

Patch: I want to do what our regional editor did when he started the interview with Duncan Hunter, which is ask you to give us an assessment of the main issues in your district and what you plan to do about them? What are the main issues in the 77th (Assembly District)?

Jones: I feel like I'm kind of blessed in the 77th. It's kind of considered a safe Republican district. But if you break down the political attitudes of the residents, it's really Libertarian in that the folks out here just want government to stay out of their way and let them live their lives and run their businesses, run their families. There's not really a lot of demands from the constituents here on new legislation or going up to Sacramento and doing, you know, a lot of government-type stuff.

The general attitude that I've come up with from the district is, "Go to Sacramento and undo some stuff. Get government out of our hair. It's too intrusive, there's too many regulations, too much bureaucracy, too much duplications of some of the departments. Can we just eliminate some of the government?" That's kind of the attitude I get when I'm talking to the voters.

Patch: I like that idea. Have you been able to get anything eliminated or worked on that path>

Jones: Well, we started with nine bills last year, in January **(2010 or 2011?)**, and we didn't introduce all of them. I think we introduced five. Three got held up in committee. Two made it to the governor's desk. He signed one of them, a welfare-reform bill. It's a minor reform, a minor tweak to some of the systems they have in place for processing applications, and we just cleaned that up a little bit for them. It streamlines it, reduces the number of man-hours per month that they need to spend on that process. So yes, I've had a minor victory in streamlining and reforming government.

Patch: And in that job, sometimes a minor victory is a major victory. And on that note, I've heard people say something like that every time a new law is enacted, an old one is taken off the books. Would that be along your line of thinking? Would you consider something out there in legislation to be like that?

Jones: Oh, sure. My position would be that for every one law we pass, we need to repeal 10. You know in January, the state Legislature introduced 2,300 new bills. So there's 120 of us, 40 senators, 80 Assembly members -- 2,300 new bills, I don't know how many that works out to per person. It's a lot. So the questions I ask is, "Does California really need 2,300 new laws?" I mean, these aren't just ideas, not just neat things to do. These are laws, actual legislation. So of those 2,300, 1,100 made it to the governor's desk and he signed 868. So in Jan/1 this year, we have 868 new laws going into effect. **Still not clean on which year he means, 2010, 2011 or 2012?)** I think you'd be hard-pressed to find one Californian to agree we need 800 new laws starting Jan. 1.

Patch: Here's my take on it: 868 laws, that's just a drop in the bucket in what exists. How many of those laws are you cognizant of, and would you even know if you broke one of them? And if you don't how, many else of us would?

Jones: Right, exactly. Now I will say a lot of those laws -- for example, my bill -- it's not going to affect your life day to day, but it affects the way government operates. So, you know, a lot of the bills are like that. They're not really regulations on our life. But there are some new regulations coming down And then you have the situation like yesterday where **CARB(???)**, on its own authority, passes cap-and-trade, without any input from the legislation (**think he meant Legislature**). And I haven't even read the article yet because I'm afraid to read it. I know it's going to be horrible.

Patch: About cap-and-trade, do you agree that something has to be done to control manmade emissions to deal with the global warming problem?

Jones: Well, I'm going to take that as two questions. No. 1, do we need to control manmade emissions? I think the argument is safe to say yes. When my family moved here in 1978, the air was pretty dirty here in California. So I think there's some science that backs up we need to control emissions, just for our own health. But we've moved from science to ideology. And this whole cap=and=trade goes into the second part of your question: global warming. I think it's safe to say there's not significant enough science to prove, No. 1, global warming exists, and No. 2, is manmade. So now when we take that idea, global warming, and we start regulating emissions, now you've moved into ideology. And now we're going to limit emissions based on a perceived ideology and a perceived outcome we haven't been able to prove yet. So the answer to your second for global warming is no.

Patch: Ninety-seven, maybe 98 percent of reputable scientists insist that climate change is occurring, it is manmade and that the potential effects of this are catastrophic. What do you say to 98 percent of scientists who deal with these issues?

Jones: There was a time in world history that 97 percent of scientists, philosophers, theologians, well-known scholars believed that the Earth was flat. To the same conclusion of the same global warming...

Patch: Are you saying that the scientists of today are at the same level of intellectual authority as the scientists of centuries ago?

