

2022 Greater Greater Washington Questionnaire At-Large General Election Questionnaire

Name: Karim D. Marshall, Esq.

Email: campaign@marshallfordc.com

Website: <https://www.marshallfordc.com>

Social media accounts: @marshallfordc

Greater Greater Washington Questions are in Black and Bolded

Karim D. Marshall's responses and additional comments are in Blue

HOUSING PRODUCTION

Do you support Mayor Muriel Bowser's goal, announced in 2019, to add 36,000 new units of housing in the District by 2025?

Yes! We need to build much more housing and with urgency. However, as a Councilmember, I would have used the Committee on Housing as a platform to work with the Executive to facilitate the development of a shared housing construction goal. That way, the builder community, renters, building managers, low-income housing advocates, and all other relevant stakeholders could have had a voice in the placement and the target to make it more reflective of capability and identify any tools necessary to enable the goal. I would also have provided affirmative oversight over the use of the Housing Production Trust Fund to ensure that funds are appropriately used, particularly

for low-income residents. Headlines that report \$82 million dollars have been misused represent a failure of both management and Council oversight.

If successful, the 36,000-unit goal will be met by 2025. However, the District's population is estimated to grow to 987,000 people by 2045, and the region is expected to have a shortfall of about 690,000 housing units by then. Will you support a second goal for housing production in the District by 2045? If the mayor or your colleagues don't propose a production goal, will you propose one yourself?

Yes, I'll support another housing production goal and would be willing to propose one myself.

With 36,000 presumably completed units as a baseline, how many additional units do you think should be built in the District by 2045?

Over 100,000

Housing production in D.C. has been uneven and particularly concentrated in certain planning areas, such as Lower Anacostia Waterfront/Near Southwest. Do you support the mayor's goal to set production targets in each area of the District to more evenly disperse the construction of new housing?

Yes, completely, and it's about time.

However, the council can still act to increase housing production, whether through legislation and budgeting, or by directing the executive to pursue amendments before the zoning commission. Please rank the following policies that would increase housing production in the order that you would request your staff to pursue them, if elected. If you would not request your staff pursue a specific policy, please select N/A. (This list is purposefully not inclusive of

affordability and stabilization policies, which are addressed in subsequent questions.)

1. Amending the building code to reduce construction costs
2. Increasing the percentage of affordable housing required in public-land dispositions
3. Eliminating parking requirements in new construction
4. Subsidizing individual homeowners to construct ADUs
5. Legalizing two-unit buildings District-wide
6. Legalizing four-unit buildings District-wide
7. Legalizing and incentivizing housing above public facilities, such as libraries, rec centers, and fire stations
8. Incentivizing the conversion of office buildings to residential properties
9. Eliminating the Height Act

Additional Comments: The District needs a comprehensive revision of our approach to housing policy. Despite the above ranking, I would pursue these policies in concert. To be successful in a transaction as complicated as constructing a multi-unit, mixed-use building requires that the regulatory and financial landscape be stable and predictable. The iterative approach that the Council has taken in housing policy has created an unpredictable development landscape which only serves to increase risk and thereby increase costs. I would reform the whole landscape in a single stroke.

I believe that increased density should be available in all neighborhoods but should be done in a way to avoid drastically altering the character of a neighborhood. We still have a significant number of brownfield, infill space, and vacant homes that can be activated

Eliminating parking requirements should be based on the relative density of the neighborhood, access to reliable and proximate public transportation, and whether the neighborhood is adequately served by recreation, grocery, and educational services.

The Height Act severely restricts the three-dimensional space within which we can construct housing in the District. However, this is not currently within the power of the DC Council to change. Section 602(a)(6) of the Home Rule Act prohibits the DC Council from enact[ing] any act, resolution, or rule which permits the building of any structure within the District of Columbia in excess of the height limitations contained in section 5 of the Act of June 1, 1910 [An Act To regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia (36 Stat. 453)] (D.C. Code, sec. 5-405)[D.C. Official Code ' 6-601.05], and in effect on the date of enactment of this Act [December 24, 1973]. While Amending or

Eliminating the Height Act would be the most impactful action we could take as a jurisdiction, it is also the strategy that is least within our current control. However, I would use every tool available to a Councilmember to lobby Congress to provide this authority to the Council and to pursue Statehood so we can control our own destiny.

