

Your Granite State Taxpayers Candidate Survey Responses

cruroe@server264.web-hosting.com <cruroe@server264.web-hosting.com>
on behalf of
Granite State Taxpayers <info@granitestatetaxpayers.org>

Tue 7/5/2022 4:14 PM

To: Richard Girard <rich@girardfornhsenate.com>

Hello Richard,

Thank you for answering our 2022 candidate survey. Your answers are provided below for your records.

Personal Information

Name

Richard Girard

Address

283 Orange St.
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104
United States
[Map It](#)

Email

rich@girardfornhsenate.com

Phone

(603) 624-5668

Political Party Affiliation

Republican

Office

Which office are you running for?

State Senate

District

20

Candidate Questions

Will you oppose any income or sales tax, or any increase in the overall tax burden in New Hampshire?

Yes

Will you support decreasing state spending or at least preventing any increase in state spending?

Yes

Comments

If spending is to increase, my goal will be to keep it below the rate of inflation, especially considering how high inflation is running. If population growth is less than inflation, that will be my ceiling for spending.

Will you support limiting voting to persons who have been New Hampshire residents for at least 30 days?

Yes

Will you support using the same residency standard for all NH services that require residency?

Yes

Do you believe that state public school funding should be set by state budget and not by the courts

Yes

Do you support additional school choice options?

Yes

Will you support passing Right-to-Work legislation?

Yes

Will you support reducing business taxes and regulations to encourage economic development and business retention?

Yes

Will you support pension reforms for government employees including a transition from defined-benefit to defined-contribution plans?

Yes

Will you vote to terminate expanded Medicaid if the Federal contribution is cut?

Yes

Will you oppose casino gambling?

Yes

Will you support actions that decrease electricity rates, rolling back RGGI, and oppose any actions that will increase them, including net metering and expanded alternative energy mandates?

Yes

Comments

I also think we need to take a serious look at bringing Merrimack Station back on line, rather than paying for its "stranded cost" in our utility bills. The state forced Eversource to spend over \$400 million to upgrade its environmental systems, then forced its sale for pennies on the dollar. It should be producing electricity for NH utility customers! We should also be looking into building a second reactor at Seabrook Station. In addition, I think we should be looking to open discussions with Hydro Quebec to see what can be done to bring their abundant hydro energy to our state. We have a supply problem that requires production capacity. Neither coal, nuclear nor hydro plants are subject to the price or availability of oil or natural gas. Wind and solar simply cannot fill the gaps that are being created by the removal or shortage of fossil fuel generation capacity. Before the current rate hikes were announced, we had the highest electric utility costs in the nation and it's really the fault of bad legislation and policy.

Will you support paying down the State's debt as opposed to increasing the rainy day fund?

Yes

Comments

In general, I agree with the concept so I've answered "yes." Given my experience with municipal finance, there are some things I would also want to consider. Any new debt that's issued will likely be at much higher rates than the debt we have on the books. If this proves to be true, then using the surplus to avoid using debt to finance already planned capital projects might have a better return for the taxpayer. If so, then I would look to avoid new debt before I retired existing debt.

I do not support eliminating the Rainy Day Fund because bond rating agencies look to see what reserves a government entity has when determining its bond ratings. I don't know what threshold the rating agencies have for state government but I wouldn't want to be below it. A decrease in the state's bond rating means higher costs of borrowing and does not well serve the interests of the taxpayer.

Under no circumstances will I support using funds that could reduce debt, avoid debt or increase the RDF for operating expenses.

Acknowledgement

I have reviewed my survey answers and understand that my submission is final and may not be edited once submitted.