

From: Ed DeVilbiss
Sent: 5/11/2015 4:33:35 PM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Fwd: TAX INCREASE ON GAS, 12 cents/gal. PROPOSED

Friends,

I got an email from Tom Davis 12 minutes after I sent him the following email and a phone call a few minutes after that. He stood up last week to support the caucus with the Governor and Senate to discuss the gas tax and related issue of a tax decrease. He does not support a gas tax. He understands the suggestion of aligning responsibility for a given road with getting tax dollars, similar to a business profit center. We as citizens need to stay on top of this to help make a positive change in the process leading to accountability.

Thanks to Tom for his quick reply, and I hope we can avoid a tax increase until we clear up the process. If questions come up about this at the Tea Party meeting tomorrow evening in Bluffton I will clarify his position.

ED

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Tom Davis** <tdavis@harveyandbattey.com
<<mailto:tdavis@harveyandbattey.com>>>
Date: Mon, May 11, 2015 at 2:33 PM
Subject: RE: TAX INCREASE ON GAS, 12 cents/gal. PROPOSED
To: Ed DeVilbiss <eddevilbiss@gmail.com <<mailto:eddevilbiss@gmail.com>>>

No, I have not and will not vote for the gas tax. What is your number? I will call you to discuss. Tom

From: Ed DeVilbiss [<mailto:eddevilbiss@gmail.com>
<<mailto:eddevilbiss@gmail.com>>]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2015 2:21 PM
To: Tom Davis
Subject: Re: TAX INCREASE ON GAS, 12 cents/gal. PROPOSED

Tom,

I just heard that you voted for this gas tax. Why? I talked to three House members about why they voted for their version and they said basically, "they needed to move a bill forward to get something done for the road problem". If

they wanted to get something done they could have restructured DOT and had it report to the Governor. I pointed out to one of them the following:

Transportation Accountability:

1. County roads are maintained by the county with the exception of state highways like 278 and I 95, and county roads should be funded by the county.
2. Township, city, or community roads likewise should be funded and maintained by the local governments if they fall within their jurisdiction.
3. State roads like 278 and I 95 should be maintained by the state and funded by the state. If this is not the situation then please let me know what is the situation and who is responsible. If the state is responsible for all of the roads in collecting taxes then every legislator should be fired for not getting the roads maintained because you were responsible for distribution of the funds.
4. Since responsibility and funding should be in the same jurisdiction for accountability this should be aligned before taxes are increased.
5. With the dollars involved, a plan should be designed in each accountable tax district for roads as well as other major issues like Education, Health Care, etc. as part of their budget.
6. For roads they should include Location, Work to be Done, Estimated Cost, and Date of Completion. This should be included in a rolling 3 year plan.

ED

On Fri, May 8, 2015 at 3:42 PM, Ed DeVilbiss <eddevilbiss@gmail.com> wrote:

Friends,

The long and short of the gas tax increase is explained by SC Policy Council below. Voters are not being assured that there is a plan to fix the roads and that the funds from this tax will even be used for our roads. With no accountability for which roads will be fixed and lack of trust in our system that allocates funds for roads, a tax is putting the cart before the horse.

Ashley Landess will be speaking this next Tuesday, May 12, 6:30 at the Bluffton Tea Party meeting. This and other issues will be covered.

ED

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ashley Landess** <ashleyl@scpolicycouncil.org
<<mailto:ashleyl@scpolicycouncil.org>>>

Date: Fri, May 8, 2015 at 3:11 PM

Subject: hold on ... that's not a 'roads plan'

To: Ed <eddevilbiss@gmail.com <<mailto:eddevilbiss@gmail.com>>>

View this email in your browser <<http://us2.campaign-archive1.com/?u=90f4d72dbc04b9503f9c911dc&id=cdc2d2d0f3&e=b9d5cf75a9>>

Good afternoon Ed,

I wanted to give you a quick update on the debate over roads.

Yesterday, a number of senators got together to present yet another “roads plan.” This “plan” would raise the gasoline tax by 12 cents, and this would supposedly be offset by a reduction in income brackets by 1 percent over 5 years.

That’s not a “roads plan.” That’s a tax increase.

It’s not a tax “cut,” either, even if those senators are spinning it that way. It’s a tax increase any way you look at it. The reduction is tiny, takes five years to be fully implemented, and only affects some taxpayers. The increase, by contrast, is substantial, takes effect almost immediately, and hits everyone who drives a car. Even worse: Senators said that the tax cut would be rescinded if projected revenue doesn’t grow by 4 percent – which it almost certainly will not!

This might be more about tax bills than you wanted to know, so our policy team put together a quick fact sheet explaining the essential points of the whole debate. It's here. <<http://scpolicycouncil.us2.list-manage.com/track/click?u=90f4d72dbc04b9503f9c911dc&id=8e0a3937b0&e=b9d5cf75a9>>

Meanwhile, our Director of Research, Jamie Murguia, has posted a terrific piece <<http://scpolicycouncil.us2.list-manage1.com/track/click?u=90f4d72dbc04b9503f9c911dc&id=1e930f9d40&e=b9d5cf75a9>> about how Gov. Haley’s demands for a “tax swap” involving an increase to the gas tax – especially the demand that the gas tax hike not go higher than 10 cents per gallon – mysteriously vanished from her website at exactly the time the Senate