1. Many employers in the downtown and center city neighborhoods— including the City of Seattle— fully or partially cover the cost of ORCA transit passes for their employees. Incentivizing public transit and reducing drive-alone commuting is especially important during the next five years, with the “Seattle Squeeze” creating challenging traffic conditions. However, many employers don’t provide any transit pass subsidy. Anecdotally, higher-paid workers are more likely to receive employer-subsidized passes than lower-wage workers, who are disproportionately women and people of color. Many lower-wage workers earn too much to be eligible for the ORCA LIFT low-income reduced fare program, but not enough to afford housing in Seattle without being severely cost-burdened. For the following questions, please choose either Yes or No. You may explain your answers if you like.

- Do you think employers of a certain size should subsidize employee transit passes? (Yes/No)
  - Certainly. When I was in student government at the University of Washington I was part of the team that advocated for and adopted the Universal U-Pass. By making it universal, rather than optional, we dramatically lowered the cost of the pass.

- Would you support city council action to make this a requirement? (Yes/No)
  - It would depend on the location of the employer, the size of the employer, and whether they have effective access to mass transit connections. Additionally, my preference would be an incentive rather than a mandate. But I am happy to look into some kind of mandatory ORCA pass regime.

- Do you think the City should cover the costs of transit passes for employees of human service providers that are funded by city contracts? (Yes/No)
  - It would depend on the scope of the work, how attenuated the connection to City investment is, and how necessary the transit pass is to get to work. But generally, yes. I am supportive of this.

2. Report after report— notably the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report released in October 2018— tells us we need to cut carbon emissions dramatically NOW. What will you do to put Seattle on the path to decarbonization?

   I recently wrote an editorial for the Urbanist on the need to expand the use of cross-laminated timber (CLT) in our built environment. Together, cement and steel production account for 14% of global CO2 emissions. CLT, which has similar structural strength to cement and steel, effectively acts as a carbon sink, and can be locally sourced. We need to do a better job of demanding a built environment that reflects the needs of our natural environment. CLT buildings from 12-20 stories can effectively make our built environment carbon neutral.

   Additionally, I strongly support efforts to expand seagrass, oysters, and kelp into the coastal areas around Seattle. I strongly support the Blue Carbon initiative of the Port of Seattle to do exactly this, and would allocate City resources to undertake similar efforts in saltwater areas controlled by the City.
Moreover, I support expanding the Transportation Benefit District (TBD). Currently, 4 out of 12 households in Seattle do not have access to fast mass transit. It is great progress that 8 out of 12 do have access to fast transit, but we cannot continue to have a third of our City dependant on single occupancy vehicles to get to work. Let’s expand the TBD to get to those last couple houses and use our leverage with METRO to drive restructures of routes if necessary.

3. What is one community, specifically in your district, that you feel is being “left out” as our city grows and changes? What will you do to make sure their voices are heard?

Interbay is one of the fastest growing and most dynamic neighborhoods in Seattle, but it is often seen as the valley in between Queen Anne and Magnolia, and not a community in its own right. It is one of the few truly affordable parts of District 7, and home to a robust maritime industrial community supporting countless family wage jobs. I am committed to working with Interbay to be an ally in shaping the community as it grows with the coming of ST3, and will advocate to support investment that will strengthen communities, not displace them. I will insist on resident representation on stakeholder committees making decisions about the scope and direction of growth, as well as town halls and possibly even a new community center.

4. What should the City’s role be in creating a healthy climate for business in Seattle?

The City has a set of charter services it is obligated to perform for the benefit of all stakeholders in Seattle, including business. Those charter services, generally, are parks, transportation, public safety, and libraries. The City needs to maintain those services and work hard to make sure they are being effectively and run with accountability. We rightfully expect high standards from our business community in respect to treating labor fairly, paying more progressive taxes, and being accountable to consumers. But they also deserve the full benefit of the social contract in the form of public services.

5. Seattle has the most regressive tax system of any city in Washington State, which has the most regressive tax system of any state in the US. Do you believe that the City has a responsibility to raise significant new revenue to address the challenges facing our communities? If so, what tax policies would you advocate for at the city level to generate new revenue?

I am a firm supporter of the City’s high earner income tax, and fully hope it will be upheld in the courts. I further support a progressive real estate excise tax and a capital gains tax. Moreover, I support using revenue from those taxes to reduce extremely regressive sales taxes and over-leveraged property taxes.

