

D



2018 Legislative candidate survey

Candidate name: Representative Dave Hayes Legislative district: 10th L.D. Pos. 2

You are a candidate for: House of Representatives Senate

If you are a candidate for the House of Representatives, which position are your running for? Position 1 Position 2

Local government background

Have you ever been elected or appointed to a local government position, or served on a local government board, committee, or as staff? *Local governments include cities, counties, public utility districts, school districts, fire protection districts, port districts, and more.* Yes No

If yes, in what capacity?

Police Officer for the City of Marysville 1990-1998, Deputy Sheriff/Sheriff's Sergeant, Snohomish County Sheriffs' Office 1998-present

1. State-shared local revenues

When the state encounters fiscal problems, legislators often take revenues historically shared with cities, or increase fees on services provided to cities to fill the state's budget deficit. Recently, some shared revenues have been restored. However, during the last recession, the Legislature enacted cuts and diversions, while unfunded mandates and other local government cost drivers remained unaddressed, including the following items:

- Changes in liquor tax and profit distributions resulting in losses of nearly \$200 million in funds that supported essential local services, such as public safety;
- Sweeping and diverting over \$1 billion in local utility taxes, real estate taxes, and project loan repayments from the nationally-acclaimed Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF) that helps keep local infrastructure operating; and
- Requiring cities to pay training fees for officers attending the Basic Law Enforcement Academy (BLEA).

Do you support or oppose the Legislature continuing to use locally-shared revenues or revenues intended for capital projects in order to balance the state's operating budget? Support Oppose

Briefly describe one or more actions that you would take to ensure your views on these issues are accounted for by your caucus and in a final budget.

I was the prime sponsor on HB1113 during the 2017-18 legislative session. This bill would have restored liquor tax revenue over a period of time. I am and will continue to be an advocate for restoring these revenues to the state. Additionally, I support the increase in revenue sharing for recreational marijuana taxes. These are important local issues and I am a big advocate for these policies in the Legislature.

2. Basic infrastructure financing

Cities face many challenges when repairing and updating critical infrastructure such as drinking water and sewer systems. Historically, the Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF), a revolving loan fund, was a significant source for financing infrastructure. As the state wrestled first with a recession and then with the *McCleary* education funding challenges, legislators repeatedly turned to diverting these funds and leaving nothing in their place. Since 2013, nearly all of the tax revenues deposited into the PWTF were diverted to the state's education funding account instead. Those revenues were scheduled to come back to the PWTF in 2019, but the revenue diversions were extended another four years.

Would you support or oppose a budget that diverted more resources from the PWTF to address state general fund obligations? Support Oppose

Do you believe that it is part of the state's obligation to help fund critical local infrastructure, especially when taxes and fees raised to do so in 1985 continue to be levied? Yes No

As a lawmaker, how will you work to secure the revitalization of the PWTF and protect it from future raids?

I have always felt that the state sweep of the PWTF was a huge injustice. In my mind, these revenues belong to the local governments as the tax revenues are generated locally to repay the trust fund. I have supported efforts in the past to restore this vital funding source and will continue to advocate for restoring the existing structure or developing a new funding mechanism to assist in developing these local infrastructures.

3. Homelessness, affordable housing, and mental health

Across the state, housing costs are rising and affordability issues are impacting homebuyers and renters, as well as exacerbating the already critical homelessness problems in many communities. Mental health services are stretched thin and cities (not normally in the business of providing these particular social services) find themselves increasingly trying to help residents and keep their communities safe and secure. Cities have a strong desire to work together with the state, counties, business, nonprofit, and faith communities to help address these challenges. We continue to seek financing, regulatory, and funding tools to help.

Which of the following are priorities for you? Choose all that apply.

- Help to end homelessness
- Ensure adequate mental health services for those in need
- Provide tools to help control the spiraling cost of housing

Would you support or oppose a proposal for the state to override local zoning or density decisions to promote more affordability in housing construction? Support Oppose

Please elaborate on what you suggest doing to address one or more of these issues:

Local control is a very important value for me and I resist any proposal that reduces local control. There must be ways to incentivize cities to develop policies that address positive steps forward in land use municipal & county codes that will allow for increases in affordable housing. We need a combination of privately funded/developed housing as well as subsidized housing to truly address this issue of access and cost of housing.

Additionally, the state has taken some remarkable steps forward in Capital Budget dollars to address behavioral health treatment. I believe that we must continue these investments within our communities to ensure that local treatment options are available.

With all this said, I believe incentives are the best way to move forward, not mandates.

4. Economic development

Economic development opportunities vary greatly across the state. Some communities have deteriorating commercial or industrial areas or lack the needed infrastructure for critical development, and others lack access to adequate broadband services. AWC supports expansion of current programs and funding, including expansion of state Local Revitalization Financing (LRF) and Local Infrastructure Financing Tool (LIFT) programs as options to incentivize economic development and support job creation.

Would you support or oppose legislation that expands the financing options available to local governments for economic development? Support Oppose

What other ideas do you have for bolstering the state’s economic development opportunities?

I was a member of the Community Economic Revitalization Board for my first five years in office. The state clearly has a role in participating in the cost of economic development at the local level by using state funds to trigger additional investments from private companies and other sources. Low interest loans and grants from various state programs are great tools for local communities, the legislature just needs to hold them as a funding priority.

5. Local control

Cities succeed when they can respond to local residents’ unique needs and desired outcomes through exercising local control. The State Constitution and state statutes provide cities with wide discretion in serving their communities. However, the Legislature sometimes considers preempting cities from enacting local ordinances or engaging in certain activities. We believe that the relationship between the state and cities functions best as a partnership, where the state gives careful consideration to the varied conditions of local governments, and appreciates the importance of retaining local flexibility.

Do you believe that local control is important to ensuring responsive local government? Yes No

If you disagree that local control should be preserved, please describe one or more specific issue areas or situations in which the state should preempt local control.

OR

If you agree that local control should be respected, please describe how you would argue for the protection of local control to colleagues who want to preempt local governments.

As expressed in question #3 above, I believe in local control as a value and we must protect it as a value for the state with little exception. Every proposal that comes before the Legislature that effects local control or implements a preemption for local municipalities must be evaluated for priority and options considered to incentivize cities as opposed to top down state control.

If you have any questions, please contact Regina Adams, AWC Government Relations Coordinator, at 360-753-4137 or ReginaA@awcnet.org. Please return your survey **by the end of the day on Wednesday, July 4** by:

- Email to ReginaA@awcnet.org;
- Fax to (360) 753-0149; or
- U.S. mail to AWC Candidate Survey, 1076 Franklin Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501-1346.

Thank you for your participation!