

Mark Sanford

From: Joel Sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2009 7:04 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Woman releases statement

This is up on the AP now, and will be widely played tomorrow:

Argentine Woman Acknowledges Affair With Sanford

South Carolina Gov. Mark Sandford Tells AP He Considered Resigning

CBS News Interactive: Political Scandals

SULLIVANS ISLAND, S.C. (AP) —

A 41-year-old Argentine woman acknowledged Sunday a relationship with South Carolina Gov. Mark Sanford. The governor admitted last week to a yearlong affair with a woman in Argentina.

In a statement sent to news network C5n of Buenos Aires, Maria Belen Chapur says she will not talk about her private life.

But she says e-mail exchanges with Sanford that were widely published by U.S. media and elsewhere were obtained by someone who hacked her account.

She denies the hacker was a friend of hers.

Chapur says she suspects she knows who the hacker is but will not identify him, because she lacks proof and for legal reasons.

She says Sunday's 200-word statement will be her only comment on the matter.

Meanwhile, Sanford told the Associated Press in an exclusive interview Sunday that he had considered resigning from office after the extramarital affair came to light.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.375 / Virus Database: 270.12.94/2207 - Release Date: 06/28/09 17:54:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2008 8:14 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Punked

thanks... M

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2008 7:55 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Punked

Text follows, document attached:

There is an unusual television show called "Punked," in which the actor Ashton Kutcher plays strange practical jokes on other Hollywood types. In watching the Washington and Wall Street drama of the past few weeks it strikes me we are in the process of getting "punked" as a nation. I say this because turning for answers to the people who created the problem is normally the domain of strange thinking or practical jokes.

In times like these, people are genuinely frightened about what comes next, but it is important they not forget Washington was instrumental in getting us here.

We want answers, we want a cure. The problem is that whether in a reality TV show or in real life, we don't make the best of decisions when gripped by fear. We gravitate toward security, or what we perceive to represent security.

There are a lot of proposals now coming from Washington aimed at making us feel more secure, and over the months ahead there will be many more. It is important we take a deep breath and realize that in financial terms, we leveraged up as a country and we are now going to de-leverage. It will hurt, but let's not compound it. We need to be very circumspect about the solutions both Republicans and Democrats are offering and look closely at their cost, their unintended consequences, and the ways in which they compliment or degrade the very principals that have been instrumental to the creation of initiative and wealth in this country.

Let me illustrate. Lately on television I've heard seemingly unending opinions on what should come next by former congressional colleagues Mr. Dodd and Mr. Frank. With all due respect, I find it flat out unbelievable that Mr. Dodd or Mr. Frank have any credibility in this debate. For more than the last 10 years Mr. Frank's record was "close to perfect as a stalwart opponent of reforming Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac," according to the Wall Street Journal.

Over the years a handful of House and Senate members have tried to change Fannie and Freddie, and even current White House hopeful Sen. John McCain tried in 2005 to advance a strong reform bill. A threatened Democratic filibuster killed the bill, and Mr. Dodd refused even holding Congressional hearings on it. Of the \$170 million in lobbying efforts and political contributions tied to Fannie, Freddie, and their employees, Mr. Dodd happened to be the top recipient.

The point here is that they resisted reforms that could have been instrumental in avoiding what we are just beginning to go through - and if they didn't have the answer then, why do they have it now? This is particularly true since they pushed in the opposite direction insisting with others in Congress that Fannie and Freddie and the Department of Housing and Urban Development increase purchases of mortgages, and lending, to low-income borrowers, as well as to people who represent poor credit risks. They insisted on specific targets and quotas irrespective of a borrower's ability to repay. From the time of the Community Reinvestment Act to present, Washington, rather than pure "market forces," has

driven much of what would come next on housing credit. These effects were heightened by a Fed under a Republican administration that held down rates and thereby let the credit party go unchecked by market forces.

Nonetheless, instead of Washington, some blame greed. As tempting as this might sound it is hardly the new variable in contributing to today's financial mess. Greed has been, and always will be, with us - whether in Wall Street or in someone buying too much house. Given this constant, the question lies in what people responded to - and in this case the answer lies in incentives born in Washington. People will always respond to incentives offered - that's why as a country we spend time fighting as we do on Washington's many proposals. They matter, they have effect.

The irony is that those in Washington offering solutions and casting blame most loudly now are in many cases the same web of policy-makers who had the most bearing on what is unfolding. It's important we not forget this.

Despite what today's campaigning populists suggest, this was not a simple failure of capitalism. Its opposite, "crony-capitalism," is what paid over \$100 million to the connected few who ran organizations like Fannie Mae in Washington. Politics drove a big part of what has happened, and as a consequence every one of us needs to be vigilant in making sure neither fear, nor the illusion of security, drives us to accept the newest proposals coming out of Washington. Without careful examination we risk living with consequences that will ultimately prove much more far-reaching than today's current financial storm - and that would indeed make for a tragic "Punking" of America.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 01, 2009 11:33 AM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: SCSPA search committee

Attachments: SDOC6405.pdf



SDOC6405.pdf
(347 KB)

-----Original Message-----

From: Robbie Harrison [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2009 11:18 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: SCSPA search committee

Mark:

Here is the list of search committee members. Please let me know who is who.

Also enclosed a number of observations from folks I know who are familiar with the port. They are in no special order. I sent these to Tim McNamara who is the hired outside search exec.

Please let me know what you think.

Best,
Robbie

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.4/1976 - Release Date: 02/27/09 13:27:00

Mark Sanford

From: O.L. Thompson [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2009 3:10 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Cc: Finn, Bill
Subject: RE: Gov Sanford

Mark,

Are we supposed to take this personally? (see quote below)

I agree that our State is moving in the wrong direction in putting more control under the legislative branch and taking control away from the Governor's office. The Governor should have control and oversight of the SPA and Santee Cooper.

We are in desperate need of restructuring.

Thanks for not using Bill and my names in the quote.

Take care,
O.L.

From: Finn, Bill [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2009 2:52 PM
To: O.L. Thompson
Subject: Gov Sanford

OL
I hope he wasn't referring to us in this statement.
Bill

"At the end of the day, this bill will do little to ensure that the SPA is a well-managed agency and will, in fact, only further entrench our state government in its antiquated structure of control by unelected, unresponsive and unaccountable boards and commissions," Sanford wrote in his veto message to lawmakers.

E-mail originating from AstenJohnson E-mail Services.

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.62/2168 - Release Date: 06/10/09 18:30:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: scott richardson [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2009 4:33 PM
To: dlauderdale@islandpacket.com; Eli Lehrer; sanford mark; Jeffrey McPherson; Ravenel Richardson; Margaret Richardson; Bill/Laura Richardson; Rusty Ross; greg ryberg; John Vann; Wayne Wolfson
Subject: Fw: From newyorker.com

All, thought you would appreciate this great article. SHR

--- On Mon, 6/8/09, srichardson@doi.sc.gov <srichardson@doi.sc.gov> wrote:

From: srichardson@doi.sc.gov <srichardson@doi.sc.gov>
Subject: From newyorker.com
To: [REDACTED]
Date: Monday, June 8, 2009, 4:05 PM

(srichardson@doi.sc.gov) saw this on newyorker.com and thought you'd like to see it.

Very informative and thought provoking

Click here: http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2009/06/01/090601fa_fact_gawande

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.62/2168 - Release Date: 06/10/09 18:30:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2009 11:17 AM
To: 'Thomas Hartnett'
Subject: RE: Port and Other Matters

I dont know how I missed this but will read and get back if there is action to be taken on this...thanks.. Mark

From: Thomas Hartnett [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2009 10:32 AM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Port and Other Matters

Your Excellency:

Sorry to intrude on your solitude but I have several things about which I would like to give you my thoughts.

[REDACTED]

Second, I am a member of the Legislative Audit Council. We are moving ahead with the requests for an audit of the ESC. Takes a while but we will get it done. In that regard, George L. Schroeder has served as director of that council since its inception. He is a wonderful man of unquestioned character and he has really served the state well. The staff of the council has asked the members of the council to request that you consider giving the Order of the Palmetto to Mr. Schroeder in recognition of his outstanding service to the state. Please consider this email as my adding my voice to that chorus requesting that you do present the Order to George.

Third, The State Ports Authority. Please don't throw out the baby with the bathwater. The SPA is a wonderful organization that has been a tremendous engine which has driven a large part of the state's economy. It is uniquely setup to operate unlike most other port authorities. I don't have to go into all of that with you as you already know that.

