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Good morning.

Welcome. Happy New Year to all.

I hereby call to order the regular meeting of the Board of Elections for January 2014. It is Wednesday, January the 8th, 2014, and the time is 10:36 a.m.

We are in Room 280 North of One Judiciary Square. I am Deborah K. Nichols, the Board Chairman.

Present with me this morning is Devarieste Curry and Stephen Danzansky. Also present on the dias are the Board's Executive Director Mr. Clifford Tatum, the Board's General Counsel, Mr. Kenneth McGhie and the Board's Director of Campaign Finance, Ms. Cecily Collier-Montgomery.

Without objection the agenda for today's meeting is adopted.

Are there any changes, amendments or corrections to the minutes of the December
meeting? So, without, I have a couple of edits - minor edits, so without objection, the minutes of the regular meeting of December 4th, 2013, are adopted with the minor edits noted.

Are there any public matters to be brought before the Board this morning?

Hearing none are there any matters which members wish to be raised in this public meeting? Hearing none we will move to the report of our Executive Director, Mr. Clifford Tatum.

MR. TATUM: Good morning, Madam Chair and Members of the Board. I have a number of items on my report today to make to the Board.

The first is the Candidate Filings and the Challenge Period Update. As of today's date we have 141 candidates who have submitted petitions to the Board for seeking office during the April primary one election. Those 141 candidates will receive preliminary
determination letters from our office today indicating that they are determined to be eligible for the ballot subject to any contemplated challenges that may be found by other candidates or registered voters within the District of Columbia.

The challenge period for the April primary runs from January 4th, 2014, through January 13th, 2014. Our office will be open on Saturday and Sunday of this coming weekend for any challenges to be filed. And the challenge period closes at 5:00 p.m. on January 13th, after which if there's any challenges filed there will be preliminary hearings held on those challenges which may or may not result in action being brought before the full Board. As of today's date, there have been no challenges filed.

The second item on my report for today is the proposed precinct relocations for the April 1st primary election and I'd like to bring Arlin Budoo up to present those
relocations to the Board. Some of these are
what were previously temporary relocations for
the re-election that we need to move back to
their permanent locations and some will be
permanent locations that will be relocations
going forward to the election body.

Mr. Budoo.

MR. BUDO: My name is Arlin Budoo, Support Service Specialist for the Board of Elections. Good morning.

The first precinct I'll start off
with is Precinct Number 4 which is the West End Public Library.

In past elections we have received reports from the ULS, University Legal Services citing that the site is structural in accessible due to the size of the elevator. The elevator is not up to ADA Code. I am now proposing that we relocate the West End Public Library to the School Without Walls at Francis-Stevens located at 2425 N Street, Northwest. The precinct will be on the other
side of the boundary. It's not within the
precinct boundaries, I mean. It's on the
other side of the boundary which is just on
the other side of N Street but it's only two
blocks away from the West End Public Library.
And I do want to make a note that the West End
Public Library will be closing for
renovations. They haven't started it yet but
this will move us along a little faster
because regardless of whether or not we use
the West End Public Library it's going to
close.

The next location is Precinct
Number 5, Christ Episcopal Church. During the
April 23rd, 2013, special election we
relocated to the Georgetown Neighborhood
Library because the church was not available
due to a art auction that they were having in
the location within the facility that we used.
I now propose that we relocate back to Christ
Episcopal Church located at 3116 O Street,
Northwest.
The next relocation is Precinct Number 31, St. Columba's Church which served as a polling place in the November 2012 election. We relocated the polling place to combine with Janney Elementary School because the facility was not available for the April 23rd special election. I now propose that we relocate back to St. Columba's Episcopal Church located at 4201 Albemarle Street, Northwest.

The next polling site is Precinct Number 38, Cesar Chavez Prep Charter School which was not available for the April 23rd, 2013, special election. We relocated to Parkview Recreation Center and combined Precincts 38 and 43 for that election. I now propose that we relocate back to Cesar Chavez Prep Charter School located at 770 Kenyon Street, Northwest.

The next precinct is Precinct 70, Burroughs Elementary School. We were not able to use the location for the April 23rd, 2013,
special election due to renovation and remodeling within the facility. I now propose that we relocate back to Burroughs Elementary School located at 1820 Monroe Street, Northeast.

And our last relocation is Precinct 139, Thurgood Marshall Elementary School. We were informed by DCPS that we would not be able to use this site. Initially, DCPS did let us know that even though they were closing the school, we would still be able to use the school but upon me sending a notification to DCPS they did let me know that the site had been winterized which means they cut off the water and electricity so it would not be available for the April election. I propose that we move to the Theodore Hagans Cultural Center located at 3201 Fort Lincoln Drive, Northeast.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All right.

Thank you, Mr. Budoo.

Are there any questions from
members? Go ahead.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: I have a question just about the Christ Episcopal Church. As I recall, did we have some access problems with that?

MR. BUDO: No, sir.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: I got the wrong one. Okay.

MR. BUDO: No, that's fine.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: That's at 31st and O?

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Right on the corner.

MR. BUDO: Right on the corner.

Right on the corner, yes, sir.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Okay. Sorry, thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Budoo, for this detailed report and I noticed that, you know, what we have has even more details in it. But I noted with respect to the Christ Episcopal Church that the voting
space is described as only Good and the lighting as only Good whereas in all of your other reports with the exception of one, the space and the lighting are shown as Excellent. Is this the best alternative then if the space is only Good?

MR. BUDO: Ms. Curry, I would rather stay at the Georgetown Neighborhood Library but the residents in that area want to remain at the Christ Episcopal Church.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Oh, okay.

MR. BUDO: Because they say that this church is more centrally located for those residents in the area.

Now, I have attempted to stay at the Georgetown Neighborhood Library because it does suit what we are trying to do better but I'm going off the residents in the area.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: What they desire?

MR. BUDO: Right and their desire is to remain at Christ Episcopal Church.
CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Okay. And with respect to - well, I understood your reasons for moving back to Cesar Chavez but that voting space also is described as only Good, although the lighting is described as Excellent.

MR. BUDOO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: But that's the best alternative we have for that one also.

MR. BUDOO: And Precinct 38, Cesar Chavez, there are no other alternative sites. We used to be in Bruce-Monroe Elementary School before they tore it down. So, that was the site that we initially used. We relocated to the Cesar Chavez after they remodeled because that would have been one of the schools they closed and they remodel and they moved the Chavez School and that was the only location that we could find within the precinct boundaries.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: And all of these proposed precincts that you have here they are
all handicap accessible?