Jones: Do we have more knowledge now that we did then? Of course we do. But that's the whole purpose of science, is to test theories and to prove them right or wrong. I don't mind these scientists having a theory that global warming is manmade. That doesn't bother me at all. I don't mind the scientists trying to prove that their theory is correct. But until they've proven that it's correct and that it is manmade, it's still a theory. What's happening today is that people are taking that theory and presenting it as truth, and it's not yet proven as truth.

Patch: So would you say maybe that regulation is necessary on the basis of statistical emissions and whatnot, but throwing the global-warming moniker in there isn't necessary? That attaching regulation to the idea of global warming isn't necessary but there are emissions issues that need to be looked at and there are stats we can look at to base those regulations on?

Jones: Rather than me agreeing with your statement, let me say it myself: Yes, we need to control emissions based on science. When you add in the prescription of global warming, you move from science to ideology.

Patch: One of your other major initiatives is to reverse the realignment of jail occupancy, with the state moving prisoners into the county jail systems. It seems like the train has already left the station. How do you reverse jail realignment?

Jones: Well, the first thing we have to do is address the issue of illegal immigration and the number of illegal immigrants in our jails at this point in time. And the best statistic that I've been able to come up with, being in Sacramento, is that it's about 18 percent. Some people are going to argue it's 30 percent. I don't think it's that high. Some people are going to try to argue it's 10 percent. We've done some research, we've asked people who should know these things and the best number we can come up with is about 18 percent of the current population is illegal immigrants. Now you can't ... you know, one of the positions is take all those people out and send them to their home country, That would be great, if we knew they weren't going to come back. But right now, they've got a free ticket to come back. I mean, we send them home, they're going to be back. So we've got to secure our borders so we can stop the transfer back and forth of illegal immigration. And then send those people home.

Or, a wild idea is let's coordinate with their home countries, let's build their prisons in their home countries and send them to those prisons. They'll operate at a lot lower expense than being here in California, and let that home country take care of them. I haven't done any math on this. It be cheaper for California to actually for the prisons in the other countries if the other country will actually run it and keep them in prison.

Patch: Some people would say that's one of the reasons for the overflowing prisons is the three-strikes law which you had nothing to do with, you weren't in the Legislature at that time, No. 1, do you agree with the three-strikes law? No. 2, do you agree that it contributes to the overcrowded, overflowing state prisons?

Jones: The three-strikes law I believe has been effective in encouraging some people not to get that third strike. But does it add to our overcrowding? Absolutely it's got to be a part of the equation. It's not *the* cause of our overcrowding, but it's a part of the cause of our overcrowding. So are there some tweaks and reforms that we can do to three-strikes? Maybe. But I haven't studied it enough yet to present what those reforms will be.

Patch: There is an interesting story from Marty Block about Grossmont College and funding and all that. Do you have any comment on that?

Jones: I saw it. You know, Marty's a politician, I'm a politician. He has a particular personality and I have a particular personality. He likes to scrap, and I've got to learn how to scrap.

Patch: Are you going to try to get in that fray?

Jones: No, I saw him at an event the other night and said to him, “Hey, man, thanks for getting my people fired up. They want to vote for me even more now.” So we had a little bit of a chuckle about it. He and I actually get along well. We cooperate on the floor.

Patch: Your district is going to change. You might have to run in a different district in 2012. You’re losing La Mesa, for example. How does that change the dynamics of your campaign and what are your plans for 2012?

Jones: Well, the main population base stays the same: Santee, El Cajon, Lakeside, Alpine, Rancho San Diego. I’m pretty well-known in all of those areas. The parts I pick up in Riverside (**County?**), as best we can tell, we got all the unpopulated areas of Riverside. And we haven’t even been able to determine yet if I have all of Idyllwild, a little bit of Idyllwild or what’s going to happen. But I do pick up Julian and Pine Valley. So the land mass gets a little bit bigger but I drive through Julian and Pine Valley to get to other parts of my district anyway. If I’m going to Borrego Springs I’m going to go through Julian or near Julian, so it makes sense. Of all the 80 districts and all the changes, mine’s probably in the top five that made the most sense. There’s a lot that don’t make sense, but mine makes sense for me to have all the mountain areas together, with East County. So I’m excited about it. I’m looking forward to representing the new areas. It’s going to fit in well with my current area and we’re going to do a good job.

Patch: In 2008 you were a distant second in the Republican primary to Duncan D. Hunter for Congress...

Jones: You don’t have to say “distant.” I mean, it’s just second. Why do you have to editorialize?

Patch: (Laughter.) Seventy-two percent to like 14 percent?