Where in the District do you think new housing should be built? If you do not think new housing should be built in the District, please write, "I do not think new housing should be built in the District."

I think we should build new housing in all parts of the District. We must create communities where every resident has access to recreation, grocery, and educational services within a ten-minute walk. I believe that if we build in a coordinated manner and maximize use of brownfield and infill space we can do so in a way that preserves the general character of neighborhoods but also produces enough in housing to take pressure off of supply and accommodate our growing population.

Where in the District do you think density should be increased to accommodate the construction of new housing? If you do not think density should be increased in the District, please write, "I do not think density should be increased in the District."

I believe that density should be increased in the central business district first and around METRO stations as they already have the supporting infrastructure to accommodate high density use. As PEPCO expands the utility undergrounding program (PLUG), the corridors that are undergrounded should be the next priority for increased residential and commercial density. This must be combined with a strategic expansion of safe and consistent multimodal transportation infrastructure to reduce the reliance on automobiles in these corridors.

Aside from converting office buildings to residential or paying building owners to place affordability covenants on units, what is your preferred approach to address the District's housing shortage at all income levels? What parts of your preferred approach fall under the authority of the council?

There is simply not enough housing in the District. We have a housing shortage because of a failure to develop a plan to build enough housing at all income levels, a needlessly duplicative and bureaucratic administrative state, and a failure to put as many available properties into productive use exacerbated by a tax and probate system that robs Black families of generational assets. To reverse this trend, as a Councilmember, I would implement the following:

Require and adequately resource the Executive to truly consolidate application methods so there is a single point of contact for all building applications instead of requiring submission of information through separate “applications” through DCRA/Dept of Buildings, DOEE, DDOT, and various utilities.

Aggressively use the tax code to encourage banks to liquidate their holdings of foreclosed residential properties and discourage speculative paper transfers.

Proactively work with the local and national Bar Associations, law professors, the courts, the executive, and local stakeholders to reform Titles 18-20 of the DC Code to enable to preservation of generational wealth in the form of houses for Black and brown families and low-income families that may own property, but have challenges with liquidity or lack of access to legal counsel.

Provide property tax relief to anyone on a fixed income above the age of 65 who lives in a high poverty census data tract.

There are at least ten thousand vacant lots and abandoned houses in the District of Columbia. Building on this infill space and rehabilitating these parcels/units would provide a unique opportunity to house families while preserving the generational wealth of Black families.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

I consider affordable housing to be (check all that, in your opinion, apply):

Means-tested or income-restricted

Built by the government

Cheap

Subsidized

Rent-controlled

Costing no more than 30 percent of one's household income

I consider market-rate housing to be (check all that, in your opinion, apply):

Not means-tested or income-restricted

Built by private developers

Expensive

Unsubsidized

Not rent-controlled

Costing more than 30 percent of one's household income

Additional Comments: I do not believe that any household should be cost-burdened when it comes to housing.

The D.C. Housing Authority is an independent entity, and its debt is likely too great for it to realistically be moved under the purview of the District government. Given this, how would you, as a councilmember, answer calls to "fix" public housing?

Since the Faircloth limit was imposed, the federal government has steadily decreased the financial support provided to Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) across the country. However, there are financing tools which have successfully allowed PHAs to convert public housing sites into successful higher-density, mixed-income communities while preventing displacement. For example, the Faircloth to RAD Conversion program

provide an enhanced tool to access private funds while preserving or even expanding public housing units. As a Councilmember, I would encourage DCHA to expand the use of this tool using neighboring PHAs as a blueprint (Richmond, VA).

