

# Brianne K. Nadeau

## Page 1: Contact information

### Q1

#### Contact information

Name	<b>Brianne K. Nadeau</b>
Email	<b>brianne@briannefordc.com</b>
Website	<b>briannefordc.com</b>
Social media accounts	<b>@BrianneKN</b>

## 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?

**Between 50,000 and 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   | <b>2</b> |
| Legalizing four-unit buildings District-wide  | <b>1</b> |
| Subsidizing individual homeowners to construct ADUs   | <b>4</b> |
| Increasing the percentage of affordable housing required in public-land dispositions                            | <b>3</b> |
| Incentivizing the conversion of office buildings to residential properties                                      | <b>7</b> |
| Eliminating the Height Act  |          |
| Eliminating parking requirements in new construction  | <b>9</b> |
| Amending the building code to reduce construction costs   | <b>6</b> |
| Legalizing and incentivizing housing above public facilities, such as libraries, rec centers, and fire stations | <b>8</b> |
|   | <b>5</b> |
-

**Q8**

Where in Ward 1 do you think new housing should be built? If you do not think new housing should be built in Ward 1, please write, "I do not think new housing should be built in Ward 1."

As part of the revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, I worked strategically to make changes to the Future Land Use Map all across Ward 1. There are dozens of sites that now have the opportunity for increased housing density. I was able to increase our publicly owned sites along U Street to high-density residential, to ensure we take advantage of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to provide significant amounts of affordable housing and enhance U Street as a Black business corridor. But those are examples of larger sites where we can get a great deal of housing at once. Conversion of single family housing to multifamily across the ward is also important, and can include family-sized housing in places where popping up and back is permitted. I am also excited to have made way for new alley dwellings around the ward by being the sponsor of legislation that named the alleys and thus allowed for them to be developed into housing. Ward 1 is the densest ward, but we still have room to grow and are proud to do our fair share.

---

**Q9**

Where in Ward 1 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 1, please write, "I do not think density should be increased in Ward 1."

I think density should absolutely be increased in Ward 1! See my answer to question 8 and my work increasing residential density on public sites in the Comprehensive Plan. I also commissioned a study to look at the affordability and equity impacts of single-family-exclusive zoning. Almost all of Ward 1 already allows for at least 2 units by-right, but there are ways to accommodate 4-6 unit buildings even in moderate density row house neighborhoods. This is already quite common in areas like Adams Morgan. I'm proud to be the Ward 1 Councilmember because Ward 1 is living proof that density and character go hand-in-hand in any neighborhood.

---

**Q10**

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 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**
- 

**Q11**

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**

**Q12**

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

- Means-tested or income-restricted,**
- Cheap,**
- Subsidized,**
- Rent-controlled,**
- Costing no more than 30 percent of one's household income**

**Q13**

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

- Not means-tested or income-restricted,**
- Expensive,**
- Unsubsidized,**
- Not rent-controlled,**
- Costing more than 30 percent of one's household income**

**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.

There are so many opportunities to make it easier and quicker to build affordable housing in the District, and it starts with making our priorities more clear, on paper. Much of the work I focused on in the comprehensive plan was meant to allow for more housing density and clearly prioritizing affordable housing in zoning decisions. Updating our maps, eliminating restrictions to building multifamily housing (which is outright illegal in many parts of the city right now), establishing programs that provide bonus density with simple guidelines, eliminating parking minimums, and even fixing DCRA's permitting and inspections would all reduce barriers. Leveraging public land to build more affordable housing is a critical tool. As a result of my work on Council, we require no less than 30% of housing built on public land to be affordable. We should also pass a bill I introduced to extend those requirements to quasi-public land like that owned by WMATA, DC Water and the DC Housing Authority. We should continue to use land value as leverage in deals to get even more affordable housing than is required by law, and use DC's significant resources to acquire land in places where more housing production needs to occur. Council can also commit more funding to the Housing Production Trust Fund and Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and fully wield federal funds that are coming to the District now and in the future.

**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?

As the author of the bill that would have brought DCHA under the District government, I should reject the premise of the question, but I will play along for the purposes of this questionnaire. :) I've been trying to make New Communities work at Park Morton for 8 years, and those who came before me have been trying to make it work for even longer. The promise of New Communities is to redevelop public housing communities by building first and not requiring relocation until the new units are available, providing the right to return for anyone who voluntarily relocates during the process, and building 1:1 replacement units for those who reside on the site. In addition, the amount of housing across the sites is essentially tripled with the addition of workforce and market rate housing that help fund the operating costs. The projects are funded through a mix of HUD dollars, local dollars and tax credits. The District has yet to make New Communities work fully, and the reason for that is multi-fold. First, the Housing Authority has been a poor partner, not fully committing to the tenets of New Communities unless they are dragged kicking and screaming. Codifying New Communities would help with that. Second, DMPED has rarely committed the funding needed to build these projects until pressed. This creates doubt and can slow down the projects. New Communities needs to be mapped out in the Capital Improvement Plan at the outset. Third, the District has rarely identified the build first sites in advance, instead leaving it up to the development partners to acquire the land.

