticeship program with the City of Seattle.
- I sponsored legislation, passed by the Council in 2017, creating a private right of action for workers to get justice when OLS doesn’t pursue a claim.
- I worked in 2017 to encourage adoption of an OLS Director’s Rule to end the minimum wage exemption for people with disabilities. (Legislation passed later, led by Councilmember Mosqueda, when she took over the Council’s Labor Committee).
- I worked with Silence Breakers in 2018 to pass legislation that I sponsored to extend the statute of limitations for people experiencing harassment in the workplace.
- I sponsored legislation, passed in 2017, expanding the Priority Hire Program.
- I worked with PROTEC17 to successfully call for Mayor in 2018 to reconvene of the City’s Labor Management Leadership Committee.
- In 2019, I sponsored a resolution that was passed last month to call on the Office of Labor Standards to work with the Labor Standards Advisory Committee to develop policy options for the Council to correct the harm that is done when workers are misclassified as contractors and deprived of their rights as employees
- Sponsored a bill that passed in 2018 that gives contracted domestic workers the right to file a complaint with the Office of Civil Right for harassment, discrimination, and retaliation in the workplace.
- 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?

**Yes. It’s a regional problem requiring a regional solution. I also believe we need to take an Emergency Response approach, as recommended by the City Auditor (I requested the Auditor review the approach of the Navigation Team). The Council may need to approve administrative changes to allow for it at the City level.**

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

The Third Door Coalition, composed of business leaders, service providers, and researchers is correct in saying:

The [top five causes](#) of homelessness are: 1) lack of affordable housing, 2) lack of a living wage, 3) domestic violence, 4) medical bankruptcy, and 5) untreated mental illness. These causes can happen to anyone.

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

I sponsored “first in time” legislation for rental applications, to combat discrimination in rental housing, and ensure fairness and equal access to housing

I think that we need to have a more sophisticated analysis on high-displacement risk neighborhoods, generally communities of color, and do more to both incentivize affordable, community-driven development in those areas and limit market-rate development that results in the demolition of existing market-rate affordable housing.

We must fix our broken eviction system that displaces people from their homes and communities when they are “a dollar short and a day late”. The mark of an eviction has long-term consequences, and as we’ve seen with important studies on evictions like the “Losing Home” report, people of color, specifically Black women are disproportionately impacted by evictions locally. There are several recommendations I am leading on in the report that could continue to expand the ability for the City to address evictions even past the victories the Housing Alliance lead on in the 2019 state legislature.

As mentioned before, based on a racial equity assessment of displacement, I am championing a policy that would promote the development of additional affordable housing in areas at high displacement risk that has disproportionately impacted communities of color. The goal of this policy is to ensure that developers that build housing that threatens naturally-occurring affordable housing stock either a. replace removed housing units in their new developments or b. pay more into the MHA fund so that the City has greater capacity to build replacement affordable housing.

I am also supporting the development of community preference and affirmative marketing strategies to be implemented by the Office of Housing in its function as a funder. These tools would help build capacity and priority for community-based developers that are experts in serving their neighborhoods to build affordable housing. These strategies have had success by people of color-led organizations like AfricaTown and El Centro de la Raza.

Also within our funding priorities I have recently led the Council to vote to increase funding caps for coops and community land trusts so that they have the capital necessary to buy and develop properties up for sale with the goal of creating greater homeownership for communities that have faced historical barriers. If we match these capacity-building opportunities for alternative housing models with refining our “Notice of Intent to Sell” ordinance, and new authority to transfer surplus,

publicly owned land at low- or no-costs, we will create greater opportunities for community-driven development to counter displacement.

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

I’ve supported historic landmark status for the Campbell and Crescent-Hamm buildings in the West Seattle Junction (where Cupcake Royale and Easy Street are located), as recommended in a study by the Southwest Seattle Historical Study Group.

I’ve also supported extending the Pike Place Market Historic District to include the Showbox. If we lose our cultural venues in the City, we will take away a significant portion of what draws people to a vibrant, urban center.

