

**Santa Monicans for Renters' Rights
School Board Questionnaire - 2026**

Name: Robbie Staenberg

Email address: staenberg4schoolboard@gmail.com

Did you include the requested Additional Materials? **Yes**

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

Your Candidacy

1. What is your understanding of the role of a Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District board member?

I see the board's role as maintaining a "big picture," governance-level perspective — setting a forward-looking vision, clear goals, and prudent fiscal and educational policy, while trusting the Superintendent and district staff to handle day-to-day implementation. A board member should not be a micromanager who second-guesses the expertise that teachers and administrators bring to their work every day, but a board member should also never simply defer and disengage. That means providing oversight as well as setting policy. (That oversight also includes holding the district accountable for following through on the initiatives it launches, not just approving them and moving on.)

The board also plays a critical role as the bridge between our community and the district. This means both sharing district priorities and plans with the community, and it also means listening to parents, teachers, students, and residents, and incorporating feedback into decision making.

2. Why are you running to be a SMMUSD board member?

I'm running because I love our schools and believe SMMUSD is facing a consequential set of decisions over the next four years — on fiscal stability, technology and AI in the classroom, and on achieving academic excellence for all students. These aren't abstract policy questions to me. I attended SMMUSD schools, and I've since spent years in the classroom as a teacher and in state government as a legislative staffer.

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

- **Classroom experience.** I taught high school social studies at a Title I school in Oakland, where I built a ninth-grade writing course and the school's first AP Government and Politics course from scratch — one where my students, more than 90% of whom were on free or reduced lunch, passed the AP exam at rates exceeding the state and national averages. That experience taught me firsthand what teachers need to succeed, how much parental involvement matters, and how to pair rigorous expectations with genuine support for struggling students. I hold a cleared California teaching credential.
- **State policy experience.** As a staffer for Assemblymember Rick Chavez Zbur, I work with state policy-making and legislative processes that impact our community.

- **Community roots.** I was born and raised in Santa Monica and attended our K-12 SMMUSD schools.

These three experiences combine to inform my interest in community engagement and consensus building. I enjoy working with people from all backgrounds and know our community well.

4. What sets you apart from the others running to be a SMMUSD board member?

If elected, I will bring a new perspective to the board. I will be the only board member who has experience as a K-12 classroom teacher, and I will be the only board member who has attended our K-12 schools (relatively recently) which gives me a much closer understanding of the day-to-day experiences of a current SMMUSD student. I will pair that educational perspective with a strong understanding of the state legislative process and relationships across levels of government.

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).

- Santa Monica Democratic Club
- Community For Excellent Public Schools (CEPS)

Questionnaires for both are attached to my email.

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

My campaign is in a solid financial position, and I have raised funds from a wide range of community members, elected officials, friends, family, and folks who have told me that they support the idea of someone with my background joining the board. I do not have a set amount that I intend to raise by election day; however, I think that I have a strong message and set of experiences, so if this is a competitive race, I will aim to make sure that I raise enough money to widely communicate that message and experience.

Below is the most recent list of local leaders who have endorsed my campaign. (Apologies if anyone is missing, this list may need further updates.)

- Alicia Mignano — SMMUSD Board of Education (President)
- Laurie Lieberman — SMMUSD Board of Education (Vice President)
- Maria Leon-Vazquez — SMMUSD Board of Education
- Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein — SMMUSD Board of Education
- Jon Kean — SMMUSD Board of Education
- Jennifer Smith — SMMUSD Board of Education
- Caroline Torosis — SM City Council (Mayor)

- Lana Negrete — SM City Council
- Dan Hall — SM City Council
- Ellis Raskin — SM City Council
- Barry Snell — SM City Council
- Natalya Zernitskaya — SM City Council
- Dr. Sion Roy — SMC Board of Trustees (Chair)
- Nancy Greenstein — SMC Board of Trustees
- Anastasia Foster — SMC Board of Trustees
- Sophia Manavi — SMC Student Trustee
- Danny Ivanov — SM Rent Control Board (Vice Chair)
- Kay Ambriz — SM Rent Control Board
- Rick Chavez Zbur — CA State Assemblymember, 51st District
- Gleam Davis — Former SM City Councilmember / Mayor
- Shari Davis — SMC Adjunct Professor (Co-Director, Public Policy Institute),
Former Chair of CEPS, Community for Excellent Public Schools
- Nicole Faries — President, Santa Monica-Malibu Council of PTAs

