

**Santa Monicans for Renters' Rights
City Council Questionnaire - 2026**



Name: ___Eli Gill for City Council 2026_____

Email address: ___eli@eli4sm.com_____

Did you include the requested Additional Materials? Yes X or No

☐ Please email completed Questionnaire and Additional Materials to
smrrinfo@gmail.com

Your Candidacy

1. Why are you running for City Council?

I have lived in Santa Monica for over twenty years and chosen to build my life here. This is where my family lives, works, and goes to school. I love this city, and I am frustrated by how hard everyday life has become for the people who make it what it is. Families are being squeezed out by housing costs. Renters are dealing with negligent landlords and inadequate enforcement. Small businesses are struggling under red tape and high fees. And too often there is a gap between what City Hall decides and what actually gets done.

Good governance is not about ideology or grand gestures. It is about clear priorities, honest tradeoffs, and following through. Santa Monica has the resources and the structure. What it needs is a council member focused on actually delivering.

2. What skills, background, and experience do you possess that prepare you for this office?

I have spent my career in operations and management across complex, regulated industries, including construction lending, just-in-time manufacturing, and building a large-scale logistics operation from scratch during the pandemic. I know how to set priorities, build systems, and follow through. Beyond my professional background, I have been attending and engaging with City Council for over fifteen years, with involvement in mobility and housing advocacy. I have served on the steering committees of Santa Monica Forward and Santa Monica Families for Safe Streets, and I am a founding member of Santa Monica Greenways and Abundant Santa Monica.

3. What sets you apart from the others running for City Council?

What sets me apart is the combination of genuine urbanist conviction and operational discipline. I believe Santa Monica needs more housing at all income levels alongside stronger tenant protections, safer streets for people walking and biking, and a government that actually delivers on its commitments. Most candidates treat those as separate or competing priorities. I believe they belong together. I also bring a career background in execution rather than politics, which is what this city needs right now.

4. If elected, what would be your number one and number two goals for the next 2-4 years, and how might these goals be achieved?

My number one goal is housing: building more of it at all income levels while strengthening tenant protections and anti-displacement measures so that existing renters are not pushed out as the city grows. That means faster permitting, lower barriers to construction, stronger code enforcement with real accountability for landlords, and policies like Tenant Opportunity to Purchase that give residents genuine tools to stay in their communities. My number two goal is public safety and public realm quality: clean, welcoming, accessible public spaces backed by the right mix of responses for each situation, with accountability tied to measurable outcomes.

5. List each organization other than SMRR whose endorsement you have sought and whether or not you completed a questionnaire for that organization. Provide a copy of any questionnaire(s) you submitted to any other organization(s).

I submitted a questionnaire to the Santa Monica Democratic Club and Santa Monica Forward and have completed their endorsement interviews. I am actively pursuing endorsements from CEPS, labor organizations, and law enforcement.

6. Please list your main funders, endorsers, and supporters, and provide an overview of your campaign's financial progress to date.

My campaign has raised approximately \$25,000 to date, with a goal of \$100,000 by Election Day. Key endorsers include Glean Davis, former Mayor of Santa Monica; Pam O'Connor, former Mayor of Santa Monica; and Jesse Zwick, the incumbent vacating one of the open seats. I draw broad support from the local community, members of Santa Monica Forward, Santa Monica Greenways, Santa Monica Families for Safe Streets, and Abundant Santa Monica.

7. Will you accept donations from developers and/or their paid lobbyists for your campaign?

Yes, I would accept contributions from developers and their lobbyists if they genuinely share my vision for Santa Monica and have the interests of the community at heart. Developers are not inherently bad actors. They are necessary partners in building the housing this city desperately needs. What I will not accept is money from anyone expecting favorable treatment in return. The test is not what industry someone works in. It is whether they are genuinely invested in Santa Monica as a community.

8. Please provide a list of all organizations with which you are a member, along with a description of leadership positions held, whether related to your civic, community or professional endeavors.

Santa Monica Forward (member, former steering committee member), Santa Monica Families for Safe Streets (member, former steering committee member), Santa Monica Greenways (founding member), Abundant Santa Monica (founding member, former co-chair), Santa Monica Democratic Club (member), SMRR (member).

SMRR

1. How long have you been a member of SMRR? Please outline the extent of your relationship and engagement with SMRR.

I have been a member of SMRR for several years. I share the core commitments that drive the organization: protecting renters, preserving affordable housing, and ensuring Santa Monica remains a city where working families and long-term residents can afford to stay. I have engaged with SMRR members, leadership, and policy positions throughout my years of living in Santa Monica.

2. Do you pledge, if elected, to attend SMRR's monthly Steering Committee meetings to provide the Council report (in rotation with other SMRR supported Council members)?

Yes, I pledge to attend SMRR Steering Committee meetings and provide the Council report in rotation with other SMRR-supported council members.

3. Do you pledge, if elected, to discuss major policy issues related to your office with SMRR leaders prior to making decisions?

Yes. I would engage with SMRR leadership on major policy issues the same way I would with any organization that represents a large group of city residents. Their members are exactly the people I will be elected to serve, and I want to hear from them before making significant decisions.

