

Beau Finley

Page 1: Contact information

Q1

Contact information

Name	Beau Finley
Email	beaufinleyforcouncil@gmail.com
Website	beaufinley.com
Social media accounts	twitter: @beaufinleyanc3c fb: https://www.facebook.com/beaufinleyforward3/

Page 2: Prescreening questions

Q2

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

Q3

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?

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

Page 3: Questionnaire

Q4

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

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

Yes

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

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."

New housing should be prioritized near higher density corridors that have good access to transit. In Ward 3, that means we have the opportunity to build more housing in:

- Woodley Park at the Wardman site and along Connecticut Avenue near the Woodley Park Metro;
- Cleveland Park along the business strip and adjacent to the Cleveland Park Metro;
- Van Ness/Forest Hills along the northern portions of the business strip and possibly in conversion of existing underused space currently owned or leased by UDC;
- Tenleytown along the business strip and adjacent to the Tenleytown Metro;
- Friendship Heights along Wisconsin Avenue, including Mazza Gallerie.

In addition, I support recent efforts to streamline the production of ADUs in our residential neighborhoods. More needs to be done to make accessory apartments not only easier for homeowners, but to incentivize their construction when homes are purchased and renovated for resale. The market needs to be invited to play a role in creating ADUs. This gentlest form of density provides opportunities for our seniors to age in place and offers quality housing to new families and reasonably priced homes for our teachers, fire/EMT, police and others in need of workforce housing closer to where their jobs are.

We should also be looking to DC-owned sites for the production of affordable housing at all levels, including for seniors, like the Chevy Chase Library and Community Center, the Tenley Library, as well as underutilized land owned by our many places of worship. Both

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."

Density means housing more people on the same area of land. It can range in scale from adding an ADU to a single family home, to building out a high rise where a smaller building or vacant land once was. From that broad perspective, we should be looking to add homes wherever we can. Large scale density increases should be focused on our transit-served corridors. Our upcoming planning processes for Upper Wisconsin and Lower Connecticut will move us in that direction with appropriate analysis and community engagement. I will fund additional studies to extend planning to Middle Wisconsin and Middle Connecticut (Van Ness) so we can begin taking advantage of the greater allowable density increases provided by recent Future Land Use Map amendments, including the one I proposed for Cleveland Park and was adopted by Council (Amendment 2123).

As noted above, we should be looking for ways to kick start our ADU production, which really has been a disappointment in terms of results so far.

We also need the rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan to begin in earnest soon. Low-scale density increases off our major corridors are something we need to look at. Where I live in Cleveland Park, our side streets just off Connecticut Ave are dotted with house-scale apartment buildings that provide convenient and lower-priced housing than the adjacent single family homes. They fit into the neighborhood well. House-scale apartments just off our transit corridors are ways to add more housing without overwhelming residential streets. Similarly, the conversion of larger homes into multiple-home buildings should be considered in areas where it is currently illegal. Montgomery County calls this broad category of low-density homes "attainable housing." It's not subsidized, but due to its scale and the shared land costs, it provides housing options to our kids and grandkids who have been priced out of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

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, Built by the government, Subsidized, Rent-controlled**
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, Not rent-controlled**
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.

Councilmembers may propose any of a huge range of policies to produce affordable housing. They can, in theory, propose changes to any law and can theoretically propose any amount of spending. In reality, however, councilmembers need to secure the votes of a majority of their Council colleagues and the support of the Mayor (or the support of enough Councilmembers to override the Mayor's veto). And, the District must have the funds to pay for any spending proposals the Council passes.

Therefore, a Councilmember has broad authority to legislate and fund policies to provide incentives to the market to encourage the construction of housing, including affordable housing, and to direct and fund District-owned affordable and public housing.

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?

We must ensure that public housing lives up to its promises so families in need can live in dignity. There are two parts to the "fix." The first involves bringing the property under control of DCHA up to a state of good repair. This means upkeep and maintenance of capital assets. In the Mayor's last budget, there was only \$22 million proposed for renovation/repair, which was devoted solely to Claridge Towers. We need to increase this funding to ~\$60 million per year if we are going to truly address the maintenance issues in the District's public housing portfolio. The second part is ensuring that the Local Rent Subsidy (LRSP) and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs are well run, properly funded, and have necessary wraparound services attached to them to ensure that participants are not failed by our system. These wraparound services are not currently provided or funded by DCHA, nor should they be. However, we need to look at expanding them to ensure that our lowest-income residents have the support they need. (On my site, I have a plan for a lead agency model to provide more robust wraparound services - <https://beaufinley.com/affordable-housing-for-all/>). We also need to ensure that the housing units occupied by LRSP/HCV participants are in good condition and that the buildings are operated well.