When I think of how to consider Seattle’s indigenous communities in how we define historic character, I think of the words of Ken Workman, a member of the Duwamish Tribe and the great-great-great-grandson of Chief Seattle, our city’s namesake. Workman said, referring to how the Duwamish buried their dead in soil that the grew trees. “We are in the trees, in the beams,” he said. This was at a [Ghosts of Seattle Past](#) event, held in a renovated brick warehouse supported by large old-growth wooden beams that Workman gestured to as he spoke.

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

When I think about multi-generational housing, I consider the age groups that haven’t traditionally been represented in our dialogue on housing, specifically aging people with complex medical needs cycling through the shelter-hospital pipeline; senior and young adults in the LGBTQ community; communities of color, and immigrant and refugee communities that face barriers to homeownership.

Especially given Seattle’s history as a home for the queer community, we know that building affordable housing should challenge heteronormative notions around domestic partnership and combined incomes. I’ve followed the leadership of LGBTQ community-based organizations like LGBTQ Allyship and GenPRIDE to understand that we need to prioritize projects that support the aging LGBTQ community. Allyship’s 2017 Housing Survey of the LGBTQ+ Community identified isolation and lack of access to culturally-relevant resources as major issues for the LGBTQ+ community, especially as our neighborhoods gentrify. With that, for several years I’ve supported Capitol Hill Housing’s efforts to build LGBTQ senior housing in the heart of Capitol Hill by advocating for capital investments that elevate this lens in our Office of Housing funding priorities, and I am leading the effort to address the spike in hate crimes in our communities that target our LGBTQ communities.

I believe that the McKinsey report offered important lessons about targeting our homelessness investments at Permanent Supportive Housing. This is becoming clearer as we find an aging homelessness population that also have [chronic health concerns that cannot be stabilized as in a shelter setting](#)—a recent report from the King County Medical Examiner have revealed that people with chronic diseases living unsheltered die years younger than housed people. These folks need a

home to get better that comes with services and resources to meet their needs, be they mental illness, an addiction, or chronic disability. While we invest in the infrastructure of this housing, I am interested in building the capacity of organizations like DESC to partner with medical providers to serve these folks while accessing our Federal dollars through Washington state's 1115 Medicaid waiver period. Services work best when they are located where the need is, and housing providers have better options to accessing local, state and Federal capital investments when they can demonstrate that they can pay for the services that they intend to offer.

Finally, I am intent on broadening options for people beyond renting, especially for communities of color who have historically been excluded from building equity and wealth through homeownership. This is because 1) given the extent to which Seattle is zoned for single-families, we've got to make sure that while we work to accommodate urban growth (that doesn't exacerbate displacement), we are creating new opportunities for homeownership for communities of color; and 2) while our goals to increase density with multi-family housing are key, it may not be cost-effective for multi-family projects to produce units that are multi-generational. During our most recent revision of the Office of Housing's Housing Funding Plan, I sponsored an amendment that lifts the funding cap on the maximum allocation for resale-restricted homes of 3+ bedrooms based on property costs. The goal is to create more options for community land trust organizations and cooperatives to serve as a pipeline for communities whom have not had access to homeownership.

New ADU legislation will provide multi-generational housing opportunities, but without reducing ADU permitting and building costs and providing funding those opportunities will predominately benefit white homeowners.

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

I believe we need a fact-based discussion on the issues facing Seattle in order to reach productive solutions. I don't believe vilification, slander, and false statements have a role in this. The role of President Trump in toxifying national issues is illustrative.

On the local level, I draw a contrast between groups such as the neighborhood business groups that commissioned the System Failure report, which, despite having an error or two, was brought forward in the spirit of enhancing debate and working toward solutions.

By contrast, the "Seattle Is Dying" news broadcast falsely conflated homelessness and drug addiction. The Third Door Coalition notes "Roughly 32% of individuals experiencing homelessness suffer from addiction to drugs and alcohol—a figure approximately 20% higher than reported abuse of alcohol and illicit drugs by the general population."

I believe in engaging with people with different perspectives; I invited the Chamber to participate in the Progressive Revenue Task Force (they declined). In this spirit, I participated in the Speak Out Seattle debate in District 1. However, I insisted that before beginning the forum, that the moderator make a public statement that not all homeless persons are addicts nor are they criminals.

