

## **CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE – WARD THREE – ISSUES AND RESPONSES**

*(You can write and edit the questionnaire in Word; please feel free to do so and use as much space as you would like.)*

### **RECKLESS VOUCHER TENANTS PLACEMENT IS AN IRRESPONSIBLE POLICY**

Ward Three tenants have been confronted with a sticky situation. Some voucher recipients who are unready and unprepared for community living are being placed in rent control building without screening beforehand. This policy is causing major safety issues and seriously disrupting the peace of rental communities. Some regular renters and even other voucher tenants have relocated for their safety. Some observers attempt to minimize the problem, claiming that the alarm and concerned reactions of tenants are racist and NIMBY; but tenants in these building overwhelmingly welcome voucher residents, and often say they are good additions to their buildings. However, some voucher holders are in need of “permanent supportive housing” instead. The policy of placing voucher holders who are in need of independent supportive housing in regular rent control buildings (not equipped to provide support or even willing to contact social services when need or emergency arise) is unwise, if not harmful to all tenants – regular voucher tenants, regular rent control tenants, and tenants in need of special social services.

Worse, voucher holders not ready for independent living need “wrap around” social services. Being placed recklessly or intentionally in rent control buildings without the special support services these tenants need has had dangerous results. Lack of wrap around services has made these tenants a harm to themselves and their neighbors. Other tenants, even other voucher tenants, have to relocate for their safety. Remaining tenants are outraged as this policy is disrupting and destroying once peaceful communities that have become the scene of drug usage, drug dealing, verbal and physical threats, violence, harm and constant police and emergency services response.

Some advocates believe these special needs voucher tenants are being directed on-purpose at rent controlled buildings. There does seem evidence that the policy is an intentional effort to destroy rent control in order to significantly further pad the pockets of landlords.

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, I would support hearings. But first the policy that places voucher recipients in regular rent control, who instead need social services, halfway houses and mental health housing, must end immediately.

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?

Nobody should be getting a voucher until the people who deserve a voucher, many who have spent decades on the list, get a voucher. Then we can look at screening others.

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, but we must be very careful with funding. It is not the proper role of government to fund everything. Some things must be left up to charities.

4. While TENAC does not favor a blanket moratorium on all vouchers, one candidate has suggested a moratorium (temporary) on all vouchers? Would you support this?

No. The people who have been on the list for decades should receive a voucher before anybody else.

5. Would you support instead a temporary moratorium on voucher recipients being placed in rent control buildings until a remedy is worked out? This is 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 support a stop to the voucher program until I get my voucher. Then we'll talk. I do not like being told that I must be mentally ill, pregnant, homeless, and have a couple of kids before I get a voucher that I have been on a list to get for 18 years.

### **VOUCHER PLACEMENTS DESTROYING RENT CONTROL FOR THE WORKFORCE**

The methodology and target of the mayor's policy of placing harmful voucher tenants in rent control units clearly indicates it is being done to destroy rent control. The much higher rent amounts that vouchers pay will eventually replace all rent control housing. RESIDENTS NEED AFFORDABLE HOUSING NOT ITS DESTRUCTION.

6. 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?

We must all work together to stop Mayor Bowser. If elected, I will work with my fellow councilmembers to take the power away from Bowser and return it to the people.

7. 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.

8. 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,).

Yes. Rent increases are too high and too much for most people.

9. 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, I am committed to abolishing the mayor's supposed authority and to abolishing the wicked Ayatollah herself altogether. I am committed to abolishing her power and to stop her continuing efforts to destroy as many small businesses and lives as possible.

I love TENAC and attended a protest in front of Sidwell Friends school. It was because Sidwell purchased the Washington Home and kicked the seniors out. The seniors soon died and the building remains empty. If elected, I will be counting on and calling upon TENAC to help with all of these issues.

Adrian Salsgiver  
Libertarian candidate for Ward 3 DC Council  
<http://adriansalsgiver.com/>