MR. BUDO: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All right.

Thank you.

Any other questions? All right.

I will entertain a motion to

publish the proposed precinct relocations in

the D.C. Register for public comment.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: So moved, Madam

Chair.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Second?

MEMBER CURRY: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All in favor,

aye.

(AYES)

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All opposed?

Motion carries.

Thank you, Mr. Budoo.

MR. TATUM: Madam Chair, the next

item on my report is the proposed early voting

center locations for the primary election and

I'd also ask Mr. Budoo to present that to you.
MR. BUDOO: With regards to the early voting sites, as in previous elections we have had one site per ward. We have added five additional sites with one relocation of a previous site. I will go down the list and read them off.

Ward 1, will remain at the Columbia Heights Community Center located at 1480 Girard Street, Northwest.

Ward 2, will be One Judiciary Square Headquarters here downstairs in the Old City Council Chambers located at 441 4th Street, Northwest.

Ward 3, will remain at the Chevy Chase Community Center located at 5601 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. We will adding an additional site within Ward 3, the Stoddert Recreation Center located at 4001 Calvert Street, Northwest.

Ward 4, will remain at the Takoma Community Center located at 300 Van Buren Street, Northwest. We will be adding an
additional site in Ward 4 at the Emery
Recreation Center located at 5801 Georgia
Avenue, Northwest.

Ward 5, will remain at the Turkey
Thicket Recreation Center located at 1100
Michigan Avenue, Northeast.

Ward 6, we are adding two
additional sites. We will remain at the King-
Greenleaf Recreation Center located at 201 N
Street, Southwest. We will be adding an
additional site at Sherwood Recreation Center
located at 640 10th Street, Northeast, and we
will also be using the Kennedy Recreation
Center located at 1401 7th Street, Northwest.

Ward 7, we will remain at the
Dorothy Height/Benning Library at 3935 Benning
Road, Northwest. We will add an additional
site at Hillcrest Recreation Center located at
3100 Denver Street, Southeast.

And Ward 8, we will relocate from
the Southeast Tennis and Learning Center to
the Bald Eagle Recreation Center located at
100 Joliet Street, Southwest.

I want to make a note that all of the new additional sites at the recreation centers we will be using the gymnasiums. When we did look to add the additional sites, I did look for a recreation center where will have the large space within the gymnasiums.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Budoo.

Are there any questions regarding the additional early voting centers?

Do we need a motion on this to publish?

MR. TATUM: I don't believe we need a motion but I'm not sure we have to post this or not.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

Thank you, Mr. Budoo.

MR. TATUM: Madam Chair, the next item on my report is the on-line mobile app.

As we previously reported to the
Board we have been working with the Federal Voting Systems Program to generate a mobile application that would allow uniformed and overseas voters to register to vote on line and to request an absentee ballot on line using a mobile device. With Federal grant money received from FVAP and with our partners ConnectAd and Election Management Consulting Services we have developed a mobile app that will allow on-line registrations to take place. And we propose to deploy the mobile app at the end of January or the beginning of February so that our uniformed overseas citizens can use the application to register for the upcoming primary election.

As we indicated, we've been taking the mobile app through its paces and feel comfortable with the security measures and with the way the records would be processed in the back end. And I just wanted to put that on the record for the public and make the Board aware that we are planning to go live
with the mobile application.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Okay. Are there any questions of Mr. Tatum?

MEMBER DANZANSKY: I just - on all of these things, Mr. Tatum, I know you have a plan for letting the public know about these. Can you just describe how we're going to go about doing that because obviously almost doubling the early voting sites will require some education on the part of the -

MR. TATUM: Yes, sir, that is correct. We have what the Chair has heard me refer to our Election Modernization Project called the EMP. There is an external communication plan that's been created by Tamara Robinson, our Public Information Officer, and part of that plan includes TV PSAs, radio PSAs as well as print publications and some of the media - paper media outlets and her plan identifies several subscriptions that we will publish information in like the "Hill Rap", the "Northwest Current", and the
"Informer" and a few other of those type of publications. So, she's also scheduling radio PSAs for us to participate in and to get that type of word out.

We will have placards, wall posters if you will in some of the Metro stations themselves. That will be the first time that we've actually ever posted something inside of a Metro site as well as the placards on the side of busses that will be traveling through the routes - through the city routes.

We've also, again, talked about using our street teams that will go out into the neighborhoods and pass our flyers and that type of thing. So, there will be more of a continued concerted effort to get that information to - these new improvements notices out to the voters. Of course, we do the Voter's Guide for the primary election which is mailed to every resident in the District.

And for the relocations that take
places for polling places every voter in the polling places that are relocated will receive a notice in the mail that your precinct has been relocated as well as a voter card as I understand it. So, there are a number of avenues that we're following to educate to publicize these type of improvements. The interesting thing, the mobile app itself as we initially posted the app into the market so that we could download it we had voters actually go the app before we can load it. So, those type of things drive themselves to some degree but we will also make notification of those.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Great, thank you.

MR. TATUM: Thank you.

And the last item I have, Madam Chair, is the general matters and as with the mobile app the Board has joined the ERIC Consortium which is the Electronic Registration Information Center which is a
consortium of states that have combined and created this nonprofit organization to share voter registration data and this will allow the Board to compare its electors list to the other electors list of the member states. So, at this point there's roughly eight states and I think three to five additional states that are waiting to join this 2014.

We will have the benefit of comparing our registration list to those other seven or eight and perhaps even ten states to compare our list to their list and insure that we don't have voters registered here in the District and in those other states as well.

The ERIC process also allows us to compare our internal data for address issues, duplicate voters on the list, that type of comparison which will allow us to create an even more cleaner list than we have in the past.

I might also add that it includes the Death Register List from the Social
Security Administration so we'll receive an
update of the nationwide death list, not just
those voters who pass away here in the
District.

And we are also a member of the
STEVE, the state and territorial electronic
vital records exchange. That's our own local
vital records department and we'll be
receiving vital records, death records from
vital records here in an electronic format as
well due to an electronic mailbox type of
scenario. So, all of that is in an effort to
keep our list clean and as up to date as
possible. And I think this will be - ERIC
will allow us to take more proactive steps
before and after every election as opposed to
buy-in of candidates of the general election.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Continuous
process.

MR. TATUM: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Absolutely.

MR. TATUM: And, Madam Chair,
that's all I have to report on today.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All right.

