

#2

COMPLETE

# Graham McLaughlin

Collector:

Started:

Last Modified:

Time Spent:

IP Address:

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information

Name	Graham McLaughlin
Email	info@grahamfordc.com
Website	www.grahamfordc.com
Social media accounts	@grahamforDC1 twitter, @grahamfordc IG, FB, and Tik Tok

## 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?

## 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 planning areas, such as Lower Anacostia Waterfront/Near Southwest. Do you support the mayor’s goal to set production targets in each area of the District to more evenly disperse the construction of new housing?

---

**Q6**

Council's land use authority is limited: The Home Rule Act states, "The mayor shall be the central planning agency for the District," and councilmembers do not, generally, vote up or down on individual developments, unless they will require public financing, such as tax abatements or TIFs. 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. If you would not request your staff pursue a specific policy, please select N/A. (This list is purposefully not inclusive of affordability and stabilization policies, which are addressed in subsequent questions.)

- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| 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>9</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>8</b> |
| Amending the building code to reduce construction costs   | <b>4</b> |
| Legalizing and incentivizing housing above public facilities, such as libraries, rec centers, and fire stations | <b>5</b> |
|   | <b>6</b> |
-

**Q7**

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

EVERYWHERE. We should especially encourage increased density near transit hubs and affordable housing in wealthier areas of the city that currently have a lower percentage of it and historically have had policies of de facto racial segregation. There's also significant opportunity to better utilize publicly owned or partially controlled parcels, and to use zoning changes to partner with faith institutions and other non-profits to enable increased housing production.

Lastly, with commuters decreasing during COVID and working from home appearing to be a long term trend, attracting more residents to the city, and enabling them to have the housing to live here, is an important component of ensuring a strong long term tax base to fund social programs. Density across the city (with a mix of both affordable and market rate) is also what's needed to provide the foot traffic required to support a thriving local economy, grocery stores, and local retailers.

We should use every tool at our disposal, including but not limited to zoning changes and lot size requirements, to cultivate production of housing across the District (and, where possible, in partnership with the broader region).

---

**Q8**

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

EVERYWHERE. Many publicly owned sites could be utilized for high density residential or mixed-use developments, especially near transit hubs. Legalizing two and four-unit buildings across the District would create opportunity in more residential neighborhoods, as would, to a lesser extent, incenting production of ADUs (if required to use for long-term tenants). Creating more "by right" opportunity and reduced parking requirements would streamline development and lower costs, enabling greater density and affordability across the city. I would encourage greater market rate development in areas with food and retail deserts, and a higher rate of affordable housing in Rock Creek West and other higher-wealth areas with lower percentages of affordable housing.

---

**Q9**

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

As discussed in previous questions, increase production and density everywhere. Make two and four-units legal everywhere. Create more “by right” zoning and bonus density opportunities. Remove height and mass from historic review. In cases where unable to do this through Council action, partner to amend the comprehensive plan to encourage increased density, including bold actions like lifting restrictions on multifamily housing across all parts of the city, eliminating parking minimums, and requiring DCRA to provide permits and inspections within 60 days or the District would automatically grant the applicant the right to move forward.

I agree with some of the work being pushed forward by CM Nadeau and others requiring 30% of new housing on public land to be affordable, and extending this mandate to land owned by WMATA, DC Water, DC Housing Authority, and other quasi-governmental organizations.

Lastly, I would introduce a Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA) as part of a broader commitment to preserve affordable housing. With some changes to TOPA and introduction of COPA, we could create an environment where tenants or community organizations are actually purchasing properties through these programs, and by streamlining the decision we could reduce the transaction costs and time to sale in a way that would increase overall affordability in the broader market.

---

**Q10**

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

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

---

**Q11**

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

- Not means-tested or income-restricted,**
  - Unsubsidized,**
  - Not rent-controlled**
-

**Q12**

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?

