

Urbanist Coalition of Portland 2026 Candidate Questionnaire Raw Responses

District 4

Anna Bullett

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

Portland needs more multi-family housing, specifically in our transit oriented development zones, and preferably with community spaces and useful for the everyday person, affordable retail stores on bottom levels. In my first term on council construction has begun on 2,068 housing units and I have voted to approve a further 2,213 which hopefully will break ground soon. This is still not enough. Changing the Inclusionary Zoning policy will help, as will increasing our partnership Maine State Housing and whoever is voted in as the new governor.

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition's analysis that Portland's Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

With my colleagues I am taking steps to redesign our inclusionary zoning policy to make it more realistic for developers to build affordable housing. We know that the "Green New Deal" is one of the most likely contributors to the decline in housing development. We also must be aware that there was also a pandemic, supply chain crisis, and tariff fight in this time period. We expect to have a full council vote on a rewritten inclusionary zoning policy before the end of 2026. I am very thankful to Portland developers and housing advocates for taking the time to meet me and provide guidance as we navigate this policy change. I find the concept of value capture or a percentage of the capital improvement plan budget designated to the housing trust interesting and worthwhile to explore, however I think for the sake of speed, simplicity, and majority vote (which we need to pass anything lets not forget!), we might seek to require 10% at 100% of area median income, this was the pre-referendum structure, so in essence we would be looking at a reset.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

To me social housing is affordable housing in which a municipality has a financial stake and a level of policy control. I am a strong supporter of the Portland Housing Authority and feel that with a bit more intentionality in the relationship between the city and PHA, they are best equipped to build and manage a social housing development. I am particularly interested in low income housing models that have a pathway to ownership, and the building of financial equity for residents.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called "Portland in Motion". What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

All roads lead to robust public transit. Pun intended. I recognize that for the vast majority of people, the future will be free of cars. My voting record at council and on the board of Greater Portland Metro makes clear that I want to heavily invest time, effort, and resources into bus rapid transit, improved bus stop and shelters, lower fares for low income residents, and housing and retail development in our transit oriented development zones. My hope is to expand the high school bus pass program to include middle school students *and* to elderly residents who income qualify. I also recognize that we live in the present and that our public transit system is not yet accessible or frequent or fast or comprehensive enough for a large number of residents. To that end I do still keep vehicle operators in mind for all of our city projects. Cars are never my first priority, but I am fully aware that Portland is a regional hub, and many residents from off peninsula neighborhoods and other communities with zero public transit frequent the city center for arts & culture, restaurants, sporting events, work, etc - I want to ensure that those visitors have affordable and accessible places to park and hope that someday that might be in satellite lots with affordable frequent shuttles to bring visitors to and from downtown.

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)'s plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement here for context)

I do not support NNEPRA's proposed site for train station relocation. My dream is for MaineHealth to sell Union Station to the city, state, or NNEPRA and to return it to its former glory as a pedestrian oriented train station from which residents could walk to their jobs or to a baseball game, or hop on a bus to get elsewhere in the city. This said, I understand the need to compromise when working in government and support Portland planning department staff's

proposed site. I believe in building infrastructure where pedestrian facilities and lighting is already located, not in locations that would necessitate an extreme (and expensive) makeover before it is pedestrian ready.

6. Do you support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

I fully support Reimagining Franklin street. My priorities are dense family housing, very safe pedestrian and bike lanes, recreation space with lots of tree canopy, bus shelters for stops in both directions, and smart, safe, slow vehicle lanes with lights and intersections or traffic circles that make it almost impossible to violate traffic laws.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

My priorities for the midtown lots are 1. Affordable housing. 2. Family shelter. 3. Recreation spaces open to the public. 4. Easy, safe, well signed bike and pedestrian connections to trails and streets. 5. improved street lighting. 6. TREES. 7. ADA accessible community space for rent to community groups to hold meetings at a reasonable day and hourly rate.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

I must express my gratitude to the urbanist coalition for such thoughtful and informed approaches to advocacy and policy change!

Jake Viola

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

Yes. Portland hasn't grown its housing supply at the same rate as the region. This mismatch drives our affordability crisis. We need more housing at every level, not just towers downtown or sprawl at the edges. The City should streamline internal processes like permitting to make it easier and quicker to build, shift more projects to minor site plan review so they move faster, and remove barriers like the 25% IZ law.

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition's analysis that Portland's Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

Yes. Portland has among the most restrictive IZ policies in the country, adding cost specifically to multifamily housing while exempting single-family homes. This puts the burden of building affordable units onto renters and new buyers. The data shows IZ has produced few affordable units while stalling projects. I'd support eliminating or reducing Portland's inclusionary zoning requirements to encourage more housing units to be built.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

To me, social housing means the city takes a more active role in developing, financing, or owning land for housing, rather than leaving affordability entirely to private developers or regulations like inclusionary zoning. I support this in a specific form: the city retaining ownership of land and ground-leasing it to private developers under conditions that require real affordability and real timelines, with market-rate units cross-subsidizing income-restricted ones in the same buildings. That's different from the city owning and managing housing itself. I don't support Portland becoming a landlord. I am in favor of trying aspects of public-private partnerships to incentivize more production of affordable housing in the city.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called "Portland in Motion". What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

Yes. Pedestrian and cyclist safety should be weighed alongside vehicle speed, not treated as an afterthought. I'd prioritize data-driven fixes on streets with documented speeding or crash issues, rather than a citywide overhaul, along with more reliable transit service. On parking, I'm not looking to make driving harder. Smarter management and opening underused garages cuts down on circling for spots and brings in city revenue without a fight over lane space. For all of this work, I'd prioritize resident engagement in the process.

