



COMPLETE

Collector:

Started:

Last Modified:

Time Spent:

IP Address:



Page 1: Contact information

Q1

Contact information

Name

Ebbon A. Allen

Email

friendsofebbonallen@gmail.com

Website

ebbonfor7.com

Social media accounts

@ebbonfor7

Q2

Please upload a high-resolution headshot that GGWash has permission to use.

Headshot%20High%20Resolution.png (4.7MB)

Q3

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?

Q4

I’ll support another housing production goal, but won’t 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 over 900,000 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 2050? If the mayor or your colleagues don’t propose a production goal, will you propose one yourself?

Q5

Between 36,000 and 50,000

With 36,000 presumably completed units as a baseline in 2025, how many additional units do you think should be built in the District by 2050?

Q6

Yes

Housing production in D.C. has been uneven and particularly concentrated in certain neighborhoods. Do you support the mayor's approach of setting production targets in each of the District's planning areas to evenly disperse the construction of new housing?

Q7

Yes

Should apartments be legal in all parts of all the District's neighborhoods?

Q8

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

Q9

If you have any other preferred means by which you, as a councilmember, would increase housing production, please share them here.

I would propose mixed use housing developments within Ward 7, amenities included.

Q10

Where in your ward do you think new housing should be built? If you do not think new housing should be built in your ward, please write, "I do not think new housing should be built in my ward." At-large candidates should indicate where, and whether, they think new housing should be built in the District.

There could be mixed use developments near RFK stadium.

Q11

Where in your ward do you think density should be increased to accommodate the construction of new housing? If you do not think density should be increased in your ward, please write, "I do not think density should be increased in my ward." At-large candidates should indicate where, and whether, they think density should be increased in the District.

RFK

Q12

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

Raising the Height Act only for buildings that will produce more income-restricted, subsidized housing than required by inclusionary zoning

Q13

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

Q14

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

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

Q15

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

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

Q16

Check any of the below combination of features that you would consider social housing.

District-owned housing on District-owned land, built by a District agency and managed by a District agency

District-owned housing on District-owned land, built by a private construction company and managed by a District agency

Q17

What do you think is the greatest obstacle to ensuring that housing is built in the District for residents who make between 0 percent MFI and 30 percent MFI, and why?

Well, I'd say it's a mix of factors, but chiefly, it boils down to affordability and available resources.

First off, constructing affordable housing in a city like the District of Columbia is no easy feat. Land costs are high, construction expenses are rising, and there's often resistance from existing residents or developers who may not see the immediate financial benefit in building low-income housing.

Then there's the funding challenge. Affordable housing projects often rely heavily on government subsidies or tax incentives, and securing these funds can be a bureaucratic maze. Sometimes, even when the funding is available, it's not enough to cover all the costs, leading to delays or compromises in the quality of housing.

Furthermore, zoning and regulatory hurdles can slow down the process significantly. Navigating through zoning laws, obtaining permits, and meeting compliance standards can add months, if not years, to the timeline of a project.

Lastly, there's the issue of societal attitudes towards affordable housing. Despite efforts to promote inclusivity and diversity, there's still stigma attached to low-income housing developments. NIMBYism (Not In My Backyard) is a real challenge, with some communities resisting the idea of having affordable housing units nearby due to misconceptions about crime rates, property values, and so on.

In essence, it's a complex web of financial, bureaucratic, and social challenges that make it difficult to ensure adequate housing for those in the 0-30 percent MFI bracket. It requires a concerted effort from government, developers, and the community to overcome these obstacles and create a more equitable housing landscape.

Q18

What do you think is the greatest obstacle to ensuring that housing is built in the District for residents who make between 30 percent MFI and 50 percent MFI, and why? If your answer is the same as above, please explain why.

The challenges for ensuring housing for residents making between 30 and 50 percent of the median family income (MFI) in the District are quite similar to those faced by the 0-30 percent MFI bracket. While the specific income range differs, many of the underlying obstacles remain the same.

