



# 2018 Legislative candidate survey

Candidate name: Nicole Macri Legislative district: 43rd

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?

**Member, Housing Levy Oversight Committee, City of Seattle.** January 2011 – December 2016. Appointed by Seattle City Council to 13-member citizen oversight committee charged with monitoring the progress of \$145M Housing Levy approved by voters and designed to provide affordable housing opportunities for low-income Seattle residents, and reporting to the Mayor and City Council on that progress.

## 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.**

As a member of the Capital Budget Committee, I was a strong supporter of HB 1677 to reform and strengthen the PWTF. I have and will continue to be a consistent voice among my colleagues to maintain and restore resources to local communities, and providing expanded local authority to generate new revenue.

---

## 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?**

We are facing an urgent infrastructure crisis that is having real impacts on families and communities across our state. Our state's extreme housing affordability crisis is directly related to underinvestment in infrastructure at all levels of government, and particularly at the state and federal levels. Likewise, economic development and job growth is severely hindered in parts of our state – particularly in rural areas – because of infrastructure needs. I have voted for budgets that don't go far enough in restoring the PWTF, understanding that compromises are required to ensure basic state obligations are met. However, I have been a strong supporter of this and other programs that support local infrastructure, and for tax code reform. I have sponsored proposals for new progressive revenue and closing ineffective tax exemptions, rather than diverting funds from PWTF and MTCA to meet operating budget shortfalls.

---

## 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:**

I support approaches that incentive a significant increase in the development of affordable housing across the state. The crisis is too great not to consider multiple options. I may consider a carrot & stick approach that provides local communities some financial or other support while promoting more rapid affordable housing production, including overriding density or other local regulations. I would work closely with AWC and other stakeholders on any ideas we explore. The challenges we face are large and urgent, and I hope I have demonstrated my thoughtful approach to engaging key stakeholders in the complexity of considerations related to housing policy changes.

---

## 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’ve demonstrated through my work as a member of the Community Development, Housing and Tribal Affairs and the Capital Budget Committees, that I am a strong proponent of tools that expand infrastructure and promote economic development and job growth across the state. In particular, the state can and should assist smaller communities that lack the tax base for adequate options at the local level.

---

## 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.

At times, the state should implement fundamental protections for all residents. This is particularly true in instances of civil rights. In general, needs vary across communities, and I don’t think the state should limit a local community’s ability to implement policies that expand protections to residents beyond statewide standards. I introduced two bills this past session to roll back statewide pre-emptions on local control – and advocated for the restoration of local authority on residential rents and on firearms.

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

- Email to [ReginaA@awcnet.org](mailto: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!**