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

I will not accept donations from anyone who would expect their donation to entitle them to influence over my actions on the board in any way. I hope it goes without saying that I would never take a contribution from an individual or entity who I believe is harming or seeking to harm our students, teachers, staff, parents, or school community. As for developers specifically, I have not solicited donations from developers, and going forward, my plan is just to continue to ask folks who are interested in our schools to contribute to my campaign. If someone who works on commercial or residential developments hears about my campaign and would like to donate because they believe in what I am doing, I would not reject their contribution. Most importantly, as I said above, if anyone contributed and then had some expectation of influence, I would return or reject their contribution without question.

(I should add that as far as I know, no developer who operate in our area has contributed to my campaign.)

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.

The Santa Monica Democratic Club, Santa Monicans for Renters' Rights, the PTAs of Franklin, Lincoln, and Santa Monica High School (as an alum).

SMRR

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

I joined SMRR this year. I have worked with SMRR leaders on a few issues and hold SMRR in high regard. I have been endorsed by multiple former co-chairs and members of SMRR, and I am very grateful for their support.

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

Yes.

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

Yes. I value the experience and expertise SMRR leaders bring to the table and would very much appreciate their perspective and opinion.

Issues Relating to the School District

1. What are the top 3 goals you want to achieve during your term on the SMMUSD Board? How do you think you can achieve these goals?

My top three goals are:

- Ensuring engagement, collaboration, and transparency with our Santa Monica community. In my conversations with folks around Santa Monica, including parents, teachers, and engaged residents, I have found that there is a degree of dissatisfaction in the way the district engages with the public. One of my principal goals on the board is interpersonal in nature—to connect with a wide range of stakeholders in Santa Monica and make sure that their views and the views of the communities they represent are not only heard but really listened to.
- Pursuing academic excellence for all students, with particular focus on closing persistent outcome gaps between student groups. This means ensuring that our highest performing students are actively challenged academically while simultaneously ensuring that our most academically vulnerable students are given the tools needed to succeed. My teaching experience has given me confidence that it is possible to make significant strides for both of these segments of a school community.
- Championing sound, data-driven fiscal management that ensures our district's long-term stability. Our structural deficit has grown to approximately \$9.5 million, and the potential

loss of \$12 million in annual City funding through the Master Facilities Use Agreement (MFUA) is the single most significant near-term risk facing the district.

As for how I would achieve these goals: I will bring my experience as a teacher and legislative staff member, along with my local relationships and knowledge, into my efforts on each of these issue areas. On engagement, I would personally connect with leaders in our community organizations to ensure a regular and consistent flow of information back and forth, and I would press the district to make sure that community groups are engaged when policy proposals are being formulated. On achievement, my first step would be to assess where and how our teachers think that outcomes can be improved—our teachers work with our students every day, and no one is in a better place to understand what changes or additions are necessary. And on fiscal policy, my approach would be grounded in data, transparency, and genuine engagement with our community about the trade-offs involved.

2. What do you think SMMUSD has done well over the last few years, if anything? What do you think SMMUSD has done poorly, if anything, and what would you propose to change to address what you view as shortcomings?

I attended SMMUSD schools from approximately 2001-2014, and when I talk to teachers and parents or walk around our school campuses, I find myself comparing SMMUSD's offerings today with my own experience. In short, there is a lot to celebrate – in areas ranging from academic offerings to support systems to physical infrastructure.

Academically, our board members have been working diligently to improve outcomes for our students, and there is real progress to point to. The district has also maintained a comfortable reserve despite past projected deficits, ensuring stability over the next couple of years. And finally, after a decades-long process, the district reached a set of negotiated agreements with Malibu intended to ensure financial and educational equity for both communities.

Where has the district fallen short? Two areas stand out to me.