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)'s plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement here for context)

Yes, I support moving forward with relocating the station. The current detour and backtracking required at the Portland Transportation Center is the main obstacle to expanding Downeaster service, including additional daily trips. Further delay to relitigate the exact site risks pushing back real service improvements for years. I'd want to see mixed-use development, especially housing, actively encouraged around the new station site.

6. Do you support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

Yes. Franklin Arterial displaced housing and neighborhoods to prioritize car travel. My priorities would be building housing back into the corridor, prioritizing transit, pedestrians, and cyclists, expanding Lincoln Park, and planting trees for shade and traffic calming.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

I'd listen to public input and engage with residents. The city could retain ownership of the Midtown lots rather than sell them. A sale nets a few million dollars for land worth far more. Instead, the city could ground-lease the parcels to developers with lease terms that require real progress on construction timelines so we don't repeat the last decade of delay. My priority for what gets built is density paired with genuine income mixing: market-rate units alongside affordable ones in the same buildings, not a separate subsidized program bolted on after the fact. Nearby Bayside buildings show this level of density is achievable here. Done right, this becomes a long-term asset for the city instead of a one-time payout.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

Portland's building codes should be reviewed for places where local rules exceed state requirements without clear benefit, like sprinkler and separate sewer line requirements for ADUs, which can add tens of thousands of dollars and make small-scale housing unaffordable to build.

District 5

Ilma Lopez

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

yes, we do. We need more work force housing. we have the Jill

udson fund that it will be a great way to help with cost, have an agreement with the developer and see where the line gets drawn. I don't believe the city should take the roll of a developer or rental company. Maybe in the future when we get everything under control and have systems in place.

about the amount is hard to know without having asses the need and finding what's already built and can be a part of the housing, some of it, just the need of capital to fix/invest on buildings that are already existing and subside the rent for the people, not all of it but a percentage.

and I can not give you a perfect answer since We need to work with planing, environmental and urbanist to create that perfect plan to have portland grow with longevity and sustainable for our citizens of today and tomorrow

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition's analysis that Portland's Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

yes I do, I think the math does not work. I think it should be all rewritten base on the cost of building. I will love to see your solutions.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

Social housing is needed and necessary however i think we need a diverse built outs in portland. I will like social housing to be an up to date building with hard working people that wants a beautiful and functional place. Again our system is prioritizing low income but is not pushing low income to raise to the top and the hard working middle class is being punished if they get a raise by taking benefits like health insurance away.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called “Portland in Motion”. What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

I believe that is a way we can all get what we need and want for our city's future, we need to start with our walking pass and keep our Portland citizens safe, in tandem with being a good host to our tourist and our Mainers from other cities, vertical parking will be a great addition to solve some of those problems and if we focus on transportation and walkability within our city will help when those parking lots are located away from downtown.

Let's start with lighting our pathways, and asking all the businesses to keep their outdoor lights on overnight. and same goes to buildings. it has to be a collective effort. and if some people can not afford it we can help as the ity for a path to our safety that it means their employees, renters, all of us.

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)’s plan to relocate Portland’s Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement here for context)

yes i do, I know it needs to fine tune the proposal. and what would happen to the existing zone? what would be the new purpose?

6. Do you support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

no I don't, i think expending that amount of money and having a vital road lose while construction is not the best use of our budget.

I believe new signals, lights and a better design to provide safety as new speed limit. also we should not let traffic move on red light on franklin.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

I will add more greenery and parks, i would focus on making portland more pedestrian friendly. and focusing parking lots on the city outskirts. if we create a city that we all know park and walk and we can add better transportation, lights at night , safe place for all and at all times the progress and future will be brighter. I have to work at 3am, and is not a single light, i walk in the middle of the street where the cars drive because i feel safe there instead of the sidewalk.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

I would love to have a meeting with your team.

Thank you for working on a better, safer Portland for all

Jakobi Delgado

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

Yes. While I don't have an exact number of new units to be built, I am a firm believer that an over-supply of housing is more beneficial than an under-supply. I will admit I am not an expert on this subject, and it's why I asked to meet with your organization. As a councilor I will always have the strength of character to admit when I don't know the specific facts of the solution and work with people who spend so many hours of their life researching the solutions.

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition's analysis that Portland's Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

I agree. I hear this issue at the door quite often. With the IZ requirement developments often either pay the fee to the city which doesn't create more units directly, or is a set unit of high-end housing developments with a few below-market rate units inside.

I think what Portland lacks heavily to truly bring down rent costs is a major increased in market rate housing; which if I read the analysis correctly is what is defined as a major issue by the coalition.

As such I would be in favor of changing the incentives and perhaps reducing the IZ requirement.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

I think social housing should be a goal but would need to be done in partnership with the State / Federal government to finance it on a scale that would actually affect the cost of housing in the city. The city on its own if we take on debt can perhaps make a few buildings of social housing but this on its own won't fix the issue. If we do social housing it needs to be done at scale with several neighboring municipalities to bring down the cost of living in Cumberland county.

I will support the measure if a plan is presented to do it at a reasonable scale and is capable of being financed without placing the city in financial hardship.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called "Portland in Motion". What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

I will always prioritize public transportation. I grew up in Portland, I had to rely on the Metro growing up, and throughout High School and college thus far. While I have recently been able to purchase a car there are thousands of people like me who rely on this system.

As a fan of Strong Towns, I also have a strong belief that public transit is the solution to pedestrian safety, traffic issues, and much more. Given time I would like to make bus lanes in parts of the city, implement priority light-signals for busses, and increase the bus route frequency from 30 to 15 minutes.

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)'s plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement here for context)

While my personal belief is in favor, I would like to clarify that this is something that the current council will be handling based on conversations with the mayor. If elected for the sake of stability and ensuring that we remain reliable partners with NNEPRA I will see to it that we follow any already established deal.

