



NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, MICHIGAN

Michigan Questionnaire for Michigan House and Senate Candidates 2026

Dear Candidate:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire to educate the voters in your district.

1. Briefly provide biographical information, and relevant experiences, qualifications, and skills you bring to the position.

I am a lifelong Oakland County resident, a working mother of four daughters, and a paralegal with nearly 20 years of experience in construction litigation. My career has taught me how to navigate complex problems, bring people with competing interests to the table, and work toward practical solutions.

For years, I have also been deeply involved in housing and community development in Oakland County. I co-founded and chaired YIMBY Oakland County, served six years on the Oakland County Housing Trust Fund Board, including two terms on its executive committee, and served four years on the Neighborhood & Housing Development Citizens Advisory Committee. Through that work, I helped support the creation of more than 1,100 mixed-income homes and the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars in housing and community development.

I have served as an Orion Township precinct delegate since 2018 and have been active in local and county civic organizations. I bring to this position both the perspective of a working parent raising a family in our community and the professional experience of someone who has spent her career solving problems, understanding complex policy issues, and turning ideas into measurable results.

2. What are the top three priority issues that the legislature should address?

My top three priorities are lowering costs for working families, strengthening public education, and expanding access to attainable housing.

First, we need to address the everyday costs squeezing Michigan families—from childcare and healthcare to utilities and groceries. I support expanding affordable childcare options, lowering prescription drug costs, protecting consumers from excessive utility increases, and creating good-paying jobs that allow families to build real economic security.

Second, we must fully and predictably fund our public schools, recruit and retain qualified teachers and support staff, expand career and technical education and apprenticeship opportunities, and ensure every child has access to a safe, high-quality education regardless of their ZIP code.

Third, Michigan needs more housing that working people can actually afford. I would continue investing in attainable and workforce housing, give communities more tools to create housing that fits their needs, help first-time homebuyers, and protect Michigan families from being priced out of their communities.

3. Please answer the following questions on specific areas of concern to our members and supporters:

EDUCATION

Background: *Michigan lawmakers periodically consider proposals that would allow public funds to be used to support students attending private or religious schools.*

Question: What types of legislative proposals would you be most likely to support or oppose, and why?

I strongly believe that public dollars should fund public schools. I would oppose voucher programs, tax-credit schemes, or other proposals that divert public education funding to private or religious schools.

I say that as someone who attended Catholic elementary school myself and who respects the important role that private and faith-based schools play for many families. Parents should absolutely have the right to choose the educational environment that is best for their children. But public funding should be directed toward schools that are open to all students and subject to public accountability, transparency, and oversight.

Michigan's public schools already face significant needs, including teacher shortages, special education funding, mental health services, literacy support, transportation, and aging facilities. Our priority should be making sure every neighborhood public school has the resources it needs to provide every child with an excellent education.

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

Background: *In 2022, Michigan voters approved Reproductive Freedom For All (Proposal 3), which amended the Michigan Constitution to establish a constitutional right to reproductive freedom, including a right to choose abortion.*

Questions:

1. How should Michigan legislators approach future legislation that would affect reproductive healthcare in light of Proposal 3?

Michigan voters spoke clearly when they approved Proposal 3 and enshrined reproductive freedom in our state Constitution. I believe legislators have an obligation to respect that decision and ensure that state law protects—not undermines—the ability of individuals to make deeply personal healthcare decisions for themselves.

I would oppose legislation designed to create unnecessary barriers to abortion, contraception, miscarriage care, fertility treatment, or other constitutionally protected reproductive healthcare. Instead, I would support policies that make those rights meaningful in practice by protecting access to care, safeguarding patient privacy, supporting providers, and addressing barriers that disproportionately affect people based on income or where they live.

Reproductive healthcare decisions should be made by patients in consultation with their medical providers—not by politicians. The legislature’s role should be to protect the constitutional rights Michigan voters established and ensure that every Michigander can actually exercise them.

2. Should access to mifepristone (medication abortion, which is available through telemedicine and mail) be protected? If so, how can it be protected within Michigan’s existing legal and regulatory framework? If not, please explain.

Yes. Access to mifepristone should be protected as part of Michigan’s constitutional right to reproductive freedom. Medication abortion is an important part of reproductive healthcare, and patients should be able to access it through telemedicine and approved mail-order channels when medically appropriate.

Within Michigan’s existing legal framework, legislators should ensure that state law does not impose medically unnecessary restrictions on prescribing or dispensing mifepristone, protect the ability of licensed providers to offer reproductive healthcare through telehealth, safeguard patient privacy, and support the Attorney General in defending Michigan residents and providers against efforts that unlawfully interfere with constitutionally protected care.

This is also an access issue. Telemedicine can be especially important for patients in rural communities, people with limited transportation, and those who cannot easily take time away from work or caregiving responsibilities. Michigan should protect evidence-based reproductive healthcare and allow patients and their medical providers—not politicians—to determine the appropriate course of care.