First, community engagement. Clearly, there have been moments that have left some members of our community with the impression that the board is not open or interested in their input—the recent changes to the music education program or the installation of artificial turf versus grass are examples some families might point to. We need to follow experts, but we also need to make sure that our experts are informed by conversations with parents, teachers, and students, and that whenever possible, new proposals are fully communicated to community groups before decisions are made.

Second, follow-through on equity. The 2016 Noguera Report documented persistent and troubling disparities in outcomes between different student groups—and it also warned about a district pattern of launching initiatives without seeing them through. While outcomes generally

have improved since the Report was published, significant and problematic disparities remain, and to my knowledge no independent follow-up review has been commissioned in the decade since. I would propose that we audit our current initiatives with two questions in mind: 1) is the initiative being effectively implemented; 2) if so, what does the data show on its effectiveness in improving student outcomes? I would like to reassess the programs in place before beginning new initiatives—teachers and school administrators must know that the district is serious about addressing this problem and is not simply introducing a new initiative without long-term commitment.

3. With all of the stress and strife in the world and on school campuses today, what will you do if elected to help alleviate tensions that may arise and keep our public schools from being a hostile environment? Please address the issue in general, as well as address specifically the needs of our Black students, our Latino students, our LGBTQ+ students, our Jewish students, our Muslim students, our students from immigrant families, and students from any other groups targeted in the world with hate.

Students, teachers, administrators, and staff must feel safe at school, and parents must know that their children are safe at school. That is the foundation on which everything else in public education rests. I believe strongly that public education must serve every student—and that “every student” is not an abstraction. It means the student who is a first-generation English learner, the student who has an IEP, the student who comes from a family experiencing housing instability, and the student who belongs to a community that has historically either been underserved by our public schools or targeted with hate.

In general, keeping our schools from becoming hostile environments requires a few things at once: clear anti-harassment policies that are consistently enforced; staff who are trained to recognize and interrupt bullying and bias; easy access for students to well-trained counselors; and regular measuring student sentiment and taking it into account when crafting policy. It also requires modeling the civic skill set I worked to teach in my own classroom: engaging respectfully with people who hold different views. Our students are watching how the adults in this community handle disagreement, and the board should set the example.

As to the specific communities named in this question:

- Our Black students and Latino students continue to experience the outcome disparities documented in the 2016 Noguera Report—disparities I saw myself as a student in our K-12 schools. Continuing to address those findings—in hiring, in curriculum, and in school culture—is part of making our schools non-hostile, inclusive environments, and it is why I want the district to measure and publicly report on its progress. The report also documented a lack of diversity among our teachers and administrators, and staff of color who reported feeling silenced. The district has made substantial progress in this area, but

this work is not done. For example, Hispanic/Latino representation amongst certified staff increased from 16.9% in 2019-20 to 21.3% in 2024-2025. However, the student body is approximately 29.8% Hispanic/Latino. We should celebrate the progress the district has made while committing to continue that work going forward.

- Our students from immigrant families are living through a period of fear that is unprecedented in recent history. I was glad to see the board approve updated policies on the district's response to immigration enforcement this past March. Policies on paper are only the beginning: every site administrator and front-office staff member must be trained on those protocols, and families must know—in their own languages—exactly what protections the district provides.
- Our LGBTQ+ students are the targets of an organized national political campaign aimed at removing the policies and curriculum that support them. First, I should note that I would oppose any political pressure to abandon programs that have demonstrable positive effects on student outcomes, and I would much rather lose my seat than allow our students' education to be compromised by political pressure. That includes maintaining the district's commitment to inclusive learning environments that reflect the diverse identities and experiences of our students. Second, I had/have the pleasure of working for Assemblymember Zbur, who is the former executive director of Equality California (EQCA), the largest statewide LGBTQ+ civil rights advocacy group in the United States. One of the first pieces of legislation I talked to Asm Zbur about was the Safe and Supportive Schools Act (AB 5), his bill to help foster inclusive classroom environments for LGBTQ+ students by supporting high quality, professional development opportunities. (The bill was sponsored by CTA, CFT, EQCA and State Superintendent Thurmond.) Through my work for the Assemblymember, I have deepened my understanding of the unique challenges facing the LGBTQ+ community, and I will advocate for the policies necessary to maintain a school environment that is truly safe and inclusive for all.
- Antisemitism and Islamophobia have no place on our campuses, and the district must enforce anti-discrimination and anti-harassment policies without hesitation or double standards. Beyond this (hopefully) obvious point, it is critical that our Jewish and Muslim students are never be made to answer for world events. None of this means teachers need to avoid difficult material in the classroom. Instead, it means that teachers should guide students through difficult material and discuss complex global events with rigor, thoughtfulness, and empathy, and be cognizant that no student or group of students is singled out or made to feel like they cannot participate in the lesson on equal footing with the rest of their classmates.