Rent Control and Tenants Rights

1. Do you support Santa Monica's rent control law? Why or why not?

Yes, I strongly support it. In a city where 70+ percent of residents rent, rent control is a necessary foundation of housing stability for the majority of people who live here. Without it, market forces in a city as housing constrained and desirable as Santa Monica would rapidly displace everyone except the most affluent. That is not the city I want to live in or represent.

2. What if any specific changes would you support making to our rent control law?

I would strengthen how code enforcement works with the Department of Building and Safety so that rent control protections are backed by real accountability. I address that in more detail in question 5.

3. Have you ever taken a proactive role to protect Santa Monica tenants? If so, please describe specifically what you did.

I have been a renter in rent-controlled housing in Santa Monica for over 20 years and have seen firsthand what inadequate accountability looks like: buildings that deteriorate while landlords face no real consequences and tenants have no practical recourse. Over the years I have helped neighbors navigate difficult landlord situations, including walking people through the rent reduction arbitration process and helping them understand what protections they actually have. Most tenants do

not know their rights, and the process for enforcing them is not easy to navigate alone. That experience is a big part of why I care about getting enforcement right, not just having the law on the books.

4. What can you point to that should give Santa Monica renters and their allies confidence that you are committed to renters' rights and Santa Monica's rent control law?

I bring something most candidates cannot offer: over 20 years as a renter in rent-controlled housing in Santa Monica. I know what it feels like to deal with a poorly maintained building and a landlord who faces no real accountability. That lived experience, combined with my years of research, and advocacy on housing and tenant protection policy, is what gives me standing to talk about these issues with honesty and credibility.

5. What would you propose, if anything, to improve Santa Monica rent control and/or to strengthen tenant protections (including code enforcement)?

Our current remedies for bad landlords do not go far enough. Rent reductions as a penalty should be based on a percentage of actual rent paid, not an absolute dollar cap. A \$100 reduction on a \$4,000 unit does not move the needle or change landlord behavior. Right to counsel should extend beyond eviction proceedings to cover habitability disputes and other landlord violations, because tenants face a steep power imbalance in all of those situations, not just when facing removal. I also want to explore mandatory training for landlords on tenant rights and their own legal responsibilities. Too many violations happen because landlords do not know the rules (or at least feign ignorance), and too many others happen because they know there will be no real consequence. Getting code enforcement to work more closely and systematically with the Department of Building and Safety would help close that gap. Stronger habitability standards enforcement and real consequences for repeat offenders are long overdue.

6. Do you think it is appropriate for the City Council to propose changes to the Rent Control law without full involvement of the Rent Control Board and tenant advocates?

No. Changes to the Rent Control law should involve the Rent Control Board and tenant advocates as full partners from the start, not as an afterthought. The Board has institutional knowledge and expertise that the Council should be drawing on, and tenant advocates represent the people most directly affected by any changes.

7. Which is more important to you: Preserving controlled rental units and retaining existing renters, or allowing temporary or permanent displacement of tenants who are occupying aging controlled housing stock to replace old buildings with new ones? Please explain.

This question presents a false choice. My starting position is clear: displacement is a harm, not a planning tool. Existing tenants have built their lives here and deserve to stay. But protecting people does not always mean preserving the specific unit they are in. It means preserving their ability to remain in Santa

Monica. An aging building in poor condition is not a tenant protection win just because it stays standing.

What actually protects people is having somewhere to go. That means building senior housing so longtime residents can right-size without leaving the city, mixed-income buildings that cross-subsidize affordable/rent-controlled units, and right-to-return guarantees with real teeth. If a building is genuinely beyond repair and replacement would produce more affordable units with stronger protections, I could support that, but only with relocation assistance, guaranteed right of return at equivalent affordability, and the tenant fully involved in the process.

The goal is keeping people in Santa Monica, not just keeping them in aging units. That means protecting the people who are here now and building enough housing that the next generation can actually get in the door. We can do both if we build the housing pipeline that makes it possible.

Affordable Housing, Homelessness, General Affordability and Development

1. Do you support increasing the production of deed-restricted affordable housing in Santa Monica? If so, what specific strategies or policies would you pursue to achieve this?

Yes, I strongly support increasing the production of deed-restricted affordable housing. Strategies I would pursue include using every public land site identified in the Housing Element to create deed-restricted units; exploring community land trusts and other permanently affordable models that take units off the speculative market; supporting social housing models where mixed-income properties cross-subsidize affordable units; and pursuing public banking as a tool to access lower-cost capital for affordable housing investment. Tenant Opportunity to Purchase is another tool I want to explore seriously, giving tenants and community land trusts the right of first offer when a building comes up for sale.

2. Do you support a Great Park **and** below market-rate housing development on Santa Monica Airport land when the airport is closed? Why or why not?

I strongly support closing the airport and building a great park, full stop. Santa Monica is a dense city with very little undeveloped land left. The airport site is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create meaningful public open space, and we should not squander it. Our neighborhoods already have the capacity to absorb significantly more housing through infill, mixed-use development, and better use of underutilized commercial and industrial sites. We do not need to trade away one of our last chances for a great park to meet our housing goals.

