

# Ben Bergmann

---

## Page 1: Contact information

### Q1

#### Contact information

Name	<b>Ben Bergmann</b>
Email	<b>ben@benbergmann.com</b>
Website	<b>www.benbergmann.com</b>
Social media accounts	<b>twitter.com/bzbergmann; https://www.instagram.com/ben4ward3/ https://www.facebook.com/ben4ward3/ https://medium.com/@benbergmann</b>

---

## Page 2: Prescreening questions

### Q2

**Yes**

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

---

### Q3

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

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?

---

## Page 3: Questionnaire

**Q4** **Over 100,000**

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

---

**Q5** **Yes**

Housing production in D.C. has been uneven and particularly concentrated in certain neighborhoods. 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?

---

**Q6** **No**

On the forty-three percent of all surface area that is owned by the federal government in the District, it is illegal to build an apartment; according to a D.C. Policy Center report, “single-family units make up only 30 percent of the District’s housing stock, but occupy 80 percent of its residential buildings.” Should apartments be legal on 100 percent of all surface area governed by the District?

---

**Q7**

Council's land use authority is limited: The Home Rule Act states, "the mayor shall be the central planning agency for the District" (page 13), and councilmembers do not, generally, vote up or down on individual developments. Councilmembers' most direct influence on land use is through the Comprehensive Plan, though they cannot change that unless amendments are proposed by the mayor. 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. (This list is purposefully not inclusive of affordability and stabilization policies, which are addressed in subsequent questions.)

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

**Q8**

Where in Ward 3 do you think new housing should be built? If you do not think new housing should be built in Ward 3, please write, "I do not think new housing should be built in Ward 3."

Everywhere.

I am committed to making this a city where everyone can find their footing, raise a family, and age in place. That means we must do more, much more, to reduce the cost of housing and childcare and improve public transportation.

A community that fights a building that would allow renters to live in a high opportunity area is not a welcoming one, regardless of what their yard signs say. A community that privileges aesthetics over people is not one that cares about diversity, equity, or inclusion. If we genuinely care about racial justice, and about repairing the damage of decades of segregationist policies, redlining, and racial covenants, or about the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion, we must commit to reimagining the Ward.

There is no silver bullet, no magic solution to this crisis. Solving the housing affordability crisis is the most significant and complex challenge facing the District of Columbia. We can't leave any tools on the table.

Here is what I am calling for:

1. We must aggressively densify the relatively dense transit-oriented corridors that already exist (e.g. Connecticut and Wisconsin Avenues). Transit-oriented development is better for the environment, an important secondary benefit of adding housing. We also stand to benefit economically by further densifying our commercial corridors beyond the levels contemplated during the last round of comprehensive plan amendments. By encouraging greater densification there, we can build upon the benefits of the current built landscape, resulting in even more dynamic mixed-use neighborhoods and increased foot traffic to sustain our small businesses.

It is essential that the Council look seriously at ways to streamline the housing production process in areas near transit. It is entirely appropriate to rigorously vet proposed projects, particularly when the developer is requesting zoning relief to build a nonconforming structure. But we can't tolerate a system that bogs down every development project of significance for years, particularly when the opposition comes from the same familiar group of ideologues and anti-change curmudgeons.

I will propose legislation to reduce time, expense, and subjectivity during the review process in priority housing areas, such as around Metro stations, by creating a set of firm commitments that, once met, would result in the project being automatically fast-tracked for approval. Commitments could include agreeing to provide significantly more affordable units than required by current inclusionary zoning rules. These "fast track commitments," which could be uniform or customized for a particular community, would be decided upon ex ante and developers would not be permitted to request flexibility. (A developer that decided to not meet the "fast track commitments" could still proceed through the process as it exists now.)

2. We must increase incentives to faith-based and community groups to re-develop properties to include affordable housing. These projects are not only compatible with the mission of these organizations but may enable many historic churches and congregations that are struggling financially to remain and thrive in their current communities.