Are there any questions on the membership and ERIC and the clean up of our data for Mr. Tatum? Hearing none, we will now move on to the Campaign Director's Report, Ms. Collier-Montgomery.

DIR. COLLIER-MONTGOMERY: Yes, good morning.

First, I would like to announce that no later than January the 28th, 2014, the Office of Campaign Finance will present at its website a 2014 educational brochure as well as our campaign finance guide. The link for both have been under construction at the website because both have been under review for updating consistent with the changes in the law. So, those items will be presented at the website no later than January the 28th, 2014.

On December the 10th, 2013, was the deadline for filing of the Report of Receipts and Expenditures by a principal campaign
committed and political action committees who
are participating in the 2014 election cycle.
We had 90 total number of required filers and
that breaks down to 41 principal campaign
committees and 49 political action committees.
We had 84 timely filers. We had six who
failed to file and we had six who were
referred to the Office of the General Counsel.
And basically that boils down to three PCCs,
Michael Green Mayoral Committee, Michael
Green, Treasurer, Bruce Majors, Libertarian
for Mayor, Bruce Majors, Treasurer. The
league filed on December the 24th, 2013.
Sewell for Mayor 2014, Otis Sution, Treasurer.

The PACs who failed to file were
the DC Dealers, James Jackson, Treasurer, the
Libertarian Party of D.C., Sarah Harvard,
Treasurer, the Youth Action Political Action
Committee, Gabriel Moise.

Also during the month of December
we had 69 new candidates and committees who
registered to participate in the 2014 election filing. The names of those candidates and those committees will be published at our website with our December stats.

In the Audit Branch for the month of December the Audit Branch completed 88 desk reviews. Forty-nine desk reviews were conducted of political action committees, 35 desk reviews were conducted on principal campaign committees, two were conducted of exploratory committees and one desk review was conducted of the candidate for the Attorney General.

With respect to full field audits, we had three full field audits which were under review by the Audit Branch. The first was an investigative audit, Gray for Mayor, and in that case, again, the final audit report was completed in draft on May the 15th, 2012. However, at the request of the U.S. Attorney's Office additional information may be necessary. The final audit report has not
been released for public dissemination.

There were two full field audits of newly elected officials. The first as Bonds for Council. A preliminary audit report was issued on November the 27th, 2013. The committee response was due on December the 27th, 2013, but was extended until January 10th, 2014, for the response due to the holiday season.

The second full field audit of a newly elected official was Mendelson for Chairman. The preliminary audit report was issued on November the 21st, 2013. The final audit report has been completed and will be released on January the 105th, 2014.

With the periodic random audits of political action committees and continuing committees, there were three periodic random audits which were conducted by the Audit Branch of continuing committees. The first if Mara 2013. The Statement of Findings was issued on November the 21st, 2013. After
additional information was provided, a revised Statement of Findings was issued on December the 20th, 2013, to which the committee will have to respond.

The second is Committee to Elect Perry Redd. The final audit report was issued on December the 9th, 2013. In this case, the Audit Branch found that the reports and the statements of the committee were not in compliance with the Campaign Finance Act. The final audit report has been referred to the Office of the General Counsel for enforcement action.

The third is Elissa 2013. The final audit report was issued on December the 20th, 2013, and the Audit Branch found that the report and statements of the committee were, in fact, compliant with the Campaign Finance Act.

With the period random audits of Central Campaign Committee, the Audit Branch has initiated two period random audits of
principal campaign committees or candidates
who have registered to participate in the 2014
election cycle. This is a new process in the
Office of Campaign Finance which we have
initiated due to the increase of auditors in
our office and also so the office can become
more proactive with respect to monitoring the
campaign operations of candidates and
principal campaign committees during the
actual election cycle.

The first principal campaign
committee which is the subject of the period
random audit is Brianne for D.C. The audit
notification letter was issued on December the
4th, 2013. The field audit is in progress and
this is of the October the 10th, 2013, filing.

The second is Reta Jo Lewis for
Mayor. The audit notification letter was
issued on December the 4th, 2013, and again
the audit field work is in progress of the
October the 10th, 2013, filing.

I would now ask the General
Counsel - oh, and before he gives his report
I would also like to say that all of the final
audit reports that have been issued by the
agency are available for review by the public
at our website.

Thank you, ma'am.

MR. SANFORD: Good morning, Madam
Chairman and distinguished Board Members.

My name is William Sanford. I am
the General Counsel for the Office of Campaign
Finance.

During the month of December 2013
the Office of the General Counsel for the
Office of Campaign Finance received nine
referrals which included seven from the Public
Information and Records Management Division
and two from the Reports Analysis and Audit
Division.

Four orders were issued by the
Office of the General Counsel which includes
the following. One order for failure to
timely file in which no fines were imposed.
One order for failure to timely file a report.

There is a fine of $1,700 that was imposed against candidate for mayor, Frank Sewell.

Two orders involving failures to respond to requests for additional information in which fines of $1,100 each were imposed against Pete Ross for senator and Nestor for Mayor.

During the month of December the Office of Campaign Finance collected $200 in fines and imposed $3,900 in fines.

During the month of December the Office of Campaign Finance, Office of the General Counsel carried five open investigations and they include the following.

OCF Full Investigation 2011-103.

That was internally generated and the respondent in this matter is Sulaiman Brown for Mayor. As the Director has indicated, this matter has not been completely resolved because there are documents that are the
custody of the U.S. Attorney's Office that
have not been made available to us.

OCF Full Investigation 2011-104,
also internally generated. The respondent in
this matter is Gray for Mayor. This matter
also has not involved as a companion case
because there are documents with the U.S.
Attorney's Office that have not been made
available to the Office of Campaign Finance.

OCF Full Investigation 2013-013,
internally generated. The respondent Lee
Calhoun and OCF Full Investigation 2013-014,
also internally generated. The respondent in
this case is Stanley Straughter. These are
companion cases which involve the Alleged
Illegal Campaign Contributions through the
Jeffrey Thompson apparatus.

And the final open investigation
is OCF Preliminary Investigation 2013-019.
That was internally generated and the
respondent in this case was Frank Sewell. The
order in this matter was issued on the 5th of
December and a fine as I stated earlier was $1,700 was imposed against this Sewell's campaign committee.

During the month of December no requests of interpretive opinions were received by the Office of the General Counsel and no show-cause proceedings were conducted.

And that should conclude by report unless you have questions.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Sanford.

Are there any questions of Mr. Sanford or Ms. Collier-Montgomery? Hearing none, we will move on to the General Counsel Report, Mr. McGhie.