Affordability remains a significant barrier. Even though this income bracket might have slightly more financial flexibility compared to those at lower income levels, they still struggle to afford decent housing in a city like D.C. where housing costs are steep.

Funding constraints persist as well. Affordable housing projects targeting this income range often require subsidies or tax incentives to be financially feasible. However, securing these funds can be challenging due to budget constraints and competing priorities.

Zoning and regulatory hurdles also come into play. Navigating through the complexities of zoning laws, obtaining permits, and meeting compliance standards can be time-consuming and costly, delaying the development process.

And, just like with lower income brackets, societal attitudes towards affordable housing can pose a barrier. Some communities may resist the idea of having affordable housing units nearby, fearing perceived negative impacts on property values or neighborhood safety.

In essence, while the income range may differ, the fundamental obstacles to building affordable housing in the District persist. It requires a multi-faceted approach involving government, developers, and the community to address these challenges and ensure that housing is accessible to all income levels.

Q19

What do you think is the greatest obstacle to ensuring that housing is built in the District for residents who make between 50 percent MFI and 80 percent MFI, and why? If your answer is the same as one above, please explain why.

The greatest obstacle to ensuring housing for residents making between 50 and 80 percent of the median family income (MFI) in the District shares similarities with the challenges faced by lower income brackets, but there are some nuances.

Affordability remains a significant hurdle. While those in this income range may have a bit more financial flexibility compared to lower income brackets, the high cost of housing in the District can still strain their budgets. The gap between median incomes and housing costs continues to widen, making it difficult for moderate-income individuals and families to find suitable housing within their means.

Funding constraints are another obstacle. Affordable housing projects targeting this income range often require subsidies, tax incentives, or other financial support to be financially viable. However, securing these funds can be competitive, as there are limited resources available for affordable housing initiatives, and there may be other pressing priorities competing for funding.

Zoning and regulatory challenges persist as well. Navigating through zoning laws, obtaining permits, and meeting compliance standards can be complex and time-consuming, adding delays and costs to the development process.

Lastly, societal attitudes towards affordable housing can pose barriers. Some communities may resist the development of affordable housing units in their neighborhoods, fearing potential impacts on property values or neighborhood character.

While the specific income range differs, the fundamental obstacles to building affordable housing in the District remain similar across different income brackets. Addressing these challenges requires a collaborative effort from government, developers, and the community to ensure that housing is accessible and affordable for all residents, regardless of income level.

Q20

What do you think is the greatest obstacle to ensuring that housing is built in the District for residents who make between 80 percent MFI and 120 percent MFI, and why? If your answer is the same as one above, please explain why.

The challenge of ensuring housing for residents making between 80 and 120 percent of the median family income (MFI) in the District has its own set of hurdles, though there are parallels with lower income brackets.

One significant obstacle is the affordability gap. While individuals and families in this income range may have higher earning potential compared to lower income brackets, they still face challenges in finding housing that fits within their budgets. The high cost of living in the District, including housing costs, can stretch their financial resources and make it difficult to secure suitable housing options.

Additionally, zoning and regulatory constraints can impede the development of housing in this income bracket. Navigating through zoning laws, obtaining permits, and meeting compliance standards can be cumbersome and time-consuming, leading to delays and increased costs for developers.

Furthermore, there may be funding limitations for affordable housing initiatives targeting this income range. While individuals and families in the 80-120 percent MFI bracket may not qualify for certain subsidized housing programs, they still may need assistance to afford housing in a high-cost city like D.C. Securing funding sources to support mixed-income housing developments can be challenging, especially given competing priorities for limited resources.

Societal attitudes towards development, particularly in affluent neighborhoods, can also present obstacles. Some communities may resist the integration of affordable or workforce housing in their areas, fearing potential impacts on property values or neighborhood character.

While the specific income bracket may differ, the overarching challenges to building housing in the District remain similar across different income ranges. Addressing these obstacles requires a collaborative approach involving government, developers, and the community to ensure that housing is accessible and affordable for all residents, regardless of income level.

