Page 1

Q1

Candidate Information

Name	**Drew Cranmer**
Office, District	**U.S. House of Representatives, KS 4th District**
Party Affiliation	**Libertarian**

Q2

Please provide preferred contact information. This information will be made available to cities in your district.

Preferred Email Address	**info@drew4kansas.com**
Preferred Phone Number	**316-749-8351**
Campaign Website	**https://drew4kansas.com**

Q3

Please list your current occupation.

Data Engineer

Q4

Please briefly describe why you are running for federal office.

I'm running because I believe the federal government has drifted far from its constitutional limits, and ordinary people and the communities closest to them pay the price. I'm running as a Libertarian on one principle: principle over party, always.

City leaders know their neighbors and answer to them directly. Washington too often overrides that judgment with unfunded mandates, strings-attached grants, and surveillance programs that local governments are pressured to adopt. I want to return power to states and localities, restore Congress's constitutional role, and put fiscal discipline back in Washington. I'd also work to ensure Kansas cities can serve their residents without being steered by federal decisions made far from home.

Q5

If you have held any elected public office previously, what position(s) did you hold?

I have not previously held any elected public office.

Page 2

Q6 **Yes**

Do you support continued tax-exempt status for municipal bonds?

Q7 **Yes**

Do you support a city's ability to refinance municipal bonds?

Page 3

Q8 **No**

Do you support legislation that seeks new federal investments addressing water quality challenges in Kansas?

Q9

Please explain why or why not.

Safe drinking water is a core function of local government, and I take it seriously. But I can't support new federal spending funded by borrowing, because deficits push costs onto the same residents these projects are meant to help. What I do support is fixing how existing water dollars are spent. The State Revolving Funds are the right model: formula-based, administered by the state, and repaid so the money recycles. When Congress diverts that money into earmarks, cities lose predictable funding for the pipes and treatment plants that protect public health. I would work to restore full SRF funding by redirecting existing federal dollars, not by adding new debt, and to give states and cities more flexibility in how they use it.

Q10

Do you support the reauthorization and fully funding both the Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund and the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund to ensure adequate resources for drinking water and wastewater treatment facilities irrespective of targeted funding?

Yes

Q11

Please explain why or why not.

Yes. The State Revolving Funds are one of the better-designed federal programs for local infrastructure. They’re administered by the states, they lend instead of simply giving, and the repayments are recycled into new projects, so the same dollars protect public health for decades. Reliable funding for them lets cities plan for the pipes and treatment plants they need. Funding the SRFs fully should come ahead of earmarks, which pull money away from the formula process and leave Kansas cities with less predictability. I would support full funding by prioritizing it within existing federal spending, not by adding to the deficit.

Page 4

Q12

Do you oppose legislation that seeks to require collective bargaining at the local level?

Yes

Page 5

Q13

Do you support legislation that appropriates federal funds for the research and development of pilot projects on stormwater management?

No

Q14

Please explain why or why not.

Stormwater problems differ a great deal from one Kansas city to the next, and local engineers and public works departments are better placed than a federal program to decide which pilot projects are worth trying. I’d rather see Washington stop imposing new mandates on cities than create another spending program, especially one funded by borrowing. Cities didn’t create the PFAS problem. They receive it in their water, wastewater, and biosolids, and they shouldn’t be left holding the cleanup bill for contamination they didn’t cause. I would back reforms that put costs on the manufacturers responsible, and that require EPA to account for what its rules cost local ratepayers before they take effect.

Q15

Would you support legislation to appropriate federal funds to identify and/or replace lead/copper pipes?

Yes

Q16

Please explain why or why not.

Lead in drinking water is a real public health hazard, and cities shouldn't have to choose between safe water and balanced budgets. If Washington requires cities to find and replace lead service lines, it should pay for the mandate or lift it. I would support funding for identification and replacement that goes through the existing State Revolving Funds, where states decide priorities and repayments recycle into new projects, and that is offset by cuts elsewhere instead of new debt. Cities and states are best placed to decide which pipes get replaced first. Congress's role is to fund what it mandates.

Q17

Yes

Would you support legislation to mitigate exposure to PFAs and forever chemicals, as well as remediation efforts?

Q18

Please explain how Congress can provide assistance related to PFAs and forever chemicals.