While absorbing DCHA would likely exhaust our Debt Cap, the situation is so critical and the deficits so severe that the Executive should be encouraged to formally share services and staff with DCHA to fill gaps in expertise and headcount. The Executive has existing authority to detail staff, and as a Councilmember I would support an initiative of the Executive to deploy a team of highly skilled and experienced staff to supplement the efforts of the DCHA. In addition to public employees, I would encourage robust public-private partnerships for DCHA. A temporary and targeted deployment would provide an infusion of effort and be used to close the backlog of maintenance requests, provide an actionable development plan to modernize and transform facilities, and help improve the management of the Authority.

This chart, the Department of Housing and Community Development's 2021 inclusionary zoning maximum income, rent, and purchase price schedule, shows the income level that corresponds with certain percentages of median family income in the District. The next few questions will refer to this chart.

How many units of housing do you think should be built in the District by 2030 for households making between:

0-30 percent MFI (\$0- \$27,100 per year for a household of one)? **20,000**

30-50 percent MFI (\$27,100-\$45,150 per year for a household of one)? **25,000**

50-80 percent MFI (\$45,150 to \$72,250 per year for a household of one)? **15,000**

80-120 percent MFI (\$72,250 to \$108,350 per year for a household of one)? **10,000**

Additional Comments: The Metropolitan Washington Planning Framework suggests that the region needs to add at least 320,000 units by 2030. I believe that to avoid displacement and encourage the retention of working families, the District should construct at least 70,000 new units in these income brackets by 2030. Our focus in new construction should be to supplement the efforts of the DCHA and expand housing access to persons making between 0-30 percent of MFI, while constructing new and

rehabilitated housing for persons making between 30 and 80 MFI, while providing strong incentives for the construction and purchase of workforce housing (80 -120MFI).

How will you ensure that the District produces housing for residents who make between 50 percent AMI (\$45,150 for a household of one) and 80 percent AMI (\$72,250 for a household of one)?

As a Councilmember, I will work with my colleagues to ensure District land is maximized for residential use while preserving access to the natural environment and incentive the construction of housing. This means using District land to test innovative strategies such as social housing and buildings which enable high-quality co-living. This also means making sure the government is not a barrier to construction by eliminating unnecessary regulatory hurdles for projects. I would work with my Council colleagues and the Executive **to streamline and consolidate application requirements and reduce the fees associated with projects that include units above the baseline affordability required under law.** This incentive based IZ+ approach would grant any projects which are consistent with our more ambitious housing goals an expedited review, lower fees, and preferred access to the locally funded financing mechanisms (HPTF, HFA loans, etc.) to make the projects more financially attractive.

How will you ensure the District produces housing for residents who make between 80 percent AMI (\$72,250 for a household of one) and 120 percent AMI (\$108,350)?

Workforce housing would require a similar set of incentives as 50-80% AMI, however, I would supplement those efforts with more robust homeownership programs that improved accessibility and preserve affordability for new homeowners. First, for any locally funded home purchase assistance program, I would revise the eligibility criteria for the program to provide an allowance for any debt that is not dischargeable under 11 USC §523 particularly student loan debt. I believe the homestead exemption and senior citizen exemptions should be programs which automatically enroll participants instead of requiring recipients to affirmatively apply.

While the District has a robust Housing Production Trust Fund, it is not infinite, and land costs in the District impact the number of affordable units that can be constructed, as well as the percentage of MFI to which they are subsidized. The below scenarios are not inclusive of all options that will ever be on the table. They are, however, representative of the tradeoffs inherent in balancing funding for and the location of publicly subsidized affordable housing, which is often cross-subsidized with market-rate housing. Please choose the scenario you would prefer, and explain why you prefer that scenario.