I reject the idea that because DCHA's debt is too great, we cannot "fix" public housing or make DCHA a better agency. We simply cannot fail those families in such need that they rely on these programs. However, given that 99% of DCHA's funding comes from the federal government, we should consider seeking a federal bailout or capital infusion while we have a Democratic Congress. In addition, we should explore whether to redevelop or sell off parts of DCHA's properties to fund both capital upkeep and to create better, new facilities.

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)?	25,000
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)?	25,000
80-120 percent MFI (\$72,250 to \$108,350 per year for a household of one)?	25,000

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?

I agree with former Director Donaldson that coordination and support from other agencies is necessary. When the Department of Housing and Community Development makes a Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF) award, we need to make sure that there is coordination for a commensurate commitment from DC Housing Authority via the Local Rent Subsidy Program, Housing Choice Voucher Program, or Project-Based Vouchers as well as with the Department of Human Services and the Department of Behavioral Health for necessary wraparound services to help the housing insecure.

We need to be innovative in how we create more extremely low-income housing. The Mayor's last budget will only create ~675 units of deeply affordable housing, which just isn't enough. This is why I propose also using the HPTF to purchase current and proposed inclusionary zoning units to make them available to households at or below 30% AMI, with the units operated by the District or experienced non-profits. This is similar to a successful Montgomery County program designed to create more deeply affordable housing.

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 a threshold matter, we need to fully fund the Housing Production Trust Fund, ~10% of which helps bridge the financial gap to help developers build housing for those making between 50%-80% AMI. Inclusionary zoning (IZ) is our current primary policy that we use to achieve housing for residents at these income levels, but I would like to reimagine IZ so that it provides incentives to build even more housing at these levels, especially in Ward 3, instead of serving as a ceiling for units. I would also like to reduce barriers, like the Height Act, for projects that exceed IZ targets.

We should offer tax credits to developers who set aside a higher percentage of inclusionary zoning units, especially in Ward 3. This would work similarly to the federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. If the new Tax Abatements for Affordable Housing in High-Needs Areas (HANTA) proves successful in increasing affordable housing stock across the four planning areas where it is available, including Rock Creek West, we should look to deploy HANTA across other areas of the District.

We need to prioritize DCRA, BZA, DDOT, and HPRB review of projects that exceed IZ targets. Regulatory review frequently adds time and therefore substantial costs to large projects. Prioritization should reduce costs for developers while encouraging the supply of IZ units beyond what is currently required. I would also work to prevent the weaponization of historic preservation, which I have fought against for years on ANC 3C. It is unfortunately deployed rather frequently to stymie the building of new housing, including affordable housing, in parts of Ward 3.

I look forward to evaluating the effect of the new clarity surrounding Planned Use Developments (PUDs) over the coming years. PUDs provide a great opportunity for communities to work with developers to obtain more affordable housing. I would like to explore whether and how the PUD process can be modified to standardize the incorporation of affordable housing rather than requiring a community to ask for it.

Social housing also provides us with the opportunity to provide more housing for those earning between 50%-80% AMI. It is a model we must consider given our needs, especially when redeveloping large tracts.

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)?

People in the 80%-120% AMI range are frequently rent-burdened in the District (paying more than 30% of their income on rent). While a 2019 report by the National Low Income Housing Coalition showed that DC has an oversupply at the 100% MFI level and provides 96% of needed housing at the 80% MFI level, our city needs to create more housing at this range to keep pace with population growth and to maintain rental costs. To ensure that we have housing for residents who earn within this range, we need to expand rent control to buildings built between 1977 and 2005 and end the vacancy increases that drive rent-controlled housing costs up for tenants. But the solution doesn't just lie in converting existing housing stock to rent control - we must also build more housing across the District and in Ward 3. We cannot truly address our housing crisis if we do not build more housing.