3. We need to make public property a part of the solution The District owns a number of non-historic buildings throughout the District—libraries, fire stations, police stations, and so on—that could be redeveloped, now or at the end of the building's useful life, to include housing. In addition to helping us add units where there are none, we can leverage the fact we control these properties to ensure that a higher proportion of the units are affordable and deeply affordable. This is not a new idea. There are examples within the District and elsewhere of new mixed-use buildings with a fire station or library on the ground floors and housing above. But these projects are approached on a one-off rather than systematic basis. This has consequences. An effort to add housing to the Tenleytown Library was famously defeated a few years ago—we should not allow this to happen again. I will propose legislation to require the development of a long-term master plan to redevelop all non-historic District property to include a housing component with exceptions for where this is not safe or feasible. The District should also engage the federal government regarding federally-owned property in the District that

could also be redeveloped to include housing (e.g. post offices).

4. We must break down the barriers that exist in our low-density single-family home neighborhoods, many of which were erected during segregation with the specific aim of excluding people of color and low-income Washingtonians. We need to build more housing near transit and along our major corridors, but we should not give our wealthiest, most exclusive, neighborhoods a free pass when it comes to building a more welcoming and diverse Ward 3.

As an initial step, we must legalize \*smaller\* single-family homes in wealthy neighborhoods. Excessive minimum lot size requirements prevent the construction of row homes and other modest single-family homes, shutting middle class families out of exclusive neighborhoods. Reducing minimum lot size and other requirements that effectively only permit construction of large mansions would be a modest, yet significant, step towards filling a gap in our housing market and achieving some marginal increases in density.

I am not opposed to single-family zoning, which is why I answered No to Question 6, but I will not defend mansion zones, which is what we have in parts of DC today. Single-family homes are increasingly out of reach for all but the wealthiest because supply of all types of housing is so limited. The result is a steady exodus of families out of the District. By just allowing smaller homes, such as the row-homes that populate other parts of the District, we could greatly increase supply without actually reducing single-family zones.

5. That said, I do believe that we should be looking aggressively for single-family neighborhoods that are suitable for gentle densification—a task that the Office of Planning began and then dropped when proposing amendments to the Comprehensive Plan because of the political blowback. I can understand why others running for this seat might want to avoid touching this issue. But I believe that gentle density can be done in a manner that is entirely consistent with the \*spirit\* of current land use patterns. I believe in my neighbors in Ward 3 and I think that a good faith process and engagement can result in broad support for allowing gentle densification in some of our high-opportunity neighborhoods.

I will propose legislation and funding for a planning process to identify neighborhoods suitable for gentle densification, with a focus on neighborhoods that have a documented history of excluding racial minorities and other groups. These neighborhoods remain, in large part, segregated and exclusionary today because of the high cost of housing. When the status quo land use rules remain in place for these neighborhoods after this process, as may happen, there should be a reason and that reason better be a good one.

Gentle density can mean many things—to me, it means allowing for different types of housing that meet the spirit of current land use practices, i.e. buildings that match the scale (height and mass) of other properties in the neighborhood. These are buildings that do not seem bizarrely out of place as you walk, bike, or drive down the street. It is also important that these buildings impact parking, traffic, and noise in a similar fashion to any other new construction in the neighborhood. Taken together, that means that in most low-density neighborhoods gentle density that conforms to the look and feel of current zoning and land use patterns will only allow for duplexes or possibly triplexes. In some communities, smaller 4–6-unit apartment buildings might be appropriate, but those situations will need to be studied and thoroughly vetted. In both scenarios, ANCs and community members should be consulted and given a meaningful role in evaluating design choices to ensure that a proposed building blends in effectively with the other homes in the neighborhood. While I am generally skeptical of parking minimums, especially with respect to projects that are close to transit, I think it would be appropriate to require developers of gentle density projects to take additional steps to minimize the parking and traffic impact on the neighborhood, which may not be particularly close to transit, e.g. an on-site parking requirement and/or deed restrictions limiting the number of vehicles associated with the property.