6. Do you support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

I would consider it. I would like to talk to city planners to see if they would have any other proposals such as changing a lane to be a bus lane, or if there would be any issues someone without a background in city planning wouldn't see at first.

However, if the plan goes through, I would like to place a priority on wider sidewalks, safe crossings, and ensuring walkable and bike-safe infrastructure in the area.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

One word: Housing.

My priority is housing.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

I think my main goal as a councilor is to ensure that the city is left a little bit better than I found it. While I think I was clear that my main goal is to increase the units of housing, that is a big goal and won't be achieved in just a 3-year term. What I can achieve is partnering with local

residents across the city to find what complaints the city can easily fix; stuff like speed bumps, new cross walks, raised medians, and streetlights near crosswalks and bus-stops.

The Day-to-day infrastructure that we use daily, that children use to go to school in the day and come home at night sometimes in the dark during winter. If I can improve this daily use infrastructure and just make sure a kid can cross the street safely, or a disabled person in Riverton in the winter doesn't have to sit in the road because the sidewalks weren't cleared I would of done my job.

Todd Chretien

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

Yes. We need 5,000 units in the next 5 years. I favor building on all fronts: market rate, social, workforce, low-income. There are multiple sites and I am open to discussing all of them. The city should aggressively solicit plans for new building and sponsor a bond measure to jump start social housing construction.

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition's analysis that Portland's Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

Inclusionary zoning is one factor among many, including inflation and availability of construction inputs, local skilled labor shortage, etc. I am willing to discuss and negotiate changes to IZ as long as they lead to balanced (and significant) growth in housing stock in the short and medium term.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

I support the work of the social housing task force and believe that social housing is an important component in addressing our affordable housing crisis.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called “Portland in Motion”. What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

I believe Portland must improve walkability and bikeability in (and between) our neighborhoods, increase accessible and high frequency public transportation, and prioritize pedestrian safety. These are all linked closely to supporting smart housing construction plans. Since most traffic in Portland comes from outside Portland (especially during commute hours), we must work with other municipalities as well as the state and county, to develop a regional transportation plan to give commuters options to leave their cars at home.

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)’s plan to relocate Portland’s Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement [here](#) for context)

I believe the priority should be getting the new station built as soon as possible while taking care to consider all proposed sites.

6. Do you support Portland’s Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

Yes. As long as it is beneficial for all Portland residents, including district 5 folks. That is, the plan must consider how it affects access to Commercial Street and the Old Port for residents who cannot walk from their homes to Gritty’s.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

The Midtown lots should be housing first. The area represents a generational opportunity to build smart, dense, accessible housing for several thousand people across the economic spectrum.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

From a district 5 perspective, increasing our housing stock (for instance, Lambert Woods) must go hand in hand with traffic safety, expanded and connected sidewalks and trails, and bike lanes. One way to reduce traffic in and out downtown is to build up local neighborhood restaurants, small businesses, and community events. For example, North Deering hosts a significant commercial plaza at the corner of Allen and Washington, along with three public schools, major apartment complexes, churches, and public spaces (the Grange hall, etc.). The area ought to be a significant business, sports, and cultural destination, yet it is a dangerous intersection and does not yet feel like a cohesive whole. Planning to make it so is just as important as downtown projects and redesigns.

At Large

Atiim Boykin

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

Yes, Portland needs significantly more housing, and the data backs that up: 64 percent of Maine households can no longer afford the median home, up from 39 percent in 2020. I met a young woman on Old Mast Road this summer, Carrie Ann, who told me a single bedroom in this city now runs about \$2,500 a month. She still loves her neighborhood. She just does not know how much longer she can afford to stay in it.

Picture Portland five years from now, where Carrie Ann is not choosing between her neighborhood and her rent, where a nurse finishing a night shift drives home to this city instead of an hour outside it. That is not a fantasy, it is a supply problem with a real fix.

The crisis is not really about approvals. Portland approved a record 1,420 units in 2025 and completed only 187. The real bottleneck is a handful of large projects stalling before groundbreaking over financing and material costs, not paperwork. I would pursue city-backed gap financing for those large stalled projects, build housing on land the city, the school district, and local hospitals already own, and pilot an IZ-free zone on underused industrial land for a fixed ten-year term, with the neighborhood closest to it helping set the terms before any zone is drawn.

None of this works without honesty about the risk. Gap financing means the city taking on real exposure if a project still fails. A pilot zone that does not deliver has to be allowed to end on schedule, not quietly extended because ending it is politically hard. What would it take for you to trust a city government enough to let it experiment with your neighborhood first?

HOW THIS CONNECTS TO PRIORITY 01: Same numbers, same brief: 1,420 units approved in 2025, just 187 completed, and a \$48,000 income gap driving the 64 percent affordability figure. This isn't a fresh statistic for this survey — it's the data the whole Housing platform runs on.

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition's analysis that Portland's Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

Your data is convincing, and I take it seriously. Since 2020, the 25 percent IZ requirement has produced only 12 unsubsidized units, and almost nothing has been paid into the Jill Dusen Housing Trust Fund through the fee in lieu. That tells me the requirement itself is stalling projects, not that developers are cheaply buying their way out. I still believe in inclusionary zoning as a tool, a city should not build market-rate housing without building affordable housing alongside it, but a policy producing 12 units in five years is not holding a line, it is not working.

I support moving toward a flexible, project-based IZ that offers developers a real choice: more units at a higher AMI, easier to finance, or fewer units at a deeper, lower AMI.

I want to be transparent that this specific mechanism came out of one conversation with a housing finance expert, and I am actively seeking a second, independent source to confirm it before I present it as settled policy rather than a strong direction.