We also have the incredible opportunity to redevelop downtown DC with housing for every income level. The COVID-19 pandemic has devastated downtown, with the resulting necessary remote work emptying offices and closing businesses. Whether good or bad, the traditional office model is not coming back at the scale it was pre-pandemic, so we must adjust. Fortunately, this provides us with the opportunity to address our ongoing housing crisis through smart redevelopment of a transit-accessible series of neighborhoods. If we're smart about rezoning commercial zones to mixed use and residential uses, combined with some short-term plans to reactivate downtown (e.g., more rapidly deployed commercial vacancy taxes to encourage pop ups, small single-store retailer commercial rent stabilization, an online commercial office space sublet portal for more agile companies and startups to access vacant but leased office space, streetscape activation, etc.), we can remake the transit-accessible downtown DC into several 15-minute neighborhoods with grocery stores, daycare, schools, and more. (I have a substantial plan on redeveloping downtown at <https://beaufinley.com/economic-dynamism-and-resilience/>.)

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 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

I prefer this scenario because:

This is a tough choice. Assuming only one of these scenarios can happen, I would go with the third option, which I think appropriately balances building housing and diversifying neighborhoods, though it has its trade-offs. Forest Hills has very little housing at the 60%-80% MFI range while Bellevue has 413 affordable units, with most between 30%-60% MFI. Adding subsidized homes in Forest Hills adds needed diversity to the area and provides well-funded schools, walkable amenities, and easy access to bus and metro. Adding market-rate units in Bellevue could inject more liquid income into the local economy, though doing so carries the risk of furthering gentrification and eventual displacement.

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?

Meeting and exceeding our targets for Rock Creek West calls for a multi-pronged approach. Fortunately, our affordable housing toolbox has several tools in it that we can leverage and even amend to reach our affordable housing targets. Unfortunately, according to Open Data DC in combination with the proposed Lisner and Wardman projects, we only have 408 existing AND planned affordable housing units built, under construction, or in the pipeline for Ward 3.

To provide incentives and reduce barriers to building more affordable housing, I would fully fund the Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF), amend our inclusionary zoning (IZ & IZ+) rules to include further density bonuses (e.g., 5%-10% additional density for projects in Ward 3), and create local tax incentives for residential development in Ward 3, beyond the new Tax Abatements for Affordable Housing in High-Needs Areas (HANTA).

I look forward to seeing the effects of HANTA on producing IZ units in Rock Creek West. However, the \$200,000 cap may not be enough of an incentive for developers to create substantially more affordable housing. We need to provide further incentives for more IZ units in Ward 3 specifically. Fewer than 1% of DC's new affordable housing units built since 2015 have been built in Ward 3. We should offer tax credits to developers who set aside a higher percentage of inclusionary zoning units in Ward 3. This would work similarly to the federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and should help increase racial and economic integration in Ward 3.

In addition, I would propose that we amend the Height Act and create fast-track review at DCRA, HPRB, and BZA for projects that exceed our IZ targets. I would also work to prevent the weaponization of historic preservation, which I have fought against for years on ANC 3C. It is unfortunately deployed rather frequently to stymie the building of new housing, including affordable housing, in parts of Ward 3.

To directly increase the supply of affordable housing units, I would propose allowing use of HPTF to purchase units on behalf of the District in existing multifamily housing to make that housing available to households at or below 30% MFI. These units would then be managed by the District or by non-profits.

We also need to explore funding social housing models, especially in large tracts such as at Friendship Heights, as well as determine the capacity for faith-based institutions to develop affordable housing in Ward 3. We have a number of faith-based institutions across Ward 3, many with vacant land ripe for housing.

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 restrict this.,

Please explain your selected response.:

I have not been involved in any TOPA issues and therefore have limited experience with TOPA. My concern is that these buyouts are sometimes used as something akin to union-busting - the offer to waive one's TOPA rights for compensation reduces the tenant association's power to negotiate. Further, when individual buyouts happen, the vacated units are often re-rented at market rates, removing lower-priced units from the market, even when the tenant's association has been successful in organizing. I would like to see some vetting or other requirements of third party buyers of individual TOPA rights, to ensure that affordability is maintained should the property transfer to that party. On the landlord side, the TOPA buyout permissions have led to nightmare stories of single-family landlords keeping units off the market for an extended period of time until previous tenant TOPA rights expire. If my concerns are valid, then we should consider tasking the Office of Tenant Advocate with designing model tenant association articles of organization and bylaws that provide protection against the dilutionary effects of buyouts on tenant associations.

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?

Limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts are great vehicles for low-income households to both build wealth and have an affordable place to live. Both make a lot of sense where land acquisition costs are low. Council has the authority to designate District-owned land disposition which can allow the use of public lands for limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts.