The port, as with most all other businesses and agencies that don't receive direct state or government assistance, has fallen onto some tough economic times. As with in the past, these times will pass. The port of Charleston has been and will continue to be one of the states biggest assets.

There is nothing wrong with the management team that is in place. That same team has run the port successfully and profitably for a number of years. They are good people dedicated to their jobs and conscience of their responsibility.

[REDACTED]

7/14/2009

[REDACTED]

Any problems belying the port rest squarely at the feet of the board members and not the staff. If the chairmen who have been either elected by the board or elected by the board at your direction in recent years would quit meddling and quit micro managing the business I think you would see better results from the management team. The board should give direction and leave the everyday running of the port up to the professionals.

As with in the past, you are going to do what you damn well please but I firmly believe you will be making a trememdous mistake if you tamper too much with the Ports Authority. It was established with great thought by a very bright group of men back in the late forties or early fifties. Much like the framers of our US Constitution, they had great foresight in their planning and they produced an agency that has been envied my many.

PLEASE, PLEASE go easy and slowly before supporting any major changes at the port.

There, I have said it. Hope you are too ticked.

Your pal,

Tommy

(Please overlook any spelling or grammatical errors)

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - <http://www.avg.com>

Version: 8.0.176 / Virus Database: 270.10.7/1894 - Release Date: 1/14/2009 7:27 PM

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2009 5:49 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Stimulus

You are most kind...realize I have been outgunned in getting the word out on where we are coming from...will try and work on this...thanks again .. M

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2009 5:15 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Stimulus

My Governor;

I've changed the salutation since people keep asking me, "What is *your* governor doing?" We were going over some advancement requirements with Boy Scouts this weekend and in talking about the economy one asked a question I thought insightful enough to pass on: Why is it my parents can't borrow money without showing they can afford to pay it back, but the state can? It surely says something that 12 year-olds (who will ultimately have to pay it back) get it, but the adults don't.

[REDACTED]

Meanwhile, stick to your guns, there are some of us who get it.

Alan

Save money by eating out! Find great dining coupons in your area.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.41/2040 - Release Date: 04/06/09 06:22:00

Mark Sanford

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2009 2:23 PM

To: Mark Sanford

Cc: Joel Sawyer

Subject: Anti Sanford campaign

Mark-

I just left Joel this information but I got a call this morning from a friend in Columbia who said Bob McAlister led a briefing yesterday discussing a paid media plan against you to "condemn the governor for his position on the stimulus money. According to the message I received, Senators Leatherman and McConnell were in attendance. McAlister indicated they would be spending 250k for television and direct mail. As you know, McAlister is a consultant to the Ports Authority and receives approx. 6 thousand dollars per month and has for years. It's funny how loyalty works! Clearly, it doesn't work both ways.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.1/2071 - Release Date: 04/21/09 08:30:00

Mark Sanford

From: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2009 12:39 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: press release from Area Development

Sent using BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Taylor <jtaylor@commerce.state.sc.us>
To: Joe Taylor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Mon Jun 15 12:33:41 2009
Subject: FW: press release from Area Development

From: Kara Borie
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2009 11:35 AM
To: Joe Taylor
Subject: press release from Area Development

AREA DEVELOPMENT MAGAZINE RECOGNIZES EXCELLENCE IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

4th Annual Gold & Silver Shovel Awards Celebrate Success in Job Creation and Positive Economic Impact

WESTBURY, N.Y., June 11, 2009 - Area Development, the leading executive magazine covering site selection and facility planning, has announced the winners of the 2009 Gold & Silver Shovel Awards. The State of Tennessee was awarded the Gold Shovel in recognition of projects undertaken in 2008 creating a significant number of high value-added new jobs as well as investment. Silver Shovels were awarded to Texas, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, and Indiana.

Area Development Magazine's Annual Shovel Awards recognize state economic development agencies that drive significant job creation through innovative policies, infrastructure improvements, processes and promotions that attract new employers as well as investments in expanded facilities. The Gold Shovel is presented annually to the state that has achieved the most success in terms of job creation and economic impact.

For the Silver Shovel Awards, states were compared only to other states in their tier based on population. Texas, Michigan, and Pennsylvania were winners in the over 10 million population group. Indiana, Virginia, and Georgia and North Carolina

7/14/2009

(tied) were awarded Silver Shovels in the 5 to 10 million population category; and Arkansas, Alabama, and South Carolina were honored in the under 5 million population group.

Each of the 50 states was invited by Area Development to submit information about its top-10 job creation and investment projects. Only those projects that began to materialize in 2008 were considered. Based on the number of high-valued added jobs per capita, amount of investment, number of new facilities, and industry diversity, Area Development awarded the Gold Shovel to the state with the highest weighted score overall.

"All economic development agencies make significant contributions to their states, but every year there are a few standouts," said Geraldine Gambale, Editor of Area Development. "These 11 states deserve special recognition."

A full review of this year's Gold and Silver Shovel Award winners will be published in the June/July issue of Area Development and is posted online at <http://www.areadevelopment.com/awards>

Area Development is published bi-monthly and has more than 45,000 executive subscribers. It also has a very active custom publishing group and maintains several highly visited websites. They can be reached through the main address of www.areadevelopment.com <<http://www.areadevelopment.com/>> .

###

Contact:

Area Development Magazine

Gerri Gambale, Editor, 516-338-0900 Ext. 211

gerri@areadevelopment.com

Kara Borie

SC Department of Commerce

1201 Main St., Suite 1600

Columbia, SC 29201

(803) 737-1998 direct

(803) 806-3458 fax

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.70/2177 - Release Date: 06/15/09 05:54:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2009 12:47 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: Tomorrow's unemployment rate
Attachments: Eco Devo 052109.doc

Sent using BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Taylor <jtaylor@commerce.state.sc.us>
To: Joe Taylor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thu May 21 12:45:34 2009
Subject: FW: Tomorrow's unemployment rate

<<Eco Devo 052109.doc>>

From: Braden Bunch
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2009 12:24 PM
To: 'Joel Sawyer'; Joe Taylor
Cc: Kara Borie; Rebecca Gunnlaugsson; David Logsdon; Adam Jordan; 'Ben Fox'
Subject: Tomorrow's unemployment rate

See attached. As always, further analysis will follow tomorrow after the official BLS release of all 50 states.

Braden Bunch

Research Analyst

South Carolina Department of Commerce

(803) 737-0656

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/21/09 06:22:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Dangerfield, Tim [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2009 8:34 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Thank you

For appointing me to the infrastructure board. I will make sure I sit right next to sen letterman. Keep up the good work. I know it is difficult but keep pushing forward. Tim
Tim Dangerfield

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may contain information which is legally privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure. They are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipients or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: Internal Revenue Service regulations generally provide that, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax penalties, a taxpayer may rely only on formal written advice meeting specific requirements. Any tax advice in this message, or in any attachment to this message, does not meet those requirements. Accordingly, any such tax advice was not intended or written to be used, and it cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax penalties that may be imposed on you or for the purpose of promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matters. mmcorp

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.1/2071 - Release Date: 04/29/09 06:37:00

Mark Sanford

From: Krystal McManus [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2009 7:32 PM
To: Sanford, Mark
Subject: Tea Party Video

Click here to look at the Tea Party video - FYI this video is not yet public

<http://governorsanford.com/index2tea.html>

Krystal

[REDACTED] cell
[REDACTED] blackberry

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.1/2071 - Release Date: 04/29/09 06:37:00

Mark Sanford

From: Crayton Walters [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2009 5:22 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Pilot Bill

Mark,

I hope all is well with the fight. Keep it up.

The bill that covers our pilot boats has passed the Senate and House unanimously and will come to your desk this week. This action is something we have been working on since port security took a front seat after 9/11. A lot of effort and work between many groups over the past few years has led to this legislation. We have the support of environmentalists and law enforcement. I have not asked much, but this bill is very important to us and hope that you will sign it. The good thing is that not 1 dime of taxpayer money is involved!!

I would be glad to give you any information about the bill if you are not totally familiar with it. There was some mis-information put out by some groups and I would like to make sure you have all of the correct facts. Please call me before you make your decision.

If you feel any pressure, please allow the bill to pass without your signature.

Sorry to bother you "at home" but this is important to us.

All the best and I hope to see you soon.