Finally, I would note that all of these commitments are connected. A district that is serious about belonging for one group of students builds the culture, training, and trust that protects all students.

4. What specific steps will you take to reduce achievement gaps of students from socio-economically challenged backgrounds (or otherwise)?

The Noguera Report (2016) reflects some of what I saw myself as a student in our K-12 schools, and while outcomes have improved since the Report was published, significant and problematic disparities remain. Here are some specific steps I would like the district to take:

- Audit our current initiatives with two questions in mind: 1) is the initiative being effectively implemented; 2) if so, what does the data show on its effectiveness in improving student outcomes? (If the district has already done this, I would very much like to see the results.) I would like to reassess the programs in place before beginning new initiatives; I think this will help teachers and school administrators know that the district is serious about addressing this problem and is not simply throwing out another initiative without committing to follow it through. As part of this, I would be interested in the board commissioning an independent follow-up to the Noguera Report, so that a decade later we have a rigorous outside assessment of where we actually stand.
- Fully prioritize chronic absenteeism, which disproportionately affects our most vulnerable students and has a direct correlation with outcome disparities. From my personal experience teaching at a Title 1 school, I know that any progress on this issue directly mitigates disparities in educational outcomes. The district's new attendance recovery programs and trauma-informed approach to engaging families are steps in the right direction, and I would work to strengthen them.
- Ensure that our highest-performing students are challenged—through rigorous coursework, AP access, and enrichment—while simultaneously ensuring that our most academically vulnerable students receive the targeted support they need. These goals are not in tension; my teaching experience has given me confidence that it is possible to make significant strides for both.
- Regularly measure and publicly report on outcome disparities so that the community, the board, and all SMMUSD employees have transparency as to the state of progress in this area.

As we measure the effectiveness of existing strategies and implement new strategies, we must combine qualitative data (survey, interview, observation) with measurable data on outcomes. This requires that at least some, if not most, of our goals and programs are specific and measurable.

5. What can you point to in order to assure SMRR that you are truly committed to reducing achievement gaps for students from socio-economically challenged backgrounds (or otherwise)?

I can point to about five years of my life. (And since I am only 30, that is a pretty high percentage!)

After graduating from Columbia, I was hired as a social studies teacher at a Title 1 high school in Oakland. My students were predominantly first-generation students of color, more than 90% of whom received free or reduced lunch—and many existed in a system where their future appeared preordained. I taught there from 2018-2023, during which time I created a new ninth-grade writing course and our AP American Government and Politics course (there was no AP Gov prior).

I was and am particularly proud that my AP Government students passed the AP exam at a rate exceeding both the California and US average, defying expectations of what students at a Title I high school can achieve. I also helped to create a program for our college-bound students to systematically workshop their application essays and worked with many students who are, as of now, the first in their family to graduate college. I also dedicated considerable energy to my students who were not college bound. (My last letter of recommendation was actually for a student who was applying to be sponsored by Swinerton to join the Carpenter's Union.)

I worked to pair rigorous expectations with empathy and personal dedication, and I am proud of the results I achieved. And when I left the classroom, I trained my replacement teacher—an amazing young woman who had grown up in the community, graduated from our school, and attended UC Davis.