HOW THIS CONNECTS TO PRIORITY 01: My Housing brief names this exact fix — "recalibrated inclusionary zoning where developers choose their own path" — as one of the first policy steps under Priority 01. This answer is that policy tested against real Portland numbers before I call it settled.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

Social housing, to me, means one thing plainly: more than 400 people who sought help at Portland's Homelessness Services Center this year came from other Maine towns, and too many of them are cycling through a system with no single door and no place that is truly theirs to keep.

Picture a building where a formerly homeless veteran and a young service worker are neighbors, not because either one needed charity, but because the city decided permanently affordable housing was infrastructure, the same as a road or a school. Community Housing of Maine has already proven a version of this works, FUSE Greater Portland has housed more than 538 people since 2015 with a 90 percent retention rate, over 20 organizations coordinating around the same people instead of past each other.

Portland already has real momentum here through the Social Housing Task Force, established by unanimous council vote in 2025. I want to build on that foundation, not replace it, with dedicated public financing that does not depend on winning a fight over inclusionary zoning every single year.

Here is the honest part. Social housing built well takes years, and a task force that does not outlive a single council term risks becoming a good idea that quietly dies at the next election. What would it take for this city to fund something patient enough to actually work?

HOW THIS CONNECTS TO PRIORITY 01: Essential-worker housing on public and institutional land, and One Door coordination with homelessness response — both are named policies in my Housing brief. Social housing isn't a separate idea from what I've already published; it's the same infrastructure argument, applied to who gets left out of it.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called “Portland in Motion”. What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

Portland in Motion is a genuine opportunity, the city has called it the most comprehensive transportation study in over 30 years, and it is meant to guide the next 20 years of how people and goods move through this city.

Four pedestrians were killed on Portland streets in a four month span in 2025, Cynthia Karst crossing Franklin Street at Congress, Joe Lewis at India and Middle, Justin Mitchell near the Homelessness Services Center on Riverside. I want to picture a Portland where a plan like this is the reason that number stays at zero the following year, not a study that sits on a shelf while the same intersections keep failing people.

I want this plan to prioritize multimodal access and safety first, building directly on the city's own Vision Zero commitment, before it prioritizes driving speed or parking convenience. Yes, I am willing to prioritize walking, biking, and transit over car speed and parking supply where the data supports it.

The honest part: safety investment costs real money and sometimes real inconvenience for drivers, and a councilor who promises both faster commutes and zero deaths is not being straight with you. I would rather tell you plainly which one I am prioritizing. Which would you rather I protect first, someone's ten minutes, or someone's life?

HOW THIS CONNECTS TO PRIORITY 03: My Safety brief names this by number: four pedestrians killed in a four-month span in 2025, and nearly 80 pedestrian- and bicycle-related crashes citywide — Portland's deadliest year on record. A connected, low-stress network isn't a separate ask from Portland in Motion; it's the same Vision Zero commitment, applied to the plan that's supposed to deliver it.

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)'s plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement [here](#) for context)

I want to be honest that this is not a position I have fully settled. I understand the case for Site 3, getting the Downeaster onto the main line now, at lower cost, with real benefit to Maine Medical Center and Mercy Hospital commuters, and I take seriously that your own coalition changed its position on this after weighing the same tradeoffs.

I picture a station that actually serves the people who would use it most, hospital shift workers, students, someone visiting family without a car, not just the site that pencils out easiest on a spreadsheet. I do not yet know for certain which site delivers that.

What I am not willing to do is treat a decision this size as settled without hearing directly from the neighborhoods and riders it actually affects. If elected, I would want a real public process before I stake out a final position, not because I am dodging the question, but because a councilor who has not walked through the tradeoffs with the community has no business pretending certainty on a decision this size. If you had to choose between a station that opens sooner and one that serves the neighborhood better, which would you choose, and why?

HOW THIS CONNECTS TO PRIORITY 04: Building Our City is explicit that transit only works for Portland if it runs on time for the people who actually depend on it — hospital shift workers, students, someone visiting family without a car. Siting a station for who uses it, not just what's cheapest to build, is that same economic-infrastructure logic applied to one specific decision.

6. Do you support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

Yes, I support Reimagining Franklin Street. This corridor destroyed immigrant and working-class neighborhoods in Bayside during urban renewal in the late 1960s, physically dividing the city in a way we are still living with. I want to be direct about something larger too: across this country, highways and thoroughfares like this one were often used as a tool against communities of color, cutting through Black neighborhoods specifically in city after city. I don't have evidence that Portland's history followed that exact pattern, the documented displacement here was largely Italian and other immigrant families, but I know the underlying instinct is the same one: whose neighborhood gets treated as expendable when a city decides it needs faster car access.

Door after door this summer, one thing has come up again and again, on its own, unprompted: people miss the trolley. Not the traffic it would relieve, the feeling of it, a city that moved together instead of everyone sealed alone in a car. I let myself imagine it sometimes. A corridor that actually connects people to where the city is growing, downtown to the Roux Institute, the current campus on Fore Street and the new one rising in East Deering. I can't promise that. It's not in my power to build it alone, and I won't pretend otherwise. But it's the lens I bring to every smaller decision on this corridor, does this choice make that kind of city more possible someday, or does it close the door on it a little further.

Narrowing Franklin Street, making it safer to cross, and freeing up land for housing is not just smart planning to me, it is repair. My priorities for the project: make sure the housing that gets built back is genuinely affordable to the people this corridor originally displaced, and keep pedestrian and cyclist safety as the design's actual priority, not an amenity added after the fact. What would it take for you to believe a street built to move cars faster could become a street that brings a neighborhood back together?