Crayton

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.1/2071 - Release Date: 04/27/09 06:19:00

Mark Sanford

From: Michael Royal [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2009 12:00 PM
To: Mark Sanford; Scott English
Subject: For the "Education Policy" File

Mark and Scott –

Great editorial in WSJ this weekend about the "tragic lost opportunity" caused by education superintendents (following union pressure) placing caps on the number of Teach for America teachers in states around the country. I was shocked to read that 11% of Ivy League seniors applied for the program in 2008. Few are accepted because of the education lobby. Wouldn't it be great to raise or eliminate the caps in SC on these highly motivated, highly educated teachers?

M

Teach for (Some of) America

Too talented for public schools.

Here's a quiz: Which of the following rejected more than 30,000 of the nation's top college seniors this month and put hundreds more on a waitlist? a) Harvard Law School; b) Goldman Sachs; or c) Teach for America.

If you've spent time on university campuses lately, you probably know the answer. Teach for America -- the privately funded program that sends college grads into America's poorest school districts for two years -- received 35,000 applications this year, up 42% from 2008. More than 11% of Ivy League seniors applied, including 35% of African-American seniors at Harvard. Teach for America has been gaining applicants since it was founded in 1990, but its popularity has exploded this year amid a tight job market.

So poor urban and rural school districts must be rejoicing, right? Hardly. Union and bureaucratic opposition is so strong that Teach for America is allotted a mere 3,800 teaching slots nationwide, or a little more than one in 10 of this year's applicants. Districts place a cap on the number of Teach for America teachers they will accept, typically between 10% and 30% of new hires. In the Washington area, that number is about 25% to 30%, but in Chicago, former home of Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, it is an embarrassing 10%.

This is a tragic lost opportunity. Teach for America picks up the \$20,000 tab for the recruitment and training of each teacher, which saves public money. More important, the program feeds high-energy, high-IQ talent into a teaching profession that desperately needs it. Unions claim the recent grads lack the proper experience and commitment to a teaching career. But the Urban Institute has studied the program and found that "TFA status more than offsets any experience effects. Disadvantaged secondary students would be better off with TFA teachers, especially in math and science, than with fully licensed in-field teachers with three or more years of experience."

It's true that only 10% of Teach for America applicants say they would have gone into education through another route, but two-thirds stay in the field after their two years. One program benefit is that its participants don't have to pass the dreadful "education" courses that have nothing to do with what they'll be teaching. Those courses are loved by unions as a credentialing barrier that makes it harder to get into teaching.

Some districts may be wising up. Mississippi's education superintendent has asked Teach for America to double the size of its 250-member corps in the poor Delta region and is encouraging local superintendents to raise hiring caps.

7/14/2009

Since Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans has also sharply increased the percentage of corps members among its new teachers, to 250.

But why have any caps? Teach for America young people should be able to compete on equal terms with any other new teaching applicant. The fact that they can't is another example of how unions and the education establishment put tenure and power above student achievement.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.1/2071 - Release Date: 04/26/09 09:44:00

Mark Sanford

From: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2009 2:28 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: Tomorrow's unemployment rate
Attachments: Eco Devo 041609.doc

Sent using BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Taylor <jtaylor@commerce.state.sc.us>
To: Joe Taylor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thu Apr 16 14:12:16 2009
Subject: FW: Tomorrow's unemployment rate

<<Eco Devo 041609.doc>>

From: Braden Bunch
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2009 1:46 PM
To: 'Joel Sawyer'; Joe Taylor
Cc: Kara Borie; Rebecca Gunnlaugsson; David Logsdon; Adam Jordan; 'Ben Fox'
Subject: Tomorrow's unemployment rate

See attached. As always, further analysis will follow tomorrow after the official BLS release of all 50 states.

Braden Bunch

Research Analyst

South Carolina Department of Commerce

(803) 737-0656

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.58/2061 - Release Date: 04/15/09 19:52:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Jeff Schilz [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2009 6:21 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Cc: Scott English; Ben Fox
Subject: Alternative Budget
Attachments: Alternative Budget Memo 4-10-09.doc; Stimulus Options 4-10-09.doc

Governor,

As we discussed yesterday we have prepared a budget for some Senators to offer as an alternative to what Senate Finance will produce. A memo summarizing this budget is attached. I have also attached a document that Swati/Brandon have worked on that breaks down some of the scenarios with the stabilization funds. Should you have questions, my cell number is [REDACTED]. Have a good weekend.

Jeff

Windows Live™: Keep your life in sync. Check it out.
No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.48/2049 - Release Date: 04/09/09 06:09:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2008 10:16 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Budget idea

thanks and be well.... M

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2008 2:55 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Budget idea

Governor;

I saw a trooper this morning gassing up at Pawleys Island at \$3.59 a gallon; 10 miles away in Georgetown (which is probably where he was going anyway) gas is \$3.19. That made me think with these guys constantly on the roads, keeping up with local gas prices wouldn't be hard and letting everyone know where the lowest prices are could save hundreds or even thousands a day in state fuel costs. Somebody has probably already thought of this, but I thought I'd pass it on.

Your op-ed piece was directly on target, I wish we could have heard something like it last night. Keep your plans open for next summer, it may be time to start visiting New Hampshire and Iowa. Best to all,

Alan

McCain or Obama? Stay updated on coverage of the Presidential race while you browse - Download Now!

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2008 7:00 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Evac uation order

you are kind and they are..talk soon.. M

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2008 11:00 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Evac uation order

Governor;

I wanted to take a minute and commend your staff on the evacuation order. We had the state judges conference going on at North Myrtle Beach Thursday and had to decide whether to shut it down. I called your office late that afternoon, got right through to Legal and got the information I needed. We decided to be cautious and send everyone home Friday morning. We lucked out down my way with a fallen tree that missed the house and the fence. Hope everyone is doing well,

Alan

Looking for spoilers and reviews on the new TV season? Get AOL's ultimate guide to fall TV.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2009 1:34 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Stimulus

Thanks...and keep me posted on the fees front would love to learn of any others....

From: Alan [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2009 9:46 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Stimulus

Governor;

I just wanted to send a little encouragement to you for pointing out to the "kick the ball down the road" crowd that we've run out of road. I wondered if that \$700 million could be used to fund the ESC (after you fire the crowd there now) to erase these loans and avoid borrowing more fed money - it seems to me the real day of reckoning is coming when that's got to be paid back and the accompanying tax increase that will really destroy our job creation potential.

On another note, it's interesting that the county governments (mine included) are looking at their revenue streams to see how much is going to the state as a way to push back on budget cuts. My office took in \$140,000 last month with \$78,000 going to the state - which becomes non-transparent. These fees and surcharges are passed every year as "temporary" budget provisos. Keep up the fight, hope to see you soon.

Alan

Access 350+ FREE radio stations anytime from anywhere on the web. Get the Radio Toolbar!

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.10/1995 - Release Date: 03/11/09 08:28:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2009 6:43 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Stimulus/payday loans

Missed this one..it is great... M

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 9:33 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Stimulus/payday loans

My Governor;

Maybe I'm once again stating the obvious, but the irony is too great not to point it out from the Martin/Land op-ed: "We have heard the horror stories of individuals quickly getting in debt over their heads. Unable to pay back the original loan, they take out more loans to repay the earlier ones. The cycle repeats itself to the point that borrowers find themselves thousands of dollars in debt with no way of getting out. Such tragic situations will continue unless the Legislature acts this year." This stimulus is nothing more than a federal payday loan and these guys don't want to act on that. I'd love to see you throw that analogy back at them. Look forward to seeing you in a couple of weeks.

Alan

A strong credit score is 700 or above. See Yours in Just 2 Easy Steps!

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/18/09 17:55:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 9:44 PM
To: 'Ann Timberlake'
Subject: RE: today's press conf

Thanks for the kind note... much appreciated... Mark

From: Ann Timberlake [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 7:04 PM
To: 'Mark Sanford'
Subject: today's press conf

Governor, thank you for taking the stand that you did today and using the tone and the context of the responsibility of leaders reacting to change. I commended your leadership and your forward thinking in my comments to Sammy Fretwell so I hope some of that will be picked up by the press. We accept your challenge.

