

What do you think the problems are with housing? How will you address them? *

The primary issue with housing is cost and supply; for landlords or other property owners, it makes more “economic sense” to run an Airbnb rather than finding renters for year-long leases.

For instance, I recently visited a 2.6-million-dollar 8-10 unit building that was owner-occupied. They rented one floor with several bedrooms for \$10,000 of monthly revenue, and two other bedrooms as studios for \$2,500 each month. If the owner did not occupy the building, they could potentially double their revenue and generate close to \$300,000 in gross revenue from the property, potentially \$40,000 - \$60,000 a year after taxes, fees, and operating costs. Rather than our housing market being dominated by large corporate landlords, I think we do have a lot of small-time landlords that own a building, several units, or potentially several buildings across the Bay Area.

Addressing the housing crisis should go like this:

- clear a path for new housing (change zoning, relax requirements, or fund public housing);
- expand the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to require other Bay Area cities to build more
 - (currently, San Francisco and San Jose have “goals” to create thousands of units whereas other cities are only expected to make hundreds);
- implement more rent control with conditions similar to rent stabilization, i.e. rent can only be increased if the property is improved.

I should also note that new housing developments across the Bay Area are mostly above moderate income, which ranges from \$120,000 - \$160,000 for individuals (based on ABAG RHNA data).

I must stress that the goal of rent control is not to lower rents in the long-term, but to make being a landlord unprofitable without significant investment. When landlords sell their excess properties, it opens homes for renters to buy — and we can expand existing rental assistance programs or extend tax breaks to lenders willing to provide low interest rate loans to first-time home buyers in San Francisco.

Without all this, investing more power in the ABAG to create public housing outside San Francisco with San Francisco tax dollars may be the next step. Unless the City is willing to tackle the extremely thorny issue of making room for much higher density development in historically low-density areas or removing green spaces, then we need to sustainably develop outside San Francisco proper along public transit corridors.

How will you address the issues around homelessness? *

In 2019, the Bay Area's homeless population was estimated to be around 25,000 people. 2 in 3 unhoused residents live in either San Francisco or San Jose. This is a critical piece of why I think other Bay Area cities need to be making homes in addition to San Francisco and San Jose, especially when we consider that San Jose has a 20% larger population than San Francisco, but takes up dramatically more space, i.e. SF is already quite dense.

I think we can only address homelessness with a housing first approach in the long-term. Housing is what helps evicted families and individuals; that's why San Francisco already provides eviction protections and rapid rehousing services. For people that are chronically homeless, I think it's only with supportive housing, mental health services, and drug rehab/harm reduction that the chronically unhoused can be supported in the long-term. Taking away drugs or jailing dealers does little to house, treat, or employ chronically unhoused that happen to be drug users.

It is important to note that homelessness looks different across the Bay Area. Denser cities or their downtown areas have more unhoused residents rough sleeping or residing in unsuitable arrangements, i.e. tents. But along expressways and other streets in San Francisco, there are more RVs. Other Bay Area cities have been trying to grapple with RVs — some by providing services or official spaces, others by restricting parking out of fear for who might be living in those RVs, e.g. Cupertino and Fremont.

With that in mind, housing first can only work if the whole Bay Area wholeheartedly subscribes to it, and only if the other cities in the Bay Area are willing to make more housing than they currently are — especially more affordable housing.

What do you think the problems are with transportation? How will you address them? What are your views on free and accessible public transit, and how can the Board of Supervisors work to achieve that? *

Transportation is too expensive and complicated across the Bay Area. Within the borders of San Francisco, people living in some neighborhoods can get where they want to with 0 transfers, but many others must make at least one transfer or several to get around for work, leisure, and business.

Even with Clipper card, individuals can expect to pay \$15-\$30 traveling around the Bay Area on a regular basis --- much more expensive than a car. Residents living in San Francisco can greatly decrease their costs with a monthly pass, but that does not carry over to Bart outside the City, AC transit, SamTrans, VTA, etc. For the less dense counties, they are even more underfunded and lack ridership save for enthusiasts or people that genuinely depend on public transit, i.e. those who cannot afford a car, seniors, those living with disabilities, or those who cannot drive. Smaller jurisdictions like Emeryville can only provide free rides with a district improvement tax on businesses because they serve an a very small area with low capacity. We need this process expanded to the Bay Area.