Jones: I thought this was an interview?

Patch: We’re editors, right? We are editors. Because of the realignments of congressional districts, have you taken a look at the new maps and thought maybe you could jump into one of those races?

Jones: No. The three Republican congressmen we have now are doing a great job. And the two Democrats we have .., they’re not areas where my wife wants to move. And I don’t want to move. And I wouldn’t move just to run for Congress like that. So there would have to be more compelling reasons than just to run for a seat that’s available.

Patch: California has term limits for Assembly and state Senate. What are your long-term plans in California politics or your own life. What are your plans after you’re termed out?

Jones: Well I can tell you, six years ago I never had any intentions of going in the Assembly. So that kind of came up and just happened on the natural ... So really, right now I’m focused on building the Republican membership in the Assembly so that we can get more seats. We’re at 28. My goal in 2012 is to get 32, at least, and then build it from there. So that’s what I’m focused on right now. My last term, I know I’ve got to find

something, but I'm perfectly happy to come back to San Diego and go back into the private sector, where I came from, and go back and stay home. I've got no problem with that. But we'll see. Other opportunities may open up as well. Who knows where the pathway is going to take me?

Patch: Rural fire fee? You and I were talking about that in August. How'd that all go. You have any comments on that?

Jones: It's such a mess. I think if there's anything, any one issue that demonstrates the dysfunction of Sacramento, it's that SRA fee. They pass a bill. The governor signs it. Within two weeks they realize, oops, this doesn't do what we want it to do. So they pass another bill. The governor signs it. Now Cal Fire and the Forestry Department, they're all trying to figure out how to implement it. They can't implement it. The Board of Equalization is trying to figure out, OK, how do we collect this tax and fee? And nobody knows how to make it work, and how to make it happen.

Patch: A wonderful example of efficiency?

Jones: There's no better picture, single-issue, that points out how bad our state government runs other than that. So I don't even have an answer for your question.

Patch: Among the things that Gov. Brown pushed through to achieve a semi-balanced budget is elimination of redevelopment agencies statewide and that's going to be fought in courts for a while. What is your take? Do you think redevelopment agencies should be left intact? Do you think that monies from them are needed for the state budget?

Jones: There's a bunch of issues regarding the development agencies. No. 1, that whole "close down the redevelopment agencies to balance the budget (idea)" is a farce. The only redevelopment agencies have the money they have is because they're a redevelopment agency. You remove them, they don't have that money anymore. So closing them doesn't bring in any extra money to the state. It's all a power grab, with the unions in the background pushing that forward, because most of these redevelopment agencies do not use union labor in their projects. So to close them down just gives more influence to the unions. Now that's going to be a hard thing for me to prove, but if we drilled down, I think we could prove it.

The second thing is, should they continue? As a free-market conservative, I disagree with the concept of redevelopment agencies because it's the government picking winners and losers. But, in California right now, we don't have a free-market economy. We have, in California, the state government, through the influence of the unions, picking winners and losers. The bill that approved the stadium project in L.A. was all about bypassing the **SEQUA (???)** system, getting out of the environmental regulations so that a union project can get built by union companies owned by Democrats. And in Sacramento right now, it's all about the politics of power, it's not about the politics of principle. So to bring that back to the redevelopment agencies -- it's the one tool that cities and counties have right now to get things built in the current economic system that we're in here in California. So my preference would be, let's re-form **SEQUA (???)**, let's re-form the

bureaucracies, let's re-form the permitting process. Let's get it back to a baseline of free market and then remove the redevelopment agencies.

Patch: You raised the issue of unions' influence in politics. In many states, such as Wisconsin and Ohio, there were and are initiatives to roll back their power and security and also their pension plans. Do you have any proposals or do you support and legislation that would limit the types of pension plans, such as San Diego is going to vote on -- Carl DeMaio's plan -- what do you think of basically scrapping pension plans for 401(k)s?

Jones: I think that regardless of how you reform the pensions, they've got to be reformed. We're in a system now where a municipal employee or a state employee retires and they're guaranteed a particular income for the rest of their life. You know, that's a great concept if everybody can have that concept. But you and I as private citizens don't have that.