Ann Timberlake
Executive Director
Conservation Voters of South Carolina
701 Whaley St., Suite 207, Columbia SC, 29201
office (803) 799-0716; fax (803) 799-0719
cell [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Join Conservation Voters Today:
http://www.conservationvotersofsc.org/take_action/join_conservation_voters/

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.233 / Virus Database: 270.10.17/1933 - Release Date: 02/03/09 17:48:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 10:36 PM
To: Ben A. Hagood
Subject: RE: Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report -- Gov's Press Release

thanks for your work and will do... M

-----Original Message-----

From: Ben A. Hagood [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 8:44 AM
To: Mark Sanford; Scott English; jsawyer@gov.sc.gov
Subject: RE: Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report -- Gov's Press Release

Mark, I will mention to Dana that the press conference did not mention nuclear and focused on the clear positives such as the energy efficiency recommendations. The nuclear reprocessing issue was very touchy for the committee and the recommendation is very nuanced as Dana quotes. The recommendation for 6% new nuclear energy is clear, as long as it is coupled with the 5% renewable and 5% conservation energy portfolio standard. In message level statements, I would suggest staying away from the reprocessing issue and focus on the 5/5/6 energy portfolio standard recommendation.

Ben

From: Mark Sanford [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2008 9:02 PM
To: Scott English; jsawyer@gov.sc.gov
Cc: Ben A. Hagood
Subject: RE: Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report -- Gov's Press Release

Scott - Did you give me bad info on nuclear?

Ben - Thanks again, and if you have the chance please let Dana know that I don't believe the news conference misled anyone about the report or the opportunities it brings going forward.

-----Original Message-----

From: Dana Beach [mailto:DanaBeach@sccl.org]
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2008 5:15 PM
To: [REDACTED]; Scott English; jsawyer@gov.sc.gov
Cc: Ben A. Hagood
Subject: FW: Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report -- Gov's Press Release

Mark, Scott, and Joel,

This release is inaccurate and misleading regarding CECAC's recommendation on reprocessing. Here is what the report says:

This approach offers the benefits of significantly reducing the inventories of commercial spent nuclear fuel and plutonium, as well as reducing the total volume of waste requiring geologic disposal. However, a number of technical, economic, environmental, and other hurdles must be evaluated and overcome before nuclear

waste reprocessing is a viable alternative for South Carolina.

Compared to most other states, South Carolina bears a burden for the environmental and health risks associated with the disposal of nuclear reprocessing waste. The state currently has a significant amount of nuclear waste for which there is no designated disposal site. South Carolina's support for in-state nuclear reprocessing should be contingent on the shipment of the waste out-of-state to an operating facility that is actively receiving nuclear waste for long-term disposal.

The CECAC unanimously recommends evaluation of the economic, environmental, waste reduction, national security, and other implications of nuclear waste reprocessing-recycling in South Carolina. If this evaluation shows that reprocessing and recycling of spent nuclear fuel are cost-effective and viable for South Carolina, this policy calls for expeditious implementation of applicable regulatory and legislative actions to support the construction of such facilities. South Carolina's support for in-state nuclear reprocessing should be contingent on a plan for the 5-10

shipment of the waste out of state to an operating facility that is actively receiving nuclear waste for long-term disposal.

The release implies that reprocessing received unqualified support from the committee in the same light as net metering, bike lanes, and forest conservation. That is clearly not the case.

Further, the release completely ignores the energy efficiency provisions in Energy Supply and Residential, Commercial and Residential. These are the largest contributors to greenhouse gas reduction among all of the recommendations. Forty percent of all identified reductions are from efficiency. Additionally, they are by far the most important from the point of view of economic development and community well-being, creating potentially tens of thousands of jobs in communities around the state and producing higher disposable income levels for all South Carolinians.

I hope you will consider following up on this with commentary that is more substantive, insightful and accurate. There is still great potential to highlight the positive potential CECAC offers. This release completely missed the boat.

Dana

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2008 4:28 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report -- Gov's Press Release

Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report

REPORT DETAILS POLICIES FOR REDUCING GREENHOUSE GASES, OTHER CLIMATE GOALS

Columbia, S.C. - September 22, 2008 - Governor Mark Sanford today accepted the report of his Climate, Energy and Commerce Advisory Committee (CECAC), a group tasked with reviewing possible climate change impacts in South Carolina and formulating strategies to address those changes going forward.

Governor Sanford formed the group in 2007 as a proactive step toward addressing climate and energy policy in South Carolina in hopes that the state could begin to act on those issues on its own, before being saddled with costly future mandates from Washington, D.C. The governor has said he believes looking for ways to lead on this with ideas consistent with market principles rather than simple government dictate to be very important, given that if we do nothing Washington will be sure to fill in the blank with new government mandates. He has also said leading on this is important because the cost of inaction will be particularly felt in a variety of ways, ranging from insurance cost to ocean level rise on the coast of South Carolina. Among the report's recommendations are:

- Carbon Footprint: A voluntary reduction in state carbon emissions to five percent below the 1990 level by 2020.
- Energy: Nuclear fuel reprocessing, focusing on bringing renewable generators to the state, and expanded use of net metering.
- Transportation: Expanded bike and pedestrian opportunities, alternative fuel infrastructure, more mass transit and carpooling options.
- Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Management: Forestland conservation and methane reclamation projects.

"We said from day one that it was important that neither extreme of the political spectrum dominate the discussion on climate change, which is why we appointed a committee with such a broad array of backgrounds and perspectives -- and more than anything, I want to thank them for their work," Gov. Sanford said. "Some of these recommendations will make a whole lot of sense for South Carolina and others won't. But we believe this report is an excellent place to begin the conversation and debate - and it is our sincere hope that many of these findings will be implemented in South Carolina."

South Carolina's gross emissions of greenhouse gases grew by 39 percent between 1990 and 2005, twice the national average of 16 percent, while the state's per-capita emissions increased 15 percent over the same time frame. By 2025 greenhouse gas emissions are projected to increase 87 percent over 1990 levels.

In addition to climate change, the report also talks about the importance of renewable energy. In 1970, the United States imported 24 percent of its oil, and today is importing nearly 70 percent. The United States consumes about 25 percent of the world's oil production despite having only four percent of the world population.

governor.sc.gov - Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2008 6:40 AM
To: Ben Fox
Subject: RE: AEI guy's testimony attached

please put on my desk, thanks..

-----Original Message-----

From: Ben Fox [mailto:bfox@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2008 5:24 PM
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: AEI guy's testimony attached

Governor: Alan Viard from AEI will be on the second panel, and his written testimony is one of the two attached. Thanks, Ben

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2008 12:58 AM
To: Ben Fox
Subject: RE: budget summit talking points

thanks again for all your hard work on this... M

-----Original Message-----

From: Ben Fox [mailto:bfox@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2008 10:59 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Patrick Franks
Subject: budget summit talking points

Governor: I'm bringing tomorrow's summit talking points over to the mansion - I'll have them at the back gate by 11:15pm. There will be charts attached (we've got large copies here at the office) - we can edit first thing in the AM if necessary. I'm also included an attendance sheet and a potential seating chart. Thanks, Ben.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2009 9:48 PM
To: 'Bobby Pearce'
Subject: RE: job creation

Good ideas...we need to follow up on them... M

From: Bobby Pearce [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 05, 2009 10:34 AM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: job creation

Mark, you may or may not remember my prior emails about focusing on job creation and small business formation--you know, "Grow Our Own" business mantra---if you ever want to review the ideas or suggestions which I think would make a big difference if you got fully behind them, let me know---you could put so many of your ideas, including education etc etc, under the umbrella of job creation and maybe have greater buy-in from folks--remember my suggestion of a statewide tour by you focusing on small businesses---small business formation and expansion is what, I feel certain, will help lead us out of this terrible economic crisis--anyway, just my thoughts again--hope to see you soon--Bobby

Bobby Pearce

Phone: [REDACTED]

=====

Confidentiality Notice

This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure.

If you are not the named addressee, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately either by phone (800-237-2000) or reply to this e-mail and delete all copies of this message.

To ensure compliance with the requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including the attachments) is not intended or written to be used, for the purpose of (a) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (b) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or tax-related matter[s]. To provide you with a communication that could be used to avoid penalties under the Internal Revenue Code will necessarily entail additional investigations, analysis and

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2008 9:36 PM
To: Dana Beach
Subject: RE:

will look at tomorrow, thanks.. mark

-----Original Message-----

From: Dana Beach [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2008 1:53 PM
To: Scott English; [REDACTED]
Subject: FW:

Scott and Mark,

Would you take a look at this letter that former Governor Hunt from North Carolina will sign and would like to know if you would be willing to co-sign. Hunt is going to see if Easley will also sign. Please let me know what you think.

Thanks,

Dana

From: Chris DeScherer [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2008 10:24 AM
To: Dana Beach
Cc: Derb Carter
Subject:

Dana:

Attached is a draft op-ed for Governor Sanford's consideration. As you will see, it is written from the perspective of both the Governors of SC and NC. When you get a chance, please let us know what you think. Also, please feel free to let me know if you need additional information from me.