6. Seattle is deeply divided on how to address the homelessness crisis. How would you characterize these divisions, and how would you address them?

First, homelessness is a staggering public housing and public health crisis that requires dramatic action to address. Second, the public debate has, I believe, two components. First, a misconception by the general public that homelessness is primarily a public safety issue, which I find offensive as a prosecutor, and, second, that the City Council has the resources to
address the issue but is not competently doing so.

On the public safety issue, I will say firmly and unequivocally that public safety is a big issue and property crime remains a big problem in Seattle. But, it is driven by small bands of professional criminals, not our thousands of neighbors experiencing homelessness. We need to get serious about property crime, get more cops walking beats in neighborhoods and business districts, and build strong cases against prolific property criminals, but we cannot kid ourselves that cracking down on the homeless en-masse is going to do anything but create human misery.

On the second point, I believe all governments should aspire to practices emphasizing good government and accountability. I wrote an editorial for Crosscut last fall calling for more performance auditing to make sure we are effectively implementing city services. But, Seattle cannot solve the crisis of homelessness on its own with the resources we currently have. What we need to do is elevate the problem to be a regional issue, using our resources to leverage state and county issues to build more permanent supportive housing. Effective accountability and oversight can build public will for more action, and we should take it seriously.

7. There is widespread agreement that all areas of response to the homelessness crisis need to be stepped up— but in practice, an elected official's job is often to prioritize. How would you rank the following in terms of relative priority for increased funding and attention? (1=highest, 4=lowest)
You may explain your choice, but if you fail to rank the options, we will not consider your answer.

- **Homelessness prevention (1, 2, 3, 4)** Homelessness prevention needs to rank high as well, and I put it second on this list. A recent study by the Seattle Women’s Commission and the King County Bar Association found that people are being evicted for as little as $10 in arrears. This is unacceptable and something needs to be done about it. We need more investment in rent stabilization so when our neighbors need a little bit of money to get them through a rough period it is available. By keeping people in their homes we can prevent the number of our neighbors experiencing homelessness from increasing.

- **Mental health and drug treatment services (1, 2, 3, 4)** I don’t mean to undercut the importance of providing mental health and substance abuse treatment. As a prosecutor, I see on a daily basis the massive human cost of our failure to treat public health problems with public health solutions. But, I am running for Seattle City Council. Public health is a function of King County, mental health treatment is an obligation of Washington State. Seattle’s role in the homelessness crisis is housing, shelter, and homelessness prevention, those are the issues in our wheelhouse and must be our primary focus. That said, Seattle does need to use the bully pulpit of our leadership to push for more aggressive public health interventions from King County via the Seattle City Council’s position on the Board of Health. Moreover, we need to make it clear to Olympia that we need a new University of Washington behavioral health teaching hospital and we need it now. We need to commit to expediting environmental review, permitting, and design and review for such a facility to make sure it is a matter of months and not years before we have robust behavioral mental health treatment.

- **Low-income housing (1, 2, 3, 4)** This has to be our first priority. If we do not significantly increase the stock of permanent supportive housing, workforce housing, and affordable housing we will never truly overcome our epidemic of homelessness. I
support working with King County and our suburban neighbors to pool our resources and bond against them to dramatically increase the amount of housing we are building. I am a full supporter of the Enterprise Foundation’s Home and Hope plan, the outline of which is the type of regional response I am envisioning.

- Emergency shelter (1, 2, 3, 4) I know it seems odd to put them one last, but we need permanent supportive housing not more emergency shelter. We cannot get out of the cycle of poverty and homelessness via shelter alone, and when we do not have reliable housing placements to transition people out of shelter we over leverage the extent to which shelter can be helpful. I have met countless people who refuse to take advantage of emergency shelter because of a bad past experience where they were a victim of a crime, were expected to make some kind of religious observance, or had absolutely no privacy. People need plumbing, electricity, and a lockable door. Until we can adequately provide that we are going to be unable to effectively solve our homelessness crisis.

8. What lessons do you think should be drawn from the experience of the “head tax” last year?

We need to put a regional plan in front of proposed funding mechanisms. While the Seattle City Council did have a plan to spend employee hour tax revenue on permanent supportive housing, the plan could have been more impactful if it was merged into a regional plan with regional resources. Seattle cannot continue to go it alone when it comes to addressing the homelessness crisis. When we become part of a broader regional plan we will be in a better position to advocate for funding sources to pay for it.