6. We must explore ways to encourage our universities to build more on-campus housing. AU students have rented an apartment next to us since we moved to our building. They have always been great neighbors. But if they lived on campus, that unit could be rented by another family seeking to live in walking distance to a great DCPS elementary school or to a senior looking to age in place in a building that is large enough to sustain a small market and is on a bus line. Shifting undergraduates and other students to campus housing can free up rental units occupied by students, as well as minimize friction that can sometimes occur when students live off-campus in great numbers. Of course, care would have to be taken to ensure that new dorms do not just lead to a commensurate rise in enrollment numbers. We would also need to look seriously at how we can reform the sometimes contentious campus plan process to make it harder to obstruct universities from building residential housing on their campuses. (The Campus Plan process should also

be reformed to enlist universities in the project of building more walkable, transit-oriented communities. Ground floor retail can coexist with a student dorm just as much as it can with an apartment building. Investment in transit infrastructure, safety upgrades, and other amenities can benefit both students and the surrounding neighborhood.)

7. In addition to increasing space for private developers to add to our housing stock, we must commit to doing more as a city to build affordable housing. That means ensuring that the Housing Production Trust Fund is meeting its mission, specifically that we are helping the households that need the help the most (MFI below 30%). Given the documented benefits of living close to opportunity, we should be working to use these funds to build more affordable units in Ward 3 and other high opportunity areas for this population.

For similar reasons, our focus cannot just be on building new housing. We must invest in maintaining and improving the existing affordable housing stock we have. It is far less expensive to preserve an existing affordable unit than it is to build a new one and extending the life of buildings with affordable units is also less disruptive to tenants. This means ensuring that the new Department of Buildings is doing its job.

We must also improve rent control so more tenants can benefit. When combined with other complementary policies, such as those aimed at increasing the overall housing supply, rent stabilization policies play an important role in controlling the cost of housing.

---

## Q9

Where in Ward 3 do you think density should be increased to accommodate the construction of new housing? If you do not think density should be increased in Ward 3, please write, "I do not think density should be increased in Ward 3."

As I just said, I believe we need to encourage greater densification along transit-rich corridors, particularly the areas immediately surrounding metro stations. I also believe we must reduce excessive minimum lot sizes District-wide, which will result in additional densification between avenues without necessarily reducing single-family zoning. While I am not opposed to single family zoning, per se, I will propose legislation to fund a planning process to identify neighborhoods suitable for gentle densification, with a focus on neighborhoods that have a documented history of excluding racial minorities and other groups. This process, which I anticipate leading to legalization of 2-, 3-, and 4- unit buildings in many Ward 3 neighborhoods, will subtly, but significantly, increase densification.

When the Council again discusses changes to the District's comprehensive plan, my starting assumption is that the \*entire length\* and \*both\* sides of Ward 3's major avenues (Connecticut, Wisconsin, Massachusetts) should be categorized as, at a minimum, medium-density residential. The reasons for densifying these avenues is obvious—these are transit-rich corridors served by Metrobus and (for Connecticut and upper Wisconsin) Metrorail. It should go without saying that a starting assumption is merely that. There will be segments where a lower-density designation is appropriate for any number of reasons, including the preferences of the ANC and residents.

But formal densification should not be reserved to Connecticut and Wisconsin Avenues. I live in a 13-story multifamily building on Cathedral Avenue, across the street from the Wesley Heights neighborhood. Every day, I see how this low-density neighborhood benefits from living in close proximity to the dense stretch of multifamily buildings and townhomes on New Mexico Avenue, a busy but not major roadway. The density makes it possible to sustain restaurants and shops on New Mexico that would otherwise not survive if they depended just on the Wesley Heights neighborhood. There are other lower-density commercial corridors in Ward 3, such as MacArthur Boulevard, that would benefit from increased densification. Similarly, Nebraska Avenue, which acts as a major transit thruway for Ward 3 residents (and the many, many Maryland and Virginia commuters), has active bus lines that make it a good candidate for concentrating additional housing. Thus, on Ward 3's "secondary" corridors (MacArthur Boulevard, Nebraska Avenue), my starting assumption when considering changes to the District's comprehensive plan is that the entire length and both sides of these two streets should be categorized as, at a minimum, moderate-density residential. As stated above, however, a starting assumption is just that and I would fully expect certain segments to remain low-density residential at the end of the process.