Thanks.

Chris

Christopher K. DeScherer
Senior Attorney
Southern Environmental Law Center
38 Broad Street, Suite 200
Charleston, SC 29401
P.O. Box 609
Charleston, SC 29402

843-720-5270
843-720-5240 (fax)

[REDACTED]
www.southernenvironment.org

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 9:55 PM
To: 'Dana Beach'; 'senglish@gov.sc.gov'; 'Jschilz@gov.sc.gov'
Subject: RE: Port

Lets try and work out...if not me then at staff level m very interested...

From: Dana Beach [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 9:41 PM
To: senglish@gov.sc.gov; Jschilz@gov.sc.gov
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Port

Scott and Jeff,
Can Ron Brinson and I come up and meet with you all and Mark on the fth, 7th or 8th of April to talk about port privatization? More revenue potential from this than from the stimulus! And it's not a one time shot.
Dana

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.10/1995 - Release Date: 03/11/09 08:28:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2009 9:45 PM
To: 'Dangerfield, Tim'
Subject: RE: Thank you

Will do and thnaks...

From: Dangerfield, Tim [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2009 8:34 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Thank you

For appointing me to the infrastructure board. I will make sure I sit right next to sen letterman. Keep up the good work. I know it is difficult but keep pushing forward. Tim
Tim Dangerfield

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may contain information which is legally privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure. They are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipients or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: Internal Revenue Service regulations generally provide that, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax penalties, a taxpayer may rely only on formal written advice meeting specific requirements. Any tax advice in this message, or in any attachment to this message, does not meet those requirements. Accordingly, any such tax advice was not intended or written to be used, and it cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax penalties that may be imposed on you or for the purpose of promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matters. mmcorp

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.1/2071 - Release Date: 04/29/09 06:37:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2009 4:25 PM
To: 'David Taub'
Subject: RE: BJWSA

Got it...thanks.

I would ask you to really watch the upper Beaufort County area though as BJWSA could undo all that has been done on the conservation front through local, state, private and federal efforts.

Not every inch of the coast needs to be developed – thanks. M

From: David Taub [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2009 11:42 AM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: BJWSA

Hello Mark. I hope this short missive finds you and yours well. I wanted to write to thank you ever so much for signing Bill 793 concerning Beaufort-Jasper Water and Sewer Authority. It sets the stage for our effective and efficient operations for the next decade. As you know Hampton County Council has made an official inquiry to us regarding providing services in the future, but until 793 we did not possess the legal authority to address their interests. Please be assured that there is nothing in the Bill, nor in our "Master Plan" that will impact negatively the Sheldon area; there are no plans that I am aware of for developing this area.

On a personal note,

Warmly, David

David M. Taub, Ph.D.
Chairman, BJWSA
843 524-6872 (H); 6873 (O)
cellular: [REDACTED]

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.67/2174 - Release Date: 06/14/09 05:53:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2009 8:27 PM
To: 'Dennis Avery'
Subject: RE: OCRM bridge issue

Please print all this...thanks.. M

From: Dennis Avery [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2009 4:58 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: OCRM bridge issue

Mark:

I appreciate your making the time for our phone conversation as well as any help you can give me with this issue. As I mentioned, I have three years in this project dealing with problems with the AG's office and OCRM and very significant funds at risk.

I have attached the following:

1. Executive summary addressed to me from our attorney Stan Barnett.
2. Letter of permit approval from Carolyn Boltin to upgrade the bridge to comply with City of Charleston regulations for the PUD that is in place on the property. This permit was renewed twice....
3. Letter from Barnett to Curtis Joyner giving him a heads up that our application was coming and that his verbal representation that the bridge may be subject to the "bridges to islands" regulations.
4. Letter to me from Steven Brooks citing technical difficulties with our application. We have addressed each issue and submitted supporting documents but we are not acknowledging item 7 as valid because it requires that we submit to these regulations.

As I mentioned, this project has been unanimously approved by the City of Charleston with no public objection. Further, when the application request was advertised for public comment, only DNR responded. They state that they have no objection to this bridge as long as we follow what are, essentially, basic best practices during construction. In sum, there is no opposition to this project or the bridge.

Also note that Brooks states in his letter that staff would be glad to meet to discuss the permit but we have chosen not to do so because this would give credibility to the claim that this permit is subject to the bridges to islands regs.

Again, thanks for you help. Please give my regards to Jenny and the boys.

Dennis

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - <http://www.avg.com>

Version: 8.0.176 / Virus Database: 270.10.2/1874 - Release Date: 1/13/2009 8:17 AM

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2009 8:42 PM
To: 'Joe Taylor'
Subject: RE: press release from Area Development

Thanks! To be discussed and more tomorrow night...

From: Joe Taylor [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2009 12:39 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: press release from Area Development

Sent using BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Taylor <jtaylor@commerce.state.sc.us>
To: Joe Taylor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Mon Jun 15 12:33:41 2009
Subject: FW: press release from Area Development

From: Kara Borie
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2009 11:35 AM
To: Joe Taylor
Subject: press release from Area Development

AREA DEVELOPMENT MAGAZINE RECOGNIZES EXCELLENCE IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

4th Annual Gold & Silver Shovel Awards Celebrate Success in Job Creation and Positive Economic Impact

WESTBURY, N.Y., June 11, 2009 - Area Development, the leading executive magazine covering site selection and facility planning, has announced the winners of the 2009 Gold & Silver Shovel Awards. The State of Tennessee was awarded the Gold Shovel in recognition of projects undertaken in 2008 creating a significant number of high value-added new jobs as well as investment. Silver Shovels were awarded to Texas, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, and Indiana.

7/14/2009

Area Development Magazine's Annual Shovel Awards recognize state economic development agencies that drive significant job creation through innovative policies, infrastructure improvements, processes and promotions that attract new employers as well as investments in expanded facilities. The Gold Shovel is presented annually to the state that has achieved the most success in terms of job creation and economic impact.

For the Silver Shovel Awards, states were compared only to other states in their tier based on population. Texas, Michigan, and Pennsylvania were winners in the over 10 million population group. Indiana, Virginia, and Georgia and North Carolina (tied) were awarded Silver Shovels in the 5 to 10 million population category; and Arkansas, Alabama, and South Carolina were honored in the under 5 million population group.

Each of the 50 states was invited by Area Development to submit information about its top-10 job creation and investment projects. Only those projects that began to materialize in 2008 were considered. Based on the number of high-valued added jobs per capita, amount of investment, number of new facilities, and industry diversity, Area Development awarded the Gold Shovel to the state with the highest weighted score overall.

"All economic development agencies make significant contributions to their states, but every year there are a few standouts," said Geraldine Gambale, Editor of Area Development. "These 11 states deserve special recognition."

A full review of this year's Gold and Silver Shovel Award winners will be published in the June/July issue of Area Development and is posted online at <http://www.areadevelopment.com/awards>

Area Development is published bi-monthly and has more than 45,000 executive subscribers. It also has a very active custom publishing group and maintains several highly visited websites. They can be reached through the main address of www.areadevelopment.com <<http://www.areadevelopment.com/>> .

###

Contact:

Area Development Magazine

Gerri Gambale, Editor, 516-338-0900 Ext. 211

gerri@areadevelopment.com

Kara Borie

SC Department of Commerce

1201 Main St., Suite 1600

Columbia, SC 29201

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2009 10:23 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Need Jobs

Thanks...

Believe in nuclear...

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2009 7:08 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Need Jobs

Cherokee County has almost 14% unemployment. Duke Energy is planning to build a nuclear plant on a site they own in Cherokee County but have not received permits.

This project would be a great boost for the economy in Cherokee County. They estimate approximately it will take approximately 3500 workers to build the plant. We need those jobs NOW.

We would be grateful if you could see what is holding up these permits. Once Duke received their permits, construction will begin and jobs filled.

