

Respondent



1

Anonymous



134:54

Time to complete



1. Name & office you are seeking *

Michael vanecek district 100 Missoula southside, Montana house

2. Housing inventories are at all-time lows in many Montana communities. As a result, rent and home sales prices are at all-time highs. Local land use regulations and development review processes add unpredictability, delays, and extra costs to developing new housing stock, directly contributing to the housing shortage and lack of affordability. State law provides the framework and authority for these local regulations and review processes. As a state legislator, you will be asked to balance many competing interests in debates over land use policy. **Will you support legislation that streamlines and supports new housing, even if it means local governments are given less control over housing development?**

*

Yes. I would support stream lining opportunities to create new housing. Usually what creates housing shortages are price controls, locking up open space, and overly restrictive zoning regulations. I would look to eliminate things like rent controls, which tend in the end to create housing shortages for those most in need of housing, and which unfairly, but logically, steer construction projects towards high-end consumers instead. I would also look to make zoning as a little an issue as reasonably possible. Other factors would include reducing public welfare support for rent payments, and encouraging the entire economy of Montana to become more productive and increase our wealth as we increase economic output. While we need to take care of those who are disadvantaged, we cannot keep paying unproductive people to stay here. Sometimes, people need to move to where there's opportunity and not stay in an area just because they like it. I think what we want in society, in the end, are sustainable markets for industries to operate in, including for the real estate industry. These markets should not be pushed to excess or starved. I think free markets and strong property rights are the way to achieve this.

3. Property taxes are the primary funding source for local government services and infrastructure and help to fund public education. Increasing mill levies and increasing property value assessments have left many homeowners and commercial property owners asking for relief. **How would you propose providing property tax relief to Montanans?**

*

Figuratively speaking we need to make sure that we're not buying iPads for kindergartners. We need to look at expenses and make sure that they're relevant. We need to remove public services out of the public sector and put them onto the private sector wherever we can, And even introduce direct user fees like you find when you go to a national Park.. We need to remove and reduce drastically public expenses so that the government does not feel inclined to tax the citizens as much. For something practical, the legislature needs to tell itself that it is going to reduce its income in 10 years by 25% and then require itself to reduce expenditures to meet that goal. Government budgets are exactly like home budgets. Governments need to tighten their belts at times too, they cannot provide for utopia in a reality of limited resources.

4. Montana is one of only a few states in which sellers of real estate are not required by state law to provide potential buyers with a statement disclosing the condition of the property. **Will you support legislation that requires sellers to provide buyers a disclosure statement?**

*

No. I don't see why this would require a law. It seems to me that already, the buyer can ask for a disclosure and if the seller doesn't provide one then the buyer can go someplace else. Perhaps there is some problem here that hasn't occurred to me?

5. New housing and businesses require a source of water. Connecting to municipal water services is not always an option as cities are not always able or willing to extend infrastructure. In these cases, a water right must be secured through a process governed by state law and Department of Natural Resources and Conservation regulations. Reform is necessary as securing a water right is often costly, uncertain, and time-consuming. This ultimately hurts consumers and our growing communities. **Will you support legislation to streamline water right permitting processes?**

*

I know this is a very controversial topic that covers a valuable and precious resource and legal/property regime, and my actual naivety about the nuts and bolts of this issue and how it is in the real world is going to reveal itself as I attempt to answer. Wherever there is a shortage of something it is because there is a price control or unclear property rights. Los Angeles has water shortages all the time, but they have no shortages of snickers candy bars or Mercedes Benzes. This is because of price controls on water but not candy bars or cars. If prices need to reflect scarcity more accurately then those prices need to come up. When

