

Candidate name (first and last):	Burhan Azeem
How do you see transportation, housing, and climate issues connecting and how will you work to align them if elected? [600 character limit]	Housing policy is climate policy. This means reforming out-of-touch policies so that green, smart housing can be built. That enables more people to access the walkable and transit-based lifestyles offers. We need to build more housing in Cambridge so more people can lead lower emission lifestyles. Transit also benefits from having a larger base of riders living nearby. We should be investing in public transportation. We also need to address relative transit deserts in Cambridgeport and West Cambridge. This means adding bus lanes to speed up service and help people get to where they need to go
1a. Which of the following modes of transportation do you use regularly in Cambridge? (Check the top 3.)	Subway, Bike (bike-share or personal bicycle), Walking
1b. What types of housing have you lived in or owned throughout your life? (Check all that apply.)	Duplex/Triple-decker, Over-six-unit apartment building, As a renter, Housing insecure, Single-family home, Urban, Suburban
1. Often street projects designed to improve traffic safety and public transit involve removing on-street parking or reducing the number of vehicle travel lanes to make space for people walking, biking, and transit infrastructure. How would you advance these projects when there is active opposition to narrowing the roadway and removing parking? [1200 character limit]	(1) The most important opinion that matters is the ballot box. Tens of thousands of people vote in a municipal election whereas a dozen or so may speak out at a city hall meeting. As Katherine Einstein, states the people that come to city hall are furthermore not representative of the community and we should take that into account. (2) At the same time, you need to have the backing of the community. That is why you run on these issues. I am running on bike & bus lanes, on making Cambridge more pedestrian friendly and that allows me to say, once elected, this is what the people voted for.
2. The Cambridge Cycling Safety Ordinance (a) requires that when streets designated for protected bike lanes in the Cambridge Bicycle Plan are reconstructed they must include those lanes in the project; and (b) sets a mandatory timeline for the installation of approximately 25 miles of protected bike lanes within the next five to seven years. Do you support the goals of the Cycling Safety Ordinance, and would you hold the city accountable to compliance with all its requirements and timelines? [1200 character limit]	Yes. As a bike commuter I know how dangerous the streets can be and have benefited from the addition of protected bike lanes. I am committed to making our streets safer and preventing traffic deaths.
3. Quick-build bike, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure is a fast way to make improvements, while capital investments in street redesign can reshape the street to better accommodate a multi modal future. How do you consider the tradeoffs between capital reconstruction that will meaningfully fix the streets and create high quality infrastructure, and balance this with the short term benefits of quick build infrastructure? [1200 character limit]	In most cases capital reconstruction should wait until streets are being redesigned/ rebuilt there should be capital reconstruction. The emphasis should be on adding quick-build to streets that are not scheduled to rebuild. This maximizes the mileage of separated bike lanes. The MassAve4 impact analysis of four sections of Mass Ave implementing the bike safety ordinance is an example of a time when it makes sense to prioritize redesign over quick build. The report demonstrates a potential trade-off of a protected bike lane and the future potential bus lanes. The scope of the report is quick-build only and does not explore reimagining the median. I would want to know if a redesign could add both a bus and protected bike lane while maintaining safety for pedestrian crossings.