**Q10** **Removing or raising the Height Act entirely**  
Given the opportunity, how would you amend the District's Height Act?

---

**Q11** **Yes**  
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.

---

**Q12** **Means-tested or income-restricted, Costing no more than 30 percent of one's household income**  
I consider affordable housing to be (check all that, in your opinion, apply):

---

**Q13** **Not means-tested or income-restricted, Built by private developers, Unsubsidized**  
I consider market-rate housing to be (check all that, in your opinion, apply):

---

## Q14

What is, and is not, within the scope of a councilmember's authority to produce more affordable housing in the District? Or, describe not what you will do to produce more affordable housing in the District, but, rather, what any given councilmember can do to produce more affordable housing in the District.

In addition to constituent service, a councilmember's job can be reduced to three pillars: budget, legislation, and oversight.

Stepping back, with respect to the budget, the Council must ensure that adequate funding exists to fund the District's affordable housing initiatives. In order to do that, of course, the Council must exercise sufficient oversight to have a deep understanding of whether programs are adequately funded and/or falling short of their aims because of a lack of funding or because of poor leadership, incompetence, or some other reason.

I will be focused on ensuring that we are investing the dollars in the Housing Production Trust Fund effectively and appropriately, with a particular focus on examining how we can do a better job increasing the number of deeply affordable units (30% MFI).

With respect to legislation, as discussed above, the Council can do \*a lot\* to encourage the development of market-rate and income-restricted housing by changing our land use laws to make it legal to build apartments and smaller houses (i.e. rowhouses) in more places. As we do so, we should explore ways to expand and further leverage Inclusionary Zoning rules to ensure that a greater proportion of new units are income-restricted affordable housing.

Finally, as an individual, I will show leadership. It is not enough to go on a listening tour and keep your counsel to yourself until it comes time to vote. When there are contentious fights over projects that will help us reach our housing goals, I will not remain on the sidelines. We need to take concerns seriously and I firmly believe that we can and should ask developers to do more, especially when they stand to make a significant profit. But at the end of the day, I will be consistent: we need more housing in Ward 3. If a project is bad, let's improve it. But don't tell me that we can't build multifamily housing near transit or that a proposed apartment building on a major avenue is too tall. We must get serious about dealing with our housing crisis.

---

## Q15

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?

The Council cannot use DCHA's independent status as a get-out-of-jail free card. We owe it to our fellow Washingtonians to do everything we can to improve conditions and hold people accountable for failing to do right by tenants in public housing. As an initial matter, we can increase the amount of funding that is allocated to public housing repairs to over \$60 million, which is what advocates are calling for.

I will support the "Public Housing Preservation and Tenant Protection Amendment Act of 2020," which will give tenants additional protections. We must also work to ensure that the agency follows a "build first" model going forward to avoid the unnecessary and cruel displacement of public housing tenants from existing properties.

**Q16**

How many units of housing do you think should be built in the District by 2045 for households making between:

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

**Assuming we are targeting 100,000 units, I would say 35,000 should be in this category because I believe we must prioritize the development of deeply affordable units. .**

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

**30,000 of the 100,000 target units should be in this category.**

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

**25,000 of the 100,000 target units should be in this category.**

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

**10,000 of the 100,000 target units should be in this category.**

---

**Q17**

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, on page 23 of this report, 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?

The answer to this question cannot be about funding alone. There needs to be much greater oversight of the Trust, as well as on the developers receiving loans from the city. Millions of dollars have been misspent that should have gone towards creating more deeply affordable units.

The 2020 OIG report on misspending and other issues points to another issue: the Council must take a more active role in monitoring these programs. We cannot wait until there is an OIG report to find out that important programs are being mismanaged.

---

**Q18**

As a councilmember, 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 just discussed, the Housing Production Trust Fund must be adequately funded and we must ensure that it is spending its dollars effectively.