Q21

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 can be 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 income-restricted, 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 25-unit project each in both Congress Heights and Chevy Chase, for residents making between 80 (\$72,250) and 120 percent (\$108,350) MFI

Q22

I prefer this scenario because:

I would propose that families making between \$72,50 and \$108,350 would also invest in any amenities within their communities. Many families are left out that are earning between those income levels. Every family deserves a fair shot in regards to not just purchasing a home in DC, but being able to reside in the District for years to come.

Q23

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 toward these targets is shown above. As a councilmember, what will you do to ensure that enough affordable housing is built in each planning area so as to achieve this goal?

As a councilmember, ensuring the equitable distribution of affordable housing in each planning area to meet Mayor Bowser's targets by 2050 would be a top priority. To achieve this goal, several proactive steps can be taken:

Introduce and advocate for legislation that incentivizes the development of affordable housing in every planning area. This might include offering tax incentives, density bonuses, or expedited permitting processes for projects that meet affordable housing quotas. Foster community engagement and collaboration to identify suitable sites for affordable housing development within each planning area. Conducting outreach, hosting town hall meetings, and soliciting input from residents can help ensure that proposed developments align with community needs and priorities. Forge partnerships with developers to encourage the inclusion of affordable housing units in new developments. This could involve negotiating with developers to allocate a percentage of units as affordable housing or providing financial incentives to offset development costs. Implement measures to preserve existing affordable housing stock within each planning area. This might involve offering financial assistance to property owners for rehabilitation or retrofitting of affordable housing units to maintain affordability. Advocate for the equitable allocation of resources and funding for affordable housing initiatives across all planning areas. Ensure that each area receives its fair share of funding for affordable housing development and preservation efforts. Establish mechanisms for monitoring progress towards the 15 percent affordable housing target in each planning area. Regularly review and assess progress, hold stakeholders accountable for meeting targets, and adjust strategies as needed to address any disparities or challenges. Advocate for robust inclusionary zoning policies and zoning reforms that require a portion of new developments to include affordable housing units. Work to streamline zoning regulations and remove barriers to affordable housing development in each planning area. By taking a comprehensive and proactive approach that involves legislative action, community engagement, partnerships with developers, equitable resource allocation, monitoring progress, and advocating for policy reforms, we can work towards achieving Mayor Bowser's targets for affordable housing in each planning area by 2050.

Q24

This is a suitable evolution of TOPA.

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?

Q25

Please explain your selected response. If you'd like, feel free to expound upon cutbacks to TOPA eligibility, including the recently proposed 10-year exemption to TOPA in the Downtown Action Plan.

It doesn't show equity for our District tenants. The cutbacks affect the families that deserve to reside in the District. DC tenants deserve equity to be able to live and enjoy all of the amenities that our city has to offer.

Q26

Limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts enjoy widespread support. How would you encourage their proliferation?

Encouraging the proliferation of limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts is essential for promoting affordable housing and empowering communities. These models have demonstrated their effectiveness in providing stable and affordable housing options while fostering community ownership and control. To further support their growth, several strategies could be implemented.

First and foremost, providing financial incentives and subsidies for the development of limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts can be instrumental. This might include grants, low-interest loans, or tax incentives to offset the costs of acquiring land, constructing or rehabilitating buildings, and implementing supportive services.

Secondly, streamlining regulatory processes and reducing bureaucratic barriers can facilitate the creation and operation of these housing models. Simplifying zoning regulations, expediting permitting processes, and offering technical assistance can help navigate the complexities of development and ensure compliance with legal requirements.

Additionally, raising awareness and building capacity within communities about the benefits and feasibility of limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts is crucial. Providing education and training programs on cooperative governance, financial management, and community engagement can empower residents to initiate and sustain these initiatives.

