From: Pitts, Ted
  To: Godfrey, RobRobGodfrey@gov.sc.gov
         Baker, JoshJoshBaker@gov.sc.gov
  CC: Soura, ChristianChristianSoura@gov.sc.gov
Date: 7/26/2013 11:37:37 AM
Subject: Re: weekender

Quick thoughts

The governor focused this years vetoes on those agencies with excessive growth, appropriations to non state entities and programs that don't work. Though the governor feels this practice of dps providing security for college football games should be paid for by the colleges not by the agency. the governor can't veto everything she would rather seen done a different way. The sustain rate of_-on the governors vetoes shows this focused approach has worked.

From: Godfrey, Rob
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 08:56 AM
To: Baker, Josh
Cc: Soura, Christian; Pitts, Ted
Subject: RE: weekender

Gentlemen – any feedback on Josh's proposed response?

From: Baker, Josh
Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2013 3:47 PM
To: Godfrey, Rob
Cc: Soura, Christian; Pitts, Ted
Subject: RE: weekender

I think that:

The Governor's position on this has been practice has consistent, twice proposing in Executive Budgets that this proviso be eliminated. While the Governor feels that a fee-for-service arrangement between Universities and the Department of Public Safety is a model preferable to the current one, either way a state agency would bear the cost of this public safety service.   A veto would not have changed the cost of the traffic control, nor would it have stopped the traffic control from occurring. Accordingly, we have chosen to maintain a constructive approach to improving more technical aspects of state fiscal practices such as this one, instead of using the blunt veto pen this year.

Thoughts?

From: Godfrey, Rob
Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2013 3:25 PM
To: Soura, Christian; Baker, Josh; Pitts, Ted
Subject: Fw: weekender

Guidance? On deadline.

From: Adcox, Seanna M. [mailto:SAdcox@ap.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2013 03:23 PM
To: Godfrey, Rob
Subject: FW: weekender

In the interest of making this easier to look up and respond, it's proviso 63.1 in the 2013-14 budget. The pulled

proposal would have eliminated it. Haley has crossed out that proviso both this year and last in her executive budgets but did not veto them on the back end. Why?

My weekender is on a proposed budget proviso that was pulled without discussion, but made me curious....

It would have eliminated the proviso barring DPS from charging for traffic control, thereby allowing the agency to charge USC and Clemson, for example, for traffic control during home football games. According to the numbers I have from DPS, the agency spends more than $400,000 on traffic control at Clemson and Carolina football games, plus about $11,000 for SC State football games. Adding in traffic control at other sporting events (Darlington races, horse races and the Heritage) brings the total to about $520,000.

SO, my question for the governor is whether she thinks DPS should be able to recoup the money from colleges or whether this is a service the agency needs to provide for the public's safety. And please expand on the answer. Clemson, USC and SC State are the only school in the state DPS provides traffic control for, and only for football games. While Haley's never vetoed the proviso, which has been around since at least 1996-97, she did twice vote to uphold Sanford's veto of the proviso. (It was veto 16 on the 2009-10 budget)

Seanna

msk dccc60c6d2c3a6438f0cf467d9a4938