4. While the MBTA controls bus service, the City of Cambridge controls the streets the buses operate on. How would you accelerate bus service and bus priority infrastructure? [1200 character limit]	Buses are some of the most effective and efficient forms of transportation and often serve underrepresented communities. I support accelerating bus service and bus priority infrastructure. It is important to do this while improving bike safety. As I mentioned above bus trips are listed as an opportunity cost of adding quickbuild protected bike lanes the MassAve 4. I would submit a Policy Order asking for an evaluation of options and impact analysis under the scenario of redesigning these sections of Mass Ave and especially on the Mass Ave Bridge! https://www.cambridgema.gov/streetsandtransportation/policiesordinancesandplans/cyclingsafetyordinance/massave4impactsanalysis
5. The MA state legislature is considering creating a new dedicated governance board for the MBTA, emulating the Fiscal and Management Control Board (FMCB). Given this, how would you utilize the board meetings to advocate on important issues that might be outside the City's control? [1200 character limit]	Public Transit is wonderful in that it is (a) more affordable than owning a car, (b) better for the environment, and (c) makes trips around the city faster. To achieve the great benefits from public transit residents have to feel they can comfortably get around without needing a car. This means: (1) Increasing transit frequency including in off-peak hours (2) Advocating for a larger number of routes especially in the urban core (3) Working with cities to reduce fares
6. In a new housing development where space is limited, and parking adds substantially to the cost, how would you prioritize space/think about tradeoffs (between more units, parking, open space, etc.)? What would you do in the face of community opposition to developments that seek a different balance of these priorities? [1200 character limit]	I believe we need to end mandatory parking minimums. Parking minimums add to the cost of housing while limiting how much housing can be built. Requiring just one parking spot can come at the cost of a studio apartment. I do believe there is an inherent trade-off between open space and more units. If you have a one acre lot you can have more open space by building 1 six-unit apartment than 6 single family homes.
7. According to Envision Cambridge, 72.7% of new housing in 2015 was built within 0.5 miles from an MBTA subway station, with a goal of increasing to 75% by 2030. The plan separately cites declining housing affordability, increasing population, and increasing inequality in Cambridge. How will you ensure that lower-income residents have access to affordable housing near transportation? [1200 character limit]	There are two ways we can increase access to affordable housing near transit. (1) Increase affordable housing. I was big proponent of the affordable housing overlay which has helped put 350 affordable units in the pipeline. I would further push for "super-inclusionary" zoning (from Envision) to increase the number of affordable units. (2) We can also increase access to transit by working with the MBTA.
8. In addition to increasing the housing supply for low-income households, Envision Cambridge identifies increasing the housing supply for moderate- and middle-income households as a key priority. What approaches would you take to meet these goals? [1200 character limit]	Zoning reform is essential. Our current zoning articulates a suburban vision for Cambridge: low density, high cost housing. We need to make it possible to build small multi-family buildings (like much of Cambridge's existing housing stock) by right. Making this housing type by right, encourages its development by reducing the costly delays and uncertainty developers face when seeking a special permit or a variance. We need to end residential parking minimums, which increase the cost of housing forcing people to pay for parking they don't. Ending the exclusionary history of single family zoning is necessary but insufficient. Dimensional requirements like lot size per dwelling unit limit how many units can be built on a lot and lead to larger than necessary apartments. Given that housing is priced by the square foot, requiring oversized housing means requiring expensive housing. The Missing Middle Housing Zoning Petition could contribute to increasing housing for moderate income households on small lots that are not viable for the Affordable Housing Overlay.
9. Improvements to affordable housing in Cambridge requires not only increasing production and allocation, but also increasing the amount of housing that will maintain its deed-restricted affordability status. How would you try to reach Envision Cambridge's goal of making 25% of Cambridge's new housing production deed-restricted affordable by 2030? [1200 character limit]	Increasing funding to the Affordable Housing Trust, is an important solution. We need to be able to spend that money on actually building affordable housing. It is essential to protect the Affordable Housing Overlay, which has already added 350+ units to the pipeline since its passage less than a year ago. Unfortunately, it is seen by some not as a maximum not a baseline, contrary to its stated intent. This is already making approval of special permits challenging for 100% Affordable Housing projects that are denser the AHO zoning by right. We can also pass "super-inclusionary" zoning which mixes higher inclusionary zoning mandates on Mass Ave with higher FAR.

