

Thank you for the opportunity to participate. Answers in CAPS below

1. Would you support hearings on this policy to help find a solution for this policy that places voucher recipients in regular rent control, who instead need social services, halfway houses and mental health housing (called CRFs or centrally run facilities)? YES

2. Would you support as one possible solution, that screening be required for voucher recipients to discern whether they should be placed in social service housing or are ready for independent living? YES

3. Would you commit to funding the vastly underfunded housing needed by special needs tenants: halfway houses, centrally run facilities operated by behavioral health providers, and the like? YES

4. While TENAC does not favor a blanket moratorium on all vouchers, one candidate has suggested a moratorium (temporary) on all vouchers. TENAC loves voucher tenants and would never suggest a cessation or moratorium on housing unhoused people. Would you support instead a temporary re-directing of voucher recipients from being placed in rent control buildings until a remedy is worked out? We support this position in order to preserve the remaining rent control housing that is quickly being devastated by the mayor's destructive policy. Note: during any moratorium for rent control voucher placements, voucher holders can be placed in new or nonrent control buildings. (Such placement in new and nonrent control housing would actually be more in line with the luxury rent rents prices vouchers pay). I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF A BLANKET ARRANGEMENT DISALLOWING VOUCHER TENANTS TO ACCESS PARTICULAR HOUSING UNITS. I AM FOR SCREENING AND PROVIDING BUILDING OPTIONS THAT HAVE THE REQUIRED SERVICES TO MEET THE NEEDS OF A PARTICULAR TENANT.

OVERALL VOUCHER PLACEMENTS IS DESTROYING RENT CONTROL FOR THE WORKFORCE

The methodology and target of the mayor's policy of placing harmful voucher tenants in rent control units (housing built before 1976) clearly indicates it is being done to destroy rent control. The mayor's Cash2Covenant policy and Rock Creek Roadmap plainly outlines her policy of converting, under a covenant or covenant-like agreement, workforce rental housing into voucher housing. (Why not direct voucher tenants to newer building that are nonrent control? The extremely high rent rates vouchers command is in keeping with these higher priced, newer rental buildings. Too many DC tax dollars are being used to simply line landlord pockets by this policy of placing high paying vouchers into rent control units. Vouchers are sometimes paying double the actual rent control rates on apartments. This is a grand waste of taxpayer money. Worse, The much higher rent amounts that vouchers pay will eventually replace all rent control housing. RESIDENTS NEED AFFORDABLE

HOUSING
NOT ITS DESTRUCTION.

5. Eventually, only the poor (through vouchers) and the very wealthy (in newer, expensive housing) will be able to live in DC. No workforce residents, such as teachers, service personnel, government employees and the like will be able to live here. Do you see this as a problem? And if so, What is your solution to this problem? I HAVE PUBLICLY COMMENTED, INCLUDING IN PUBLIC COMMENTS IN FORUM AND IN THE WASHINGTON POST, NOTING THE NEED FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING AS A TOP ISSUE AND MY CALL TO PROVIDE NO TO LOW INTEREST LOANS FOR FIRST RESPONDERS, TEACHERS, AND OTHERS IN SIMILAR ROLES.

6. Would you commit to hearings on the issue of preserving (and expanding) workforce housing and the problem of the destruction of rent control for the workforce by voucherization, in order to identify possible solutions? YES

7. Would you commit to expanding rent control to current buildings? (Presently rent control only applies to buildings built after 1975, whose landlords own five or more units,). NO

8. A LEAKING BUCKET: WHY. Due to current policy, no matter how much affordable housing is enacted by the council, before any construction begins, our developer-mayor waives the affordability requirements mandated by law, so developers can instead build luxury housing. From our understanding, this power to waive affordability requirements is not statutory. Instead the mayor is claiming to have "implied" authority to do so. Would you commit to clarifying, or abolishing the mayor's supposed authority to waive affordability requirements so the law's requirements are carried out? YES