The reason I mention all of this is that the Housing Authority needs to completely demolish and rebuild much of its housing stock and the only way to do that is in partnership with the District government and other major landholders in the District. We have to take lessons learned from new Communities to do this. That said, DCHA has a great deal of unused land that can be used for build first and as collateral for borrowing and development partnerships and the Mayor needs to push them to do that. It is worth it to invest local dollars and utilize District borrowing power to help rebuild the Housing Authority housing stock, and even expand it. But the District will need to put guardrails in place that make the Housing Authority a better and more predictable partner in order to succeed at this.

---

**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)?	<b>30,000</b>
30-50 percent MFI (\$27,100-\$45,150 per year for a household of one)?	<b>30,000</b>
50-80 percent MFI (\$45,150 to \$72,250 per year for a household of one)?	<b>30,000</b>
80-120 percent MFI (\$72,250 to \$108,350 per year for a household of one)?	<b>10,000</b>

---

**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 lack of adequate funding in the Local Rent Supplement Program is a very real and consistent problem that has led to incredibly important projects not being selected for Housing Production Trust Fund dollars. I've had this conversation with affordable housing providers year after year, and in the past couple of years we have finally seen some movement on this in the Mayor's budget. The bottom line is that if we don't have project-based LRSP funds in place when HTPF projects come online, there is not enough subsidy to keep those units affordable. At the moment, it is up to the Mayor to make these numbers add up correctly, but it might be worth looking into a legislative measure that ties a certain amount of LRSP funding to the HPTF funding, perhaps a floor that fluctuates with rent prices in the District.

---

**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)?

In my opinion, this is not particularly difficult to do financially, because there are a number of funding streams for developing housing at this particular income band. However, there is a political challenge in that most affordable housing advocates do not believe this is affordable housing and only want to see government leaders focus their efforts on housing at 30 percent of AMI and below. To be clear, my primary focus has been on ensuring we have enough housing at 30 percent of AMI and below. And I also believe we need to focus some energy on ensuring advocacy for affordable housing includes those at 50 and even 80 percent of AMI, and that the government is not demonized for utilizing public resources for housing in these income bands, including the Housing Production Trust Fund, Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and public land value.

---

**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 would refer back to my answer to question 18 re 80 percent of AMI. For 120 percent of AMI, we should be focused on ensuring it is legal to build multi-family housing everywhere in the District, especially near transit.

---

**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:  
I think the last scenario (with the third option close behind) does the most to address the dual goals of affordability and desegregation, which are sometimes at odds. We are still under-producing units at the 30 AMI and below band, so it is critical to support that as much as possible. This is especially true for more economically exclusive areas in the western parts of DC, some of which have almost no dedicated affordable housing to speak of. Far SE/SW, on the other hand, has already exceeded its affordable housing production target, and is often the path of least resistance for LIHTC funding which risks a concentration of poverty.

---

**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 represent, Mid-City, meets the stated targets by 2050?

The good news is that Mid-City is already on the right track to be meeting this goal, with the highest affordable housing production rate of any planning area west of the Anacostia. The biggest contribution I have made to this effort are my amendments to the Future Land Use Map, as described earlier. In particular, the added residential density on public sites will be a game-changer for housing production in Ward 1. I am also working with non-profit, religious, and institutional partners to help contribute to our affordable housing production goal.

At a higher level, it is critical that we sustain investments in the Housing Production Trust Fund, and do the oversight necessary to make sure those dollars are going where they need to.

---

**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.:

Historically the most important function of TOPA has been to preserve affordability for both existing tenants, and future ones. In recent years, buy-outs have become more common, but haven't always been at levels that would sustain those displaced. Preserving long-term affordability versus creating homeownership opportunities and equity are THE biggest tension among affordable housing producers, providers and advocate in my humble opinion. That applies to TOPA too. If there was a way to update TOPA that formalized the way buy-outs were awarded so that they helped create actual equity, but didn't completely deplete our affordable housing stock, I could get behind that!

**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?

**Yes**

**Q25**

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

In Ward 1 I have established the Lower Georgia Avenue Equitable Development planning process, now being led by District Bridges and Justice Sustainability Associates. I fully expect the product of this to be a land trust in the Lower Georgia Avenue corridor, building on the success of the Douglass Community Land Trust. I have been supportive of Limited Equity Co-ops as Councilmember, and I'd like to see more of them established, but we also need to address the urgent needs of existing co-ops as they age. We have many co-ops right now that face growing costs of deferred maintenance and no feasible funding stream to address them. This deserves a study with recommendations on funding streams - should we be leveraging federal funds, or our own borrowing power to support these co-ops? I think we should also explore the best way to foster new co-ops that are sustainable past the 30-year mark.