On the specific ballot measure setting aside 25 percent of the land for 3,000 units of affordable housing: I do not support it. A promise without a clear funding mechanism is not a plan, and I worry it sets up expectations the city cannot deliver on while complicating the park vision before the airport has even closed. I am open to affordable housing on airport-adjacent or other city-owned sites as part of a broader strategy. But the airport land itself should become a world-class public park for all

Santa Monicans.

3. Do you pledge to use the public land identified in the current Housing Element to create the number of deed-restricted affordable housing units identified for each such site (whether or not on that particular site)?

Yes, fully committed. Public land should be used for public benefit, and affordable housing is among the highest and best uses of city-owned land. I would hold the city to the commitments in the Housing Element and push for accountability on both timeline and delivery.

4. Do you support devoting any other public land to the creation of deed restricted affordable housing? Which public land? How would you make it happen?

Yes. Beyond Housing Element sites, I would look at air rights over city-owned facilities, underutilized surface parking lots, and opportunities to partner with nonprofits and community land trusts. The question should always be where affordable housing dollars go furthest, not simply which parcel happens to be city-owned.

5. What's your opinion of the value to our community of expanding the development of market rate housing? Explain.

Market-rate housing adds supply that helps moderate prices over time, particularly for people who are not eligible for deed-restricted units. I want Santa Monica to be a city where people can put down roots, and that requires housing at all income levels. That said, our current cost structure has filtered out most of what we need most: missing middle housing, the studios, one-bedrooms, and small apartment buildings that used to house young people, service workers, and seniors. We need to fix that. Market-rate housing is part of the solution, but only if we are building the right kinds of it.

6. Do you support further upzoning any portions of the City beyond any further upzoning mandated by the State? Why or why not? If so, what specific upzoning? Please answer separately for at least the following: a. Downtown Santa Monica; b. Pico Boulevard; c. Ocean Park Boulevard; d. Wilshire, Santa Monica, and Colorado Boulevards; e. Main Street; f. Montana Avenue; g. single-family neighborhoods; h. multi-family neighborhoods; i. other commercial and industrial sites.

I support the upzoning accomplished through our Housing Element and I support implementing it in good faith. On going beyond state mandates, by corridor: a. Downtown Santa Monica: yes, additional density is appropriate given transit access and walkability. b. Pico Boulevard: yes, transit-adjacent and underbuilt relative to its potential. c. Ocean Park Boulevard: yes, context-sensitive density that respects neighborhood character and provides more access to some of our best parks d. Wilshire, Santa Monica, and Colorado Boulevards: yes, natural corridors for transit-adjacent density. e. Main Street: context-sensitive, with attention to the commercial corridor character. f. Montana Avenue: cautious, but open to missing middle on adjacent blocks. g. Single-family neighborhoods: I support by-right ADUs and small multiplexes and townhouses as state law requires, implemented in good

faith. h. Multi-family neighborhoods: yes, additional density is appropriate where transit and services support it. i. Other commercial and industrial sites: commercial-to-residential conversion is an underused tool, particularly near transit.

7. Do you support Santa Monica's inclusionary housing requirements for market-rate housing developments? If so, do you believe any changes are appropriate to existing inclusionary housing requirements? Explain.

Yes, I support inclusionary housing requirements. They are an important tool for ensuring new market-rate development contributes to our affordable housing supply. But I think we need to be honest about the tradeoffs.

If inclusionary requirements are set too high, they do not produce more affordable units. They produce fewer projects overall, and the ones that do get built end up being luxury developments because that is the only thing that makes financial sense. That is not a win for affordability. It just means less housing and higher prices across the board.

What I want to see is requirements calibrated to actually produce units, not just generate in-lieu fees that sit in a fund without a clear deployment plan. I also want to experiment with tiered structures that make it viable to build the missing middle housing we desperately need: smaller units, more affordable ownership opportunities, buildings that are not aimed exclusively at the top of the market. That requires being willing to adjust the requirements based on what the evidence tells us is actually working, rather than treating the current structure as fixed.

8. Did you support the original version of SB79, which lacked effective anti displacement protections and protections for rent controlled housing stock? Why or why not? What is your opinion of the version of SB79 that was adopted? Explain.

Yes, I supported SB 79 before the anti-displacement protections were added. Nearly all of the affected land in Santa Monica had already been rezoned through our Housing Element process, so the practical local impact was minimal. More importantly, Santa Monica already has some of the strongest displacement protections in the state. The bigger picture was that SB 79 was really a bill about Los Angeles and other regional cities that had been dragging their feet on housing production while the entire region suffers the consequences. Getting those cities to do their part was worth supporting. On the final version with anti-displacement provisions: they were a meaningful improvement and I am glad they were included. For Santa Monica they are largely additive to protections we already have.

9. Do you support city financing of emergency assistance to renters at risk of losing their homes, such as the recently adopted Santa Monica Renter Aid program? Why or why not?

Yes. The Santa Monica Renter Aid program is exactly the kind of homelessness prevention investment that pays for itself. Keeping a family stably housed costs far less than trying to rehouse them after they have lost their home, and the human cost of that instability is enormous, particularly for children.

10. Do you support city financing of free legal counsel to all lower and moderate income renters facing the threat of eviction? Why or why not?

Yes. The power imbalance between a landlord with an attorney and a tenant without one is significant, and the data consistently shows that representation dramatically improves outcomes for tenants. I favor expanding the right to counsel program. Measure GS funds are the appropriate source for this expansion.