MR. McGHIE: Okay. The first thing I have on my agenda is a final rule-making to amend Title 3, Chapters 5 through 7, 10, 11, 13 through 17 and 20.

As the Board may recall, at its November Board Meeting, the Board adopted these regulations as emergency and proposed
rule-making. It was published in the D.C. Register on November 22nd, 2013. The gist of these regulations it revised a number of chapters because it involves changes to the circulating requirements for petitions. So, that would involve nominating petitions, petitions for initiative referendums and recalls. So, all of the various chapters dealing with circulating of petitions were affected because the counsel amended the circulating requirements in the Board of Elections Petition Circulation Requirements Amendment Act of 2013 that was Law 20, 0031. It became law on October 17th so we had to put our regulations in compliance. That law basically changed the requirement that circulators had to be registered qualified electors in order to circulate petitions. Now circulators no longer have to be registered qualified electors. In fact they don't even have to be D.C. residents if they register with the Board of Elections that they are
circulating petitions on behalf of a candidate
or for a recall of a petition initiative
measure. So, like I said those changes were
needed in our regulations to put us in
compliance with the new law.

No comments were received during
the 30-day comment period so at this time I am
requesting that the Board entertain a motion
to adopt this as final rule-making.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All right. So,
we'll entertain a motion.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Yes, I will
move, Madam Chairman, that we adopt these
regulations as final rule-making for the
Board.

MEMBER CURRY: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All in favor?

Aye.

(AYES)

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All opposed?

Hearing none, the motion carries.

MR. McGHIE: Okay. The next item
on our agenda is a litigation status update.

There has only been one new matter that the
Board has since we last met.

The first two matters that the
Board is familiar with is the Libertarian
Party Versus the Board of Elections and that
matter is still pending and as the Board may
recall, there is still the issue of attorneys'
fees. The parties were hoping that that could
be resolved through settlement. It doesn't
look like that that's going to happen and that
they may actually mitigate the issue of
attorney fees on the Libertarian Party.

Zukerberg Versus the Board of
Elections also the Board is familiar with.

That involved a challenge by Mr. Zukerberg to
the Council legislation which would postpone
the election for the elected attorney general.
The Office of the Attorney General is handling
that matter for the Board and the District
because they are a party as well and the
I spoke to the attorney handling the matter, Mr. Parsons, and he indicated that they would be filing a motion to dismiss this week. The matter is before Judge Cordero and the next scheduled court date is February 7th.

A new matter that came up back on December 31st was Mr. Frank Sewell Versus Mayor Vincent Gray and the D.C. Board of Elections. Mr. Sewell was a candidate for, I believe, mayor. He filed a TRO in Superior Court to extend the time for candidates to file nominating petitions. Mr. Sewell did not submit his nominating petitions on time. The date to file nominating petitions was January 2nd and he was seeking this extension of time. The matter was brought before Judge Von Kann and Judge Von Kann denied the complaint and dismissed it. His TRO in chambers. The Court found that the Board was in compliance with the statute. That would be D.C. Code Section 1-1001.97(i)(4). So, that matter was summarily dismissed by the Court.
And that would conclude by

litigation statute update. And the only other

ting on my agenda is a Proper Subject Matter

determination for an initiative that was filed

with the Board that initially was entitled the

District of Columbia Right to Housing

Initiative of 2014.

And pursuant to D.C. Code Section

1-1001.16, the Board upon receipt of a

proposed initiative or measure must refuse to

accept the measure if the Board finds that

it's not a proper subject matter for

initiative or referendum in the District of

Columbia. So, this is a subject matter

determination hearing for the public's

benefit. If you would like to follow along,

I have handouts at the table and the same

material - the same information is on the

easel. But basically the Board can only

reject a proposed initiative if it is in

violation of one of those criteria. So, if an

initiative comes before the Board which is
contrary to the terms of the Home Rule Act,
which the Home Rule Act is just like the
District of Columbia's State Constitution, it
seeks to amend the Home Rule Act. The Home
Rule Act can only be amended by a charter
amendment which is proposed by the Council.
It would appropriate funds. The initiative
would violate the United States Constitution
or the initiative on a proposed initiative or
the committee that submitted the initiative is
not in compliance with the Office of Campaign
Finance filing requirements, it is not in the
proper legislative form or the initiative
would unlawfully discriminate against any
individuals or finally if the initiative would
negate or limit a budget act. So, if any of
those reasons are present or the Board make a
determination that the initiative is in
violation of any of those criteria, the Board
must reject the initiative measure.

And that would be the summary of
what the process is.
CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All right.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Mr. McGhie, has the proponent met all the statutory administrative requirements with respect to its filing?

MR. McGHIE: With respect to the Office of Campaign Finance filings, the proposer of the initiative did file their Statement of Organization but at this point whether or not they are in compliance or not is pending. The information that they submitted was not complete. They did not submit banking information so they have been granted an extension of time by the Office of Campaign Finance and so their submission is pending until close of business today.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Are there any opponents to the initiative that wish to provide testimony? Opponents? Opposing the measure?

Are there those who support the measure, proponents of the measure who wish to
provide testimony? I think we have a list
from which I will call - we'll do panels of
two.

All right. Veronica Hazel. Are
you present? Okay. India McKinney? Michael
Coleman? All right, Mr. Coleman. Janet
Sharp? Janet Sharp, are you present? Okay.
Ms. Sharp, come forward. We'll do panels of
two.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Two meaning
what?

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Two people, yes,
together. All right.

Mr. Coleman, you may go first.

MR. COLEMAN: Good morning. My
name is Michael Coleman. I'm a registered
voter. And I'm currently in a homeless
situation that was from pillar to post. I
didn't know what that meant until three years
ago. Now I know what that means quite well.

I'm disabled and I'm trying to
live on a very limited income. I've been
looking for housing for over three years, you
know. And there's just nothing in the
District of Columbia that I can find in my
price range, you know. I really don't
understand - you know, the average age of a
homeless person in D.C. in 39 to 69 years old.
And, you know, them are critical times because
it seems to me that the older you get the more
the city is pushing you out. We have no place
for you and I don't really understand. I
really think it's a shame that a city that
I've spent all my life in, had an accident and
all, have no place for seniors or disabled
people or for people like himself to go. And
when you confront them the first thing they
tell you is go to a shelter. Well, no. I
don't want to go. I mean, I don't think
that's the solution to the problem.
You know, last week the Capitol
Towers they opened a waiting list. And over
200 people showed up for one apartment that
it's going to take six months to get that one
apartment open. Two hundred people showed up to apply for that one apartment on limited income and in the same situation that I am. And I'm just one of very many people waiting for housing. You know, the waiting list in D.C. the way it's set up now it would take around 20 years before the waiting list could get someone like me housing. And I just don't think that's right.