We've got to pay into a retirement system, and then when retire hope that it performs like we've planned for it to perform. Sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't, sometimes it performs better, sometimes it performs worse. But why is it our responsibility as taxpayers to ensure that these folks have the same retirement for the rest of their lives when they never put anything into it in the first place? And they're going to argue back that it's part of the negotiations, blah, blah, blah, and yeah, it is part of the negotiations and that's what wrong with it. The unions raise their dues from their employees, the government collects those dues from the employee's paycheck and gives that money to the union, who then supports the elected official who votes on those paying benefits. That's where we're at in California right now. So I haven't written any legislation dealing with pensions specifically, but I did write legislation AB 860 that deals with the paycheck-protection aspect of it, and we've got some fires under the table for it for you before we go. And basically, my bill is more of a campaign-finance reform than it is a pension reform. So it eliminates the state's ability to make those automatic withdrawals from the paycheck of the employees. So it protects the employee's paycheck, and then if the employee agrees with the political agenda of the union, they have to voluntarily support that political agenda by writing a check or putting it on their credit card, just like you and I have to do if we're going to support our political agenda.

Patch: I'm sorry for my ignorance, but is there any effort from the state to replicate a Wisconsin-style **(couldn't understand)**.

Jones: I've got a handful of colleagues that want to take away the collective-bargaining rights. That's not my goal. My goal is just to level the playing field as far as the funds are concerned. I don't care that the employees are organized and represented and they have a negotiator in their favor, as long as it's not a conflict of interest where the taxpayers are paying for that negotiator out of the tax dollars that pay the employees' pay. It's wrong for tax dollars to be paying for the union.

Patch: So we're getting a little into the power of politics in Sacramento and how campaigns are funded, perhaps. Do you have any campaign-finance reform ideas?

Jones: That's my AB 860. The four things it does: No. 1, it prohibits the state and municipalities from collecting union dues. (It does) the same for corporations. There's not very many of them that do that, that collect automatic out of employee's paycheck, so it addresses both unions and corporations. The second thing it does is, the unions and corporations can no longer contribute directly to my campaign, or any legislator's campaign. They can still spend the money; they just have to spend it without it coming directly to me. So if they want to do a mailer in my district they have to pay for it directly, design it, implement it and pay for it. The third thing it does is eliminate contractors of the state from being able to contribute to campaigns. It just eliminates the conflict of interest.

Patch: Well, yeah, that's the key right there.

Jones: So that bill will get killed in the Legislature. But so we ran it as an initiative, a people's initiative...

Patch: Oh, good.

Jones: We've already turned in the signatures, and the initiative is call Stop Special Interest Money Now, and the website is stopspecialinterestmoney.org. And it's supposed to be on the June ballot.

Patch: Were you somehow integral in this?

Jones: Absolutely, yeah.

Patch: I'd actually like to do a story just on that. One of my pet peeves right now is politics and money.

Jones: So it's supposed to be on the June ballot, but again, because the unions own Sacramento at this point in time, on the last day of session they did a gut-and-amend on a bill, SB 202, and it moved all of the initiatives that were on the June ballot to the November ballot.

Patch: It was signed?

Jones: And he (**Gov. Brown?**) signed it, that's right. And he signed it in conflict with his original role as secretary of state in the '70s that allowed initiatives on the June ballot. He just contradicted himself again. (**DOES HE SAY "BREHM" HERE?**)

Patch: One of the major concerns of the state in Sacramento is education funding, where in the past, many years ago, properties pretty much supplied everyone with everything they needed, and Proposition 13 in 1978 drastically cut that revenue source. And nowadays one of the only ways to fund is through a tax increase, which is not happening in Sacramento. How do we fund education in California? How do we pay for it to the point where we're not continually asking school districts to lay off teachers and severely

class sections in community colleges and increase class sizes throughout the state? How do we find ways of funding education in California?

Jones: You know what? It's just like doing a budget at home. When you sit down with your wife and family and kids and you're determining at the beginning of the month or beginning of the year, what are your priorities for that month or that year, you spend your money there first. And then if there's money left over at the end of the month or end of the year, you buy the extra stuff that you want to pay for.

Well, right now, we've got politicians, mostly from the majority party, running around all over the state (saying that) "education's a priority, education's a priority. We've got to fund education. So let's raise taxes to fund education." Well, what that person has just told you is that education is his last priority. Because there's plenty of money to fund education. But he or she wants to fund all the other stuff first, and then fund education and only fund it with tax increases.