11. Do you support increasing local funding for programs providing ongoing income support to severely rent burdened renters, such as the Preserve Our Diversity (POD) program for seniors? If so, what additional households do you believe should receive ongoing income support?

Yes. Rent burden is one of the most acute affordability problems facing Santa Monica residents. I support the POD program for seniors and want to see expansion of ongoing income support to additional severely rent-burdened households, particularly households with children who face the worst long-term consequences of housing instability. Funding should come from a combination of Measure GS funds, the general fund, and state and federal grant programs.

12. Voter approved 2016 Measures GS/GSH contemplated that half of the new sales tax revenues would go to income support programs for severely rent burdened households and to create additional deed-restricted affordable housing. Beginning in 2020, the City Council either took or diverted a total of roughly \$40 million of GS/GSH revenue from these purposes to deal with the COVID emergency and to fund Euler settlements, with almost no repayment to date.

- a. Do you pledge to repay these funds to the Housing Trust Fund?
- b. Do you pledge to do so in amounts that include interest on the funds?
- c. Do you pledge not to further divert or take 2016 Measure GS/GSH funds from the Housing Trust Fund?

a. Yes, I pledge to work toward repaying these funds to the Housing Trust Fund.

b. Yes, I support repayment that accounts for the time value of money. The diversion caused real harm to the programs those funds were meant to serve and that should be recognized in how repayment is structured.

c. Yes, I pledge not to further divert 2016 Measure GS/GSH funds from the Housing Trust Fund. These funds were approved by voters for specific purposes and the city should honor those commitments.

13. Voter approved 2022 Measure GS contemplated that an additional 5% transfer tax on sales of properties for \$8 million or more would go to providing additional funds for emergency and ongoing income support programs, the preservation or creation of deed-restricted affordable housing, right to counsel, and other programs aimed at preserving existing tenancies of and units serving lower and moderate income households (as well as to the public schools). The City Council already has directed a portion of the funds raised be used for the Santa Monica Renter Aid program, expansion of the right to counsel, and for a pilot predictive model program to prevent homelessness. But on June 22, AB-736 in Sacramento was gutted and amended so that, if passed, it would cap the total transfer tax rate for all commercial and multi-family property in such a way that only 0.9% would go into the purposes outlined in 2022 Measure GS. Given that the first \$10 million raised by 2022 Measure GS goes to the public

schools, and that a City Council commissioned report in 2022 found that 93.4% of the total value of all transfers of \$8 million or more during the prior decade came from commercial and multi-family properties, AB-736 if passed will decimate the funding for homelessness prevention and affordable housing that 2022 Measure GS otherwise could provide.

a. Do you support AB-736? Why or why not?

No. Local governments need the ability to raise revenue to meet local needs. Measure GS was approved by Santa Monica voters for exactly that purpose, and AB-736 would effectively nullify that decision from Sacramento. That is not how the relationship between state and local government should work. I oppose it on those grounds regardless of any other views I have about how Measure GS is structured.

b. Do you support any other changes to Measure GS (if so, specify the changes)? Why or why not?

I have real concerns about how the transfer tax affects the economics of multifamily housing development, and I think those concerns deserve a serious conversation. But I would not support changes that reduce the funding stream without a concrete replacement already in place. The programs this revenue supports are too important to reform without a clear plan for what fills the gap.

c. Do you support finding some other local funding source for homelessness prevention and affordable housing programs? If so, what source?

Yes. These programs are too important to leave dependent on any single revenue source. I would look at the general fund, state and federal grant programs, and tools like public banking that can generate lower-cost capital for affordable housing investment without the overhead of private financing.

14. What can you point to that should give SMRR confidence that you are truly committed to expanding deed-restricted affordable housing and income support programs?

My long record of housing and tenant advocacy, my lived experience as a renter in rent-controlled housing in Santa Monica for over 20 years, my policy positions on code enforcement and anti-displacement, my support for expanding right to counsel and the Renter Aid program, and my commitment to using public land for affordable housing all reflect a genuine commitment to these goals. I also bring a professional background in operational execution, which matters here. Santa Monica has enough good intentions. What it needs is follow-through.

15. Homelessness is a serious local and regional problem. How do you evaluate the City's current efforts to address the problem? What specifically do you believe the City should do that it is not currently doing? To the extent your solutions call for new programs, how would you pay for those programs?

The City has made real investments in an integrated system of care: mental health response, unarmed outreach, and interim shelter options like SaMo Bridge. Those are meaningful steps. But the results remain insufficient relative to what we are spending and what residents are experiencing. The homelessness emergency declaration has been renewed repeatedly without clear milestones for what success

looks like or when the emergency ends. Going forward, I want a regional strategy that demands LA County coordinate a real countywide approach where every city pulls its weight, rather than exporting the problem to cities like ours that have invested most heavily in services. Every dollar spent on homelessness programming should be tied to a measurable outcome: people housed, people connected to treatment, public spaces improved.

16. Do you support the City's laws regarding short term housing, corporate housing, AirBnb? Why or why not? If you do support those laws, what can be done to ensure enforcement, and resources for enforcement, on an ongoing basis and as we lead up to the 2028 Olympics and beyond? Please explain.