Pat Hyatt

[REDACTED] cell
864-463-3013 office/fax
www.lakelureproperties.4t.com
www.commercialproperties.4t.com

You can't always choose whom you love, but you can choose how to find them. **Start with AOL Personals.**

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.234 / Virus Database: 270.10.23/1948 - Release Date: 02/12/09 07:20:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2009 1:17 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: BREAKING NEWS: Noisette creditor foreclosing on Navy base property
Attachments: ~WRD364.jpg; image001.jpg; image002.jpg; image003.jpg

Sent using BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Taylor <jtaylor@commerce.state.sc.us>
To: Joe Taylor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Mon Jun 08 13:09:57 2009
Subject: FW: BREAKING NEWS: Noisette creditor foreclosing on Navy base property

<<~WRD364.jpg>>

From: Daily Report [mailto:<<image001.jpg>> :dailyreport@scbiznews.com]
Sent: <<image002.jpg>> Monday, June 08, 2009 12:35 PM
To: <<image003.jpg>> Joe Taylor
Subject: BREAKING NEWS: Noisette creditor foreclosing on Navy base property

To view this email as a web page, go here. <<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5913757763067a7316&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>>

<<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5813757763067a7317&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>>

BREAKING NEWS
JUNE 8, 2009

Noisette creditor foreclosing on Navy base property

By Molly Parker
mparker@scbiznews.com

The financial backer for the Noisette Co. has filed to foreclose on 240 acres where the developer plans a live-work community in North Charleston, court records show.

7/14/2009

The company's note with Capmark Financial Group expired in August 2008 and "the company was unwilling to extend the note" Noisette said in a statement.

<<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5713757763067a7310&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>>
<<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5713757763067a7310&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>>
<<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5713757763067a7310&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>>

"Noisette has been put in the position of finding substitute financing in the midst of these challenge times," the company wrote. "Since August, Noisette has been working to locate substitute financing. In this economy, however, finding an institution to refinance a multi-million dollar loan has been difficult."

The portion of property for which Noisette is in default with its lender accounts for the majority of undeveloped land on the total 340-acre project that is slated for the northern end of the former Navy base. It does not include the Store House Row properties that include retail and office space.

In an interview this morning at his office, Noisette CEO John Knott said the company is "confident" it will be able to secure the necessary refinancing to negate a foreclosure.

"We have specific organizations and funding sources we've been in contact with," Knott said.

Capmark Financial is based in Horsham, Pa.

The Noisette Co. property has been the source of speculation in recent weeks after the S.C. Department of Commerce released a rail study that called for placing an intermodal facility there to provide near-dock rail access. Knott said that plan would ruin his development plans, as well as the redevelopment efforts in the city's older neighborhoods in the footprint surrounding the defunct base.

This story will be updated throughout the day.

To receive the Daily Report in your e-mail each day, subscribe online <<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5613757763067a7311&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>>

Business Calendar

<<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5513757763067a7312&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>>
Check out the latest business events in the Business Report's monthly calendar.

To read all stories, visit the Business Report's Web site <<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5413757763067a7313&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>>
Got a news tip? Let us hear from you <<mailto:newstip@scbiznews.com?subject=From%20Daily%20Report%20news%20tip>> .

© 2009 SC BIZ NEWS LLC, All Rights Reserved.

This email was sent to: jtaylor@scommerce.com

This email was sent by: SC BIZ NEWS, LLC
389 Johnnie Dodds Blvd., Suite 200 Mount Pleasant, SC 29464 USA

We respect your right to privacy - view our policy <<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5313757763067a731c&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>

<<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5213757763067a731d&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>

Manage Subscriptions <<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5a13757763067a7214&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>
| Update Profile <<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5913757763067a7215&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>
| One-Click Unsubscribe <<http://cl.exct.net/?ju=fe5813757763067a7216&ls=fdee177076620d7b7d167572&m=fe0177672620d&l=fe8b15767c67037a76&s=fe5513727c>

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.62/2168 - Release Date: 06/10/09 18:30:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Kristin Maguire [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 05, 2009 11:27 AM
To: 'Scott English'
Cc: 'Mark Sanford'
Subject: national academic standards

Why not sign onto the CSSO and NGA national standards for Math and English Language Arts?

* The Governor and the State Superintendent of Education of South Carolina do not have the authority to commit our state to adopt any specific academic standards; part of the agreement is that the states involved will have their academic standards be no less than 85% of the "common core standards." Our Education Accountability Act tasks the State Board of Education to adopt academic standards with the consent of the Education Oversight Committee. Signing the compact would commit to something that the Governor and Superintendent of Education don't have the authority to guarantee.

* We already have de facto national standards for comparison of states "apples to apples" in the standards used to construct the National Assessment of Educational Progress. All but a handful of states already participate in this nationally developed and administered sampling test. The NAEP is given at 4th, 8th and 12th grades and gives important information on trends of student achievement at these "gateway" levels. We also have the SAT and ACT. Sadly, while SC has participated in the NAEP our achievement levels have been stagnant in ELA for middle school students.

* The proposed development schedule of the standards does not indicate that a thorough and transparent national discussion will occur. Rather, with the high school standards rolling out in JULY it looks like a select group of education wonks and bureaucrats will dictate what every student in the whole nation "should know and be able to do" when they finish high school. The arrogance of this is breathtaking and counter to what a vibrant marketplace should be.

* In fact, it could be argued that there really shouldn't be national standards of what EVERY child should know and be able to do at the end of high school. (Middle school would be a more reasonable gateway.) It is the hope that high school students are choosing to direct their studies toward their lifelong career aspirations. What a biologist and a graphic artist need to know and be able to do at the end of 12th grade while overlapping are not identical.

* By having national standards that are chronologically linked (i.e. at the end of every grade) we preclude innovation as we require every child to be at the same place at the same age. What about new educational models that have different paths that lead to higher or different competencies?

* Doing a "consensus" set of standards based on the standards that are already in place will cast into concrete the standards that have by and large been developed and espoused by associations of professional educators- not industry, higher education or the military. 21st Century skills that didn't exist 10 years ago and are essential to a students' ability to compete today aren't included in most of the standards.

* The impetus of this- while seeming good- will, in fact, result in a stagnation of our academic growth. We will be micromanaging classrooms from the national level. No one REALLY knows what every child needs to know and be able to do- there are various models out there, but ultimately parents are the ones that have to choose what their children will invest their time and academic capital in- not the state. In some ways this is a way to preclude parental choice at a fundamental level. If ALL children have to be measured for success against a state adopted standard, then all schools must be aligned with these standards to look successful- regardless of the relevance to the schools mission. Schools that don't show success using the assessments based on the "core standards" will be labeled substandard. When the public reporting requirement is put on a school choice bill, it will be a poison pill for schools of choice that aren't merely separate reproductions of the traditional government schools.

To sum up, while having a "common core" of academic standards seems like a reasonable and desirable thing, it all depends on who is defining the common core and how rigidly it is applied. I have very little confidence in the process as described in the NGA and CSSO compact. If the common core would be the parallel of the Apostles' Creed for Christianity- the essential tenets, without the details- then I would be a lot more comfortable, while still suspicious. As it is, it looks like a power grab at the federal level and a way for testing companies to have larger profit margins.

Kristin Maguire

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.62/2168 - Release Date: 06/10/09 18:30:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2009 12:14 AM
To: 'Joe Taylor'
Subject: RE: Tomorrow's unemployment rate

To be discussed....

From: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2009 2:28 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: Tomorrow's unemployment rate

Sent using BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Taylor <jtaylor@commerce.state.sc.us>
To: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Thu Apr 16 14:12:16 2009
Subject: FW: Tomorrow's unemployment rate

<<Eco Devo 041609.doc>>

From: Braden Bunch
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2009 1:46 PM
To: 'Joel Sawyer'; Joe Taylor
Cc: Kara Borie; Rebecca Gunnlaugsson; David Logsdon; Adam Jordan; 'Ben Fox'
Subject: Tomorrow's unemployment rate

See attached. As always, further analysis will follow tomorrow after the official BLS release of all 50 states.

Braden Bunch

Research Analyst

South Carolina Department of Commerce

(803) 737-0656

No virus found in this incoming message.

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 08, 2009 8:24 PM
To: 'Earl McLeod'
Subject: RE: Disappointed

I understand...

The below is not accurate as we have let plenty of local pieces of legislation go through that had tax increases and other things we strongly disagreed with, but saw it as a jurisdictional issue locals should decide...

Talk soon... M

From: Earl McLeod [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2009 12:56 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Disappointed

Just what the housing industry needs a \$2500 tax increase on new homes in the worst market in my lifetime. I am extremely disappointed you did not veto this local bill.

Earl McLeod

Governor Sanford allowed S.235, legislation allowing Dorchester School District 2 in Summerville to impose **school impact fees** of up to \$2,500 on new development, to become law without his signature. Although the governor has vetoed local legislation in the past, this is the first net tax increase Governor Sanford has allowed to become law.

