

Instructions: Read each question and the background information. Search your candidates literature, commercials, websites, or speeches and answer yes or no. After answering all the questions, total the yes and no responses. Which ever response has the highest number will determine Yes, you should vote for the candidate or NO you should not vote for the candidate.				CANDIDATE ANALYSIS 2009 Rocky Mount City Council elections
Questions to ask about your Candidates		Yes	NO	
1.	Does the candidate <b>support</b> the engineered solutions to preventing resources shortages in the future. This would include measures to increase water storage capacity in the form of a larger/deeper reservoir?			Rocky Mount recently went through a drought in which the citizens were asked to limit water usage. The citizens complied and were penalized with higher water and sewer rates. With the growth potential of Rocky Mount and the possibility of cyclic droughts, it would be beneficial to all citizens to have adequate water resources to prevent a repeat of the use limitations and rate hikes. Policies of preparedness with natural resources benefit not only the citizens but the area surrounding the city by allowing the sharing of excess resources should a drought reoccur. Supporting such preparedness policies is a good thing.
2.	Does the candidate <b>support</b> the reduction of overhead, duplication, and middlemen in the current Electricities / EMPA arrangement for Rocky Mount electricity?			The Electricities / Eastern Municipal Power Association agreement was set up many years ago, for reasons that no longer apply. The citizens, however has been saddled with debt, high utility rates, and having to pay for middle men who add no value to the delivery of electricity. Currently many elected officials simply throw up their hands and say we're stuck with the arrangement. Living with a bad situation is no solution. We need politicians who are willing to address the issue and look for real solutions by addressing the problems with the current antiquated system of middlemen and brokers. Supporting an ongoing evaluation and continued attention to the issue is a good thing.
3.	Does the candidate <b>oppose</b> reducing rates for selected groups and redistributing the costs to those outside those select groups?			Many politicians will advocate reduced rates for the elderly or the low income. Upon first glance, this appears to be a noble cause but upon deeper analysis we find that it is simply shifting a burden to everyone who falls outside those two groups. While we all support reducing rates for those who need help, we should consider the moral issue of forcing others to pay for that policy. A better solution is to reduce operational costs, whether it's government or utilities so that those discounts can be given without some consumers having to shoulder the expense. Discounts should be given to all consumers if they are given to any. Reducing the cost of government or utilities is a benefit to all citizens and will contribute to the betterment of all. Support of such policies is a good thing.
4.	Does the candidate <b>support</b> reduction of the property tax by reducing the size and scope of government?			Politicians are fond of using the rhetoric of reducing taxes for the citizens while still advocating the expansion of government services or at minimum keeping any changes in taxation revenue neutral. Again there is a moral issue of simply shifting the burden by giving some groups a discount and raising the rates on others. Tax reductions on all citizens benefits everyone. Support of reducing government cost thus eliminating the need for excessive taxes benefits everyone.
5.	Does the candidate <b>oppose</b> giving only selected groups a reduced property tax while keeping the tax revenue neutral?			Property taxes are directed at only one group of citizens - property owners. This is unfair since the greatest expenditure of taxes goes to those who don't pay this tax. A more fair distribution of taxes would be a consumption tax. This way those who have little to spend pay a far smaller portion of the taxes than those with much to spend. This allows those who are able to shoulder a larger portion make the contribution voluntarily and without the political prejudices found in the tax codes. Fair distribution of taxation reduces resentment between differing income levels and promotes a greater feeling of being a contributing part of society. Support of a more fair distribution of taxes is a good thing.
6.	Does the candidate <b>support</b> a reformed system of fair taxes in the form of a consumption tax?			Over the years in NC we have seen the Global Trans Park and numerous other boon doggles sap the citizens for untold amounts of money. Pay-offs have been made to corporations have been made in back rooms in exchange for jobs and investments that either never materialize or end up costing the tax payers even more. To be realistic, bribes are common place in todays business / government arrangement. The use of tax deferrals or other non-costing methods is a beneficial solution. Taking tax dollars to subsidize operations, build buildings, make risky loans, and otherwise putting the tax payers on the hook is not a beneficial policy. Opposition to squandering tax dollars to buy jobs is a good thing.
7.	Does the candidate <b>oppose</b> placing another burden on the taxpayers by instituting risky loans and subsidies used to attract businesses?			Demands for federal money, grants, stimulus funds, or additional portions of the State tax money does nothing to help the individual citizens. It is simply taking a different route to our wallets. The only real way to help individual citizens is by cutting the cost of government. Many government programs were implemented to solve problems that were better left to either local government or individuals. A candidate opposing increasing government intrusion is supporting the individual and is worth electing.
8.	Does the candidate <b>oppose</b> placing the tax payers at risk in the name of economic growth and development?			Many candidates and politicians will talk about cutting taxes or giving discounts to low income or the elderly. While this may give many people a warm and fuzzy feeling, it should be giving them chills. Programs of this nature must always be paid for by those not included in the selected groups. The only fair way to reduce taxes or costs is by the reduction of overhead thus reducing operating costs. Passing this reduced operational cost along to all citizens is the most fair and also contributes the most to economic and social stability. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not only immoral but destructive as well. Candidates that oppose such policies are worth consideration.
9.	Does the candidate <b>oppose</b> using grants, stimulus money, and demands for a bigger cut of the state tax revenue to be spent trying to artificially induce growth?			Politicians are especially proud of the monuments they erect in their own vanity. They tell us how important these centers, facilities, and expenditures are to the local economy but what they don't tell us is how much they cost the taxpayers. Government sponsored facilities seldom collect enough direct revenue to pay for operations and always require continued infusion of tax dollars. Politicians tell us how the ancillary spending induced by such facilities benefits us all. While there is a smattering of theoretical truth in such statements, the reality is that most of us pay and never receive direct benefit. We have seen boon doggles such as the Global Trans Park and others that have sucked money out of the local economy and will likely never replace that whether in tax revenue or economic growth. Private industry with the profit motive and loss penalties should always be the lead on any developments and facilities. Since government has neither a profit incentive nor a loss penalty there is no self regulating mechanism as there is in private business. Talk of fiscal responsibility must always be backed up by explanation of how th
10.	Does the candidate <b>oppose</b> the implementation of various government initiatives that increase the size and cost of government?			Government has neither a profit motive other than taxation nor a loss penalty since losses are covered by simply increasing taxes. Talk of fiscal responsibility must always be backed up by explanation of how that will be accomplished. Will government spend to save or will they save to spend. Candidates giving concrete outlines of how they will reign in government spending and cut costs should be supported. As always be careful of the empty rhetoric.
11.	Are the candidate's proposals fair and equitable to all citizens without favoring selected groups?			
12.	Does the candidate <b>support</b> the expenditure of tax dollars in fiscally responsible ways?			
<i>If the "YES" responses outnumber the no responses you should highly consider voting for this candidate.</i>				<i>If your candidates "NO" responses outnumbered the yes responses you should consider looking for another candidate.</i>
		YES	NO	