Yes, I support the City's short-term rental laws, including restrictions on Airbnb and corporate housing conversions. Every residential unit used as a full-time short-term rental is one fewer unit of housing for a Santa Monica resident. As we approach the 2028 Olympics, enforcement will matter more than ever. I would like to see robust funding and staffing for enforcement, including proactive auditing of short-term rental platforms rather than relying solely on complaint-driven processes.

17. What, if any, specific changes to existing commercial zoning and development standards do you support? Which ones would you oppose? Explain.

I want to make it easier to open and operate a business in Santa Monica, which means I support changes to commercial zoning that reduce friction, not add to it. Specifically, I support streamlining ground-floor use requirements so that a wider range of businesses can open in corridors that are currently sitting vacant. If a storefront has been empty for two years waiting for the right retail tenant, that is a zoning problem as much as a market problem. I also support making it easier to convert underutilized commercial and industrial sites to residential or mixed use, particularly near transit. We have land in this city that is not pulling its weight, and we should be enabling better uses on it.

I would also oppose changes that add new barriers to housing production in commercial or mixed-use zones. Ground-floor residential should remain an option in areas where it makes sense, and we should not be locking in commercial-only requirements on corridors that cannot support them.

What I would oppose is any change that makes the permitting process more complicated, adds new discretionary review requirements, or increases fees on businesses trying to open here. We already have one of the most cumbersome and expensive processes in the region. The direction of travel should be toward simplicity and predictability, not away from it. Every business owner who gives up and goes somewhere else is a loss we do not have to accept.

18. Regardless of neighborhood, most residents meet their daily needs (medical services, groceries, recreation, etc.) by having access to functioning commercial businesses on nearby boulevards. What do you believe should be done if anything to improve the quality of place and vibrancy on any or all of our boulevards?

Our boulevards work best when people actually want to be on them, and right now

too many of them feel like places you drive through rather than places you go. The fix is not complicated but it does require follow-through.

We need to make it easier and cheaper to open a business here. Streamlined permitting, lower fees, and real predictability on timelines would make a meaningful difference. A business owner who cannot get a straight answer on their permit after six months is a business that opens somewhere else.

Activation is critical. Empty storefronts kill foot traffic, which kills the remaining businesses around them. While we work on the underlying economics, the city should be programming those spaces and the sidewalks around them with pop-ups, markets, and events that give people a reason to show up.

The physical environment has to work for people who are not in cars. Protected bike lanes, better crosswalks, slower traffic, and places to sit all make boulevards feel like destinations rather than throughways. A walkable city is a livable city. Santa Monica has done some of this well and stalled on a lot of it. I want to see the adopted plans actually executed rather than relitigated corridor by corridor.

Lastly, more housing near our commercial corridors is the most durable long-term solution. Businesses follow people. The more people that live within walking distance of a boulevard, the more those businesses have a sustainable customer base. Zoning and land use policy should be making that easier, not harder.

19. Did you support the original version of AB 1740? Why or why not? What is your view of the current version of AB 1740?

Yes, I supported the original version of AB 1740 and I support the current version. The Coastal Commission's permit requirements were designed to protect coastal access and the environment, and those are real and important goals. But the way they have been applied in practice has become a barrier to exactly the kinds of projects Santa Monica needs most: housing near transit, protected bike lanes, safer pedestrian infrastructure. These are not threats to the coast. In many cases they reduce car traffic and improve environmental outcomes.

Santa Monica has already done the work. We have high-quality transit, adopted climate and safety plans, and real bike infrastructure. The premise of AB 1740 is that cities that have earned that track record should be able to move faster on projects that are consistent with it, without going back to the Coastal Commission for individual approvals on every bike lane and infill housing project. That makes sense to me.

The current version of the bill, which is specific to Santa Monica, is a meaningful step forward. I would want to make sure the exemptions are applied thoughtfully and that genuine coastal access and environmental protections remain intact. But the direction is right. We should be making it easier to build housing and improve streets in a city that has already demonstrated its commitment to multimodal transportation and climate goals, not harder.

20. What if anything do you support the City doing to make Santa Monica

a more affordable place to live beyond housing production and direct income support programs? Is funding required for your proposals and, if so, how would you fund your proposals?

Beyond housing production and direct income support, the most important things the city can do for affordability are reducing the cost of starting and running a small business so that more affordable goods and services are available locally; investing in transit so that residents who cannot afford a car can still get around; and maintaining a free and welcoming public realm so people can enjoy the city without spending money. Transit improvements can be funded through state and federal transportation grants. Business support programs can be funded through the general fund and restructured fee revenue.

Workers' Rights

1. What, if any, specific proactive steps have you taken in the past to protect workers, improve their working conditions, and/or to advance workers' rights to unionize?

My civic advocacy has been primarily in housing and mobility, but I believe worker rights and quality of life issues are deeply connected. I have supported labor-endorsed candidates and ballot measures. I am committed to strong labor standards on city contracts and to ensuring that city procurement reflects the wages and working conditions we want to see in the broader economy.

2. The City of Santa Monica has adopted several strategies to ensure worker justice in our city, such as a hotel worker living wage ordinance, a labor neutrality requirement for new hotel developments, and a hotel and public property worker retention program. Do you support these programs and policies? Why or why not? What additional workers' rights policies would you propose if any?