What can we do in San Francisco? Continue investing in Muni. Even before the pandemic, much of Muni funding came from business tax revenues, parking permit and ticket fees, or other sources, e.g. grants, general fund transfers, etc. Fares have only accounted for 15-30% of Muni's operation costs. Hiking fares would dramatically hurt ridership for low-income riders that support it; applying additional business gross receipt taxes or per capita taxes with tax credits for low income riders would be ways to go entirely FREE on Muni while maintaining and expanding service.

(couple this with relaxing some permit costs to establish small businesses like groceries or potentially tax breaks to worker-owned businesses or cooperatives, and we can shift commute/movement patterns to be more local and less car dependent)

The next step is Seamless Bay Area transit. Few transit authorities or agencies are managed regionally, e.g. Bart, Caltrain, etc. When each transit agency is trying to maximize their own revenue while minimizing cost, it results in less service and for services like Caltrain or Bart --- fares that are too high for lower income residents. Public transit needs to be re-oriented around a regional model to allow people to commute effectively without a private car. We also need to pay for transit regionally to provide the necessary funding to invest in expanded transit and housing infrastructure. I think this is the only way for regional transit to make sense and for the Bay Area to grow equitably and sustainably.

What do you think the problems are with public safety? How will you address them, especially regarding policing, alternatives to law enforcement, and non-911 response teams? *

I think that the public and even police agree that alternatives to policing and non-911 response teams can help minimize violence when interacting with the police. I think we need to maintain funding for programs like CART and expand funding for the Street Crisis Response team.

I think that an overall lack of government funding --- perhaps mismanagement --- means that the “criminal justice toolbox” is hampered. People are unsure or unaware of how courts run and are disturbed by routine business, e.g. people being let out on bail. Alternatively, people are disturbed by “diversion” programs as not genuinely holding people accountable, where historically, diversion programs may only be replacing probation and parole — practices that similarly came under scrutiny for not holding people accountable, i.e. soft on crime. In either case, the public is generally unaware of

the conflicting state and federal regulations that make criminal justice *seem* like a revolving door. Federal prisons want to minimize the number of inmates and legal reform in 2019 made it easier to let inmates out on parole or to review their cases. State legal proceedings call for local jurisdictions to not make excessive punishments, e.g. sentencing in ways to prevent deportation.

Alternatively, many in-jail training and education programs offered by the Sheriff's Department in San Francisco resemble the diversionary programs offered. Why do residents want criminals to do the same things but behind bars? Alternatively, the Dreamkeeper initiative put counselors on the ground in specific San Francisco areas to proactively place at-risk individuals in training programs; many framed this as paying criminals to not do crime. Why are people only willing to help reform residents AFTER they have committed a crime?

For concerns about larceny and theft, I think we can take a more proactive approach and deploy existing sector patrols on foot instead of in cars by evaluating the types of calls police respond to. Police respond to many cases involving unhoused residents that could be handily dealt with by expanding CART and the street crisis response team. This would improve 911 response times, which the police have used as a justification for hiring more officers without considering whether those calls merit armed police response.

For crimes like domestic violence, I think we can expand the DA's office to provide pro-bono victim representation and expand the social safety net for residents that fear retaliation, homelessness, or deportation if they press charges against an abusive partner.

What are your thoughts on the SFPD's proposal to expand police and government agency power to monitor private camera feeds in non-emergency situations to arrest and prosecute? *

Why do people want the police to “proactively” respond to crime, but are less inclined to allow social workers or counselors to proactively support at-risk people? I think it is an overall negative. It will demand a huge expansion in sworn or civilian staffing to analyze film to make a case against suspects.

Even then, this assumes the change will resolve crimes. I am more inclined to believe it empowers law enforcement to arrest and prosecute individuals erroneously, i.e. where they make take plea deals or probationary sentences that open them up for further surveillance without actually addressing public safety. Existing San Francisco crime data already attests to the fact that people living in specific neighborhoods are subject to being stopped for “Suspicious behavior” much more often than other neighborhoods, often with no result except harassing that particular individual.

Which people or corporations have employed you or have paid over \$10k to you or an organization you ran over the past 5 years? How much did you receive? You may link to filings. *

None that I know of. I formerly worked for Seagate Technology, but I do not believe they donated for any organizations I have been part of.