You know, when I walk around the city I look around and I see condos here, condos there, condos everywhere but I can't even apply for this type of housing because their term of affordability is somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,200 just for the rent and not to say what it would take to get a place like that. And I saw on the news last night that the city has Metro buses around the city so people could come in and just get warm. It's that need on the street where they have to have Metro Buses at different places so people can just come in and just get warm.
So, if they don't think that there's a need for housing I don't know what our Council and all think and so I think that if the District voters, people like me, were put to a question, is this something that our Council should really take a look at, I guarantee you that overwhelmingly, 75 percent of people would say yes. The city needs to do something about housing. Can't just tell me that there's no place for me in the city. I grew up in this city.

I see condominiums going up everywhere. Last year the city said they had a $470 million surplus. Well, that means nothing to me because the more I try to help or do something there's no place for me, you know.

And I want to close by saying, you know, people in my situation, we aren't lazy, you know, contrary to what people may say, you know. People like me, we're willing to do anything that, you know, we're willing to come
to the table volunteer or doing whatever to
help get housing. But housing is such a
crisis in the city that I think that maybe the
voters of the District of Columbia should have
a saying somebody take a look at this housing,
you know. And, I mean, I'm an older guy.
There are, you know, I'm on my way down but
there are younger people. There's no housing
for them. I mean, so the city is really doing
a very, very, very poor job at housing its
people. If the city is saying that if you're
disabled or if you're a senior or if you're
very poor that you don't belong to live in the
city. That's what it sees like to me. No one
can tell me anything else. What it's saying
to me is that, you know, the city, I know - I
don't know what they call progress. I guess
that's what all of those condos are is what
you guys call progress. But not progress to
me if it's running - if some what that I'm
used to calling home I can't live no more. I
can't do this. I can't even apply for some of
these place, you know. I'm not looking for a
handout. I'm willing to help myself to even
volunteer and do whatever, but there is a
housing crisis in the District of Columbia and
no one is paying attention. No one. No one.
Everybody is just shuffling and moving on
down. Moving on down or either the question
they say to me is go to a shelter. Well, I
think I'm getter than a shelter.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr.
Coleman.

Ms. Sharp.

MS. SHARP: My name is Janet Sharp.
I live at N Street Village, 1333 N Street in
permanent supportive housing.

I have been looking, filing,
looking around. I'm a senior citizen and I
have been looking and filling out paperwork
for senior housing. Three to five year wait
list on some places. It's a severe shortage
but it's going to get worse because I was born
in 1947 and a lot of people were born - I'm a Baby Boomer and there's going to be a lot more Baby Boomers looking for senior housing.

My only concern is, some of the senior housing is built for people who have cars. I don't have a car. My eyesight is too poor to permit me plus I can't afford one anyhow.

Senior housing, low income housing, disabled housing, any kind of housing should and can be built on a bus line close to a bank, a grocery store, a drug store and any other vital area.

I look up south 14th Street. I've got a luxury apartment. I've got apartments, apartments, apartments, condos, expensive restaurants I can't afford. All the local businesses are being run out so make way for this expensive housing.

I don't understand. Why can't if the District has the money and the sense, why isn't it that we can't put mixed income
housing in areas, you know, that are
accessible to everything?

And I have been hearing on the
street those people who choose to live in this
city like me and those who have been born in
this city are being forced out. They're being
told, oh, go to P.G. County, go to Virginia.

I'm just going to close with this.

I will continue to work for the Right to
Housing Campaign as I fill out senior housing
- applications for senior housing. This is my
city. I choose to live here and I'm going to
continue to fight for descent housing.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you so
much, Ms. Sharp.

Are there any questions? Before
you leave, Ms. Sharp, and Mr. Coleman. Were
there any questions from members for either
Mr. Coleman or Ms. Sharp?

Thank you, Ms. Sharp.

Robert Warren? Eric Sheptock?
MR. WARREN: Good morning Board Members.

My name is Robert Warren. I am the Director of People for Fairness Coalition, which is a group of homeless and formerly homeless individuals.

For the last six years we have been fighting for people in Washington and ourselves to have the housing we need to be able to move our and other people experiencing housing woes of living lives to move forward.

Over this period of time we have been engaged with two mayors testifying before many D.C. Council members about housing for those most in need. We have seen and been given input to two housing task forces that has been established by the District of Columbia. And the mayors one city summit which life-long District residents determined the number one issue in this city for them was affordable housing and being able to live in the city.
D.C. residents. We are currently now trying to give voice to a task force that has been established two blocks and over at 2nd and D to determine what can be done to bring workforce housing to that property there that's under covenant with the Federal Government and has been deeded to the - some of the property I believe has been deeded to the District of Columbia. So, that's going to be one of the biggest housing projects in the city.

We at PLC believe that housing is a human right. We are living in a human rights city which is one of the reasons why we believe people are moving to D.C. at record rates. We welcome these people who are moving to D.C.. The city is looking to make D.C. - the city is looking to make D.C. their - people are looking to make D.C. their home. I believe as our city goes through these changes with old neighborhoods being made new, for our new residents that we can not take and
price out old residents of the city, long-term D.C. residents out of the city. So, we have been to the Human Rights Commission and we have testified before that board members to tell them that people are now being economically discriminated against D.C. residents. We have been to mayor – excuse me, Council Member Barry's office who chairs the Human Rights Commission. He is currently talking with his legislative aids, I believe, to try to have the Human Rights Commission declare economics as a part their venue when they look at housing as far as housing and economics because the people of the District of Columbia are economically discriminated against.

So, we testified before these board members and, again, we are losing whole neighborhoods of people because of economics so that is the main reason we decided to do this Right to Housing Initiative.

Also, I have a lot of written
testimony and different things pertaining to
the District of Columbia and the way housing
is provided to District residents. I would
like to list the record for you guys to look
at.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr.
Warren.

MR. WARREN: Also, the best way to
give people healthcare is to start with a roof
over their head. The best way for people to
be able to work and give back to the community
is for that person to have a mailing address
that is not a shelter or a soup kitchen. The
best way for young single mothers to become
self sufficient for her to have a - for her to
be stress-free is to help her out for her
where she will be able to stay without being
stressed out about how she's going to pay her
rent from week to week.