**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?

We are likely about to see the first exercise of DOPA right here in Mount Pleasant, with the Washington Housing Conservancy as the development partner. This would allow the current tenants to remain in their building with fully renovated affordable housing. That's how DOPA was intended to work, but right now we need to ensure that it is exercised more often. Our first priority should be making TOPA work, with DOPA as a backup. I think we should reduce the number of requirements a building must meet in order to be eligible — it is important for us to look at acquiring buildings and land not just to preserve affordable housing that already exists but to allow us to build more of it. As I mention a lot, public land is our most powerful tool to meet these goals, and we should not settle for a dwindling supply of it.

**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 IZ policy - which requires 8-10% of residential floor area in new buildings be dedicated affordable - is just one item in our housing toolbox. I do not see IZ as an effective route to affordable-housing production on the scale that we need it, but it is an effective way of getting more out of private, market-rate projects without needing to subsidize them. I see IZ as more a way to guarantee that new buildings are not completely exclusive and are more economically integrated.

The Zoning Commission recently instituted a new Expanded IZ program, which bumps the required IZ to 18-20% if a property is upzoned, and requires deeper affordability levels. This starts to make a dent in our production goals, but should be considered a foundation for going even further.

I strongly support proposals to eliminate parking minimums for multifamily buildings - across the board, but especially for projects with significant affordable units. Building parking is a major cost factor and often doesn't make sense, especially for a dense and transit-rich area like Ward 1. Requiring parking is effectively requiring dollars be spent that could be used to house people instead of their vehicles.

**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 1 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 1, please write, "I do not think PDR zoning should be added in Ward 1."

There is still some PDR zoning in Ward 1 south of the reservoir, which currently houses necessary DC Water infrastructure and used to be more intensive industrial use. As some properties are reactivated and redeveloped — the old Bond Bread Factory, for instance — some PDR uses may be appropriate.

I would also support a reconsideration of some of our mixed-use zones to allow for more low-intensity PDR uses. While this would not be appropriate for something like a bus depot or asphalt plant, there are some PDR uses like distilleries and distribution that can co-exist with housing and commercial uses with proper management.

---

**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 prioritize repurposing existing parking lanes.**

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 prioritize repurposing existing parking lanes.**

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 believe this revenue should be directed toward Metro, bus infrastructure, bike infrastructure and pedestrian safety infrastructure.

---

**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?

I think this is a strong argument for road pricing, ensuring that we have a dedicated funding source for public transit while being able to better manage congestion in the District. I also co-introduced the Metro for DC bill, which would give every DC resident \$100 to spend on their SmarTrip. This would significantly help close the WMATA budget gap, while also incentivizing WMATA to provide more effective service in order to unlock those dollars.

---

**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 1 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.

This is a good problem to have, but a significant number of major streets in Ward 1 do have major transportation projects in the works: we're working on bus priority and pedestrian safety corridors on Columbia Road, U Street, 14th Street, and Georgia Avenue; the crosstown protected bike lanes are being extended along Kenyon Street, and the 9th Street cycle track is breaking ground this year.

If I were to choose, I would say Florida Avenue NW — one of the most significant high-crash corridors in Ward 1 and the District as a whole. It is identified as both transit and bike priority in the new MoveDC plan, but Florida Ave today does not reflect that at all.

Crossing Florida Avenue NW is dangerous, challenging, and nerve-wracking, and crosswalks are spaced widely apart. There are also frequent backups for eastbound traffic due to the density of intersections and poor signal timing between 5th Street and 3rd Street.

What I would envision for Florida Avenue NW is a street that prioritizes the significant pedestrian and bus travel that already occurs there, and creates a safe, protected place for people on bikes and scooters. Bus priority may come in the form of full bus lanes or signal priority, which I would defer to the experts on. The streets that intersect with it should also be modified to meet at angles that slow cars, and some redundant intersections may be eliminated altogether, with that space returned for pedestrian use.

Some of the work is already done - as I noted, Florida is called out as bus and bike priority in MoveDC. It is also identified as a corridor for improvement in the new Bus Priority Plan. My job as Councilmember is to make sure that work is adequately funded and in the near-term work plan. Before a project kicks off, I like to do my own work to get thoughts from residents on what needs fixing, and can communicate that to DDOT to help inform the scope of the project. Ultimately, it is also my job to clearly communicate the priorities we've set for our transportation system, both through planning and funding, so that we can be clear about the project's goals and trade-offs. Most of this section of Florida Avenue does not have street parking, so that's less of a concern, but I will have to communicate why repurposing travel lanes is necessary for the street to work best for everyone who uses it and advances our goals of fewer single-occupancy vehicle trips.

---

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

**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.

Our household recently got rid of a car and replaced it with an e-cargo bike that I use to commute with my two kids. They love it, I love not sitting in traffic and getting some exercise and it feels good not to be polluting and spending money on gas. We still have one car, but we are hoping to get a plug in electric vehicle when our trusty little 2010 Ford Focus finally joins the great highway in the sky.