everybody is looking at the free and accurate price of something in a market, they can better determine if the project they wish to pursue is equitable or not. Therefore, I would support laws and regulations (more likely this would be removing laws and deregulating) which help free prices emerge on the market which reflect the actual cost of water in an area. Then, everyone can look at those prices and determine more accurately if they wish to buy or sell something. For me, whoever was using the water first, and was using a known amount for an honest purpose, and continues to use this amount, or very close to it, over time, can continue to have the rights to that water. Government cannot force this user to relinquish any rights for this water, even if it is to save lives and the owner of this water wants to only fill his cattle troughs. But, if the government is preventing development, or if a special interest group is leaning on the government to deny water rights to a perfectly legitimate development proposition, that's wrong! That kind of stuff needs to stop. If it takes a law to streamline around this so that we can build houses in places where people like to live, on land people want to sell, let's do this right away. Government tends to own or regulate the use of water. We're going to have to work with the government to make sure people get what they want in the end. Government will have to monitor aquifers and make sure we aren't depleting them, and it needs to easily sell water rights to those aquifers until it detects an honest problem. Two technological fixes for water conservation are these: pulling water from a river and irrigating land replenishes the aquifer, and runoff goes back to the river, while this is a slight immediate net loss to the river, the river is easily monitored by looking at it, and we are replenishing the aquifer keeping water in the area for longer. Aside from the obvious ecological and aesthetic benefits of a healthy river, the water going away down the river is a total loss for human economic potential. The existing ecology of the river demands our respect and we should preserve it, but very much of that river water can be used and it will go right back to help that river during low runoff periods. Also think containments that double as recreation areas. The second technological fix will work very well in drier rural areas. Just keep using septic tanks. The water comes off the top clean and goes back into the earth. We can even use injection wells to force any community collected waste water into an area that can run down by gravity and back into an aquifer. This can result in near zero loss. HOA's for developments in drier areas can require property owners to limit grass watering and to use low water, native plants, or pay something extra for something special if they really insist. Things like this are reasonable and can work. So, if we can convince the government that we're merely trapping the water temporarily and then re-introducing it back to its native source, perhaps rights to that will not even be necessary. Perhaps a use-permit of a new kind of legal status can be issued and that way as long as say 95% of the water being used is returned to its cycle, then this new use permit can be issued instead of a rights permit.

6. One in five homes in Montana is serviced by an onsite septic system. If properly installed and maintained, septic systems are a safe and cost-effective means of waste disposal for homeowners and businesses. Some regulations on septic systems are enforced by local health departments, and enforcement is inconsistent. For instance, how bedrooms are counted for determining what size of system is necessary and how nonconforming systems are handled varies. **Will you support legislation that brings greater consistency to enforcement of regulations on existing septic systems?** *

If there is a problem designing septic systems because of bad laws and those laws need to be rewritten. Septic tanks are a simple, wonderful and proper way for household water to re-enter the ecosystem. If one ever gets backed up or ruined, it is not too expensive to have them pumped out either. HOA's Could even integrate tiny fees that create a form of insurance so that neglected septic tanks can be pumped when necessary.

7. REALTORS® believe that private property rights are fundamental to our free-market system and are a cornerstone upon which this nation was founded. Our United States and Montana Constitutions recognize and protect the right to own property. A strong economy depends upon preserving the right to freely own, use, and transfer real property. **If elected, what approach will you take to balancing private property rights with public interests?** *

Private property rights will always come first to me. There is no need to balance. I view publicly owned property as illegitimately owned, and morally open to immediate homesteading by anybody. But, that is a very radical view and I would not recommend anybody act on that. But knowing this, you can see where my interests lie. I'm very in favor of private property rights over public. Ironically, I absolutely love the wide open spaces in the mountains and on the plains and I love being able to access those public lands for recreation. It's an interesting intellectual dilemma to me that I have been unable to settle for myself, honestly.

8. The National Association of REALTORS include sexual orientation and gender identity anti-discrimination language in their code of ethics. Montana does not prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and /or gender identity. **As a state legislator would you support legislation to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and /or gender identity?** *

I would support the right of a property owner to not have to sell to anybody he doesn't want to. Even if the seller explicitly states that he does not want to sell to someone because the buyer is gay, transgender, black, white, red, owns goats, owns an ugly car, can't build a wall right, for whatever reason. While I would find it exceedingly distasteful for a property owner to discriminate based on such silly reasons, I do not think the action of not selling to somebody for any reason is criminal in nature, and therefore I do not think the government should have any say in that matter.

9. Treasurer's Name, Address and Phone Number *

None available. As a new, third-party candidate I probably won't win. Donating to the next best option might be best. Option. If he'll actually freezes over in the future and I think I got

a chance at winning I may except contributions then.

10. Will you accept PAC contributions? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

Thank you!

We appreciate you taking the time to complete our survey so that we might better understand your position on key issues facing our community. The committee will be evaluating surveys received and responding within a few weeks regarding next steps.