


# 2016 LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE



Candidate Name: Ken Vogel Position You Are Running For: 12th Assembly Dist.  
Political Party Affiliation: Republican 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](mailto: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](mailto: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).*

The State should enact legislation that impacts cities and their residents based upon close collaboration with the cities. The legislation should be based upon the needs of cities and not the philosophy of particular legislators!

**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 *maintain existing authority*
- Return transportation funding from General Fund (\$1 billion/yr.) and reform CalTRANS:  Yes  No
- Combination of approaches:  Yes  No *see below*
- Other approaches? (Please explain)

*The state should make these needs a priority before creating new programs to spend General funds money. Take the billions of dollars slated for projects, that make little sense and fix our existing infrastructure and create meaningful jobs*

**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)

The state should not create unfunded mandates for cities. The residents end up with the burden!

**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 flexibility in requirements
- Combination of these approaches:  Yes  No
- Some other approaches? (Please explain)

The State needs to fund these requirements that financially impact cities. Some of these requirements only come about because science can now detect more minute tiny traces of substances rather than any proof of this needing to be addressed!

Candidate Signature: Ken Vogel