I would answer the call in three ways:

1) Ask questions on whether are housing dollars are being allocated most effectively to deliver the most affordable units in the quickest amount of time- Preservation is a much more cost effective way of providing affordable housing vs. production. Whatever number as a government we decide to invest in housing, should the vast majority go to the Housing Production Trust Fund, or should we be investing more deeply into preserving affordable public housing instead? This and other similar questions aimed at ensuring we are effective stewards of taxpayer dollars by taking the actions that create the highest number and highest quality of affordable units are what I would be asking as a Councilmember

2- DCHA should be accountable to its residents, not just to its Board- We need greater resident voice on how DCHA funds are used, and we need resident voices as a core part of the budget analysis on where to best spend our resources allocated for affordable housing.

3- Ensure DCHA/repair investments yield results through aligned incentives- If we do invest more in DCHA/public housing repairs, we should look into smart contracting and other means of ensuring repairs are effectively provided. We could also look to a modified European model of rent control. In their model, pricing is stabilized but tenants are responsible for upkeep. In DCHA’s case, in DC we could pilot an opportunity for residents to share in savings if DCHA’s repair costs are lower than anticipated in a fiscal year as a way of aligning incentives for upkeep.

---

**Q13**

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

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

---

**Q14**

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)?

The biggest challenge with this band is that development is not prioritized or invested in as diligently as deeply affordable. Therefore, a major way to keep this income band is preservation and conversion of existing units into affordable (especially in highest cost neighborhoods).

An additional change I would explore, but that would be more challenging to bring to fruition, would be creating workforce housing partnerships with employers that would provide private investment to fund benefits to workers at this AMI level (and potentially 80-120% as well) that would create the right operating cost economics for enhanced development at this AMI level.

Overall though, this is simply a prioritization issue from HPTF and public land development on where to allocate subsidies for development.

---

**Q15**

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)?

Many times, Councilmembers and housing advocates will push for 80-120% AMI to be the lowest production, but I take a slightly different view. Production at this band lets us know if increased density and housing production efforts are working. If we can create production at this level with very limited to no subsidies then we are beginning to stabilize on market rate housing being level with AMI. We do this by enabling housing production increases at the lowest possible cost. We legalize two and four-unit buildings across the District. We partner with faith institutions on zoning changes to enable them to build affordable housing on their land. We create more “by right” opportunities. We make construction cheaper by reducing bureaucratic friction and reducing parking requirements. Longer term, we update the comprehensive plan to enable increased building (with support structures in place to ensure the required improvement and growth in infrastructure keeps up with production). Creating opportunities to increase overall supply helps us produce at this level.

**Q16**

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**

**Q17**

I prefer this scenario because:

Scenario 3 and 4 are basically equal for me, but I chose 3 because of the greater volume of affordable housing produced in Forest Hills. I favor these scenarios because I support expanded growth of market rate in communities with food and retail deserts in order to build the economic infrastructure to attract these providers, and enhanced affordability in communities with a lower proportion currently to address historical structural racism and create greater social and economic mobility for young people in lower income housing (as outlined in this study\* and many others.) Investments in workforce housing in the 60-80 AMI range yield dividends both in diversity of backgrounds across our city and reduction of single occupancy vehicle trips (vs. if these workers live in outlying suburbs and drive in).

\*<https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/133/3/1107/4850660>

**Q18**

The Office of Planning's Housing Framework for Equity and Growth, released in October 2019, sets targets for the production of affordable housing per planning area "to achieve an equitable distribution of no less than 15 percent affordable housing in each planning area by 2050." Progress on those targets since January 2019 is illustrated in the above chart, from the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development. What will you do to ensure that every planning area meets its stated target by 2050?

Targets mean nothing without incentives and strategic efforts to hit the goal. Do we want to feel good about setting goals and then bemoan the fact that we did not hit them, or do we want to take action to meet these worthy goals, even if in some cases the action is controversial?

