



2018 State Legislative Candidate Questionnaire

BACKGROUND

Name: Patrick T. Maloney

Office You Are Seeking: Representative House District 97

Mailing Address: 6435 Mormon Creek Rd

City & Zip Code: Lolo, 59847

Phone: 406.203.2921

Email: pmaloneymt2018@yahoo.com

CAMPAIGN ORGANIZATION

Treasurer's Name, Address and Phone Number: Patrick T. Maloney, 6435 Mormon Creek Rd. Lolo, MT. 59847 (406)203.2921

Will you accept PAC contributions? Yes

ISSUES (Responses provided in Italics)

Home prices in Missoula County have increased rapidly since the end of the economic downturn and incomes haven't kept up. The median home sales price for 2017 was \$268,250, a price unaffordable for many Missoula families. These rapidly increasing prices are due primarily to a shortage of housing, particularly in more attainable price ranges. As a state legislator, you will evaluate policies that will impact housing and economic development in Missoula County.

- 1) State law broadly outlines the process by which local governments must review subdivisions of land. Subdivision is the primary vehicle for creating lots to be developed into homes for sale. Subdivision review policies attempt to balance communities' housing needs with protecting the environment, agriculture, wildlife habitat, public safety, and other interests. **Does state law provide a framework for a balanced, efficient, and predictable review process at the local level, or are reforms needed? If reforms are needed, please specify.** *It is my opinion that the current MCAs do provide "a framework for a balanced, efficient and predictable review process" where the creation of subdivisions is concerned. Where the oneness lies, in such matters, is with community planners at the municipal and county levels. And as such, state mandates are clear that counties have the authority to determine what is acceptable in regards to their current growth plan and existing land use designations. Where municipalities are concerned it is also clear that the municipality has first authority within the bounds designated under municipal jurisdiction. But must yield to the authority of the county on*

matters of subdivision when outside the legal bounds. The framework provided grants latitude to local officials to make strategic decisions based on current information and in respect to state law. The protest clauses in place protect the public and property owners from ill effects of poor planning decisions when those protections are utilized. However, it is the responsibility of the public to be vigilant and aware of changing proposals as they are made and any regulation or influence on zoning at the local level should be initiated by the citizens of the region affected. Current MCAs allow for this process as well. I would not interfere with the current MCAs as written.

- 2) Regulatory reform may be one strategy for promoting housing affordability through state law. **What non-regulatory strategies should the legislature pursue? If strategies require funding, where should it come from?** *One option would be to appropriate funds that would further promote development of affordable housing by incentivizing local governments to consider space occupancy increases (population density) and current height limitations to structures. In communities such as Missoula space becomes an issue due to the geographic constraints created by the Missoula and Bitterroot valleys shapes and sizes. And when balancing commerce with residential and industrial specific needs, it becomes even more difficult to lay out effective zones of use. By Incentivizing population density increases and structural height limit changes, housing issues can be mitigated while minimizing aesthetic and resource degradation. One such space occupancy increase option would be to zone and approve multiuse commercial/residential units that can be self-sustaining.*

- 3) The upcoming legislature may consider changes to state law governing tax increment financing (TIF) and urban renewal districts. TIF is used within the City of Missoula's urban renewal districts to combat blight and promote economic development. However, critics of TIF say that these urban renewal districts can be in place for many years, and TIF diverts property tax revenue away from schools and county governments. Supporters respond that TIF grows the property tax base and creates jobs, and that once the urban renewal districts sunset, the taxing jurisdictions have significantly more revenue than they would have otherwise had. **Does state law governing TIF and urban renewal districts need to be reformed? If so, how?** *I believe that the current TIF laws are clear and concise and they do not need to be reformed. The purpose of the law is clearly defined and the standard for initiating a TIF district is clear. The only thing that I feel might want to be addressed is the design of the districts in terms of size. It should be mandated (either locally or statewide) that any special district (TIF district) should be drawn with reasonable prudence so as to include properties that will directly benefit from the TIF designation while excluding those who would see increases in property value regardless of renewal projects in the vicinity. The other option would be to universally increase revenue by creating a blanket property tax across the county in which the renewal and development will take place this action would spread the tax burden but would not necessarily benefit all property holders equally and may in fact create economic harm for some.*