HOW THIS CONNECTS TO PRIORITY 01: Franklin Street sits right at the seam between two priorities — Building Our City calls transit and land use "the engine," and Housing That Works is explicit that affordable housing belongs on reclaimed and public land. Making sure the housing built back is genuinely affordable to the people this corridor displaced is that Housing principle, applied to one specific street.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

The Midtown lots are exactly the kind of decision I want to get right. The city already has \$15 million invested in this land after a 15 year legal battle to get it back, and a broker has been hired to market it.

I picture those Somerset Street lots five years from now as something the neighborhood actually asked for, mixed income housing, maybe a real public gathering space, not another decade of empty parcels behind a chain link fence while lawyers argue over what they are worth. That is the opposite of what happened the first time this land was handed to a single private developer in 2011, a deal that ended in seven years of litigation and nothing built.

My priority is that these parcels do not simply get sold to the highest bidder the way that original deal was structured. I want genuine public input before any sale, real consideration of mixed uses beyond another large private development, and if housing is part of the plan, real assurance that the city's \$15 million stake buys something back for residents.

Here is the honest part. Public process takes longer than a quick sale, and this land has already sat vacant for years while the city waited on a courtroom. Some further delay may be the price of getting this right instead of getting it done fast again. Is a slower, better outcome worth the wait, after everything this land has already cost us?

HOW THIS CONNECTS TO PRIORITY 01: My Housing brief names "essential-worker housing on public and institutional land" as a direct policy step. The Midtown lots are \$15 million of exactly that kind of land, sitting vacant. Genuine public input before another sale is how this parcel actually becomes the housing the brief already calls for, instead of another decade of litigation.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

Only this: I am a mental health clinician by training, and the instinct that shapes how I approach every one of these questions is the same one that shaped my career, listen first, understand the actual barrier in front of someone, and build the relationship that lets you bridge it together. Transit, housing, public land, they are not separate issues to me. They are one city, and I want to represent all of it, not just the parts that are easiest to have an opinion about.

HOW THIS CONNECTS TO THE WHOLE PLATFORM: My policy brief says this directly: "These are not six separate boxes. Housing is a safety issue. Safety is an economic issue. The arts are a housing issue." Transit, housing, and public land aren't separate chapters of my platform — they're the same city, described six different ways. That's what WITH means.

IN ATIIM'S OWN WORDS: "What would it take for you to trust a city government enough to let it experiment with your neighborhood first?"

— Atiim Boykin, Question 1, on the IZ-free pilot zone

ABOUT THE CANDIDATE: Atiim Boykin is a mental health clinician, community organizer, musician, painter, and spoken word poet with more than 20 years of experience across nonprofits, government agencies, and community-based initiatives. He served as Director of Clinical Case Management for the Young Adult Court (YAC) in San Francisco — part of the founding team of a first-of-its-kind collaborative court for criminal-justice-involved young adults. He has worked in forensic intensive case management for Maine DHHS across Cumberland County, and now serves as Clinical Liaison for Maine State Forensic Services. Boards: Cultural Alliance of Maine, Portland Ovarations, Avesta Housing. Circle of Advisors: Indigo Arts Alliance. Graduate, Leadership Portland 2022. MA, Counseling Psychology (USF) · MHRT-C (ME) · MFT (CA).

"Barrier removal is central to my career. Anything I do professionally or creatively promotes community health, renewal, and resilience."

— Atiim Boykin

Joey Brunelle

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

Yes - a lot. Surrounding communities are building many times as many homes as Portland, and this is a serious problem: we are building suburban sprawl that will have expensive negative effects on transportation, environment, and governance cohesion in the decades to come. Portland needs to build more affordable and workforce homes along transit corridors and in Portland's denser areas, as well as where land is available within city limits. This includes along Franklin and on the Midtown lots, but also where tracts of developable land are available off-Peninsula, and in-fill is possible on Peninsula. I'll give you three big to-do's for now: 1) We should set ambitious annual goals for home production, and if those goals are not met, it should trigger conversations with experts to figure out how to meet those goals. 2) Zoning needs to be improved to allow for more homes to be built (I particularly like the recommendations in the UCP platform). 3) The Permitting & Inspections office must be reformed to be made more efficient,

transparent and responsive, including perhaps a “Shot Clock” rule that automatically grants permits if the Office takes egregiously too long to respond. 4) The City should partner with real estate minds to survey where empty land is available for development, and consider buying those plots itself to ground-lease back to developers in order to both facilitate the building of more homes and keep the land in public ownership to create new long-term revenue streams for the city. 5) The City should set up the Social Housing program as proposed by the task force, funded by a bond, to give us a new tool to build homes for Portlanders.

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition’s analysis that Portland’s Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

I do. Originally I was optimistic that IZ would lead to more affordable home construction by “skimming off the top” of construction that was already happening. As a socialist I want our community to build public/social housing, but it will take many years to ramp that up after decades of atrophy. Until that time, we are dependent on private developers to continue home construction. And unfortunately, after reviewing the data, speaking with people who understand housing financing, and clocking how IZ has underperformed on its intended goals in other cities, I can no longer support IZ at its current levels. This is not a “pro-developer” stance - it is a result of looking at the math and the results of the policy. The homes just aren't being built in Portland, in part because IZ has made it impossibly expensive to do so. The homes we have built have largely been the result of public subsidies and unrelated to, or exempt from, IZ. If you factor out these homes, we've built a pitiful number of homes since IZ was passed, while surrounding communities are lapping us. Obviously this can't *all* be attributed to IZ, but IZ is one piece of the financing equation, and unlike construction costs (for example) it's one we actually have control over.