At the same time, we cannot simply rely on government funds. We need to make it easier to build more market-rate multifamily housing in the District. The argument that market-rate housing has no impact on affordability is nonsensical.

There are so many Washingtonians waiting on a list to get an income-restricted unit. If we care about displacement, racial equity, and making this a place where anyone can raise a family, we must supercharge the development of more market-rate units.

---



**Q19**

As a councilmember, 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)?

I believe the District should use its funds to prioritize the development of affordable units for Washingtonians making below 50% AMI, especially in high-opportunity areas.

While some funds should be spent on the 80 to 120 percent AMI cohort, the best approach is to focus on supercharging the development of significantly more market-rate housing.

---

**Q20**

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

I prefer this scenario because:  
As acknowledged by the question, this is a very difficult question and I struggled a little in picking an answer. Stepping back, I think it demonstrates the need to do a mix of everything and pursue an all-of-the-above strategy to housing more generally. We need to be focused on maximizing the number of units and increasing affordable and deeply affordable housing units specifically in Ward 3 and other high-opportunity areas of the city. I selected the final option because it achieves the aim of adding more deeply affordable units in a high opportunity area. An area that is close to jobs and completely unaffordable for an individual making under 30 AMI absent an income-restricted unit.

---

**Q21**

In the Office of Planning's Housing Framework for Equity and Growth, released in October 2019, Mayor Bowser set 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 the planning area you would primarily represent, Rock Creek West, meets the stated targets by 2050?

Ward 3's Councilmember should play an active role in shepherding along valuable projects that will help us reach our affordable housing goals. That means participating in the conversations between the community, the developer, and DC agencies to ensure that points of conflict are resolved amicably and quickly.

As discussed above in response to questions 8 and 9, the Council can do a lot to make it easier to build more housing and to ensure that affordable housing units constitute a greater proportion of those units.

---

**Q22**

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:

- 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**

**Q23**

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 that this is a suitable evolution of TOPA, or should the law be amended to either formalize or restrict this?

**TOPA should be amended to formalize this.,**

Please explain your selected response.:

I have concerns about allowing developers to use aggressive buyouts to essentially unravel TOPA success stories, but I am also sensitive to the equity argument raised in the question. I think the best approach is to examine how to formalize this process in a way that minimizes the potential for predatory behavior and ensures that all tenants receive fair compensation.

**Q24**

The D.C. Council voted to exempt single-family home sales from TOPA in 2017. As a councilmember, would you support reinstating single-family TOPA?

**No**

**Q25**

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

We cannot leave anything on the table and we cannot be afraid of "new" ideas. I would support legislation to make the formation of both easier and explore other ways to stimulate their development.

**Q26**

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?

I would support amending DOPA so that it applies to all rental buildings with five or more units. This will not necessarily lead to more purchases, but it would allow the District to evaluate buildings that are an important part of the affordable housing stock but are not covered by DOPA currently.

**Q27**

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?

I support inclusionary zoning, especially in Ward 3. The goal should be to ensure that more Washingtonians have the ability to live close to opportunity. We need to make sure that we are building family-sized IZ units as well.

**Q28**

**Mostly project-based**

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?

---

**Q29**

**Yes**

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 more greatly restricts density in affluent neighborhoods than elsewhere. An April 2020 staff report from Office of Planning states that a rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan should be complete by 2025 (page 8). Do you commit to supporting the necessary budget and process for a rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan by 2025?

---

**Q30**

**Creating opportunities for new housing**

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

---

**Q31**

**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?

---

**Q32**

**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, such as Near Northwest and Rock Creek West?

---

**Q33**

Where in Ward 3 should PDR zoning should be added so as to more fairly balance it across the District? If you do not think PDR zoning should be added in Ward 3, please write, "I do not think PDR zoning should be added in Ward 3."

I do not think PDR zoning should be added in Ward 3. I appreciate the argument in favor of spreading out PDR zoning, but given the current land-use patterns in the ward and our need for more, not less, housing, it just does not make sense to me to actively replace housing with industrial zones.