One 50-unit project in Bellevue for residents making between 30 (\$27,100 for a one-person household) and 80 percent (\$72,250) MFI, but no affordable housing in Forest Hills

One 25-unit project each in both Bellevue and Forest Hills, for residents making between 80 (\$72,250) and 120 percent (\$108,350) MFI

One 30-unit project in Forest Hills for residents making between 60 (\$54,200) and 80 (\$72,250) percent MFI, and one 20-unit market-rate project in Bellevue

One 10-unit project in Forest Hills for residents making under 30 (\$27,100) AMI, and one 40-unit market-rate project in Bellevue

Additional Comments: For the sake of this answer, I am assuming that land value is equal and that both projects will cost the same to build. I would need more information about massing, orientation, and configuration of the units. I supported an even split because we have to build accessible and affordable housing in all sections of the city. However, in Bellevue, workforce housing (80-120 MFI) highly correlates with market rate housing, therefore it is important to concentrate resources to the degree possible in the areas that need the most investment. These units would add to the current projects in Bellevue and potentially supplement a catalytic effect to help bring retail and grocery options to that underserved community.

The Office of Planning's Housing Framework for Equity and Growth, released in October 2019, sets targets for the production of affordable housing per planning area "to achieve an equitable distribution of no less than 15 percent affordable housing in each planning area by 2050." Progress on those targets since January 2019 is illustrated in the above chart, from the Deputy Mayor for Planning and

Economic Development. What will you do to ensure that every planning area meets its stated target by 2050?

This chart is a reflection of the lack of a reliable partner on the Council to ensure that the District's housing goals are met. As the next At-Large Councilmember, I will make sure that affordable housing projects are properly supported in the budget and that the Council is a present and thoughtful partner in addressing housing needs.

The Committee on Housing and Executive Administration has failed to advance any reform to the District's existing rent stabilization policies. Check the boxes to indicate the policies for which you would vote (*selected choices are in blue*):

Make four-unit buildings subject to rent stabilization

Make buildings built prior to 2005 subject to rent stabilization

Peg eligibility for rent stabilization to a dynamic date, so that new buildings are subject to rent stabilization after 15 years

Allow only one increase per year, with notice, for any D.C. rental housing that's exempt from rent stabilization

Eliminate voluntary agreements that take rents to market-rate

Implement stronger oversight of all landlord petitions filed with the Department of Housing and Community Development

Clarify what types of landlord upgrades qualify for capital improvements petitions

Narrow the scope of hardship petitions; stagger allowable increases; and make increases temporary, rather than permanent

Make rent increases under substantial rehabilitation petitions temporary rather than permanent

Cap annual rent increases at the level of inflation, or consumer price index, and eliminate the extra two percent allowed under current law

Eliminate vacancy increases

None of the above

Additional Comments: I would also explore tying affordability to income. We have to think aggressively about preserving affordability.

In response to criticisms that it has failed to meet its targets for building extremely low-income housing (units restricted to residents earning 30 percent AMI or below), the Department of Housing and Community Development has stated that it cannot do so without coordination and support from other agencies, such as the D.C. Housing Finance Agency and the Department of Human Services. What is the best path forward to ensure extremely low-income housing is reliably produced?

Step 0: Develop a shared goal between the Council and the Executive of housing and home ownership targets.

Step 1: Provide an accurate and comprehensive SINGLE census of all District-owned and vacant land in the District of Columbia (this information is currently spread among several agencies in multiple data sources with inconsistent coding and data quality – in many cases the classification of the parcels is not consistent).

Step 2: Assess each parcel for viability to develop and the best use of that land considering the future use map and our shared housing goals.

Step 3: Develop an equitable neighborhood development prioritization order which takes into account historic allocation of resources and relative impact of each dollar spent.

Step 4: Encourage the development of privately owned vacant parcels using all available tools and incentives available to the government (tax incentives, DOPA, condemnation, etc). Develop all viable District-owned parcels. Convert any parcels that are not viable into conservation easements and assign a responsible party to manage the parcel.

Step 5: Continuously monitor Step 4 and adjust as necessary.

The Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act has historically enabled the cooperative purchase of apartment buildings that are put up for sale by a tenants' association. There are many ins and outs of the TOPA process, one of which is the ability of tenants to take buyouts, if the interested buyer is willing to make them. Buyouts have skyrocketed to, in some deals, \$60,000 per unit, making TOPA, functionally, not an anti-displacement policy but, rather, a tenant-equity policy. Do you think this is a suitable evolution of TOPA, or should the law be amended to either formalize or restrict this?

This is a suitable evolution of TOPA.

TOPA should be amended to formalize this.

TOPA should be amended to restrict this.

Additional Comments: This practice raises the cost of housing as the cost of equity extraction is only temporarily borne by the developer and does not create a chance for tenants to develop generational wealth like ownership of a building creates. Further, the equity extraction is generally passed on to remaining tenants or future tenants in the form of higher base rent. I would support amending TOPA to ensure that tenants were empowered to become part owners of the building and instead of a single buyout. That would allow a former tenant to access the cashflow of a profitable property.

The D.C. Council voted to exempt single-family home sales from TOPA in 2017. Would you support reinstating single-family TOPA?

Yes, if the equity extraction was eliminated.

No

Given widespread support for limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts, what will you do to encourage their proliferation?

The communities that would most benefit from limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts are generally working families and would benefit from ready-made deals as opposed to being expected to organize and develop a project. As a Councilmember, I would encourage the maturation of these projects in concert with Advisory Neighborhood Commissioners to ensure they are consistent with the needs of neighborhoods.

The District Opportunity to Purchase Act "gives the mayor the authority to purchase certain apartment buildings in order to maintain existing rental affordable units for tenants and increase the total number of affordable rental units within the District." DOPA is primarily used as a preservation tool: If tenants do not exercise their TOPA rights, the District can make an offer on a building, as long as it "consists of five or more rental units and 25 percent or more of those units are 'affordable' at 50 percent of the median family income." What would you change about this, if anything?

This is a rarely used tool, I would encourage the Executive to employ it more frequently along with the ability to purchase properties. Further, the District also has the ability to use its condemnation authority to immediately acquire a property.

Describe your views of the District's inclusionary zoning policy. What do you think it should be achieving? What is it currently failing to do? What, if anything, you think should be changed about it?

The Inclusionary Zoning program is a wonderful idea. Residents that have found success through the IZ lottery are generally pleased and satisfied with the program. However, I have spoken to many more residents who are highly frustrated with a program that is opaque and seems arbitrary. Residents have even alleged that only politically connected residents are able to be placed through the IZ lottery. I know that the challenges that IZ faces are based on limited resources and a limited number of available units. The first thing I would do is require DHCD to ensure that the current IZ list is only populated by persons who are still in the District of Columbia and still seeking housing. Once we know that the list is accurate, I would then work with DHCD to ensure they are properly resourced to conduct a periodic review of the list to ensure it remains accurate. I would then work to expand the number of available units through providing

incentives to building owners to make additional units available to the IZ program. I would then publicize an anonymized version of the IZ list and the locations of IZ units so that residents would have transparency into the availability of units and their relative position on the list. This information would need to be carefully anonymized to protect the identities of residents, but the enhanced transparency would allow residents to have a greater degree of trust in the program.

Housing is publicly subsidized in two main ways: project-based subsidies (such as Housing Production Trust Fund dollars or Low-Income Housing Tax Credits) that are tied to a unit and reduce its cost for any qualified tenants who live there and tenant-based subsidies (i.e., portable vouchers) that a qualified tenant can use on any market-rate unit. Acknowledging that an even split is not realistic, how do you think the District should divide its public subsidy money between these two methods?

Entirely project-based

Mostly project-based

Mostly tenant-based

Entirely tenant-based

LAND USE

The District's current Comprehensive Plan was written in 2006 and amended in 2021. Despite an extensive amendment process, it is still out-of-date, and still restricts density in affluent neighborhoods more than elsewhere. An April 2020 staff report from the Office of Planning states that a rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan should be complete by 2025. Do you commit to supporting the necessary budget and process for a rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan by 2025?