I do believe IZ can still play a useful role in requiring some number of new affordable homes to be built and/or capitalizing our Housing Trust Fund, but it can't even do that effectively if it's set at a number that depresses home construction overall. So I would like to adjust IZ to a level that doesn't inhibit home construction but still “skims a little off the top,” if such a thing is possible given the realities of development costs right now. This is something that shouldn't just be set-it-and-forget-it - if we want to keep IZ, it must be monitored and adjusted as conditions change.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

Yes, Portland (and the country) should prioritize Social Housing. Social Housing just means mixed-income housing where the public sector retains some amount of ownership or equity and leverages that to continue building homes. In an ideal situation it creates a self-sustaining cycle,

and generates community homes and provides effective competition to the private housing market, and fills in gaps where the private housing market is not fulfilling needs. Most developed nations do some version of this - I'll never forget visiting Madrid, Spain and seeing high-rise apartment buildings stretching out to the horizon, and my Spanish friend telling me that the government builds a few new ones every single year, so that everyone has access to affordable housing. It's not rocket science - it's routine and non-controversial in other countries. It can be the same here.

I helped write the resolution that created the Social Housing Task Force and have been a supporter of their work. I intend to ensure that the program and pilot project outlined by the Task Force in their report comes to fruition, including the proposed bond. It must not stop there though - the whole point of this exercise was to create something that is self-sustaining and grows and builds. That will take ongoing political advocacy and administrative attention. We will likely need to hire a staff person at City Hall who understands housing finance, and I would like to appoint a permanent body outside the purview of the City Manager who can monitor progress and continue to make recommendations.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called "Portland in Motion". What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

I am fearful that we're going to be planning based on what people are doing right now, what they prefer right now - not based on where things should go. We are going to have record numbers of cars on our roads in the next decade because of land use decisions we made in the last decade, and we need to start working NOW to ease those pressures otherwise we'll find ourselves reacting to a traffic apocalypse. The plan should see this coming, and should prioritize expanding transit by giving it additional funding, accelerating the construction of BRT pilots, building a network of protected bike lanes across the county, exploring the possibility of small scale ferry service to Casco Bay communities, and developing a better working relationship with MDOT so we can pursue these sorts of projects faster and more easily. Would I be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars? Not only would I, but we MUST.

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)'s plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement [here](#) for context)

I was originally a proponent of Site 2, but after speaking with rail experts and representatives from Brunswick (who feel Site 3 is essential to increasing service to help their community), I've

come around to Site 3. I also see now that with the proposed redevelopment of Cassidy Point, the Site 3 station wouldn't be in the middle of nowhere in 20-30 years - it might be the centerpiece of an entire new neighborhood, if the Tyson Foods factory and other industrial sites in that area (including the Mercy Hospital surface parking lots) are redeveloped into a big, new mixed use neighborhood.

6. Do you support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

Yes. Franklin, designed to be a "car sewer," has created an unsafe, impassable barrier for our community. Traffic needs to be slowed through street routing and engineering. The median - currently effectively inaccessible to humans - must be removed, and we should build new park/pollinator space in more suitable locations along the corridor, such as expanding Lincoln Park. Cycling and pedestrian safety must be prioritized, including the addition of separated bike lanes. Land must be reclaimed on either side to build new mixed-used development and homes, and that housing should be tall and dense. The street must be designed and built to accommodate not just current transit needs, but future possibilities like a tram or BRT. Streets must be reconnected across Franklin to rebuild neighborhood interconnections that were severed by urban renewal. Cars must not be the priority - humans must be.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

Back in the City Manager Jon Jennings era, I watched in horror as the City just sold off public land all over downtown for a song. We sold our public assets for practically nothing when we could have leveraged those assets to build community wealth. We cannot allow that to happen again. We must start using different mechanisms to keep equity in our public land while still developing it, like ground leases and/or social housing models. Ground leases would generate long-term revenue streams for the City on top of the increased property tax revenue that would take tax pressure off homeowners as well as build homes. It's a win all around. I think UCP's platform around Midtown is an excellent proposal: keep ownership, do ground leases, build social housing. We have an enormous opportunity with these lots: they're acres of undeveloped land in our downtown - when does that ever happen? We must make sure it's done right. We should set a high goal for homes (at least the original goal of 800) and avoid wasting an entire plot on just a parking garage.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

I want to speak briefly about how we achieve all these goals, because I do not believe that the way the City of Portland currently operates is going to get there. These improvements and challenges are far too broad and the City administrative apparatus is too limited in terms of what it can handle on its own, either in-house or via expensive consultants. The only way I see that we can make this happen is by cracking open City Hall and empowering people and organizations like UCP to become part of the process, to treat them as partners not adversaries. This is not as radical as it sounds: we are stuck in this 1980s “corporate” model of municipal governance right now, where residents are “customers” and advocates are treated as annoyances, but it didn’t used to be this way. Cities used to be platforms for community ideas and community action. We used to work together to do metaphorical barn raisings (e.g. building playgrounds, schools, and infrastructure) tapping into community know-how, passion and elbow grease. We must get back to something like that model, fit for the 21st century, especially if the Federal Government is shirking its responsibilities. We can no longer expect to just have the City write a check and solve everything for us - those days are over, we just don’t realize it yet. We need to start treating local democracy as a platform for community action, and that will require changing how City Hall thinks. I am looking forward to beginning that process, and I look forward to working with UCP to do it. UCP has already been at the forefront of this kind of thinking, with Tactical Urbanism projects and detailed, dedicated advocacy. Action is starting to bubble up from other groups too: PBPAC, neighborhood associations, PCAT, the Bicycle Coalition of Maine, etc. The City can and should do more to empower, facilitate, organize and enable community action, instead of treating advocates and activists as annoyances and adversaries.