I'm coming to you and telling you education is one of my top priorities, public safety is one of my top priorities and infrastructure is one of my top priorities. Let's fund those three things first, which is a basic responsibility of state government and then start talking about raising taxes to fund all the environmental stuff the state's doing. Start talking about raising taxes to fund all the social services that the state's doing. Let's talk about then raising taxes to fund all the special pet projects that all my colleagues and the governor want to fund. Why can't we fund education first?

Patch: Good question. Have you taken a no-tax-increase pledge?

Jones: I have.

Patch: So you're basically in your case boxing yourself in that there's no circumstance ... is there any circumstance under which you would approve a tax increase in California?

Jones: I think at this point in time, just based on my experience on how Sacramento runs, it would have to be an extreme situation. And that would be maybe some kind of natural disaster, manmade accident or something like that. And here's why: It goes back to the cover of my flier. Sacramento's not just broke, it's broken. Until we fundamentally reform Sacramento and how they make their priorities and spend their money, why give them more money? I mean, if you're blowing your budget every month, and you're going to your parents every month and saying, "Mom and Dad, can you give me another couple hundred bucks? I can't da, da, da" ... At what point in time are they going to say, "You know what, Steven? We love you enough's enough. You've just got to cut back somewhere. You've maybe got to get a smaller apartment or a smaller house or a less expensive car."

Patch: I like the concept of: Grandpa's an alcoholic, and he's losing his house and he's losing his job, but before we got the house and the job and everything else back, we've got to put him in intervention.

Jones: Right. Let's let Grandpa lose his house and his job so that we can put him into rehab. And really, that's where the state is right now. We've got to put the state in rehab.

Patch: Well put.

Jones: Let me expand on that. Back in April and May when we're talking to the governor about putting taxes on the ballot, I was one of the Republicans that considered voting for putting taxes on the ballot. And let me explain why that's important. That would have cost me in my district. I would have had a lot of explaining to do. And I was ready to do that, and I had my reasons why. The governor wants to put taxes on the ballot, then let's at the same time put paycheck protection on the ballot. Mr. Governor, you put paycheck protection and the ballot and you get your Democratic colleagues to go along with you to put paycheck protection on the ballot, so we don't have to do an initiative, then I'll go along with putting taxes on the ballot.

Here's what he said: "I can't do that. You're asking me to defund my army, and I won't do that."

Patch: In what forum did he say that?

Jones: He said that in the forum of a caucus meeting. He came to our caucus to say that.

Patch: So is this another example of money in politics being a serious problem?

Jones: Absolutely. And what he's saying to me basically is, "Brian, I want you to violate all of your no-tax principles and just let the people vote on it. Just let 'em vote. But I'm not willing to put my sacred cow on the ballot and let people vote on it. It's OK for the people to vote on your sacred cow, but they can't vote on my sacred cow." That's what the governor's saying.

Patch: But some people would say you are not agreeing with a tax increase by simply allowing a vote to take place. Why would allowing a vote to take place frame you as supporting a tax increase?

Jones: Why (does) allowing the people to vote on paycheck protection say you're for paycheck protection? Just put it on the ballot. If you think it's democratic and you think it's equal opportunity, and you believe that people have the voice and they're the ultimate authority to vote on taxes, why can they not also vote on this issue?

Patch: Why quid pro quo? Why not just vote and why not let the people decide?

Jones: Because I'm in a position to ask for something else to be on the ballot. And I that that as a legislator from this district, it's incumbent on me to make this an issue, and bring this, and say this is important to people in my district. If I'm going to vote for taxes being on the ballot, which I'm willing to do, I've got to tell the people that voted for me that I did that as a responsible decision and part of that responsibility is also putting this on the ballot.

Patch: And that's your job, deciding to put this on the ballot.

Jones: Right.

Patch: Another hot-button issue these days across the country is immigration form and states attempting to do what they need to do because of the perceived failure of the federal government to secure borders. So, for example, Alabama's in the news, Arizona's in the news for touch immigration and citizenship rules. Do you support any similar initiative in California to prevent illegal immigration.

Absolutely. I supported AB 26 -- I was a co-author -- which was similar to the Arizona immigration law but we even made ours a little bit better and more constitutionally sound, and also dealt with human trafficking, which the Arizona law does not deal with, which is a big issue in my district. I'm the border district. I have as much of the U.S.-Mexico border as any other district, except for the 80th. But my district probably has more people coming across it illegally than any of the other districts.