Yes

No

In a rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan, which of these three options would be your top priority?

Creating opportunities for new housing

Preserving green space

Preserving the character of existing neighborhoods

Additional Comments: I think it is important to think creatively about using existing space. We can use infill and brownfield lots to build in a way that preserves green space and the character of existing neighborhoods.

Should apartments be legal District-wide?

Yes

No

Would you support amending the District's preservation laws to remove height and mass from the purview of historic review? Under such a proposal, District historic officials would still review materials, aesthetics and compatibility of designated structures, but overall density would be controlled by zoning the same way it is for non-designated structures.

Yes

No

Traditional smart-growth planning principles concentrate high-density construction, including apartment buildings, on major corridors. This, by design,

leaves residential areas off of corridors untouched. Do you agree with this approach to the distribution of housing within neighborhoods?

Yes, I believe that we should PRIORITIZE major corridors and expand into lower-density areas once the major corridors are exhausted.

No

The mayor has committed the District to attempting a fair distribution of affordable housing production across planning areas by 2050. More unevenly distributed than affordable housing is land zoned for production, distribution, and repair—basically, industrial uses. PDR zones are largely concentrated in the Near Northeast planning area. In a Comprehensive Plan rewrite, would you support a fair-share approach to the location of parcels zoned for PDR, which would necessitate adding PDR zoning to planning areas where there currently is none or very little?

Yes, particularly because the evolving nature of PDR businesses generally create a dual maker and retail space. The presence of some of these new and trendy businesses such as breweries would present an opportunity to revitalize struggling commercial corridors such as Georgetown and Cleveland Park.

Given the opportunity, how would you amend the District's Height Act?

Removing or raising the Height Act entirely

Removing or raising the Height Act everywhere but downtown

Removing or raising the Height Act only in downtown

Removing or raising the Height Act within 1/4 mile of Metro stations

Raising the Height Act only for buildings that will produce more affordable housing than required by inclusionary zoning

I would not amend the Height Act.

TRANSPORTATION

Do you think there are not enough cars, enough cars, or too many cars in the District?

Not enough cars

Enough cars

Too many cars

Additional Comments: Low-income, and Black and brown communities in the District are routinely underserved by public transportation. I would make equitable communities and transit equity a central priority as a Councilmember. There are too many cars in the District because there aren't reliable alternatives. Underserved communities have to manage the expense of a car because we cannot rely on public transportation and because our communities are bereft of education, retail, and grocery options. However, it is unfair to expect households to surrender their only reliable means of access without first providing reliable alternative methods of transportation.

The Sustainable D.C. 2.0 plan includes a target of reducing commuter trips made by car to 25 percent. Do you agree that incenting residents and visitors to drive less should be an explicit policy goal of the District?

Yes, we should provide more positive incentives and fewer punitive measures.

No

Internal data for WMATA estimates that bus delays cost the system about \$14 million per year. Buses are primarily delayed by sitting in single-occupancy vehicle traffic. Bus riders are more frequently Black and brown, and less affluent, than rail riders and drivers. Would you support removing single-occupancy

vehicle parking and travel lanes for dedicated bus lanes, which make bus service faster and more reliable?

Yes, it depends on the corridor.

No

If yes, how do you think DDOT should prioritize repurposing street space to create dedicated bus lanes?

DDOT should prioritize repurposing existing parking lanes.

DDOT should prioritize repurposing existing travel lanes.

DDOT should repurpose whichever lane its staff believe is best on any given street.

I do not think that DDOT should repurpose street space for dedicated bus lanes.

A 12-year study, published in 2019, found that protected bike lanes drastically lowered fatal crash rates *for all road users* in Seattle (-60.6%), San Francisco (-49.3%), Denver (-40.3%) and Chicago (-38.2%), among others. Would you, as council chair, support removing single-occupancy vehicle parking and travel lanes for protected bike lanes?

