



2018 Legislative candidate survey

Candidate name:	Luanne Van Werven	Legislative district:	42 nd
You are a candidate	e for: House of Representatives	Senate	
If you are a candida which position are	ate for the House of Representative your running for?	ves, Position 1 Position 2	
or served on a loca governments include	ent background n elected or appointed to a local good of the local good good of the local good of the local good good good good good good good goo	or as staff? Local ⊠	No
If yes, in what capacit	y?		
☑ Whatcom Coun	ty Youth Advisory Committee		
Whatcom Coun	ty Election Reform Task Force		
Elected Precinc	et Committee Officer 1998, 2004, 2006, 2	008	
 increase fees on servinave been restored. Funfunded mandates a items: Changes in liquor supported essenti Sweeping and div from the nationally operating; and 	Inters fiscal problems, legislators of fices provided to cities to fill the state dowever, during the last recession, that other local government cost drivitax and profit distributions resulting al local services, such as public saferting over \$1 billion in local utility to reacclaimed Public Works Trust Funday pay training fees for officers attend	e's budget deficit. Recently, son the Legislature enacted cuts an vers remained unaddressed, inc in losses of nearly \$200 million ety; axes, real estate taxes, and pro nd (PWTF) that helps keep loca	me shared revenues ad diversions, while cluding the following in funds that bject loan repayments I infrastructure
locally-shared reve	oppose the Legislature continuin nues or revenues intended for ca balance the state's operating bu	pital 🖂 🖂	е

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.

Oppose legislation that sweeps locally-shared revenue to the state's operating budget

2.	Basic	infrastr	ucture	finan	cina

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 from the PWTF to address state general fund obligations?	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?								
As a lawmaker, how will you work to secure the revitalization of the PWTF and proraids?	etect it fron	n future						
Oppose legislation that delays funding the PWTF. This fund is important for my local cities.								
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 so	ocial service	es) find						
themselves increasingly trying to help residents and keep their communities safe and se strong desire to work together with the state, counties, business, nonprofit, and faith con	nmunities to							
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						

I have advocated for increased mental health treatment for children and youth and will continue to do so in the future. I have supported practical assistance for vulnerable and low income seniors in my district and will continue to do so in the future. I have also supported housing support for homeless, families and low-income seniors and will continue to do so in the future.

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

conversations with my local cities to know if it would benefit or have a negative impact.

At this time I am unsure if I support of oppose overriding local zoning decisions. I will need further

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?

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

Reform of the GMA is needed to allow for more opportunities for economic development. I also support bringing internet capacity to depressed areas of my district to entice economic development in these areas. I worked with our local Port Commission to expand access.

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?

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 respected, please describe how you would argue for the protection of local control to colleagues who want to preempt local

If you agree that local control should be

governments.

I have always been an advocate for local control, whether in education or local government. Government closest to the people is the most efficient and responsive and I strongly support empowering our local officials.

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!