Yes, I support all of these programs. Workers who are treated fairly and paid living wages are the foundation of a stable local economy. I would support exploring whether similar protections can be extended to workers in other city-adjacent industries beyond hotels.

3. What can you point to that should give Santa Monica workers and their allies confidence that you are committed to worker rights, a living wage, and the right to unionize?

I have supported labor-endorsed candidates and ballot measures throughout my time as a civic participant in Santa Monica. I believe city contracting should reflect the wages and working conditions we want to see in the broader economy, and I would apply that standard consistently.

Economic Development

1. What policies and strategies would you pursue and prioritize to ensure that Santa Monica grows as a productive, thriving, inclusive, sustainable, welcoming, healthy and economically vibrant city for current and future generations?

I want Santa Monica to be a city that works for the people who live and work here: an economy that is inclusive, sustainable, and built on a foundation of affordable housing, good public spaces, and accessible infrastructure. My priorities are cutting the red tape and cost of starting and operating a small business; activating public spaces through programming, events, and markets; investing in transit and safe streets so that people can get around without a car; and adding housing so that more people live within walking distance of local businesses.

2. What if anything is the Realignment Plan doing well, or doing poorly, in your opinion? What would you change if anything?

The Realignment Plan for the city is a promising start and I support it. It recognizes that the retail-driven model is not coming back and that the future of downtown is experiential. What I would change: I want to see it move faster, with clearer milestones and more aggressive activation programming while the physical changes are underway. Empty storefronts waiting for construction are a drag on the corridor. Pop-ups, markets, and events should be filling that gap now.

3. For years the success of the Third Street Promenade was a cornerstone of Santa Monica's local economy. But the Promenade suffered in the aftermath of COVID and with the rise of virtual work, virtual shopping, and movie streaming. What do you think needs to be done to restore the economic vitality of the Promenade?

The Promenade needs a clear strategy, not just hope. That means working with DTSM on a real activation plan: regular programming, pop-ups, markets, and events that bring people downtown even when storefronts are empty. It means reviewing ground-floor use requirements and making it easier for smaller, independent operators to afford Downtown rents. Medium-term, the most powerful economic development tool we have for downtown is adding more residents nearby who will spend locally. More housing in and around downtown is the answer.

4. City finances continue to be strained. What will you do as a Councilmember to improve the City's financial health in the short term and long term and make sure belt-tightening doesn't threaten City financial commitments to our public schools, homelessness prevention or affordable housing programs?

The City's financial health requires both short-term discipline and long-term structural investment. Short-term, I want every major program to have a clear answer to whether it is delivering results, and I want to redirect resources away from programs that are not. Long-term, housing production, downtown vitality, and business growth are the most sustainable path to a stronger tax base. I would protect funding for schools, homelessness prevention, and affordable housing as core commitments, not discretionary items to cut when revenues are tight.

City Governance and Budgeting

1. What specific measures would you pursue to ensure that staff reports are made available to both councilmembers and the public with sufficient lead time to allow for thorough review, informed deliberation, and meaningful public participation?

Staff reports should be available to councilmembers and the public with enough lead time for meaningful review, at minimum 72 hours for routine items and longer for major decisions. I would push for a standing policy on report timelines and would be willing to delay action on items where the public has not had adequate time to engage. Transparency is not just about what gets posted. It is about whether people can realistically read and understand it before decisions are made.

2. Please describe any budgeting experience you have and how that experience would help you ensure sound fiscal management, directing of resources, and priority setting.

I have spent my career managing budgets and making operational decisions with real financial consequences in construction lending, manufacturing, and logistics. I am comfortable reading financial statements, identifying cost drivers, and making tradeoffs between competing priorities. I would bring that discipline to the city budget process: looking for programs that are not delivering results, understanding the city's long-term financial commitments, and being honest with residents about tradeoffs rather than pretending they do not exist.

3. How would you build and maintain the trust of residents, and what specific steps would you take to ensure that your constituents always feel informed, engaged, and genuinely represented in the decisions that affect their lives?

I would build trust by being consistent: acting with integrity, being accessible, and communicating proactively in plain language. Practically, that means regular constituent communication, showing up at community meetings rather than just scheduled hearings, and being genuinely reachable. I would also push for better citywide communication systems so that residents are informed about major decisions before they are finalized, not after.

4. How do you view the balance between exercising independent judgment as a Councilmember and representing the wishes and needs of your constituents?

Both matter. I believe a council member should start from a place of genuine listening and real engagement with constituents. But there are also times when independent judgment is necessary, particularly on complex technical issues where the right answer is not always the most popular one. I try to be clear about which situation I am in and honest when I am disagreeing with a majority view and why.

5. Do city councilmembers need to guard against disproportionate influence of wealthy stakeholders and powerful businesses on local government? What would you do if anything to ensure that residents with less resources and access have an equally meaningful voice in shaping city policy?

Yes, absolutely. The risk of disproportionate influence from well-resourced

stakeholders is real and ongoing. I would be transparent about who I am meeting with and what they are asking for, push for public engagement processes that actively reach people who cannot show up to a Tuesday night meeting, and be deliberate about whose voices I am hearing when I make decisions.

Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

1. Do you support the City taking steps to address the ongoing impacts of past racism? If so, what steps do you support taking?

Yes. Santa Monica's history includes deliberate displacement of communities of color, most notably the destruction of the Belmar Triangle in the 1950s and 1960s. Acknowledging that history honestly is the starting point. The most meaningful steps the city can take now are structural: building enough housing at all income levels to reduce the scarcity that enables discrimination in tenant selection, expanding housing vouchers and community land trust models, and ensuring that city hiring, contracting, and decision-making bodies actively reflect this commitment rather than just declaring it.

2. How would you use your position as a Councilmember to ensure the City actively listens to and invests in its Black community and commits to tangible improvements in opportunity, representation, and quality of life for Black community members?

I would push for specific, measurable commitments, not general platitudes. That means directing capital investment, program resources, and staff attention toward the Black community in measurable ways: targeted infrastructure improvements, small business support, affordable housing investment, and active recruitment of Black residents into city leadership roles. I would like to see the city publish regular progress reports against those commitments and be willing to adjust when progress is insufficient.

3. How would you use your position as a Councilmember to ensure the City actively listens to and invests in its Latino community and commits to tangible improvements in opportunity, representation, and quality of life for Latino community members?

Santa Monica's Latino community, particularly in the Pico neighborhood, has been historically underserved relative to the rest of the city. I would direct capital investment and program resources to correct that imbalance, prioritize small business support and affordable housing investment in Pico, and ensure that the city is communicating proactively in Spanish with residents who may not be well-served by English-only outreach. Immigrant protections are also directly relevant: I would strengthen sanctuary policies and ensure city-funded legal services include immigration support.

4. How would you use your position as a Councilmember to ensure that Santa Monica remains a safe, welcoming, and affirming city for its LGBTQ+ residents and visitors, especially during a period of heightened vulnerability at the national level?

Santa Monica should be an unambiguous sanctuary for LGBTQ+ residents and a visible counterpoint to the hostility coming from federal policy in other parts of the country. That means continuing to fund LGBTQ+ community services and organizations, ensuring city facilities and programs are fully inclusive, being actively vocal in opposing attacks on LGBTQ+ rights, and ensuring that representation in city hiring and on city bodies reflects this commitment. I would also note that Santa Monica cannot be a haven for LGBTQ+ people who cannot afford to live here, which is another reason why bringing down housing costs matters for this community.

5. How would you use your position as a Councilmember to ensure the City stands up for the dignity, safety, and rights of its immigrant residents, workers and visitors when faced with federal immigration actions in our community?

I would strengthen and maintain Santa Monica's sanctuary policies: city staff and law enforcement do not assist federal immigration enforcement absent a judicial warrant. The city should actively communicate those protections to immigrant residents so people know their rights and are not afraid to use city services or report crimes. I would ensure that city-funded legal services include immigration support and that the city is prepared to respond publicly when federal enforcement actions target our residents.

Public Safety

1. In your assessment, how well is Santa Monica performing when it comes to public safety?

Santa Monica remains a wonderful place to live. Crime rates have been trending down and the dramatic encampment conditions that some other cities are experiencing are not what we see here. That context matters despite what some voices say. That said, there is a real and persistent sense that our public spaces are not as clean and welcoming as they should be, and that perception has measurable consequences for tourism, small businesses, and residents who want to feel comfortable in their parks and on their streets.

2. Are there any trends that you find troubling, if yes which ones, and how would you address this?

The most troubling trend is the disconnect between what the city spends on homelessness services and the outcomes we see in public spaces. That is an accountability issue, not a criticism of the people working on it. I want clear metrics tied to every program: people housed, people connected to treatment, measurable improvement in public space conditions. Where programs are not delivering, we need to be willing to adjust.

3. What, if any, specific changes do you support to the manner of policing in Santa Monica?

I support a clear and enforced baseline of public order: parks are for everyone, sidewalks are for walking, and public drug use is not acceptable. I also believe in deploying the right response for each situation. That means investing in mental

health responders and unarmed outreach workers for calls that do not require a police officer, so that our officers can focus on actual public safety work. This is not about reducing the role of police. It is about making sure everyone, including the police department, has the tools and support they need to do their jobs effectively. Santa Monica's officers should not be the default response to every social service failure in the city.

4. Are there specific changes to the use of funds currently allocated to the police department that you would advocate?

I would not advocate for cuts to the police department budget. What I would advocate for is making sure we are also investing adequately in the mental health responders, unarmed outreach workers, and shelter options that take pressure off police for situations that are not fundamentally law enforcement problems. Officers should be focused on public safety, not serving as the default response to every problem in the city. Getting that balance right is good for residents and good for the department.

5. As a Councilmember what steps would you take to maintain and improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety throughout the city?

I have been advocating for street improvements, protected bike infrastructure, and safer pedestrian crossings for years through Santa Monica Families for Safe Streets and Santa Monica Greenways. As a council member, I would push to widen sidewalks where necessary, complete the bike network with physically separated infrastructure, not just painted lanes, and to improve crosswalk design and signal timing citywide. I would also push to reform how the city implements its adopted plans, moving away from relitigating each corridor individually and instead executing adopted plans systematically.