10. What actions or policies that fall under existing municipal powers (i.e., do not require a home rule petition) do you support to help prevent displacement? [1200 character limit]	Evidence from other cities finds that tenant right to legal counsel reduces evictions and discourages predatory behavior from landlords. In Philadelphia, tenants without representation were evicted 78% of the time versus a 5% eviction rate for those with a lawyer. (Phillips, The Affordable City, 2020). While Cambridge has increased its funding for tenant legal counsel, it is not a well known resource. We need to make it a well-known right for all Cambridge Tenants.
1. The Massachusetts Vision Zero Coalition supports the removal of direct policing from Vision Zero goals, citing issues of equity and a lack of effectiveness in improving safety. You can read about these issues in the Boston Vision Zero Progress Report and the Coalition Statement on Gov. Baker Administration's Road Safety Legislation. Do you support removing police enforcement from Vision Zero? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support I have been racially profiled by the police. When I turned 16, I started getting pulled over every two weeks for reasons that never held up in court. As an EMT, I benefited from police protection occasionally but I also saw some non-violent situations made harder by their presence.
2. Police details are often required for construction projects and open streets events -- it would save money and create jobs if community members were allowed to do this work. Civilian flaggers were first authorized in 2008 to help fill these roles in Massachusetts; nevertheless, these projects and events are still primarily staffed by police on overtime, and detail requests often go unfilled entirely. Do you support reducing police involvement in streets-related projects and events? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support
3. One key strategy that has been proven to effectively reduce speeding, improve safety, and remove racial bias in traffic enforcement in other states and countries is automated enforcement (i.e., speed cameras and red-light cameras). The MA Vision Zero Coalition is specifically supportive of the following bills due to their strong protections around equity and data privacy, H.2426, H.2532, S.1545. If the State House passes this automated enforcement legislation and allows cities & towns to opt-in to a speed or red-light camera program, would you support your municipality using this tool? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support
4. Many injuries from traffic crashes happen on busier arterial roads. Do you support traffic calming for high-crash intersections and roadways of arterials to prevent crashes and save lives, even when it means taking away parking or travel lanes? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Somewhat Support Unclear what this would mean in the context of Cambridge
5. Mode shift occurs when people get out of their cars and choose other ways of getting around. Do you support improving bus service through Cambridge as a way to increase mode shift? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support
6. Do you support the rapid construction of quick-build protected bike lanes on the streets listed in the Cambridge Bicycle Plan? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support
7. How curb space is managed can impact many different city functions, including bus service, commercial delivery, and residential parking. When used effectively, curb space can speed up bus service with dedicated lanes, create safe biking infrastructure, and/or allow businesses to receive deliveries quickly and safely. Do you support conducting a city-wide parking study to evaluate how effectively curb space is being used? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Somewhat Support Studies can sometimes be helpful in understanding the situation but at other times distract from the real divide. There is not a technocratic solution. Rather we need to directly confront what kind of city do we want to be.
9. The current price for residential parking permits in Cambridge is \$25 per year, which is approximately \$2.08 a month. For comparison, in Somerville, the annual parking permit fee is \$40/year. Do you support raising the annual fee for residential parking permits? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Neither Support nor Oppose The revenue generated from the parking permits is not important. If we are raising fees it is because we want to push people towards other modes of transit. I think in general this is not the ideal way to go about it.
8. Do you support free bus service on the MBTA, and a low-income fare option for other public transit options? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support MBTA fees are regressive and we have free parking, why not subsidize the MBTA?
10. Adding parking to housing developments is expensive and increases the cost of housing. While mandatory parking minimums have been eliminated for low-income housing, many standards are still in place throughout the city for new developments. In order to create more moderately priced housing, do you support eliminating all requirements for a minimum number of parking spaces for new development? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support
11. Do you support increasing density as a strategy for improving affordability and increasing housing stock? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support
12. The City of Boston and Boston Housing Authority have recently launched a city project-based housing voucher program. Do you support implementing a similar program for the City of Cambridge? Would you support expanding it to include additional funding and/or a mobile voucher program? Please explain. [300 character limit]	Strongly Support