As Councilmember, I would work with my colleagues on Council to request from the Mayor a comprehensive and descriptive map of District-owned land with associated land values. We would also ask for an overlay of any planned or hoped-for purchases or land swaps that would add land to the District's properties. From this basis, I would work with affordable housing advocates to determine which sites are viable and how best to finance such projects. I would then work with DHCD and DCFHA on funding issues and explore whether the HPTF could be used to help.

In addition to comprehensively examining the District for suitable locations for limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts, I would also explore whether the HPTF could be used to help fund compensation of co-op unit sellers to create limited-equity co-op units.

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 share former Councilmember Grosso's concerns regarding the District Opportunity to Purchase Act (DOPA) and would propose again the DOPA Disclosure Amendment Act to ensure that the pre-qualified third party buyers assigned the District's DOPA rights are experienced in providing and maintaining affordable housing and that they will actually be providing affordable housing.

DOPA projects must provide affordable housing.

Once we have that transparency and accountability with DOPA, I would amend DOPA beyond the 2021 District's Opportunity to Purchase Amendment Act that raised the affordability threshold to 60%: I would change the affordability threshold for what the District is authorized to purchase to "affordable at or below 80% of median family income." However, I would include low-income bandings to preserve affordable units at the level they were affordable prior to the District's purchase. In this case, a 50% MFI unit would stay at 50% MFI, rather than jump to 80% MFI. This would massively extend the reach of DOPA and thus the opportunities for the District to preserve existing affordable housing and to create more through redevelopment.

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?

Our inclusionary zoning (IZ & IZ+) policy is well-meaning but has not yet been successful at creating the large amounts of affordable housing that we need across the District and in Ward 3. In addition, it is not meant to create affordable housing units for those households at or below 30% MFI - its focus is on those on the 50%-80% MFI range. Even if we maximized development across Ward 3, I don't think that the math works out to meet our affordable housing goals in time, so we need to reimagine IZ beyond IZ+ and IZ-XL.

First, we should establish inclusionary zoning bonuses. To remedy the fact that IZ does not directly help those at 30% or less of MFI, I propose amending inclusionary zoning to give increased density bonuses to developers building for households at 30% MFI or below. The developer must then set aside a percentage of the increased density bonus for households at 30% MFI or lower. Currently, DC gives a density bonus based on zoning classification to developers building inclusionary zoning units. Developers building at 30% MFI or lower should receive an additional 5-10% density bonus. This bonus should also be extended to developers building 2, 3, and 4-bedroom affordable units.

We need to fully fund and creatively use the Housing Production Trust Fund. The Housing Production Trust Fund needs to be fully funded and have its funding sources stabilized. We need to set dollar amounts rather than percentages of fees for its funding level. Second, we should consider using the HPTF to buy IZ units, including multi-bedroom units, to make those units available to DC's lowest-income residents. Montgomery County currently has a similar arrangement that allows government and nonprofits to purchase up to 33% of affordable housing units produced through IZ.

We should also prioritize DCRA, BZA, and HPRB review of projects that exceed IZ/IZ+/IZ-XL targets. Regulatory review frequently adds time and therefore substantial costs to large projects. Prioritization should reduce costs for developers while encouraging the supply of IZ units beyond what is currently required.

Q28

Mostly tenant-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

Yes

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."

There is currently PDR zoning along the Potomac River in Ward 3, associated with DC Water and Corps of Engineers drinking water infrastructure. The WMATA bus garage on Wisconsin Ave in Friendship Heights is like PDR, as are the maintenance yards in Rock Creek Park, although neither is zoned as PDR. PDR is both necessary and has a wide range of impacts, from minimal to highly toxic. I would support low-impact production in many of our commercial areas, e.g., a small craft brewery in one of our dying strip malls, a woodshop or other arts/craft production, etc. These low-impact facilities should be matter-of-right in any commercial zone. The reality is that the cost of land in Ward 3 would be prohibitive for most PDR use, which tends to be land-intensive, and I'm not sure, given the prevalence of residential zoning, land acquisition costs, and the need to increase residential density whether adding more PDR zones to Ward 3 makes economic sense. As a member of Council, my priority will be to protect the residents nearest to PDR facilities from adverse conditions.

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."

\$90 to \$500 million is a wide range of possible funding.

Given that range, here are my priorities:

1. Expanded bus service and bus infrastructure with a plan to move to bus rapid transit.
 2. Fund Vision Zero street redesigns and add bike lanes where needed.
 3. Address the WMATA budget shortfall.
 4. Expand the Streetcar to provide service in transit-underserved areas and to generate network effects.
 5. Metrorail expansion within the District.
-

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?