The best way to move people out of
poverty is not to have to choose between to
pay your rent or whether you're going to be
able to feed your family. I think that was made clear just the other day when the lady who testified about who along with President Obama who stood up and said that she was trying to receive unemployment and she had to choose between just being able to have somewhere and you have so many District residents who are in that same situation who have been put in this situation through no fault of their own. When you have more people in this city is all in this packet, more than 50 percent of their income. It's so much information that, you know, people are just in this city when it comes to housing and they're being forced out. I mean, it's just - and we have to really do something to try to address this for District residents, for long-term District residents, for life-long District residents.

So, the best way in order to bring down the crime rate in the District of Columbia is for people not to have to go out
and sell narcotics or engage in illegal activities in order just to keep a roof over their head. And I know a lot of people who do this on a daily basis. This is how they maintain their housing by engaging in criminal activities. This is where we have put people at in this city.

And so I would just say in closing, we have to remember that we live in a human rights city. Housing is a human right. So, we have to really look at that and address that in this city. That's the reason why we are now considered the number one city, the gayest city in this country now because we are a human rights city. We welcome all people to come and live here. So, people should be able to live here who have been living here all their lives. They shouldn't be forced out of the neighborhood. Housing should be made available to them and I would hope you would take up this fight along with us to give the people in the District of
Columbia the housing that they deserve.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Warren.

Mr. Sheptock.

MR. SHEPTOCK: Good morning. So, first of all, I'd like to point out that I saw a few typos in what I just handed out. I been in a rush right before I came here so I apologize.

But that said, hello. I am Eric Johnson Sheptock, Chairman of SHARC. Shelter, Housing and Respectful Change, a group of homeless advocates that formed in April 2011. As such, I am aware of that there are approximately 7,000 homeless people in the Washington, D.C., about one in every ninety people. This number doesn't include couch surfers, so HUD has begun to include them in its definition of homeless people.

As recently as April 2013, there are 70,000 people on the D.C. Housing...
Authority Wait List for affordable housing but then only housing about 1,000 per year. Some of my associates who are not her today could give you some concrete numbers on the loss of affordable housing in the city over the past 10 years. If memory serves, that number has been cut in half over the past 10 years. That said, the lack of affordable housing in our Nation's Capitol is a large and growing problem. With that said, I'm certain that were the petition approved we'd have absolutely no problem getting the required number of signatures. That makes it imperative that we find the proper wording for the petition in that we not throw out the baby with the bath water. The goal is not to give able-bodied people something for nothing but rather to insure that everyone who has lived or chooses to live in Washington, D.C., can do so without the cost of housing being a factor in that decision.

So, the wording for the petition
is insufficient as it now stands. I would
implore you to modify it accordingly. Let me
remind this board that while there is no
structure in place to keep our politicians
honest or to make them keep their promises, we
can and should seize this opportunity to hold
them to their word as best we can.

On February 11th at the One City
Summit in 2012, Mayor Gray promised to make
good of Washingtonians' demand for affordable
housing. He and his predecessors convened
task forces to look at the options for
creating affordable housing. The results have
been minimal token efforts to create
affordable housing. Creating 10,000 units
between now and 2020 is like bringing a bag
lunch to a starving nation.

This petition would give
Washingtonians another opportunity to voice
their demand for affordable housing. But it
would do more than that. It will insure that
the D.C. Council takes up this matter and
addresses it in a more robust manner than 
either of our last two mayors have.

            I trust that you would do the wise 
thing concerning this issue and I thank you 
for your time.

            Eric Johnson Sheptock, Chairman of 
Shelter, Housing and Respectful Change, SHARC.

            CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. 
Sheptock.

            I have a question about the one 
quarter - the one-fourth ruling requirement 
and what it means. Can you give me, either 
you or Mr. Warren can you give me an 
explanation of what that means?

            MR. WARREN: I think the reason why 
- I made that statement in front of Muriel 
Bowser where actually during a hearing on the 
New Community Initiative. And you had a lot 
of people who were coming in and talking about 
how new communities were losing affordable 
units with these new community initiatives. 
And so I made that statement, you know, saying
that ruling, I mean, it's based on what HUD considers as affordable housing with the Federal Government as basically considered as affordable housing. And so it basically just says that been as though hopefully through that one-fourth ruling the District of Columbia would not be - it would just be the same cost that they already spending. I mean, like I said, there's as lot of information in this package and currently, I mean, Andy Shallal made a statement that the poor people of the District of Columbia were not receiving their fair share of the budget. And currently, I believe, D.C. spend like 0.2 percent on every hundred dollars they receive in D.C. tax money on affordable housing. So, it was kind of like to give everybody skin in the game when nobody is not, you know, not being accountable to the housing crisis that we are under.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: So, this is an allocation of funding you're saying should be
set aside?

MR. WARREN: Right.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Okay.

MR. WARREN: Right. I think the District residents -

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Of local revenues, of Federal revenues.

MR. WARREN: Right.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: And the individual income I'm not sure. I guess that should be the maximum of what you set - have to dedicate to housing?

MR. WARREN: No, the income would be if a person is under $39,000 and he can qualify for an affordable unit, then one-third of whatever his income is he would contribute to his rent.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Do you have anything to add, Mr. Sheptock, to this?

MR. SHEPTOCK: Well, I would do the math a little bit differently. I mean, take someone who is making $39,000 a year, 30
percent of that is $11,700. When you pay $1,600 a month rent in D.C., that comes out to $19,200 and so you don't even have 75 percent of their rent left if they were to pay, you know, 30 percent. So, anyway, the cost to the Government would actually be much lower. But I also understand that you can't pass an initiative that requires the Government to spend money. I'm well aware of that. But nonetheless, what I would say is what I said in my testimony that if by chance there's a petition as is that doesn't stand, then we should be able to modify it. I don't know what your rules are concerning that if you would do it as part of this hearing process or if you would just give us another opportunity to rework it and submit it again. So, can you tell me or how does that work?

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I'll let Mr. McGhie, the General Counsel, respond to that.

MR. MCGHIE: Yes, the Board cannot modify the language of the initiative because
it would be a totally different initiative.

But you can always - let's see, if you want to, you can withdraw the initiative if you want to. You can have the Board rule on the initiative. You can withdraw it and then make the changes so that it puts it in compliance yourself and resubmit that initiative to the Board. But since you're modifying it, it's a totally different initiative. It has to be published in the D.C. Register again so that the public is aware that this is the initiative measure so that anybody can come and speak on the measure.