I want to take action that helps people stay in DC living in high quality affordable housing.

Therefore, in addition to working on changes to the Future Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan, I would also propose zoning changes and increased development and preservation incentives in particular areas. Not only would I continue to advocate that two and four-unit zoning be allowed across the city, and that we vastly increase "by right" opportunities, but I would also provide greater incentives for creating affordable housing in particular neighborhoods (that aren't currently hitting affordable targets) and give less incentive if building in neighborhoods already beyond their target. Affordable housing only works financially with government incentives, so if we are serious about hitting our housing targets, we must use those incentives (and zoning changes) to focus building in the geographic regions we desire. Lastly, I will continue to highlight the opportunity to partner more effectively with religious organizations and other non-profits to build deeply affordable housing on their existing properties.

**Q19**

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:

- Allow only one increase per year, with notice, for any D.C. rental housing that's exempt from rent stabilization**
- 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**
- Cap annual rent increases at the level of inflation, or consumer price index, and eliminate the extra two percent allowed under current law**

**Q20**

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

The availability of subsidies is the only path forward. The problem faced is that the Housing Production Trust Fund can provide a capital investment, but at this income level rents are too low to cover operating expenses. Therefore, a target at this income level is in effect an unfunded mandate, unless subsidies are also provided. Therefore, since LSRP and PSH vouchers are currently the best (and basically only) way of ensuring these units can be produced and filled, the vouchers must be available. With our current structures, there is no other way DHCD can produce housing to hit these targets in an economical way. This is yet another reason why we should be discussing preservation as much as we discuss production in every affordable housing conversation.

Beyond the current structure, though it would take more analysis, there is an argument for putting these building funds into public housing repairs or tear downs to get our housing back up to livable levels. There's also an opportunity for more creative ways of "creating" new housing, such as (cheaper than current cost of production) subsidies for individuals to turn bedrooms or basements into affordable housing for a single individual, especially since shadow rentals are a significant percentage of current available affordable units.

To ensure low-income housing is reliably produced we must cover production and operating costs, and to do that at the cost levels required to continue to ramp up production we will need ongoing funding of current operating solutions (vouchers) as well as new and innovative ways to create new housing.

---

**Q21**

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

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

---



**Q22**

Please explain your selected response.

TOPA in its current form no longer serves as an anti-displacement policy. I would argue it is not an (asset creating) equity policy either, but rather a one-time cash infusion policy.

The major problem with the current structure is it creates payouts for a few, but doesn't actually create more equitable housing, economic inclusivity or keep neighborhood character and diversity, the very things it was created to do.

It also makes all housing less affordable since the current TOPA process is long, costly for all sides, and creates friction in the system that holds up the development (and increases costs) of housing.

I would formalize the possibility of a buyout as one option in a streamlined process. The goal of TOPA should be to get to resolution quickly and in a way that benefits both the residents of the building and the District's overall affordable housing goals. We should provide public financial support (in the form of low interest loans) to help tenants purchase their property if they desire. We should then streamline the process to enable tenants either to buy, take an \$X payout based on formalized guidelines, or have a third alternative agreed upon by the parties that must be finalized in a certain timeframe.

The key is it must be easy to understand, have clear guidelines on the options, and have a defined timeframe. If we can streamline TOPA in a way that is fair to all parties, we can reduce overall housing costs in the city and free up more affordable housing options.

I would also support adding Community Opportunity to Purchase Act legislation so that non-profit developers would have an opportunity to purchase within a streamlined process. I emphasize again though that the process must be time-bound with clear decisions that are formalized options.

Also, since there is no opportunity to explain the answer to the next question, I would not support expanding TOPA back to single family houses in its current form because it could hold up a sale by an individual/family in a way that creates significant repercussions for their move and next steps. It would also reduce "shadow rentals" (rentals outside of apartment buildings), which is one of the largest sources of affordability in the District, since single homeowners would be more hesitant to rent their property if TOPA existed on their single family home.