Earl E. McLeod, Jr.
Executive Director
Home Builders Association of Greater Columbia
P.O. Box 725, Columbia, SC 29202
(803)256-6238 FAX (803)779-0635

It's a great time to buy a home!
Visit www.BuyNowBuildNowColumbia.com today for more information.

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.4/1976 - Release Date: 02/27/09 13:27:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2009 12:43 PM
To: 'Joe Taylor'
Subject: RE: CDBG Infrastructure grants

Lets not approve....

Thanks....

From: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2009 9:54 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: CDBG Infrastructure grants

Fyi on Dale

Sent using BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Taylor <jtaylor@commerce.state.sc.us>
To: Joe Taylor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Fri Mar 13 09:47:25 2009
Subject: FW: CDBG Infrastructure grants

From: Bonnie Ammons
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2009 8:55 AM
To: Joe Taylor; Daniel Young
Subject: CDBG Infrastructure grants

I wanted to give you a heads up that Georgetown County plans to apply for a sewer grant to bring sewer service to Annie Village which is just south of Plantersville. The project will involve individual grinder pumps, a pump station and force main to get the sewer to Highway 701. I haven't seen cost estimates but it could be an expensive project. I think there are about 50 homes in the area. This community is second highest on the DHEC health threat list.

Also, Beaufort County intends to re submit the Dale Community Water project that we previously turned down. We have tried to discourage the application but the County is insistent about applying.

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.13/1999 - Release Date: 03/13/09 05:59:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2008 11:49 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: WSJ - Joel Edits

1. why am I the staff writer, I must have written 100 things to day, including letters etc. We ahve to get this part of my life leveraged.

2. go with your edits, though you missed one typo. 5th paragraph, 7th line down - after California government (grew) - not the present grow...

thanks.. M

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2008 8:11 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: WSJ - Joel Edits
Importance: High

** High Priority **

Overall very good...I like the tone of it. I've yellowed my edits as usual. Two notes:

1. The Paris Hilton thing was both weird and verbose, so I took it out. You can make the same point without it.

2. Did the dumptruck of sugar line come from somewhere? If so, it needs to say, "as so-and-so recently wrote/said."

I'd like to get this up to them early tomorrow...we may be able to get weekend consideration.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2008 9:07 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: GOP Reflections for Regnery

print hard copies and have on my take home for weekend pile...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2008 5:36 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: GOP Reflections for Regnery

Your version and mine attached. Due date is Nov. 5

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 9:13 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Governor's Daily Press Briefing - Mon., Oct. 27, 2008

why not on sat sun

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 7:24 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Governor's Daily Press Briefing - Mon., Oct. 27, 2008

always 3 on Monday. two from weekend, one from today.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

>>> "Mark Sanford" <MarkSanford4@Comcast.net> 10/27/2008 7:10:41 PM >>>
why do I get three today?

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 10:04 AM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: Governor's Daily Press Briefing - Mon., Oct. 27, 2008

Governor's Daily Press Briefing - Mon., Oct. 27, 2008

Times and Democrat editorializes against automatic DNA collection
<http://thetandd.com/articles/2008/10/27/opinion/doc4902a92c5b481483169084.txt>

Report looks at water pollution in DHEC 'mixing zones'
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/27/dhecs_pollution_pass59330/

Job outlook in SC examined
<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/568413.html>

State considers new ways of road funding
<http://npaper-wehaa.com/bluffton-today;see-BVa0909vSqsana40#c-91216>

Rep. Skelton debates with opponent over education, budget
<http://www.upstatetoday.com/news/2008/oct/25/skelton-gale-make-their-case-state-house/>

FBI investigates claim of excessive force with Taser (AP)
<http://www.aikenstandard.com/State/m1032-BC-SC-TaserProbe-1stLd-Writethru-10-26-0646>

In Senate 49 - Hutto, Strickland at odds on roll call voting
<http://www.thetandd.com/articles/2008/10/27/news/doc4905294f04713893623880.txt>

NRA backs Vida Miller
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/27/nra_fund_backs_incumbent_miller/

Clyburn likes his chances against nominal opposition
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/27/clyburn_likes_his_chances59336/

Post and Courier editorializes on cost of higher ed budget cuts
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/27/higher_ed_cost_budget_cuts59323/

Greenville News endorses McCain
<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/article/20081027/OPINION/810270305/1008>

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 7:11 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Governor's Daily Press Briefing - Mon., Oct. 27, 2008

why do I get three today?

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 10:04 AM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: Governor's Daily Press Briefing - Mon., Oct. 27, 2008

Governor's Daily Press Briefing - Mon., Oct. 27, 2008

Times and Democrat editorializes against automatic DNA collection
<http://thetandd.com/articles/2008/10/27/opinion/doc4902a92c5b481483169084.txt>

Report looks at water pollution in DHEC 'mixing zones'
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/27/dhecs_pollution_pass59330/

Job outlook in SC examined
<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/568413.html>

State considers new ways of road funding
<http://npaper-wehaa.com/bluffton-today;see-BVa0909vSqsana40#c-91216>

Rep. Skelton debates with opponent over education, budget
<http://www.upstatetoday.com/news/2008/oct/25/skelton-gale-make-their-case-state-house/>

FBI investigates claim of excessive force with Taser (AP)
<http://www.aikenstandard.com/State/m1032-BC-SC-TaserProbe-1stLd-Writethru-10-26-0646>

In Senate 49 - Hutto, Strickland at odds on roll call voting
<http://www.thetandd.com/articles/2008/10/27/news/doc4905294f04713893623880.txt>

NRA backs Vida Miller
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/27/nra_fund_backs_incumbent_miller/

Clyburn likes his chances against nominal opposition
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/27/clyburn_likes_his_chances59336/

Post and Courier editorializes on cost of higher ed budget cuts
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/27/higher_ed_cost_budget_cuts59323/

Greenville News endorses McCain
<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/article/20081027/OPINION/810270305/1008>

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 7:11 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Santee-Cooper Coal-Fired Plant

bring up with me...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 9:02 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Santee-Cooper Coal-Fired Plant

More on this front, too...will bring up next time you're in AM meeting...

http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/26/coals_time_bomb59266/

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Santee-Cooper Coal-Fired Plant
Date: Sat, 25 Oct 2008 20:28:58 -0400

lets discuss

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2008 9:53 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Santee-Cooper Coal-Fired Plant

Please review the following clip. We need to consider weighing in on Coal Plant sooner rather than later.

<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/565526.html>

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 26, 2008 12:35 AM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Saturday press clips

1. who is pete?
2. have some one give me one paragraph on david frum's book or thinking on compassionate conservatism
3. same on michael gerson who has apparently rambled on the same front..

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 10:55 PM
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
kevin, [REDACTED] Ben Fox; Scott English
Subject: Re: Saturday press clips

No, i did not. All of the Cabinet pio's had been good about calling me re : budget stuff. Never heard from Pete.

Joel Sawyer
Office of the Governor

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott English
To: Mark Sanford [REDACTED] > [REDACTED] Barton Swaim
[REDACTED] Ben Fox <bfox@gov.sc.gov> Joel Sawyer
<jsawyer@gov.sc.gov> Joel Sawyer [REDACTED] > Creation Date: 10/25 10:52 pm
Subject: Re: Saturday press clips

Why in the world would Pete O'Boyle not provide comments for the Post and Courier?

Sam Glover spends 75 percent of his day complaining about the PPP budget and when they finally get a chance to advocate in some way - they say nothing?

Joel * Did we know that Yvonne had been in touch with the P&C?

>>> "Barton Swaim" [REDACTED] 10/25/2008 8:42 AM >>>

SYNOPSIS

-Yvonne Wenger has a story on competing explanations for the state's budget problems. It's mostly predictable, but Darla Moore is quoted as saying that "until the General Assembly develops and maintains a tax structure designed from the standpoint of adequacy, equity and efficiency, and with the goal of maintaining and enhancing South Carolina as an optimum competitor, it will fall miserably short."

-The Post & Courier also has a story on the severity of budget cuts at PPP. McConnell and Harrell are quoted as saying, in effect, "Sorry, maybe next year." Pete O'Boyle declines to comment.

-The Beaufort Gazette has a story that says a second environmental impact study on the deepening of the Savannah River from the Atlantic will not be released Monday, as previously expected. This, the article says, might effect the Jasper Ocean Terminal's development.