MR. SHEPTOCK: Okay. So, I guess my other question would be that, you know, if by chance it doesn't pass, would you issue a statement to the proponents of it here so that we can understand why it didn't pass?

MR. McGHIE: Well, yes. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Board will deliberate on the measure and there will be a written opinion and in the written opinion if
it doesn't pass everything - the reason why it
did not pass is stated in the written opinion.

MR. SHEPTOCK: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All right.

MEMBER CURRY: I have a question.

First off, let me commend all of
you for your efforts and your work and ask you
to keep at it. We are limited in what we can
do and I personally want to say and it's
inappropriate that I wish I could do more.

Mr. McGhie, are we prohibited from
referring these gentlemen to other advocacy
groups that might be in a position to help
them with the language and help them in some
other because we can't do it. But are we
prohibited? There are more established
groups. Your group appears to be kind of new
but there are homeless groups that's been
around for years and housing advocacy groups
and we could make no guarantees, but are we
prohibited from referring them to -
MR. McGHIE: No, we are not, and previous boards have made that type of referral to other organizations or advocacy groups that could assist them.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: If we could do that. Thank you.

MEMBER CURRY: You know what Frederick Douglass said, you just got to keep at it.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Don't go back tot he -

MR. SHEPTOCK: And he also said power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you.

Thank you so much, Mr. Warren and Mr. Sheptock.


Reginald E. Black? Reginald Black?

Good morning. All right. We're
going to let Mr. Honey go first and they you, Mr. Black.

MR. HONEY: I apologize for being late.


MR. HONEY: And I don't have anything written for you -

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Not a problem.

MR. HONEY: - but I would like to present oral testimony.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: All right.

MR. HONEY: My name is Victor Carl Honey. I am a legal consultant for my company which is Victor Marketing Enterprises.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I'm sorry, sir, would you speak up because I didn't hear your company's name?

MR. HONEY: I am the legal consultant for my company which is Victor Marketing Enterprises.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Okay.
MR. HONEY: I have been here back and forth from Washington to Texas for several years now and have decided to try to obtain housing in the District of Columbia area. I have issues in Texas against the governor and several state officials, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson and traveling back and forth has been quite time consuming. So, I'm here today to provide my testimony and my story concerning housing in the District of Columbia.

I applied for housing when May Anthony Williams was in office in approximately 2004. So, I've been on the housing list for that long time. I've been in the homeless shelter area for several years. I stayed at the Franklin School Shelter for two years, although it was quite long. From Franklin School Shelter I went into a housing program, Pathways to Housing D.C. The president of the organization is Christie Vasquez. Her and her organization were
atrocious. They have been a detriment to my business, to my legal plans. My first try at business was in real estate and as a notary. Also my former Texas commission notary public.

The housing program which I entered into I was not aware that they cater and try to provide for severe mental disabled people and as a person trying to start a small business and going to law school it was a conflict of interest. So, I suffered an eviction for the - they call it case management company not taking care of their part of the responsibilities and actually trying to categorize me with the other disabled people, mentally disabled people.

I have a physical disability which is back injury and it started in 1996 and it's been quite a battle with this housing agency where they want to keep someone in their program to make money like in other programs they just want someone to stay around and not provide the proper services and housing and
that type of thing. So, the program ended and I returned back to the shelters. So, there's an issue where a shelter by the name of 801 East Shelter where it was not too far from my apartment and several individuals, one in particular by the name of Wanda Pool and a residential counselor by the name of Ms. Lisa Gordon. They've been not adequate concerning looking for or helping the persons in the shelter provide housing. They will not provide housing lists. They would not provide any referrals. They would not do anything. The only program they had was on the RP Program which is run by Mr. Carter and the program just wasn't suitable for me. Their persons were felons, quite dangerous and violent persons and the program just was not the type of program that I needed to be involved in.

So, I'm here today to provide assistance to provide input and I called Council Member Muriel Bowser, Council Person
Jim Graham and Phil Mendelson's office to see if anyone would be able to possibly show up today to assist in this initiative and I'd appreciate the Board consider it first.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Honey.

MR. HONEY: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: I like your name. All right.

Mr. Black?

MR. BLACK: I do have this to give you.

Hello friends, neighbors and fellow supporters. Thank you Board of Elections for lessons in ethics for hearing this proposal for declared public policy entitled "The Right to Housing Initiative."

My name is Reginald Eugene Black, Jr., and I am Chief Executive Officer and owner of Wellocity. Wellocity came about after I saw the need for something different. Wellocity's mission is to strengthen
impoverished communities so they can stand for
themselves. It is Wellocity's hope that these
ideals will become universal all over
Washington.

I am a native Washingtonian and
have been living in Washington my whole life.
And I have watched as changes have occurred.
I remember the day you could secure an
apartment at a price that was affordable
enough to promote social mobility. That is
what my parents accomplished. They were able
to save enough money to eventually buy a
house. That kind of mobility seems to have
vanished in recent years. There are
staggering numbers that have many asking, is
Washington, D.C., really a role-model city for
the rest of the country?

The District of Columbia is not
currently reducing homelessness at all. With
a stagnant 11,000 people reporting literally
homeless how can Washington get better? I
have noticed that there is development near
the vital facilities that are keeping people alive. This last year 26 people died because they didn't earn enough. New development is not necessarily a bad thing but with studio apartments like Kennedy Ros prices being right around $1,500 a month I don't see how Washington can call itself a role-model city.

With 10,000 residents gone, I don't believe we're doing enough to save lives and create a better community. Even Federal programs like HOPE IV and CHOICE have not helped those in poverty to move forward. So, what is it that will make Washington better?

For me, it would have to be to declare war on poverty itself. The first step to that I have taken. You have seen and heard others before me. They all feel housing is a human right.

I have brought before you today the Right to Housing Initiative, a declare public policy that says all have a right to a stable place to live, all on their own or
with someone else. It says that no one can
just take your home for no reason and answer
to the question of what is affordable and
affordable to whom?

Last year the Housing Finance
Agency set income and rent limits that
determine a household of one would have to be
$37,600 a year and should pay $940 a month for
a studio apartment that means an individual
would need to earn at least $12.82 and that
would be enough to cover the cost that will if
the individual is able to work every single
day of the year without missing a day of work.

Our own city Council show down a
bill that would have given the service workers
currently working at $8.25 an hour a chance to
earn at least $13.00 stating that it would
only kill jobs and it’s not a real living
wage.