I would add one more thing: I attended SMMUSD schools from kindergarten through grade 12, and the disparities documented in the Noguera Report reflect some of what I saw myself as a student here. This is not an issue I discovered while preparing a campaign.

My commitment to reducing the achievement gap is the reason I became a teacher, and it is a central reason I am running for this board.

6. Do you pledge to support continuing SMMUSD's policy of admitting students whose parent(s) or guardian(s) are employed in the district, even if they do not live in the district? Why or why not?

Yes.

There are many reasons to support this policy—here are three:

First, it is one of the most meaningful benefits we can offer in recruiting and retaining excellent teachers and staff. Housing costs in Santa Monica and Malibu put living in our district out of reach for many employees of SMMUSD, and the ability to enroll their children in our excellent schools is a powerful reason for talented educators and staff to come here and to stay here. As a

former teacher, I can tell you that this kind of benefit matters and is an excellent way to retain staff.

Second, enrollment has declined significantly in recent years, though it shows signs of stabilizing. As a result, we have capacity to welcome the children of our employees without building additional facilities or hiring additional staff.

Third, and most simply: the people who educate, protect, and care for our students every day are part of our school community. Their children should be welcome in it.

7. Education in California (and beyond) is changing a lot. What does the future of education at SMMUSD look like to you? What will you do if elected to facilitate your vision for the future of education at SMMUSD?

I think the district is at a meaningful inflection point, and the choices we make over the next decade—about technology and artificial intelligence, financial priorities, and what we believe the core purpose of education to be—will shape SMMUSD for a generation.

When I imagine the future of SMMUSD, I see expanded access to quality early childhood education that meets working parents where they are. I see a future that includes a bell-to-bell approach to student cell phone use, where administratively feasible, so that school is a place for attention and human connection. It is a future where schools educate and care for the whole child, with easy access to well-trained counselors and in-house mental health supports. It is a future where students graduate with a rigorous and thorough civic education, so that every student understands how their government works and recognizes that they have a role to play in our shared civic life.

I see a future SMMUSD where technology enhances teaching rather than replacing it, and where the measure of every digital tool is whether it helps our students become critical, independent thinkers. Artificial intelligence holds both genuine promise and real risk in our classrooms. The promise is *not* realized through giving our students access to platforms like ChatGPT, Claude, or Gemini; rather, it is about the platforms and programs that will soon be able to utilize AI to personalize instruction so that we can meet students where they are. This has the potential to help fill in gaps in students' learning—which in turn can help close gaps in outcomes. As noted above, this does not mean simply giving students access to platforms where they can ask for answers without thinking. Unfettered use of large language models has the obvious potential to undermine the critical and independent thinking skills that are core to a liberal arts education. In the same vein, Chromebooks and digital platforms can be valuable when they genuinely enhance learning; they can be harmful when they become passive entertainment or a substitute for real instruction. I was encouraged by Superintendent Shelton's May 2026 statement on instructional technology, which emphasized that technology in our classrooms is meant to supplement

teachers—not replace them—and that digital tools must be used purposefully rather than by default. I share that view.

If elected, I would facilitate the immediate stage of this vision by bringing the discussion of artificial intelligence in the classroom to the board and the school community. I would like to see SMMUSD utilize community processes—involving teachers, parents, students, and outside experts—to develop clear, thoughtful, evidence-based guidelines for AI and technology use in the classroom. We must ensure that our students are thinking critically and independently, and that they are as prepared as possible for an uncertain technological future.

8. Do you support SMMUSD building housing affordable to its workforce, including both teachers and non-teachers (such as maintenance workers, food services workers, crossing guards, etc.)? If so, what will you do if elected to assure that it happens?

Yes—and I appreciate that this question explicitly includes our classified employees. The people who maintain our campuses, feed our students, and get kids safely across the street are essential members of our school community, and they are often the employees for whom Santa Monica housing costs are most crushing. Any workforce housing effort that serves only certificated staff would be incomplete.

Workforce housing addresses several district priorities at once: it helps us recruit and retain excellent teachers and staff in one of the most expensive housing markets in the country; it strengthens the connection between our employees and our community; and it supports enrollment, since employees who live locally enroll their children locally.