High quality, frequent, reliable transit service is essential to a connected, vibrant city. Unfortunately, the interstate compact governing WMATA was designed with construction in mind rather than high quality, frequent, reliable transit service. We shouldn't expect WMATA to make money for itself; it's also unfair to expect that of a public service that increases economic development throughout our region.

We have to close WMATA's funding gap and get Metro not just "back to good" but providing regular, reliable, and relevant service with short headways that make riding Metro the preferred option. The alternatives - to let the system decline into peak-service-only or to mothball the entire system - are unacceptable. Too much of our regional economic development has sprouted around our Metro stations for us to give up and deny transportation access to so many.

We need to move WMATA oversight to the Committee on Transportation and the Environment so that we truly view WMATA as an essential part of District transportation policy. We also need members of Council to forge strong regional partnerships with legislators in Maryland and Virginia to raise their 3% subsidy growth caps. I would close the funding gap, push to move WMATA oversight to the Committee on Transportation and the Environment, and work with our neighbors in Maryland and Virginia to get WMATA to the robust level we need to ensure a connected, vibrant city.

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.

I believe in a Ward 3 with vibrant, walkable neighborhoods accessible to people of every age. To accomplish that, we need to redesign Wisconsin Avenue away from cars and toward bus and bicycle lanes. We need a Wisconsin Avenue that is safe for children to bike to school, for seniors to shop and dine, and provides safe transportation options to those who live, work, and play along Wisconsin Avenue.

With Connecticut Avenue slated for a major transportation project (the Connecticut Avenue bike lanes that I am quite proud of pushing for continually since becoming an ANC in 2017 and am looking forward to seeing them come to fruition), both Wisconsin Avenue and Massachusetts Avenue are ripe for substantial improvement. I would prioritize Wisconsin Avenue, which has the more pressing need for a serious redesign that prioritizes transit due to its existing density, traffic, and impending growth due to developments at City Ridge and 4000 Wisconsin Ave.

Wisconsin Avenue needs bus lanes that can be transitioned to bus rapid transit as we grow as a city. Wisconsin Avenue also needs bicycle lanes connected to the growing Ward 3 bicycle network.

My first step would be to contact the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) to determine how much an initial study of Wisconsin Avenue would cost. I would also seek feedback on the price range for the entire project. I would include the sidewalks on either side of Wisconsin within the scope of the project and explain the need to future-proof the redesign for bus rapid transit. (For the Connecticut Avenue PBL project, DDOT frequently used the project scope as a reason to veto ideas from pedestrian, cycling, and transit advocates that involved using some of the extra sidewalk space in parts of the corridor to provide safer infrastructure for all.)

After providing funding and substantial scoping of the project for DDOT's initial study, I would be in close communication with DDOT throughout the study period so that, once completed, DDOT would have funding to move to the design phase. I would encourage DDOT to listen to transportation experts and urban planners to ensure that the redesign of Wisconsin Avenue improves access and connectivity throughout the corridor and beyond and is set up to serve Ward 3 well for the next fifty years. I would also encourage DDOT to identify any procedural, financial, or regulatory hurdles that would prevent the ideal redesign from being implemented. I would work with my colleagues on Council and DDOT to overcome or mitigate any such hurdles.

I would ask DDOT to minimize construction disruptions to schools and small businesses. Further, I would remain in close contact with DDOT to ensure that delays are minimized and safety is prioritized.

I am not sure if I would rather be on the first bus driving down a new bus lane or with the first group of cyclists to ride down a new protected bike lane, but I'm sure my smile would be wider than Wisconsin Ave.

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	6
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	7
Regional reciprocity for automated traffic enforcement	8
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 two to three blocks, in any direction of their residence (about a five- to seven-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.

For the past 20 years, I've commuted by Metro or bicycle, and would continue to do so if elected to Council. For groceries, I'm lucky enough to have three grocery stores within walking distance and another just one short bus/rail trip away in Van Ness. The one trip I take by car on a regular basis is to visit my parents in Chevy Chase, near the intersection of Rock Creek Park and the DC/MD border. I've biked there hundreds of times, though cycling isn't the most enjoyable option after a big home-cooked meal, but taking a Metrorail/bus combination is something I would commit to. According to Metro's Trip Planner, I'd save ~1.9 lbs. of CO2 each way!