



2018 Legislative candidate survey

Candidate name: Dave Wilson Legislative district: 6th LD

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?
Enter text here

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.

For the past several budget cycles, the state legislature has taken a short-term approach while dealing with major revenue shortfalls and partisan gridlock. Now that the budget has stabilized somewhat, we need to start thinking in the long term. I want to create a sustainable budget that can withstand tough economic times without placing undue burden on local jurisdictions. As a part of that process, I want to re-appropriate locally-shared revenues and revenues intended for capital projects to their intended targets, and make it less likely that they will need to be redirected to the operating budget in the future.

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 believe we can craft a budget that protects the PWTF without neglecting other critical budget areas. The first step is creating a more sustainable budget that is resilient in the face of economic recession and other revenue crises. Once we have a stable budget, we can make long-term budgetary decisions and commitments that will ensure the state can keep its promises to support local infrastructure. The ability to plan long-term for infrastructure projects is essential.

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 believe the state government should work with local jurisdictions to develop affordable housing options rather than simply overriding the policy decisions of local officials. Affordable housing should be a priority at both the local and state levels, but the relationship between the two should be collaborative and equitable. Local officials best understand the needs and interests of their specific constituencies while state agencies can offer resources and other expertise. If a positive relationship can be established between state and local governments we can help all Washington residents have access to affordable housing options.

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?

The foundation of economic development is education. We need to ensure that K-12 remains adequately funded, and invest in more early-learning/pre-K education. We also need to make post-secondary education more affordable for state residents, including vocational training and apprenticeships. This is especially true for families not in the top 20% of income levels. It is essential that Washington have a well-trained and educated workforce.

Secondly, we need to invest in infrastructure projects. Capital and transportation projects are vital to economic development and good jobs. The multiplier effect of these projects is enormous. Part of these projects should include investments in clean and renewable energy projects.

Economic development projects also need to benefit working-class and low-income communities and giving *everyone* a shot at economic success. Education and jobs are the best social programs, and this kind of economic development will contribute to long-term prosperity for all.

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.

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.

OR

I take a balanced approach to the issue of local control. On one hand, when it comes to the issues that directly affect people's day-to-day lives local officials have a better understanding of the needs of their communities and should therefore maintain control over those issues. On the other hand, some regulatory uniformity across the state is required to promote economic growth and make public resources more easily accessible to everyone. Absolute local control can lead to a patchwork of policies and regulatory structures that can potentially make it difficult for businesses to operate or for residents to understand how to engage with government services. Wherever possible, I want to see state and local officials work together throughout the policy and legislative processes so that overriding local decisions is rare.

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!