It's a huge issue. So when all the other states -- Florida, Alabama, even Midwestern states -- are passing things like voter ID ... you have to prove who you are when you go and vote. They're requiring E-Verify. They're allowing police to impound vehicles of unlicensed and uninsured drivers. They are asking people to identify themselves on a reasonable detainment, when they're pulled over for cause, they're allowing the police officers (to say) "Can I see your license and identification, please?" California's going the opposite direction.

This year, the AB 26 that I supported died in committee, the other bill that required voter ID died in committee. So what passed? The California Dream Act passed, giving illegal aliens access to our higher education and paying for it. What else passed? The California Legislature passed a law this year prohibiting E-Verify, and passed another law that (was about voter ID). It's criminal what passed out of the Legislature this year and what the governor signed on illegal immigration.

It's a huge problem. It's estimated right now that in California, we've got 4,000 to 12,000 cartel members, armed cartel members, operating their operations out of the forests and rural areas. National forest land, state forest land, growing their pot and processing their other stuff in these rural areas. Armed cartel members. I'll direct you to Tim Donnelly's website. He's my colleague from the 59th Assembly District. He's got a map on his website that shows every single county in California. When we started putting this map together, we were hoping to get five or six counties that had some kind of cartel activity. Every county but two ... we came up with legitimate news sources talking about cartels interacting with law enforcement or firefighters -- armed.

So what does that tell you? Our state's being taken over by a guerrilla army that we're not taking any steps to control. Is that America's about? And I would argue it's not.

Patch: About marijuana. The state's voters clearly stated a preference for allowing marijuana sales for medicinal uses. But cities and counties have cracked down on medicinal marijuana clinics, closing them with zoning ordinances and other means. What

is your stance? Should the relevant people on **(intelligible, kids making noise in background)** marijuana clinics be **(ditto)** or the federal government's prohibitions take precedence?

Jones: First of all, we live in a country with the rule of law, so yeah, the federal government's got a law against this and if there's not a legal way for us to get out from underneath that law, then we've got to obey it. So if we can't invoke states' rights to remove ourselves from that federal regulation, then we're bound by it. Now if we can use states' rights and get out of it, then let's get out of it. There's a lot of things the federal government does that I'd like to get us out from under.

OK, so that's that. Now on the issue of marijuana, I believe marijuana's a gateway drug. It leads to other drug use. I think if you do a poll or a study, the number of people that use marijuana and then move on to other drugs is far greater than the number of people who use marijuana and stick with marijuana. Now, can it be used for medicinal purposes? I'm not qualified to make that decision. Am I willing to go along with the will of the people? I would say if it's restricted to people who need it for legitimate medicinal purposes and there's a legitimate medicinal use for it, I could go along with that. What's happened, is the law, as many of us predicted and as we knew would happen, has been abused and expanded far beyond the intent or the meaning of the law to where it's no longer about medicinal purposes, it's just an excuse to use it legally. So I do support the cities and counties cracking down on it because it's been abused.

Patch: What do you say to the people of La Mesa who have been your constituents and will soon be in Marty Block's district? Any parting words?

Jones: Well, the good news is Marty Block is vacating the seat and moving to the Senate. So Marty Block won't be able to fail them. Although we will be representing them in the Senate, though, I think. Will he? You know, I love La Mesa. I lived in La Mesa when I was going to San Diego State, I love going to the Village up there, and the people of La Mesa are fantastic. I feel like they're a part of this district; they're a part of East County. So I'm going to miss representing that area/ I'm still going to go to that area, I'm still going to go be in that area and I'm still going to be friends with La Mesians (sic). And I'm helping to find them a good representative right now to run for that seat and represent them. I hope when I find somebody that they'll be encouraged and help me help that person win.

Patch: Any parting words for your Santeans **(spelling correct?)**?

Jones: I live in Santee, I love Santee. The whole district is great, though. This is a fantastic place to live. The people here are great and I'm really excited to represent them in Sacramento. As bad as Sacramento is on a daily basis, when I come home I get energized and encouraged and my batteries recharged to go back and do it again.

Patch: You miss anything about the City Council?

Jones: Oh, yeah. The camaraderie and the cooperation and the collaboration on getting things done. You know, even when we had a 4-1 vote or a 3-2 vote, it was never with any

animosity or personal vendettas or anything like that. We were all just trying to move the city in a positive direction. I think we did that. I think the guys that are there now are doing a good job -- Sacramento lacks that. So I do miss that about the City Council.

Patch: Thank you very much, Brian Jones, and when do you expect to go back up?

Jones: I'll be back up Nov. 1 for some hearings.