Congress can help in four ways without creating a new federal program. First, make the polluter pay: cleanup costs should fall on the manufacturers responsible, not on local ratepayers. Second, protect passive receivers: Congress should clearly shield water and wastewater utilities and local governments from liability for PFAS they only receive and treat. Third, fund what it mandates: where federal rules require PFAS treatment, Congress should pay for it through the existing State Revolving Funds, offset by cuts elsewhere, or give cities realistic timelines and flexibility. Fourth, require EPA to account for the cost to local ratepayers and the science behind new standards before they take effect.

Page 6

Q19

Yes

Do you oppose the imposition of unfunded mandates on local government?

Q20

Under what circumstances would you impose unfunded mandates on cities?

Almost none. If Congress wants a city to do something, it should pay for it or leave the decision to local voters and officials. The narrow exception is where a city itself is violating a constitutional right, such as due process or equal protection. Washington enforces those protections whether or not it provides money, because rights don't depend on a local budget. Even then, the remedy should be to stop the violation, not to create new programs or reporting requirements. Anything beyond that is a policy preference, and policy preferences are not a reason to bill local taxpayers for decisions made in Washington.

Page 7

Q21

Explain your approach to ensuring Kansas receives funding for special projects.

My approach is to put Kansas first in the formula, not first in the earmark line. I'm skeptical of earmarks. They reward seniority and political leverage instead of need, and they pull money away from formula programs like the State Revolving Funds that give cities predictable funding. Where federal money is going to be spent anyway, I would make sure Kansas cities compete for it on equal footing by pushing for transparent, merit-based and formula-driven distribution, and I would help local officials navigate the grant process directly. If I ever requested project funding, it would be public, tied to a named local sponsor, and offset by cuts elsewhere, so Kansas isn't borrowing against its own future. I'd rather bring federal money home through fair rules than through backroom deals.

Page 8

Q22

What do you believe are the five most important issues in the upcoming 120th Congress?

Issue #1	**War powers and foreign policy. Restore Congress's Article I authority over war, end open-ended authorizations for the use of military force, and stop unconditional foreign aid.**
Issue #2	**Privacy and surveillance. End warrantless surveillance under FISA Section 702 and set clear limits on automated license plate reader networks and the data they collect, including how local governments use them.**
Issue #3	**Fiscal accountability and sound money. Stop deficit spending, which pushes costs onto families and local governments, and bring transparency and a full audit to the Federal Reserve.**
Issue #4	**Local control and the Tenth Amendment. Return power to states and cities by ending unfunded mandates and conditions on federal grants, and by ensuring decisions are made by the people they affect.**
Issue #5	**Judicial reform and the sanctity of life. Abolish the federal death penalty and uphold a consistent ethic of life.**

Q23

What legislation do you hope to introduce in the next Congress?If the legislation involves cities and you would like the League to consider supporting it, would you share a copy of your legislation with us?

I would focus on four bills. First, an unfunded mandates bill: new federal requirements on cities and states would take effect only when Congress pays for them, enforced by a point of order against any bill that doesn't. Second, a surveillance reform bill requiring a warrant to search Americans' communications and setting rules for how license plate reader data is stored, shared, and retained. Third, a war powers bill that sunsets existing authorizations for the use of military force and requires a congressional vote before sustained military action. Fourth, a bill to abolish the federal death penalty.

Yes. The unfunded mandates bill and the license plate reader provisions would directly affect cities, and I would share drafts with the League before introduction. Local officials know how these rules work in practice, and their input would make the bills better.

Page 9

Q24

Please use this final space to provide any comments you would like to add to this questionnaire or add any information you want the cities of Kansas to know about you.

Thank you to the League and to the local officials who read these answers. City government is where decisions get made closest to the people, and it's where residents can still walk into a meeting and be heard.

I'm a data engineer, husband, father, Wichita State graduate, and a parishioner at St. Catherine of Siena. I'm running as a Libertarian because I believe in principle over party, and that includes principles that cut against my own preferences: I'd rather leave a decision with local voters and officials than have Washington make it for them, even when I might choose differently.

Some of my answers may differ from what you've heard from other candidates, especially on new federal spending. I've tried to be direct about that, and about where I think Congress can actually help: fund what it mandates, stop overriding local decisions, and make sure federal rules account for what they cost your ratepayers.

I also bring some practical experience. I've looked closely at how license plate reader systems are used in Wichita, and I know cities are often handed technology and contracts without much information on data retention and sharing. I'd welcome the chance to work with local officials on that and on other issues.

If I'm elected, my door will be open to the League and to any city official in the district.