Do you support a SF municipal bank that’s in line with the principles of racial, social, economic, and environmental justice, and how will you implement it? *

I think in the long term, a municipal bank makes sense in the same way that America’s first legislators recognized that a Federal Bank would be useful for infrastructure and other large-scale efforts, i.e. war.

San Francisco invests money to finance pensions for its employees. It owns property to sell to residents at below market rates, but it expects a list of approved lenders to help residents buy those properties.

Why not remove the middleman? Opponents may decry this as too much government or taking on too much cost/liability for the City, but the City can leverage a lot more funds at lower cost than a private institution. In theory, it is much more able to forgive debt because it relies on tax revenue rather than profits, so it can protect individuals if need be. This bank would not handle the cash management of City finances; it would only provide loans for housing development, wholesale business loans, and direct small business loans.

Short of a municipal bank, I think we can potentially rewrite the City charter to create a "District fund." This fund would circumvent the existing budget review process of addbacks, where supervisors reevaluate the proposed budget and reassign funds to other departments or agencies. The departments and agencies may allocate those funds to particular projects or service areas, which may be fulfilled by nonprofits or government actor that applied for these changes.

If 10% of the budget were scaled back and distributed to each district under the authority of the supervisor, they could use it to reimburse permit spending, pay the city or private contractors for repairs, administer grant programs for nonprofits, cooperatives, etc. This would give each supervisor much more power and discretion to impact their district, whereas in the current environment, much is left to the Mayor's office and the will of each department or agency in providing equitable, high quality service to districts.

Ultimately, a municipal bank may be hamstringed by its serving a smaller jurisdiction. We may benefit more from a "Bay Area Bank" or a State of California Bank.

What have you done to address systemic racism, sexism, economic inequality and discrimination in SF, and how will you address it as supervisor? *

As a public information officer working for the Department of Technology, I was interim lead of our Racial Equity Action Plan, and I regularly worked to close action items and have been working on a new baseline "Introduction to Racial Equity" training with fellow racial equity leaders.

I recently became involved with the Free Muni 4 All campaign that has attempted to revive and expand the 2021 Free Muni pilot that vetoed.

What are the problems facing SF's public school systems and how do you intend to support their programs? *

Lack of funding, lack of appropriately trained staffing, and segregated schools.

I think the school board recalls reflect a backlash against certain perceived elements of San Francisco's public school district. From my perspective, we need a close eye on outcomes in our schools and a faster, more adaptive response to needs.

We need more bilingually trained teachers, which can be supported through language training grants or bilingual pay incentives. It can also be supplemented with emergency teacher certifications.

With respect to funding, it's remarkable that a district that employs close to 10,000 people and serves tens of thousands of students on a regular basis have a budget that is not even double the Police Department's budget --- which employs 2,300 full and part-time staff. We need to expand funding to support more quality teachers and reduce student-to-teacher ratios so students may receive more attention if needed.

City departments also need to resume a more hands-on approach in providing internships, field trips, and other opportunities to educate and train our students in the possibilities that are available to them.

Educator housing is another way to recruit and maintain quality teachers that are close to the students they teach without doubling or tripling their salaries (as great as that would be!).

Should the San Francisco Charter be rewritten, and if so, what changes would you make? *

Changes to the permanent civil service and hiring practices, i.e. making it easier to take on people with credentials that are not a perfect match but then training them to a satisfactory level.

Changes to the District attorney's office to provide pro-bono representation of victims in cases of domestic violence or assault.

Changes to the budgeting process and the creation of a district fund, apportioned to each district. Incorporate bi-yearly revised "goals" for new housing development, green space expansion, or business equity that increases or decreases the district's apportioned fund by 5-15%. Districts are incentivized to build housing, expand certain kinds of businesses or land use as deemed appropriate, e.g. denser housing in the westside, more green space or worker-owned businesses in the eastside to maintain funding. Meanwhile, other critical, baseline services provided are not cut.

What work have you done to improve our community? *

In my current work, I have supported the Department of Technology's Fiber to Housing project which provides high speed internet for free to low-income residents in San Francisco. Hundreds of families were also served at the start of the pandemic to support distance learning for students.

I have written local news about green spaces and advocacy stories for public transit. Regardless of this election, I will continue working hard to contribute and improve more!