Kate Snyder

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

Yes. I don’t think there’s any unit quantity limit at this moment, as housing is critically needed. I believe the focus needs to be on increasing housing supply with a focus on affordability: to various levels of AMI, LIHTC eligible, “missing middle”, and senior. I also think we should be focused on how housing proposals can help us to achieve neighborhood nodes so that we can really focus on livability within neighborhoods. With our land use code recently revised, I believe we have more pathways for growth and density. I agree (with the UC) that there are opportunities to allow small, local business within residential zones in order to enhance walkability and livability (complete neighborhoods).

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition's analysis that Portland's Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

Yes. I understand the intention of Inclusionary Zoning, and at 10% I think it had positive impacts, including funding to the Jill Dusen Housing Fund.

But, when policy stands in the way of desired outcomes, in this case IZ at 25% slowing progress, I think we have to make changes. Policy is designed to be implemented, evaluated and amended in order to achieve the results we seek.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

I understand social housing to be a decision at some level of government: local, state or federal, to fund, build, and maintain rental housing that is tied to affordability standards and requirements.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called "Portland in Motion". What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

I am in favor of prioritizing and funding safe public infrastructure for people on bicycles, people walking, people pushing strollers, and people running, through our annual municipal budget . I am in favor of decreased speed limits to improve safety overall. I am in favor of increased enforcement of our no-idling ordinance. I am in favor of a public safety campaign to encourage everyone to put down the phone while using the roads, in cars and on bikes. I am in favor of continued work with METRO to make taking the bus easier and more efficient (ie: routes, times and need for transfer).

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)'s plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement here for context)

In the absence of another feasible and funded plan, I am in favor of NNEPRA's current plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station. I think the service to and from Portland will be improved significantly with a new station that no longer requires backtracking.

6. Do you support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

I do support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street. I think we always need to be open to change that responds to how we live now; and by narrowing Franklin Street Portland will recoup land for much needed housing, and for the development of neighborhood nodes supportive of a more residential and pedestrian lifestyle.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

In addition to the uses contemplated by the current councilors, I would prioritize recreational spaces for people of all ages. I think we always need to plan for green spaces within a neighborhood, including playgrounds and safe walking and biking routes. If we add housing to this area, and I hope we do, I hope that we will plan carefully so that kids (and everyone else) will have a place to go to run around and play. I also want to be sure that anyone can get from their home or work place in the midtown area to Deering Oaks, the Back Cove trail safely so that those urban recreation spaces can be maximized.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

No. But I do want to say thank you for your work, and thank you (Nathaniel and Todd) for the time you took to talk with me on Sunday, August 23rd.

Maria Maffucci (Withdrawn)

1. Does Portland need more housing? If so, how much? What kind? Where should it go? What steps should we take as a city to get it built?

Yes, Portland needs more housing, particularly at different price points and in different sizes, from apartments for individuals/couples to larger homes for families, subsidized and workforce options, and more attainable homeownership opportunities for first-time buyers, including smaller homes, condos, and townhomes. I would prioritize housing in areas where the infrastructure to support it already exists, including downtown, along major transportation corridors, near public transit, and on vacant or underutilized properties. We should also allow thoughtful infill in existing neighborhoods while being mindful of historic properties and the character that makes Portland unique.

As a city, we need to make it easier and more predictable to build housing by identifying unnecessary delays, costs, and regulatory barriers in our permitting and approval processes. We should regularly evaluate whether our zoning policies are actually producing the housing we need and use tools like incentives, public-private partnerships, and publicly owned land where appropriate to encourage affordable and mixed-income housing. Building more housing is important, but so is preserving the affordable housing we already have. Ultimately, I want Portland to be a city where people who work here can afford to live here, young adults can stay and build their lives, and low income, families, and older residents have housing options that meet their needs.

2. Do you agree with the Urbanist Coalition's analysis that Portland's Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) policy is preventing homes from being built and making housing less affordable? What changes, if any, would you support to IZ?

I agree with the Urbanist Coalition's point that Portland should more critically analyze whether our current Inclusionary Zoning policy is making it harder to build new housing that is affordable and attainable. I support the goal of creating more affordable, subsidized, and workforce housing, but we also need to evaluate whether the policy is achieving that goal while allowing enough overall housing to be built. Portland needs more housing that is affordable and attainable for people at a range of income levels, and I don't think we should have policies that unintentionally make it more difficult or expensive to add new homes.

I would support a thorough review of the current 25% affordable unit requirement and the data on projects that have been built, delayed, scaled back, or not moved forward under the current policy. I would be open to adjusting the percentage, income requirements, or other aspects of IZ if the evidence shows that changes would allow more housing to be built while still creating

meaningful affordable and workforce housing. I support the purpose of IZ, but I also believe we need to regularly evaluate whether our policies are producing the results we want. If they aren't, we should be willing to change them.

3. What, specifically, does social housing mean to you? Do you think Portland should prioritize social housing? If so, what would you like to see?

To me, social housing means housing that is publicly, nonprofit, or community owned and kept affordable over the long term, rather than being driven entirely by the private market. I think it is a tool Portland should seriously consider, especially because it can help preserve affordability for future residents. I would like to see the City explore opportunities to use publicly owned or underutilized land, partner with nonprofit housing organizations, and use available state and federal funding to create housing for people at different income levels.

I would prioritize social housing that provides a mix of unit sizes and income levels and is located near public transportation, businesses, schools, and other services. I also think we should look at preserving and converting existing properties when possible, rather than assuming every solution requires new construction. I would want to be thoughtful about how any social housing program is funded. I would first look to existing housing resources, state and federal funding, nonprofit partnerships, and publicly owned land before asking Portland taxpayers for additional money. Any new city investment should have a clear cost, funding source, and measurable outcome. Ultimately, I see social housing as one tool in a larger strategy that includes building more housing overall, preserving existing affordable housing, supporting private and nonprofit development, and reducing unnecessary barriers to construction.

