

2016 LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE



Candidate Name: Alan S. Reynolds Position You Are Running For: CA Assembly 41
Political Party Affiliation: NPP Are You an Incumbent: Yes No

INTRODUCTION: Candidates for the state legislature in 2016 are respectfully requested to answer these questions relevant to the respective and often complementary roles of the state and city governments in California. While the League does not itself endorse candidates, the responses to this questionnaire will be shared with elected city officials in each legislative district for consideration in their own endorsement decisions as well as posted on the League website. Thank you for your participation. Please email your response to Bismarck@cacities.org or by fax to 916-658-8240 by no later than March 31. If you have any questions, please contact: League Public Affairs Director Bismarck Obando at Bismarck@cacities.org or 916-658-8273.

LOCAL CONTROL. The relationship between the state and cities functions best as a partnership where major policy issues are approached by the state with careful consideration of the varied conditions among the state's 482 cities and an appreciation of the importance of retaining local flexibility to tailor policies to reflect local needs and circumstances. Still, at times, cities have to respond to state legislation they believe undermines the principle of "local control" over important issues such as land use, housing, finance, infrastructure, elections, labor relations and other issues directly affecting cities. What is your perspective on local control and state preemption of local control? *(Please explain).*

Directly I think that the level of government best fit to working with and for the people is the most local. While at times there needs to be certain common standards (I am an engineer and so making sure everyone is using systems that can interact is important, particularly in large transportation and municipal projects.)

Wherever possible decisions should be made by the local government, which is most reactive and beholden to the views of the people who live there.

2016 LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING. Cities and counties are struggling with a \$78 billion, 10-year maintenance funding deficit for the local streets and roads system. This amount is needed simply to maintain existing infrastructure; delaying these repairs by just 10 years would increase the deficit to \$99 billion. Meanwhile, millions of cars, trucks, busses and other vehicles have been added in California, utilizing our already over-burdened transportation network. At the same time, gas tax revenues (that benefit both the state and local system) have not been raised since 1994; they have been eroded by inflation, expanded use of electric and more efficient vehicles, and more recently declined 26% since Fiscal Year 2013-14. How would you support addressing this infrastructure funding deficit?

- Additional state gas or other vehicle taxes: Yes No
- Additional state user fees (similar to the vehicle registration fee): Yes No
- Expanded local authority to raise taxes and fees locally: Yes No
- Return transportation funding from General Fund (\$1 billion/yr.) and reform CalTRANS: Yes No
- Combination of approaches: Yes No
- Other approaches? *(Please explain)*

I am always hesitant to suggest taxes and/or fees, but this is a significant problem. I have chosen a few responses here, but I would like to highlight what I view as a major issue in CalTRANS (and in LA County METRO). These agencies are bloated and often more interested in putting forward "too big to fail" projects that do not solve the problems, while misusing the funds we give them.

Local Cities need to be able to raise the money to repair and update their infrastructure, and get the money at a reasonable rate. One suggestion I have put forward is a State and/or County Bank, such as in use in North Dakota. This would give very low interest loans to cities funding municipal improvements, which could be used in conjunction with minimal local taxes to fund improvements.

If we do have to do a blanket means to raise funds, a fee is more reasonable than a gas tax, as there are those that use roads, but not gas.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING. With the loss of \$1 billion in redevelopment funding that previously went to affordable housing and the exhaustion of past state affordable housing bond funds, California has virtually no resources to construct affordable housing. Affordable units often require additional public subsidy so that rents and/or purchase prices can be made affordable to low and moderate income households. What is your solution to the affordable housing crisis?

- Allocate a portion of state general fund dollars for affordable housing: Yes No
- Establish a new permanent source of affordable housing funding from a new revenue source such as a recently contemplated \$75 state tax or fee on various real estate instruments: Yes No
- Establish a local-state matching program, where local funding commitments to affordable housing are matched dollar-for-dollar with a state contribution: Yes No
- Reduce the regulatory burden on housing production imposed by CEQA and other regulations: Yes No

2016 LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

- Combination of these approaches: Yes No
- Other approaches? *(Please explain)*

Honestly I am not as much currently involved in this as in transportation issues (Freeway & Transportation Commissioner), but I do know that this is a big issue as there are large portions of the state where middle and low income housing is not available near enough to where jobs exist and create both a burdeon on people and infrastructure.

Note I did not select the CEQA answer, because it would be irresponsible of me to choose that choice without know more about the specific regulatory burdens. It may also be a solution if I knew more.

Money in and out of general funds is very easily manipulated and would not be my first choice.

WATER CONSERVATION AND STORMWATER. Faced with the ongoing drought and increasing federal and state clean water regulations, local governments have struggled to enforce water conservation requirements and remove contaminants from stormwater and urban water runoff without reducing funding for public safety and other general fund commitments. How should the state assist cities with this challenge?

- Providing increased grants through state bonds financed from the state General Fund: Yes No
- Providing cities and other water agencies with increased flexibility to implement water conservation rate pricing and raise funds locally: Yes No
- Combination of these approaches: Yes No
- Some other approaches? *(Please explain)*

There needs to be a statewide approach to water planning improvement. Improving and repairing natural watershed regions, increasing the use of permeable building materials (so water goes back into the water table, not into the ocean), better capture and treatment of runoff (with a better branding campaign to increase knowledge on the viability of reclaimed/recycled water and it's safety and use), as well as increased storage capacity.

Additional technologies such as desalinization and other local means of water capture and use should also be pursued where viable.

Again, I am leary of utilizing the general fund, but grants financed from it are a better use, as well as the aforementioned idea of a State Bank (www.publicbankinginstitute.org)

Candidate Signature: Alan R