I would however support an updated single family TOPA law that balances support of tenants and support of the family selling the property and/or an updated law that exempts individual owners from single family TOPA but still includes commercial owners. Either way though, it must be streamlined.

---

**Q23**

**No**

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

---

**Q24**

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

I believe land trusts and limited equity co-ops are part of a holistic affordable housing solution, combined with programs enabling home ownership in more traditional settings that enable greater wealth creation. Land trusts also ensure stewardship of broader community good in important areas of the city that have enhanced public value because of their natural beauty, environmental importance, etc. Lastly, they are a great example of the opportunity for the District to be much more innovative in the way it engages in public-private partnerships. As the nation's capital and a highly visible city, we could leverage social impact bonds, philanthropic investment, and corporate partnerships in a much more significant way. Community land trusts are a great example of where we could do this (as Douglass Community Land Trust's funding and structure shows). Overall, we could expand community land trusts through a focused effort to build public-private partnership to buy private land, convert public land, or provide tax incentives to transfer individual or corporately held land to land trusts.

On the limited equity co-op side, I have concerns on public investment and support of this option without long-term support of maintenance and upkeep needs. However, I think we could expand the definition of limited equity co-op and engage in innovative ways of providing permanent supportive housing voucher recipients a stake in certain buildings that would create a pathway to equity and a sense of ownership in the building where they live. For instance, permanent supportive housing vouchers could become time bound for individuals who choose this option, with 50% of an individual's monthly contribution going to earning into a limited equity portion of their home. The developer, a non profit or private organization, would build with the agreement that a certain percentage would be financed and owned by the city as a silent and limited partner, who would then transfer this portion to tenants as an equity building strategy. There is much more detail to build on this idea, but it's an example of ways we could begin to create innovative policies that would create equity and affordability by creating shared ownership and accountability.

---

**Q25**

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?

In their current form, TOPA and DOPA are not fully accomplishing the purpose for which they were created. In both cases, in only rare instances are they invoked. As outlined in more detail in previous answers, I would advocate for actions to streamline TOPA and introduce Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA) legislation as a way of providing community (non-profit) organizations the chance to preserve affordable housing before government investment.

**Q26**

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?

Inclusionary zoning is an example of a feel good policy that appears to add a few units of affordable at “no cost,” but in reality drives up the overall rental market costs since the higher the IZ requirement the higher the rents will be on the non-subsidized units.

When a housing provider is creating expanded IZ zoning (20%), I believe the District should provide more “gives,” such as eliminating parking minimums, and we should also work with developers and housing advocates to determine how to better match supply (of IZ units) and demand (individuals who would qualify) so that these units are quickly and efficiently housing individuals.

IZ policy is not the path to creating significant affordable housing in the District, and at worst it can actually create less affordability due to increases in costs of the other units. Therefore, my major focus would be on ensuring effectiveness of the process of getting IZ units filled and win-win negotiation situations, like parking minimum reductions for expanded IZ zoning, to add more affordable units.

---

**Q27**

**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?

---

**Q28**

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

---

**Q29**

**Creating opportunities for new housing**

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

---

**Q30**

**Yes**

Should apartments be legal District-wide?

---

**Q31**

**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.

---

**Q32**

**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?

---

**Q33**

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

Yes, though “fair share” wouldn’t be a completely proportional allocation simply by land area per ward. Some areas are better positioned for industrial zones due to their geography or land values, and therefore should have that zoning, but I would support a broader distribution across all of DC of light manufacturing and other PDR zoning that could create jobs and assets in the District.

---

**Q34**

**Removing or raising the Height Act entirely**

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

---

**Q35**

**Too many cars**

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

---

**Q36**

**Yes**

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

---

**Q37**

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

---

**Q38**

**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?

---

**Q39**

**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. Would you, as council chair, support removing single-occupancy vehicle parking and travel lanes for protected bike lanes?