Furthermore, fostering partnerships and collaboration between government agencies, nonprofit organizations, financial institutions, and community stakeholders can leverage resources and expertise to support the proliferation of these housing models. By working together, these entities can pool resources, share best practices, and coordinate efforts to address housing affordability challenges effectively.

Lastly, advocating for supportive policies at the local, state, and federal levels can create an enabling environment for the expansion of limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts. This might include enacting legislation to protect and promote cooperative housing, allocating dedicated funding for affordable housing initiatives, and incorporating these models into broader housing policy frameworks.

Overall, by implementing a multifaceted approach that combines financial incentives, regulatory reforms, capacity building, collaboration, and advocacy, we can encourage the widespread proliferation of limited-equity co-ops and community land trusts, thereby advancing housing affordability and community empowerment.

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?

In theory, inclusionary zoning should serve as a powerful tool for promoting economic diversity and creating more equitable communities. It should be achieving a delicate balance between stimulating development and ensuring that a portion of that development is reserved for affordable housing units.

Ideally, inclusionary zoning should be fostering mixed-income neighborhoods, where individuals from various socioeconomic backgrounds can live together, share resources, and contribute to vibrant, inclusive communities. It should be a means of addressing the housing affordability crisis by mandating that developers include affordable units in their projects or contribute to an affordable housing fund.

However, as with many well-intentioned policies, the reality often falls short of the ideal. In some cases, inclusionary zoning policies may not be effectively enforced, leading to developers skirting their obligations or finding loopholes to avoid compliance. This can result in a lack of truly affordable housing being built, perpetuating the cycle of exclusion and exacerbating housing inequality.

Furthermore, there may be challenges with the design and implementation of inclusionary zoning policies. The requirements and incentives offered to developers may not be sufficient to encourage the construction of affordable units, especially in high-cost markets like the District. Additionally, the income thresholds used to determine affordability may not accurately reflect the needs of lower-income residents, leading to a mismatch between available housing and the population in need.

To improve the effectiveness of inclusionary zoning policies, several changes could be considered. This might include strengthening enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance by developers, providing more substantial incentives for affordable housing construction, and revisiting income thresholds to better target those in need. Additionally, there should be a concerted effort to engage with communities and stakeholders to ensure that inclusionary zoning policies are tailored to local needs and context, fostering genuine inclusivity and equity in housing development.

Q28

Mostly tenant-based

Affordable 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

I do not support public funding for privately owned sports stadiums in the District.

Sports teams and government officials have long touted the economic benefits of publicly financed, privately owned sports stadiums, but research spanning the last 30-plus years has found that these projects consistently do not deliver their promised economic impacts, while imposing major public costs. Which of the following statements best describes your view?

Q30 **Preserving the character of existing neighborhoods**

The District's current Comprehensive Plan was written in 2006 and amended in 2021. The Office of Planning will begin the process of rewriting it in 2025. The Comp Plan is the District's foundational land-use document; though land use naturally intersects with other sectors, the Comp Plan's legal scope is limited to land use alone. Which of the following will be your top priority in a rewrite of it?

Q31 **Yes**

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**

Production, distribution, and repair zones—basically, industrial uses—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 the District 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 the District, please write, "I do not think PDR zoning should be added in the District."

I do not think PDR zoning should be added to the District.

Q34

Land-use changes in the District are sometimes, though not always, required to be accompanied by a public input and/or community outreach process. The following is a non-exhaustive list of means by which public input might emerge, or community outreach might be conducted. Of course, different proposals will occur in different contexts, and it's understandable that you might feel that your preferred ranking would vary based on individual proposals. However, all else being equal, rank the following based on how greatly you, as a councilmember, would value them:

- Verbal testimony given in-person in a public forum, such as a Zoning Commission or Board of Zoning Adjustment meeting, or a council hearing **1**
- Written testimony submitted to the record of a public forum, such as a Zoning Commission or Board of Zoning Adjustment meeting, or a council hearing **4**
- Letters, emails, and calls from residents adjacent to a given site **8**
- A resolution passed by the relevant Advisory Neighborhood Commission(s) **2**
- Emails sent via click-to-send action alert **9**
- A petition with 100 or more signatures **5**
- A statistically significant survey or poll of neighbors adjacent to a given site **3**
- A statistically significant survey or poll of ward residents **7**
- A statistically significant survey of District residents **6**

Q35

Enough cars

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

Q36

No

The Sustainable D.C. 2.0 plan includes a target of reducing commuter trips made by car to 25 percent. Do you agree that incentivizing 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 at least \$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. Do 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 prioritize repurposing existing travel lanes.**
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. Do you support removing single-occupancy vehicle parking and travel lanes for protected bike lanes?

Q40 **DDOT should prioritize repurposing existing travel lanes.**
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, and Singapore by reducing the number of vehicles on the road and improving transit performance. New York City is moving forward with its implementation of road pricing. Though it is on its face unpopular to drivers who currently do not pay to do so, a road pricing program charging drivers for their trips into downtown is estimated to generate about \$345 million for the District. Would you, as a councilmember, support road pricing as a means to reduce congestion to speed up transit, improve air quality and public health, and raise revenue?

Q42
If yes, how would you propose reinvesting the \$345 million in revenue road pricing is estimated to generate for the District? If no, please write, "I do not support road pricing."

Yes. The District must take precautionary measures to protect our environment for the next 30/40 years.

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, despite 2024 legislation mandating her to do so. 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."

We must hold all public officials accountable and provide better ways for our constituents to trust the Mayor and the Council. I would propose to the rest of the Council to propose full transparency from the Mayor to release the information to the public.

Q45

WMATA's budget deficit is likely to extend beyond this year, and funding WMATA going forward will require the District to cut existing programs, raise revenue, or both. Please rank the following revenue-raising policies in the order of your preference:

Raising Metrorail and Metrobus fares	5
Increasing property tax rates around Metrorail stations and high-frequency Metrobus routes	1
Implementing a road pricing charge	4
Increasing the gas tax	6
Increasing parking rates	3
Increasing the sales tax	2

Q46

Why is the above your preferred ranking?

DC residents have more accessibility with transportation and other amenities if they reside near metro stations. Constituents should have property taxes raised when those amenities are presented within a community. The city should try to avoid raising bus and train fares if there are other proposals of bringing a street car to Ward 7.

Q47

Fare-free transit

Which of the following would you prefer?

Q48

Pick a planned transportation project in your ward that you support, and explain what you would do to ensure it comes to fruition. At-large candidates are welcome to select any project, regardless of ward.

As councilman, I would hold DDOT to come speak with constituents from each Ward 7 community and provide transparency on a timeline for the projects to be completed. DDOT would also be responsible to provide surveys from the constituents to determine whether residents will support or oppose the projects. I would also encourage my constituents to come and testify in public about the projects presented throughout the Ward.

Q49

Incentives for people to drive less and nudges to make them drive safely can prevent drivers from killing other people, but research shows such “carrots” won’t be enough to curb this public health crisis. Keeping people alive and safe on District roads requires policies that actively reshape our transportation systems and built environment to decrease single-occupancy vehicle trips, and to slow down drivers when they do make those trips. Please rank the following policies in the order that you would request your staff pursue them.

Implementing a road-pricing program	4
Increasing the cost to own a car in the District, including RPP and parking registration	9
Removing minimum parking requirements in new developments near transit	3
Implementing road diets on arterial streets	2
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
Removing travel lanes for bus lanes	5
Removing travel lanes for bike lanes	6

Q50

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

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

Q51

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 would love to walk to the Benco Shopping Plaza by foot. Im apprehensive because the area is experiencing public safety issues. The Benco Shopping Plaza also needs to be redeveloped from the Shrimp Boat to the Department of Motor Vehicles Center. I want my wife and 3 sons to be able to enjoy everything that Marshall Heights could possibly offer within the next 10 or 15 years.