How can we satisfy Federal
mandates to reduce homeless and we are only
willing to pay a service worker $11.00 and it
won't happen until three years' time has passed. I don't think it's fair for people to be forced out of the city of their birth. The sad situation there is a lot of talk about doing something for those who are in need but nothing is really done.

According to WUSA9 there are currently 15,000 homeless persons living in Washington and 1,700 of them are actually living outside.

In April of 2013, the District of Columbia Housing Authority closed its waiting list. At that point there were 70,000 names on that list. Some of these same names have been on the wait list for more than a decade. Since last year 26 people died because they did not have a secure, sanitary place to live. Their health declined and they died. Bleeding hearts like mine march for them and no later than seven days later to have another person die in a bus stop of all places. I can just imagine the scene where
people just walked by this man and did nothing to help. People like Chris Williams comes to mind when I hear the word right. Here was a senior and military veteran who was a double amputee. If my colleague and I did not act, Chris would have surely died. All around usu people just brush past them, police officers were confused and unsure what to do. Even family members thought maybe we were doing something wrong so how could that be when today Chris is still with us and has another chance to live his days in peace?

I feel that here in the District of Columbia we should be the first to say that we should have a right to ownership, whether that we buy a home or an apartment for ourselves or in cooperation with others.

In today's world we talk about compassion so why deny someone of such a place to call home? Shelters keep people alive, I know that from experience but there should be a connection to someone owning something of
their. I cannot sign on to insisting that a
person prove themselves financially in order
to live. We do not ask to be born. We just
are. And we as a city have a responsibility
to each other as a city. This is what makes
us unique. Here today we say no more. No
more deaths while homeless. No more pricing
people who have lived in poverty out of the
city they know best. No more will we allow
another person to be discriminated against
because of the amount of money they can
access. It is essential that this initiative
before you goes before District of Columbia
voters. As it stands now, we are not in
compliance of Articles 17 and 25 of the United
Nations Declaration of Human Rights where both
articles imply that housing is a human right.

I feel that it is only fair that
the District of Columbia voters be the ones to
say that everyone work together to produce
real housing and that essential housing is a
right.
The document now before you reflects and attempts to address the needs of this initiative. It is a way for Washingtonians to have a say in where and how they live. It is not for the interest of money that should decide if a person lives or dies. It is only fair that whoever is mayor should identify those who are in need of housing that would allow those individuals to stabilize themselves and promote the journey to home ownership.

It is only fair that the Human Rights Commission can act on the obvious discrimination occurring in our community, not only provide guidelines on how we can best serve our impoverished residents but also demand that entities that build housing should be able and willing to make every effort to assist those who wish to be treated fairly when attempting to acquire a place to live.

How can a city that boasts it has the most disposable income in the country
allow an entire population to roam its streets
and allow those same streets to be that
population's grave?

I have come before you today to
say, you know, let's give this a try. Allow
us to say to the Federal Government we would
like to use 25 percent of the funding you
already are giving the District of Columbia.
It should be used in securing a unit for
somebody in poverty. Allow us to say to our
local government we would like to use 25
percent of the local revenue. It should be
used in securing a unit for somebody in
poverty. Allow us to say that those who own
property could you or ask them, could you take
a 25 percent cut in rental cost to help low
income individuals and families security
units? Allow us the stand-up citizens of the
District of Columbia to contribute 25 percent
of our income to securing our housing. We
need the extra five percent that is left for
transportation and it will help foster social
mobility.

For example, a person that only make $740 a month will be able to document that they cannot pay more than $105 a month. In addition, that means even if a landlord or property manager is charging $1,000 a month, they can only charge someone who is eligible for the provisions of this initiative before them a maximum amount of $285. That difference that remains can be worked out between customer and residential management agencies equally by the parties agreeing to split the remaining cost. This is only fair for hard-working people who would not have any resources to move to the next level. We all see the need and all need to recognize that we all have a stake in our current prices as it stands now.

We have an obligation to serve those who are the least of us. I hope that we will always remember America should take care about those who live here in this country as
we should be quick about responding to our respective community needs as it pertains to housing.

For all those who have come before us, for all those who have died along our journey, allow us not to let this sacrifice be in vain. We are here to declare housing is a human right and I am one of many who feel this right is also theirs to claim.

And in closing, my name is Reginald Eugene Black, Jr., and I am a voter of the District of Columbia and housing is my right.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Black, and I apologize for incorrectly pronouncing your name in the beginning. They gave me Block but it is Black. Thank you so much for that.

And, of course, as Member Curry has indicated, we think your cause is commendable. Understand that we are limited
in what we can do but we will certainly do
everything within our power and authority, you
know, to address this.

    I have no questions.

Do any other members have any
questions for Mr. Black or Mr. Honey?

    Your testimony was excellent and
you read it so very well.

    MEMBER CURRY: Did you write this?

    MR. BLACK: Yes.

    CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Outstanding.

    MEMBER CURRY: Just keep up what
you're doing.

    CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Yes.

    MEMBER CURRY: We limited at what
we're doing but -

    CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Yes, very good.

    Yes. Absolutely wonderful.

    MEMBER CURRY: You got to do it.

    You got to move the right people.

    CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Yes. Don't give
up. Never give up.
MEMBER DANZANSKY: I, too, would like to commend all of our citizens here for making their grievances and their needs known.

Our job here is just to make sure that you are in the proper forum. We have certain statutory guidelines that permit access that we must follow regardless of the merits of your case. But we certainly appreciate all of you coming out and discussing these issues publicly and taking the time and the energy to make these needs known.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: So, with that, we will take this matter under deliberation and we will issue an order as soon as we can regarding the initiative. But remember you do have to comply with the administrative requirements that are still outstanding before the end of the day today, okay, to keep this moving.

Yes, sir, Mr. Honey?
MR. HONEY: Ms. Nichols, I didn't receive a response in writing. Luckily I was here for the meeting. Could we possibly check on the status of why I didn't if the Board doesn't mind why I didn't receive a response in writing.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: A response to?

MR. HONEY: To my request for testimony here today. Luckily I was able to get here in time.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Well, your name is on the list.

MR. HONEY: Yes, but I didn't receive a response in writing. I just wanted to know if you could possibly just check on that.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: Yes.

MR. McGHIE: I don't think if you call or write they just put you on the list.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: They just put you on a list. They don't - yes. But thank you all so much.
There being no other - yes. Are there any other witnesses? Anybody else wish to speak?

There being no further business before us, this meeting is adjourned at 12:01 p.m. on January 8th, Wednesday, 2014.

(Whereupon, the above matter was adjourned at 12:01 p.m.)
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