---

**Q40**

**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?

---

**Q41**

**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, Singapore, Milan, and elsewhere by reducing the number of vehicles on the road and improving transit performance. New York will be implementing road pricing in the next few years. However, many drivers are loathe to pay for something that they currently get for free. Would you, as council chair, support road pricing as a means to reduce congestion to speed up transit, improve air quality, and raise revenue?

---

**Q42**

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

My website- GrahamForDC.com- outlines a list of my top policy goals. Road pricing, specifically bridge toll pricing, is one of those policy goals and I use it to enable a cost neutral way of implementing the entire policy slate. From that proposal, I would use this revenue to support investments in funding the Birth to Three Act, expanded public transportation services, and supporting small businesses in order to ensure we have a thriving local economy that draws foot traffic from residents and incents commuters to come into the District (ideally via metro and bus).

That said, I also believe maintaining some flexibility of how to spend these funds is prudent to ensure that as federal supports expire and tax revenues possibly decline due to commercial vacancies the District remains in a strong financial position.

**Q43**

**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?

**Q44**

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

One of my first acts as a legislator would be introducing legislation to implement bridge toll road pricing. By pushing this as a key policy agenda and actually trying to get it done (rather than long-term legislators saying they support something like this on questionnaires but never putting political muscle behind advancing it), public momentum would be built to release the report as part of debate on whether to pass bridge toll road pricing. In parallel, we would also need to lobby Congress while developing the bill to ensure this is not viewed as a violation of the Home Rule Act.

**Q45**

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

This is one of the biggest issues facing our city, but it is receiving some of the least debate. We will no longer have a public transit infrastructure if we do not begin to take budget action now. A critical aspect is continuing to view WMATA as a regional transit provider and acting as a region in funding, but beyond regional partnership I would focus on a few supplemental levers (in priority order):

- 1- Density bonuses near public transportation for housing providers, with all fees going to public transit infrastructure
- 2- Ride hailing vehicle fee of an additional \$1 per trip on Lyft, Uber, etc. to fund WMATA, ideally implemented in a coordinated way regionally
- 3- While this is an admitted long shot, we are in a fiscal situation with WMATA where we need to put innovative long shots on the table, so I'd also push a DMV collaboration to create a regional limit on GHGs to then create a DMV cap and trade program

**Q46**

**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"?

**Q47**

**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?

**Q48**

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

I am going to cheat a bit and propose a more expanded transportation project vision at the Deanwood Metro, with a focus on Minnesota Av NE and surrounding areas. I would love to work with DDOT to reimagine the parcel that includes the huge parking lot, Deanwood Recreation Center, and the area surrounding the metro into a mixed use development that included affordable housing, a grocery store, an updated and accessible recreation center built into the development, a community garden, and other amenities provided by community feedback. This project could be a model for investment in quickly gentrifying neighborhoods that ensures long-term affordable housing (perhaps via a land trust or limited equity co-op), develops with a public health lens, and thoughtfully builds/provides incentives to particular retail based on community feedback.

**Q49**

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

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

**Q50**

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

We have to develop leverage. Right now, MD and VA have no reason to agree to reciprocity agreements. We must make it politically palatable. We do that by using our current enforcement levers more effectively, specifically substantially increasing booting and towing of MD and VA cars with an outstanding ticket through increased patrols and automated technology identify vehicles with outstanding tickets. We should also discuss reciprocity as part of regional WMATA funding discussions, specifically as a lever for VA and MD to help to contribute more of their share (since we could put a portion of ticket proceeds collected from this as part of a shared allocation toward WMATA investment).

---

**Q51**

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

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

**Q52**

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

I have never owned a car. I bike 80% of the time, and walk or take public transportation for the other 20% of in town trips. For future trips, I would pledge as Councilmember to remain car-free, and take >95% of my trips to activities of my office by bike, train, bus, or on foot

---