

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	Support	Oppose
locally-shared revenues or revenues intended for capital		\boxtimes
projects in order to balance the state's operating budget?		

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.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, all budget affecting measures come before me. I exercise my vote in committee and on the floor to limit the budget to necessary functions of government. As a former mayor, I well understand the pressure on municipalities to always do more-with-less and I take that into account each time I vote.

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	Support	Oppose
from the PWTF to address state general fund obligations?		\boxtimes

Do you believe that it is part of the state's obligation to help Yes fund critical local infrastructure, especially when taxes and fees raised to do so in 1985 continue to be levied?

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

No

 \square

Coming from local government, I am well aware of the challenges faced by municipalities, particularly the smaller cities and towns. I will support measures that reduce non-critical state spending thus freeing resources to revive the PWTF.

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.

- \boxtimes 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 Support Oppose or density decisions to promote more affordability in housing construction?

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

I sponsored a bill that addressed the housing shortfall and would have helped encourage revitalization of our cities' older buildings. Senate Bill 6347 would have given all municipalities the ability to offer property tax relief to builders who built or remodeled multi-family units. Current law allows only cities with populations of more than 15,000 to participate in this incentive program. My bill was killed in House committee at the request of Speaker Chop. I intended to re-introduce this bill in the future.

With respect to behavioral health, I believe more resources are needed at the local level. I procured \$1.55M in Capital Budget funding to provide more beds in the 39th Legislative district and will work to see that more resources are invested in similar solutions.

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	Support	Oppose
options available to local governments for economic development?	\boxtimes	

What other ideas do you have for bolstering the state's economic development opportunities? In principle, I oppose onerous regulations and excessive taxes on businesses as a way to keep Washington State's economy vibrant and competitive. I sit on the Economic Development and Trade Committee.

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.

No

 \square

Do you believe that local control is important
to ensuring responsive local government?Yes

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. 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.

Every city and every community is different. They have different histories, cultures, problems and needs. The government closest to the people best understands the people. As State legislators, we need to be constantly aware that "cookie-cutter" solutions to local problems should be carefully evaluated or avoided altogether.

OR

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

- Email to <u>ReginaA@awcnet.org;</u>
- 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!