Yes, I would support narrowing the travel lane, the parking lane, and where possible a portion of the sidewalk, to create elevated protected bike lanes that are between the parking lane and the sidewalk.

No

If yes, how do you think DDOT should prioritize repurposing street space to create protected bike lanes?

DDOT should prioritize repurposing existing parking lanes.

DDOT should prioritize repurposing existing travel lanes.

DDOT should repurpose whichever lane their staff believe is best on any given street.

I do not think that DDOT should repurpose street space for protected bike lanes.

Road pricing, or congestion pricing, in which motorists pay directly for driving on a particular road or in a particular area, has successfully reduced congestion, improved air quality, and raised money in London, Stockholm, Singapore, Milan, and elsewhere by reducing the number of vehicles on the road and improving transit performance. New York will be implementing road pricing in the next few years. However, many drivers are loathe to pay for something that they currently get for free. Would you, as council chair, support road pricing as a means to reduce congestion to speed up transit, improve air quality, and raise revenue?

Yes, and I would start with toll roads on the bridges to Virginia and the roads from Maryland.

No

If yes, how would you propose reinvesting the \$90 to \$500 million in revenue road pricing is estimated to generate for the District? If no, please write, "I do not support road pricing."

I would use the additional revenue to provide cash incentives to residents to enable the purchase of electric bikes and vehicles for residents, expand bus service, and prioritize maintenance of road infrastructure to serve residents who live in transit-starved neighborhoods.

In 2019, the council budgeted \$475,000 for a road pricing study. The study is complete, but Mayor Bowser has not yet released it. Do you think the study should be made public?

Yes

If "yes," how would you get the executive to release the report? If "no," please write, "I do not think the study should be made public."

All studies paid for with public funds should be made public and if necessary I will introduce legislation to make it so. I have worked in three different administrations, so I know there are several layers of administrative review that occur before a report is transmitted to the Council or made public. A phone call from an interested Councilmember to the relevant Deputy Mayor or City Administrator is typically enough to dislodge a transmittal, so I would make the phone call.

WMATA is facing a \$375 million budget deficit in FY24, as federal support for transit provided during Covid-19 is not likely to be renewed. Though the District, Maryland, and Virginia entered into a regional commitment to fund some of WMATA's capital costs year over year, WMATA's operations do not have a similar dedicated funding stream. Given the need to find local solutions, what will you do to assist in closing WMATA's operational funding gap?

As Councilmember, I would work with WMATA to increase ridership to bolster operating revenue. I would also support a solution to provide additional dedicated funding to WMATA with our neighboring jurisdictions and subsidize point to point trips that start and end at DC stations for District residents.

Do you support Councilmember Charles Allen's Metro for D.C. proposal, which would "put a recurring \$100 balance to D.C. residents' SmarTrip cards every month and make a \$10 million annual investment in improving bus service and infrastructure in the District"?

Yes

No

Assuming \$500 million could be invested in either fare-free transit for all users or guaranteed headways of 10 minutes or less on bus lines within D.C., which would you prefer?

Fare-free transit

Guaranteed headways of 10 minutes or less within D.C.

Additional Comments: Increased reliability and frequency of service within transit-starved neighborhoods would have the spillover effect of increasing the use of transit by households who currently rely on a motor vehicle due to transit insecurity.

Pick a major street in the District that does not currently have a pending transportation project. Describe what you envision for it, and explain how you would work with the District Department of Transportation to implement that vision.

The Intersection of Minnesota Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue SE, East of the Sousa Bridge. This section of Pennsylvania Avenue is a highway leading into three neighborhoods. Because of its location, this is an unacknowledged transit transfer/hub for the 30 lines and several lines serving neighborhoods. It is incredibly dangerous and because of its poor design (entry and exit ways around the intersection and from 295) an earlier attempt at bringing Yes! Organic to a neighborhood without healthy food options was doomed to fail. I would completely reconfigure the intersection to significantly slow down traffic, prioritize bus access, and enable safe access to bicycles. A pedestrian friendly circle at this intersection would enable access to both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue and facilitate the economic revitalization of this corridor.

