

2016 LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE



Candidate Name: Nancy Skinner Position You Are Running For: State Senate District 9

Political Party Affiliation: Democrat 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.

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).*

In general I oppose the pre-emption of local control and support the right of cities to determine the appropriate course of action for their jurisdiction and their constituents. There are limited and specific times or issues however when the welfare of the State and the needs of residents of the State as a whole, or the needs of particular constituencies, for example, seniors, disabled, minorities, low income residents or even children, may require an action that goes beyond local control. Regulations on water use during droughts as California has recently experienced are an example of times where it may be appropriate for the State to take action beyond local control. Land use incentives to increase infill housing or housing affordability can be an example where state action can assist localities.

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
- Additional state user fees (similar to the vehicle registration fee): Yes
- Expanded local authority to raise taxes and fees locally Yes
- Return transportation funding from General Fund (\$1 billion/yr.) and reform CalTRANS Yes
- Combination of approaches: Yes
- Other approaches? *(Please explain)*

Like the League of Cities, I support revenue enhancements to increase the funding available to address the real needs of our roads and transportation system. I support additional financing tools to fund these dire transportation needs. I also support using Cap and Trade funds and a portion of diesel taxes to enhance the efficiency of goods movement.

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
- 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
- Establish a local-state matching program, where local funding commitments to affordable housing are matched dollar-for-dollar with a state contribution Yes
- Reduce the regulatory burden on housing production imposed by CEQA and other regulations: Yes No

I support very targeted adjustments to CEQA and other regulations designed to reduce time delays for housing projects that meet otherwise existing requirements. SB 375 was a good example of a very targeted approach and I am open to exploring other possibilities like SB 375.