First, a basic question must be answered: to what extent do SMMUSD employees want workforce housing? And assuming there is a clear want, what type of housing are employees most interested in? This is part of a general feasibility study that should also include the alternative uses of eligible parcels. We should not take any steps toward building workforce housing without knowing the answers to those questions.

Assuming there is a clear, strong interest in workforce housing from SMMUSD staff and we determine that there isn't an clearly superior alternative use of the property, I would be a champion for this kind of project. I do not think this would need to cost the district; since the district already owns property that might be conducive to workforce housing, I think we could likely work with partners and the city to make this happen in a way that keeps costs extremely low for the district.

Of course, we would need a clear plan that pencils out before moving forward—this kind of project must be structured so that it does not harm our TK-12 students' educational funding. The good news is that well-structured workforce housing projects can be financially self-sustaining or even revenue-generating over the long term, and where additional resources are needed, I would advocate for funding from the city, county, and state.

9. Do you support the citizens' initiative Parcel Tax measure that will appear on the November ballot? If not, why not? If so, what do believe is/are the strongest argument/s in favor of the Measure?

Short answer: Yes. I signed the petition to place this measure on the ballot, and I will be voting for it in November.

The strongest argument in favor of the Measure is straightforward: the \$12 million in annual funding that the City provides to SMMUSD through the Master Facilities Use Agreement (MFUA) is key to our district's financial stability, and the City's fiscal challenges—stemming in significant part from the Uller cases—have put that funding in very real jeopardy. The district cannot afford to simply wait and see.

The citizens' initiative that reflects this community's extraordinary commitment to its public schools. I appreciate the enormous effort that Santa Monicaans for Reliable School Funding has put into getting this initiative on the ballot.

One important caveat from my perspective: this parcel tax should not mean that the city is forever “off the hook” for renewing the funding that currently comes through the MFUA. When this period of fiscal distress comes to an end, the district should continue to press the city to renew some or all of that funding. And of course, the district should continue to allow residents to have access to facilities—on that note, I was pleased to see the board unanimously pass Resolution No. 25-66, which makes clear that even without the MFUA, district facilities will continue to be available to the community.

10. 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 our public schools, for emergency and ongoing income support programs, for the preservation or creation of deed-restricted affordable housing, for right to counsel, and other programs aimed at preserving existing tenancies of and units serving lower and moderate income households. The first \$10 million collected goes to our public schools, as does 20% of anything collected above \$50 million. But on June 22, in Sacramento AB-736 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 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, and will preclude the potential for the public schools to receive more than \$10 million per year (and could threaten even that in some years).

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

My understanding is that this bill is not moving forward.

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

In my SMDC interview, I was told there are people interested in potentially changing Measure GS, which would require a local ballot measure. I had not heard about this, and I still have not heard anything to that effect (outside the interview). I am not personally advocating any changes, and I find it hard to imagine Santa Monica voters amending Measure GS.

c. Can SMRR count on you as an ally to oppose efforts that threaten continued funding of the homelessness prevention and affordable housing programs contemplated by Measure GS, even if funding to the public schools would remain unaffected? If so, what can you point to assure SMRR that you truly are such an ally?

I am not sure what my role would be in this as a school board member, but I am very open to being educated on that point. I fundamentally believe in funding programs to prevent homelessness and build affordable housing. I have worked with SMRR leaders on a few proposals/topics, and I like to think that I have demonstrated the seriousness with which I take their views.

State Ballot Measures

1. Do you support the Howard Jarvis measure (or any substitute for that 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?

I do not.

On a technical level, I find it odd to say that 51% of voters can require that a future type of ballot measure to require a 2/3 vote. At the very least, it seems like enacting a 2/3 barrier should only be done by 2/3 of the voters....

But to be clear, the main reason I do not support this measure is that it is designed to cripple local governments' by taking the ability to raise taxes out of majority rule. I do not support the intent or the means, and I will actively encourage opposition.

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)?

My understanding is that this is no longer on the ballot.

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. I do not support measures designed to restrict the number of voters in our elections. I will actively encourage opposition.