---

**Q34**

**Yes**

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, as a councilmember, support removing single-occupancy vehicle parking and travel lanes for dedicated bus lanes, which make bus service faster and more reliable?

---

**Q35**

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

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

---

**Q36**

**Yes**

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. The Washington Post recently reported that "lower-income neighborhoods in the District recorded eight times more traffic fatalities in recent years than the city's wealthiest area," and that the "40 traffic fatalities in the nation's capital last year were the most since 2007." Would you, as a councilmember, support removing single-occupancy vehicle parking and travel lanes for protected bike lanes?

---

**Q37**

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

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

---

**Q38**

**Yes**

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, and Singapore 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 a councilmember, support road pricing as a means to reduce congestion to speed up transit, improve air quality, and raise revenue?

---

**Q39**

If yes, how would you propose re-investing 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 have spent so many weekdays sitting on a bus stuck in traffic on Massachusetts Avenue

Similar to how funds from speed and red light cameras are being directed to Vision Zero, this money should be directed towards improving public transit, which will also have a positive impact on congestion. (Re Question 41, below, some of this money could be directed to help WMATA meet its funding needs.)

In addition to investing in infrastructure changes to improve bus service, I am calling for the development of a Home Rule transit system using the Circulator and Streetcar. We can plan this system to strategically fill gaps in current network and design the system to fit the needs of Washingtonians. The Metro was built to serve Maryland and Virginia commuters and it shows. Many of our neighborhoods are effectively transit deserts dependent only on limited and inadequate bus service. Even slow progress on expanding the Circulator and Streetcar networks could lead to transformative change for impacted communities, particularly if DDOT is directed to prioritize transit deserts.

---

**Q40**

**Yes**

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?

---

**Q41**

WMATA will be 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, as a councilmember, to assist in closing WMATA's operational funding gap?

If we proceed with congestion pricing, some of that revenue can be directed to assist WMATA.

Ensuring WMATA has sufficient funding is a shared burden and not on the District alone, but the Council owes it to Washingtonians that depend upon the bus or metrorail to do all it can to ensure that service disruptions are minimized.

---

**Q42**

**Yes**

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"?

---

**Q43**

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

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?

---

**Q44**

Pick a major street in Ward 3 that does not currently have a pending transportation project. Describe what you envision for it, and explain how you would, as a councilmember, work with the District Department of Transportation to implement that vision.

The neighborhoods along Wisconsin Avenue form one of the densest parts of the District. And yet Cathedral Heights and Glover Park are miles from the metro, the buses are always caught in traffic, and the street is a nightmare for bikers and pedestrians. We can do better.

In the longterm, I want the District to lobby hard for Metrorail expansion within the District. This century has seen remarkable investment in extending Metrorail out into exurban communities. It's time to start the long conversation about expanding Metrorail within the District. For Ward 3, the argument is clear: extend a line from Tenleytown down Wisconsin Avenue to Georgetown with stops in Cathedral Heights and Glover Park.

In the immediate term, however, let's focus on improving bus service by building dedicated bus lanes. Let's also look at how we can improve the street for pedestrians and cyclists. There is definitely also potential for installing a protected bike lane on Wisconsin Avenue without having a serious impact on parking availability.

---

**Q45**

Reducing traffic deaths 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 to pursue them.

Implementing a road-pricing program	5
Increasing the cost to own a car in the District, including RPP and parking registration	8
Removing minimum parking requirements in new developments near transit	4
Implementing road diets on arterial streets	
Making some streets, especially residential streets, car-free	3
Making some streets, especially residential streets, car-free	6
Regional reciprocity for automated traffic enforcement	7
Building more housing and affordable housing in the District proximate to transit and job centers	1 2

**Q46**

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 the threshold beyond which it is reasonable to park in a neighborhood, 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**

**Q47**

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 that you can commit to taking on foot, by bus, by train, or by bike instead.

More often than not, we do school and daycare dropoff by car. It would require some extra efficiency from all involved but we could do both by foot/bus.