4. Portland is currently crafting a transportation plan called "Portland in Motion". What do you think should be prioritized in the plan and how? Would you be willing to prioritize modes of transportation other than cars even if it means prioritizing driving speeds and parking less?

As one of my top campaign priorities is improving pedestrian safety, I think that should be a major focus of Portland in Motion. As someone who doesn't own a car and relies on walking and public transportation to navigate Portland, I know how important it is to feel safe getting around the city. I would prioritize improvements like safer crosswalks and sidewalks, better lighting, traffic-calming measures, accessible infrastructure, and addressing intersections and streets where crashes are happening. I also want to see better connections to public transportation and more options for people who want to walk, bike, or take the bus. These decisions should be based on data, community input, and the actual needs of the people using our streets.

Yes, I would be willing to prioritize alternative modes of transportation if doing so would meaningfully improve safety and accessibility. At the same time, I believe cars are a necessary

and relied-upon mode of transportation, and we should consider the impact on residents, small businesses, people with disabilities, and others who depend on them before making permanent changes. We need to find a balance. If slowing traffic or changing how we use street space, for instance, can make a dangerous area for pedestrians significantly safer, I would support those changes. I want Portland to be a city where people can safely walk, bike, take public transportation, or drive, and where our transportation decisions are practical, data-driven, and responsive to the needs of the community.

5. Do you support the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA)'s plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station to enable future service improvements? If not, would you take a leadership role in developing an alternative proposal? (see our latest statement [here](#) for context)

Yes, I support NNEPRA's plan to relocate Portland's Amtrak station to the main line at Site 3 on St. John Street. Improving rail service can make transportation more accessible and reduce reliance on cars. I think we should move forward with a feasible project rather than delay improvements while waiting for an alternative that may not have the funding or support to move forward. Relocating the station here would also eliminate the roughly 15-minute backing maneuver trains currently make, significantly reducing travel time and allowing for better future service.

At the same time, I would want to make sure the new station is well connected to the rest of Portland, particularly through safe pedestrian infrastructure, accessible sidewalks and crossings, bike connections, and public transportation. I would also support exploring opportunities for housing and mixed-use development around the station. As someone who prioritizes pedestrian safety and making Portland easier to navigate by foot and bike, I see improved rail service as one piece of a larger transportation strategy that gives residents more choices while still recognizing that many people will continue to rely on their cars.

6. Do you support Portland's Reimagining Franklin street project to narrow Franklin Street making it safer, easier to cross, more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, and freeing up opportunities for housing development? If so, what priorities would you have for the project?

Yes, I support the goals of the Reimagining Franklin Street project. As I've noted, improving pedestrian safety is one of my priorities, and Franklin Street is an area where we have an opportunity to make a meaningful improvement. I would prioritize safer and more accessible crosswalks, better sidewalks, traffic-calming measures, bike infrastructure, and improved connections to surrounding neighborhoods and public transportation. As someone who gets around Portland by foot or public transportation, I think our streets should be designed with the

safety of the people using them in mind, not just the speed of vehicles moving through them. The public engagement conducted so far (2025 survey, open house, workshop) shows strong support for the goals of Reimagining Franklin Street, particularly improving pedestrian safety, creating better connections, and opening opportunities for more housing and mixed-use development.

I also support using the space created by narrowing Franklin Street to help address Portland's housing needs, including opportunities for mixed-use development and housing at different price points. I would want to see the City work with nearby residents, businesses, and property owners throughout the process so we understand how the changes will affect the surrounding area. We should also consider parking, deliveries, emergency access, and people with disabilities so that the redesign works for the entire community. Ultimately, I see Reimagining Franklin Street as an opportunity to improve safety, create a more connected and welcoming corridor, and make better use of valuable land while adding housing in an area that is already well connected to transportation and other services.

7. If you were currently a councilor, how would you approach the former Midtown lots? Are there any priorities you would like to see on this city owned land?

If I were a current city councilor, I would want to see the former Midtown lots put to productive use rather than remain vacant, while taking the time to determine what will provide the greatest long-term benefit to Portland. Given our housing needs, I would make housing a major priority, particularly affordable and workforce housing, while also looking at mixed-use development, open space, and community amenities. The City owns these properties, so we have an opportunity to use an existing public asset to address some of Portland's housing and economic development needs.

I would want any development to connect well with the surrounding neighborhood, including safe pedestrian and bicycle connections, access to public transportation, and connections to the Bayside Trail. I would also support a transparent process that considers community input and clearly evaluates the long-term financial benefits and costs to taxpayers. I don't think we should decide exactly what belongs on the site before doing that work, but I do believe we should be proactive about finding a productive use for this valuable city-owned land.

8. The Urbanist Coalition of Portland advocates for transit, cycling, complete neighborhoods, and enough housing for everyone. Is there anything you would like to add that speaks to these goals that was not covered in the other questions?

One additional priority I would add is creating and preserving more "third spaces" where people can spend time outside of their homes and workplaces. Parks, libraries, community spaces,

local businesses, and other gathering places are an important part of what makes a neighborhood feel connected and welcoming. As Portland continues to grow, I think we need to think beyond just how many housing units we build and also consider the kind of community we are creating around that housing.

I would also like to see the City take a more proactive approach to vacant storefronts and underused spaces, particularly downtown. Supporting small businesses and creating more places for people to gather can help make our neighborhoods more active and vibrant. To me, thoughtful growth isn't just about building more, it's about creating a Portland where people have places to live, work, shop, gather, and feel connected to their community.