HATE CRIME PREVENTION

Background: *In 2025, Michigan enacted the Michigan Hate Crimes Act, which expanded the state’s hate crime law and established criminal penalties for offenses motivated by bias against protected characteristics. According to FBI data released in 2025, reported anti-Jewish hate crime incidents increased by 5.8% from 2023. In March 2026, Temple Israel in West Bloomfield was the target of an attack that authorities investigated as a hate crime.*

Questions:

1. What role should the Michigan Legislature play in implementing, evaluating, and, if necessary, modifying Michigan’s hate crime laws to protect the safety of all communities from bias-motivated violence?

The Michigan Legislature has an important responsibility not only to pass strong hate-crime laws, but to make sure those laws are working as intended. That means providing law enforcement, prosecutors, and the Attorney General's Hate Crimes and Domestic Terrorism Unit with the resources and training necessary to identify, investigate, and prosecute bias-motivated crimes, while also ensuring that victims know how and where to report them.

The Legislature should regularly review hate-crime data, prosecution outcomes, and reporting practices to identify gaps in enforcement or communities that may be underreporting. If the evidence shows that Michigan's laws need to be strengthened or clarified, I would support making those changes while continuing to protect constitutionally protected speech and expression.

The March attack on Temple Israel in West Bloomfield was a frightening reminder that antisemitism and other forms of hate can become acts of violence here in our own communities. Every Michigander should be able to worship, gather, and live openly without fear of being targeted because of who they are. Protecting that freedom and safety is a fundamental responsibility of state government.

2. Are there additional legislative or budget actions you would support or oppose to prevent hate crimes, improve law enforcement training and response, assist victims, or enhance security for communities that are at increased risk of bias-motivated violence?

Yes. I would support additional legislative and budget investments that help prevent hate crimes before they occur and ensure that communities receive an effective response when they do.

That includes sustained funding for security improvements at synagogues, mosques, churches, community centers, and other institutions that face an elevated risk of targeted violence; specialized training for law enforcement and prosecutors on identifying and responding to bias-motivated crimes; stronger and more consistent hate-crime data collection and reporting; and robust victim services, including culturally responsive support for individuals and communities targeted by hate.

I would also support partnerships between law enforcement and affected communities so that people know how to report threats and have confidence that those reports will be taken seriously. At the same time, prevention efforts must respect constitutional protections for speech and association and remain focused on threats, harassment, violence, and other unlawful conduct.

No community should have to accept fear as the price of worshipping, gathering, or living openly. The state should use both its legislative authority and its budget to make sure communities at increased risk have the resources they need to be safe.

VOTING RIGHTS

Background: *In 2022, Michigan voters approved Promote The Vote 2022 (Proposal 2), which amended the Michigan Constitution to expand several voting policies, including early in-person voting, a permanent absentee voter list, and prepaid postage for absentee ballot applications and ballots. In Congress, proposals such as the federal SAVE Act have sought to establish additional federal requirements for voter registration and election administration,*

including documentary proof of U.S. citizenship to register to vote in federal elections. In Michigan, the Americans for Citizen Voting ballot proposal (which echoes the federal SAVE Act on a state level) seeks to place a constitutional amendment on Michigan's November 2026 ballot.

Question: What policies do you support or oppose regarding elections, access to the ballot and voting rights?

I support policies that make our elections secure, accessible, and fair, while protecting every eligible voter's ability to cast a ballot and have it counted.

Michigan voters have repeatedly chosen to expand voting access, including through early in-person voting, absentee voting, and other protections adopted through Proposal 2. I support fully implementing and funding those constitutional rights, ensuring that local clerks have the resources they need to administer elections effectively, protecting voters from intimidation, and maintaining strong safeguards against discrimination and voter suppression.

I oppose proposals that create unnecessary documentary barriers for eligible voters, including requirements that could disenfranchise citizens who do not readily have access to a passport, birth certificate, or other qualifying documentation. Michigan law already requires voters to be U.S. citizens, and falsely claiming eligibility to register or vote is illegal. Election policy should be based on demonstrated problems and designed to strengthen both access and public confidence—not make it harder for eligible citizens to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

I also believe the Legislature has a responsibility to protect the independence of election administration, adequately fund secure election infrastructure, and ensure that every eligible Michigander—regardless of age, disability, income, or ZIP code—has a meaningful opportunity to participate in our democracy.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Background: *Some lawmakers have proposed prohibiting the sale and manufacture of assault-style firearms for civilian use, while others believe such restrictions violate constitutional rights and would have little impact on violent crime.*

Question: Do you support or oppose restricting civilian access to assault-style firearms? Please explain your position and the factors that would guide your vote.

I support reasonable restrictions on civilian access to assault-style firearms. I respect the constitutional rights of responsible gun owners, but I also believe those rights can coexist with commonsense measures designed to reduce the lethality of mass shootings and protect our communities.

In evaluating legislation, I would look closely at how covered firearms are defined, whether the law is clear and enforceable, whether it includes appropriate protections for lawful ownership, and whether it is supported by evidence showing that it can improve public safety. I would also consider provisions addressing high-capacity magazines and other features that allow a shooter to inflict catastrophic harm in a very short period of time.

Michigan has already taken important steps through universal background checks, safe-storage requirements, and extreme-risk protection orders. I believe restricting access to assault-style weapons should be part of that broader, evidence-based approach to preventing gun violence while respecting lawful gun ownership.