Safe Seattle is in a different category, with false claims that do not help in working toward solutions.

- 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?

**Racial equity is an important part of my work, as Chair of the committee overseeing the Seattle Office for Civil Rights, and emphasizing the importance of the Race and Social Justice Initiative. As a district Councilmember, while some of this work is citywide, much of it is also district-focused.**

**As a District 1 Councilmember, representing communities of color (e.g. South Park and Delridge) involves listening, and pursuing what they have recommended.**

**Being in regular contact is important, being in the community and having an open door, and letting people know they can get in touch with you anytime. Creating institutional structures to give community an ongoing seat at the table to both create policy, implement policy, and evaluate policy is paramount. Listening is critical—communities know what they need, and can tell you if you ask, and listen. South Park, for example, is majority non-white, with 40% speaking a language other than English at home, with a median household income less than half the City average.**

**A good example of my efforts to elevate the voices of people of color is the South Park Public Safety Initiative, where the crime rate is well above the national average.**

**In response to numerous ongoing complaints regarding public safety in South Park, I advocated with the Chief of Police for additional patrols, which she added, increasing police presence.**

**While helpful in the short run, I also co-sponsored the creation of the South Park Public Safety Committee in search of longer-term solutions. I asked the community what they wanted, and what they saw as the public safety priorities. The first priority was a bilingual South Park Public Safety Advocate, for which I included funding in the budget package I developed as Chair of the Budget Committee, and subsequently sponsored in the following year. Having an ongoing, dedicated staff person bilingual in English and Spanish who focuses on South Park makes it easier for the community.**

**Alley lighting behind Cloverdale was a very high community priority; my office worked with City Light to ensure this happened.**

**The report also included pedestrian safety projects we funded, and I successfully advocated for their recommendation to extend late-night hours at community centers. Recently, the community expressed concern about pedestrian safety re: freight trucks turning from 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue South onto Cloverdale, so we're working with them on that, and in touch with the community about speed control and traffic calming on Cloverdale.**

**Sometimes acting quickly to community requests is also important. Recently I received a request from a South Park community member to assist with translation for a telephone scam that was targeting utility customers, and assisted with getting City Light to translate materials quickly into Spanish,**

**Somali and Vietnamese. During the snowstorm, South Park had no bus service, so I worked with SDOT and KC Metro to get a South Park Shuttle established.**

**I've held one out of every three of my in-district office hours in South Park, and one-third in Delridge; this has allowed me to hear of numerous constituent issues I've been able to address, from road repairs to public safety issues.**

**Finally, some of helping communities of color involves doing the detailed work of serving on committees that aren't well-known or well publicized. I serve on the Flood Control District Advisory Board, and worked with SPU to get \$13 for the South Park Conveyance project, which will alleviate flooding that affects businesses there, in one of Seattle's communities most vulnerable to sea-level rise from climate change.**

- **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?**

**A race and social justice approach is very helpful. The Office of Arts and Culture has been a model for this, integrating the approach into all their work. It's resulted in significant changes to their approach on, for example, grants, and how they focus on cultural space preservation.**

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

**Washington State has the most regressive tax systems in the United States. According to the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, Washington State households with incomes below \$21,000 paid on average 16.8 percent of their income in state and local taxes in 2015, whereas households with income in excess of \$500,000 paid only 2.4 percent.**

**Local economist Dick Conway has noted [we finish last](#) when you consider fairness, transparency, adequacy, stability, and economic vitality. Our tax system inhibits affordability for middle and lower income residents. Less revenue available contributes to our difficulties keeping people housed and results on our increasing and unsustainable reliance on property tax levies. I have sought to address this.**

**I sponsored a tax on personal income that is over \$250,000 for individuals, or \$500,000 for couples. The first purpose listed for the legislation states, "(1) lowering the property tax burden and the impact of other regressive taxes, including the business and occupation tax rate." The legislation is currently under legal challenge.**

**Given the limitations of our tax system, I co-sponsored an employee hours tax, and limited it to only those companies with the highest revenues, in the same way I supported limiting the business license tax increase supported by the Chamber for hiring police officers to only businesses with the 15%**

highest revenues. A corporate income tax on net income, as in most other states, would be a fairer approach.