Education

1. Do you support the 2026 Parcel Tax citizens' initiative to provide funding to our public schools and, if so, will you actively encourage your supporters to vote for that Parcel Tax? Why or why not?

Yes, I have publicly endorsed the SMMUSD parcel tax and will actively encourage my supporters to vote for it. Strong public schools are foundational to the kind of city Santa Monica can be, and families make decisions about where to live based on school quality.

2. In the event the 2026 Parcel Tax fails, will you support continuation of the Master Use Facilities Agreement between the City and the School District after its current expiration date of next year? Why or why not?

Yes. Even if the parcel tax fails, the city's relationship with SMMUSD is important and the Master Use Facilities Agreement has been a valuable framework for collaboration. I would support continuation and look for ways to strengthen the partnership even without the additional parcel tax revenue.

3. In the event the 2026 Parcel Tax passes, will you support any level of

additional funding by the City to the School District after the expiration of the current Master Use Facilities Agreement?

Yes. If the parcel tax passes and the current Master Use Facilities Agreement expires, I would support exploring additional city funding to the school district where feasible. Investment in SMMUSD is investment in Santa Monica's long-term vitality.

4. Over the last couple of decades, the City and Santa Monica College have transitioned from an often hostile relationship to a partnership of shared goals. What will you do to maintain and expand the progress in college/city collaboration?

I would actively work to maintain and strengthen the collaboration between the City and SMC. I would engage regularly with SMC leadership and look for opportunities to coordinate on housing, transportation, and public space issues.

5. Do you pledge to ensure that the Big Blue Bus remains a ready partner to provide free “any line, any time” student transit pass service to SMC students?

Yes. The Big Blue Bus student transit pass program has been a model partnership and I would ensure it continues. Free transit access for SMC students is both an equity measure and a smart transportation policy.

6. Do you support additional bond funding for Santa Monica College when it is needed?

Yes. Santa Monica College is one of this city's most important institutions and a critical pathway for residents seeking economic mobility. When the college needs capital investment to maintain and improve its facilities, I would support putting that before voters. A strong SMC is good for students, good for the city, and good for the broader community.

Environment, Sustainability, Mobility

1. What do you view as the City's most important current environmental and sustainability programs? What more do you want to see the City do? Explain.

The city's most important environmental programs include its clean energy commitments, building electrification requirements, urban runoff treatment programs, urban tree canopy maintenance, and work on sea level rise planning. I want to see more investment in cooling infrastructure for public spaces and vulnerable residents, expanded air quality monitoring particularly near the freeway and airport, native and drought-tolerant landscaping in place of artificial turf, and a serious long-term plan for managed adaptation to coastal risks.

2. What do you view as the City's most important current mobility programs? What more do you want to see the City do? Explain.

On mobility, the Big Blue Bus and the E Line connection are the most important

current programs. I want to see more: protected bike infrastructure to complete the network, expanded bikeshare that connects seamlessly with neighboring cities, and advocacy for Metro expansion including the D Line extension through to Santa Monica.

The Arts in Santa Monica

1. What will you do as a council member, if anything, to preserve and increase opportunities for artists and the arts in Santa Monica?

I would advocate for protecting and expanding arts funding in the city budget, ensuring that public spaces are programmed with arts and cultural events, and that city land use policies do not inadvertently displace arts organizations and artist workspaces through redevelopment pressure. Arts activation of public spaces is also an economic development tool: a vibrant cultural scene makes Santa Monica more compelling for visitors and more livable for residents.

2. Are you willing to increase the budget for the Arts in Santa Monica? If so, how?

Yes, I am open to increasing the arts budget where resources allow. The Entertainment Zone expansion and downtown activation strategy both point toward experiential programming as the future of our public spaces, and arts funding is a direct investment in that direction. I would look at both direct city funding and creative partnerships with arts organizations and philanthropic institutions.

State Ballot Measures

1. Do you support the Howard Jarvis measure (or any substitute measure) to require a two-thirds vote on any and every form of new local tax? Why or why not? Will you actively encourage your supporters to vote the same way as you on this measure?

No. The Howard Jarvis supermajority requirement would severely constrain the ability of local governments to respond to community needs and invest in public services. Santa Monica needs fiscal flexibility to fund affordable housing, homelessness prevention, schools, and infrastructure. I would actively encourage my supporters to vote no.

2. Do you support the measure to require that any ballot measure imposing a new super-majority vote requirement must itself pass by that same super-majority in order to become effective? Why or why not? Will you actively encourage your supporters to vote the same way as you on this measure (assuming it appears on the ballot)?

Yes. If a measure is going to impose a supermajority requirement, it is only fair that it meets the same standard. Protecting democratic majorities from being locked out by rules imposed by a simple majority is a basic principle of fair governance. I would encourage my supporters to vote yes.

3. Do you support the measure to condition the right to vote on new voter

identification requirements? Why or why not? Will you actively encourage your supporters to vote the same way as you on this measure?

No. Voter ID requirements suppress turnout among communities that are less likely to have government-issued ID, including low-income residents, elderly people, immigrants, and renters. The evidence for the problem these measures claim to solve is essentially nonexistent, while the evidence for their suppressive effect is well-documented. I would actively encourage my supporters to vote no.