New Hampshire Avenue between Swann and U Street NW: I would close this two-block street to through vehicle traffic. It is relatively level, straight and has several other options to redirect vehicles around the closure. The road could then be repurposed into an expansion of the T Street Park greenspace. A slightly elevated cycle track could form a cyclist hub for that part of Northwest. This would require some degree of accommodation for the easements from the existing buildings, but because this portion of the city is heavily overbuilt, the addition of greenspace would help combat the heat island effect.

Preventing drivers from killing people will require not just incentives for people to drive less and nudges to make them drive better. It will also require policies that actively reshape the District's transportation systems and its landscape to decrease single-occupancy vehicle trips, and to slow down the speed of those trips when people do make them. Please rank the following policies in the order that you would request your staff pursue them. If you would not request your staff pursue a specific policy, please select N/A.

1. Regional reciprocity for automated traffic enforcement
2. Building more housing and affordable housing in the District proximate to transit and job centers
3. Implementing a road-pricing program
4. Removing minimum parking requirements in new developments near transit
5. Implementing road diets on arterial streets
6. Making some streets, especially residential streets, car-free
7. Increasing the cost to own a car in the District, including RPP and parking registration

The District's automated traffic enforcement program cannot meaningfully enforce consequences for unsafe driving upon Maryland and Virginia residents, as the District does not have any reciprocity agreement with those states. How do you think the council can best use its power to begin to develop such agreements?

The Council can use its authority to encourage the Executive to pursue such reciprocity agreements with non-cooperative jurisdictions and withholding cooperation from those jurisdictions in other areas. As Councilmember, I would work with the Executive to develop tools that authorized DPW's Parking Enforcement Division and Boot & Tow Unit to use enhanced pursuit and enforcement for the most egregious scofflaws. While out of state violators may not stay in the District for long, we can make the time they are here very uncomfortable by authorizing enforcement against scofflaws in private parking lots and garages. We can eliminate their perceived safe zones and hold them accountable.

On-street parking occurs in public space, which means that an on-street parking spot cannot belong to a specific individual, and people park in different places at different times. What do you consider a reasonable threshold for evaluating if street parking is sufficient in any given neighborhood?

A resident is able to find an available public street parking space within 100 feet (about a 30-second walk) of their residence's, entrance, most of the time

A resident is able to find an available public street parking space on their residence's precise block (about a one-minute walk), most of the time

A resident is able to find an available public street parking space within one block in any direction of their residence (about a two- to four-minute walk), most of the time

A resident is able to find an available public street parking space within two to three blocks, in any direction of their residence (about a five- to seven-minute walk), most of the time

A resident is able to find an available public street parking space within their neighborhood, in any direction of their residence, (about a ten-minute walk), most of the time

Additional Comments: However, if a person is disabled or elderly, I highly support the reserved parking space program.

The District's goal to be carbon-free by 2050 requires most of the reduction of its transportation emissions to come from residents turning existing single-occupancy vehicle trips into transit, walking, and biking trips. Please describe at least one trip you currently take by car (even if you, yourself, are not driving) that you can commit to taking on foot, by bus, by train, or by bike instead.

I currently take a 22-minute drive from my house (Ward 7) to NOMA (Ward 6) to get my daughter to a high-quality daycare. I would prefer that we and many other Ward 7 and Ward 8 families deserve high-quality options within walking distance so we can have the quality bonding and opportunistic development time that comes from being able to safely walk our children to and from school.

A large percentage of youth in Ward 7 and 8 travel over 45 minutes to get to school in the mornings. This is not a reflection of residents choosing to use a car over using transportation with less carbon emissions, it is a reflection of disparity of resources throughout our city. Action must be taken now to ensure that communities are structured to support access to basic necessities within a 10-15 minute commute, so residents have the opportunity and choice to choose low or zero emissions vehicles.