CLIPS

Legislature sends Gov. Sanford \$488M in cuts
<http://www.thestate.com/statewire/story/566218.html> (AP)

Explanations for budget woes compete in General Assembly
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/25/amid_cuts_many_taxing_questions59224/
Cuts to PPP imperil safety, officials warn
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/25/cuts_imperil_safety_officials_warn59171/
Environmental study's delay could slow development of Jasper Ocean Terminal
<http://www.beaufortgazette.com/local/story/596061.html>
Pastides proposing ways to deal with \$27M cuts
<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/566815.html>
Case backlog worries Toal
<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/566816.html>
Sex offender law confusing to local officials
<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/566812.html>
Former SC deputy sentenced in civil rights case
<http://www.thestate.com/statewire/story/566624.html> (AP, brief) Charter school gets approval in Charleston
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/25/charter_gets_approval_must_try_again59192/
Virtual charter schools' success gets applause
<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/article/20081025/NEWS01/81025007/1001/NEWS>
Guest columnist Debi Bush pens op-ed attacking vouchers
<http://www.thestate.com/statewire/story/566218.html>
Vought idles 50 workers
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/25/vought_idles_workers59230/
163 jobs saved as Johnsonville plant is sold
<http://www.thetandd.com/articles/2008/10/25/news/doc49022e1b52462227940597.txt>
Post and Courier editorializes on improving graduation rates
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/oct/25/improve_s_c_graduation_rates59184/

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 8:29 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Santee-Cooper Coal-Fired Plant

lets discuss

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2008 9:53 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Santee-Cooper Coal-Fired Plant

Please review the following clip. We need to consider weighing in on Coal Plant sooner rather than later.

<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/565526.html>

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 18, 2008 1:37 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Air Force

agreed, we did our part...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, October 18, 2008 12:57 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Air Force

i mentioned MS's whereabouts to 3 reporters yesterday, and none of them reported it. As such, I would hold off on proactively letting any legislators know about where he is until it is already in the bloodstream via the media.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2008 11:26 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Tour

think about set up and having things set ahead of time w press...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2008 8:05 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Tour

Please let me know if there are any action items we can improve on for day 2.

Joel Sawyer
Office of the Governor

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2008 11:48 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Please forward to Mark (from David Farrow)

Attachments: New Spending - jedits.doc



New Spending -
jedits.doc (29 ...

I think done...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2008 4:45 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Please forward to Mark (from David Farrow)

I have thanked David for this, and am passing it along per his request.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2008 10:27 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Statewide budget op-ed

lets plan on...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2008 10:12 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Statewide budget op-ed

If i can send it out by noon tomorrow, we could get sunday publication.

Joel Sawyer
Office of the Governor

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 10:58 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: op-ed update

I am getting tired will deal in the am...lets send what we have for now...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 10:44 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: RE: op-ed update

attached...I apologize for taking so long...I just checked this account.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: op-ed update
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 20:00:15 -0400

thanks..

and send it to me tonight might slightly update...thanks.. M

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 4:52 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: op-ed update

NYT passed, under consideration by WaPo right now. Should hear back tomorrow, and will update you. Planning on going to WaTimes next, per our discussion.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 8:00 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: op-ed update

thanks..

and send it to me tonight might slightly update...thanks.. M

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 4:52 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: op-ed update

NYT passed, under consideration by WaPo right now. Should hear back tomorrow, and will update you. Planning on going to WaTimes next, per our discussion.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 10:56 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Editorial - Doom and Gloom

Attachments: I am worried for our countryv2.doc



I am worried for our
countryv2...
version 2

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 3:35 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Editorial - Doom and Gloom

Mark -

Scott has confirmed that the attached editorial is the correct one.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 10:15 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Editorial - Doom and Gloom

Attachments: I am worried for our country.doc



I am worried for our
country.d...

version 1

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 3:35 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Editorial - Doom and Gloom

Mark -

Scott has confirmed that the attached editorial is the correct one.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 9:54 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: PLEASE REVIEW - CECAC release

show me, am

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 3:10 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: PLEASE REVIEW - CECAC release

Done have noted two suggested changes, one in the second paragraph and the other in the quote. We can deal with in the AM if you'd rather....Thanks.

Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report REPORT DETAILS POLICIES FOR REDUCING GREENHOUSE GASSES, OTHER CLIMATE GOALS

Columbia, S.C. * September 22, 2008 * Governor Mark Sanford today accepted the report of his Climate, Energy and Commerce Advisory Committee (CECAC), a group tasked with reviewing possible climate change impacts in South Carolina and formulating strategies to address those changes going forward.

Governor Sanford formed the group in 2007 as a proactive step toward addressing climate and energy policy in South Carolina in hopes that the state could begin to act on those issues on its own, before being saddled with costly future mandates from Washington, D.C. The governor has said he believes looking for ways to lead on this with ideas consistent with market principals rather than simple government dictate to be very important, given that if we do nothing Washington will be sure to fill in the blank with new government mandates. He was also said leading on this is important because the cost of inaction will be particularly felt in a variety of ways, ranging from insurance cost to ocean level rise [would say "change" instead of rise] on the coast of South Carolina. Among the report's recommendations are:

- Carbon Footprint: A voluntary reduction in state carbon emissions to five percent below the 1990 level by 2020.
- Energy: Nuclear fuel reprocessing, focusing on bringing renewable generators to the state, and expanded use of net metering.
- Transportation: Expanded bike and pedestrian opportunities, alternative fuel infrastructure, more mass transit and carpooling options.
- Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Management: Forestland conservation and methane reclamation projects.

"We said from day one that it was important that neither extreme of the political spectrum dominate the discussion on climate change, which is why we appointed a committee with such a broad array of backgrounds and perspectives -- and more than anything, I want to thank them for their work," Gov. Sanford said. "Some of these recommendations will make a whole lot of sense for South Carolina and others won't. But we believe this report an excellent place to begin the conversation and debate - and it our sincere hope that many [would change to "some"] of these findings will be implemented in South Carolina."

South Carolina's gross emissions of Green House Gasses grew by 39 percent between 1990 and 2005, twice the national average of 16 percent, while the state's per-capita emissions increased 15 percent over the same time frame. By 2025 Green House Gas emissions are projected to increase 87 percent over 1990 levels.

In addition to climate change, the report also talks about the importance of renewable

energy. In 1970, the United State imported 24 percent of its oil, and today is importing nearly 70 percent. The United States consumes about 25 percent of the world's oil production despite having only four percent of the world population.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

>>> "Mark Sanford" <[REDACTED]> 09/21/08 1:16 PM >>>
try these changes, though you will need to punctuation, spelling...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 12:00 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: PLEASE REVIEW - CECAC release

Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report
REPORT MAKES 51 SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDUCING GREENHOUSE GASSES, OTHER CLIMATE GOALS

Columbia, S.C. * September 22, 2008 * Governor Mark Sanford today accepted the report of his Climate, Energy and Commerce Advisory Committee (CECAC), a group tasked with reviewing possible climate change impacts in South Carolina and formulating strategies to address those changes going forward.

Governor Sanford formed the group in 2007 as a proactive step toward addressing climate and energy policy in South Carolina in hopes that the state could begin to act on those issues on its own, before being saddled with costly future mandates from Washington, D.C. He believes that looking for ways to lead on this in ways consistent with market principals rather than simple governemtn dictate very important given that if we do nothing Washington will be sure to fill in the blank with new government mandates. He also believes leading on this is imporatant because the cost of inaction will be particulalrly felt in a variety of ways ranging from insuarance cost to ocean level rise on the coast of SOutth Carolina. Among the report's recommendations are:

- Carbon Footprint: A voluntary reduction in state carbon emissions to five percent below the 1990 level by 2020.
- Energy: Nuclear fuel reprocessing, focusing on bringing renewable generators to the state, and expanded use of net metering.
- Transportation: Expanded bike and pedestrian opportunities, alternative fuel infrastructure, more mass transit and carpooling options.
- Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Management: Forestland conservation and methane reclamation projects.

"We said from day one that it was important that neither extreme of the political spectrum dominate the discussion on climate change, which is why we appointed a committee with such a broad array of backgrounds and perspectives * and more than anything, I want to thank them for their work,"

Gov. Sanford said. "Some of these recommendations will make a whole lot of sense for South Carolina and others won't. But we believe this report an excellent place to begin the conversation and debate - and it our sincere hope that many of these findings will be implemented in South Carolina."

South Carolina's gross emissions of Green House Gasses grew by 39 percent between 1990 and 2005, twice the national average of 16 percent, while the state's per-capita emissions increased 15 percent over the same time frame.

By 2025 Green House Gas emissions are projected to increase 87 percent over 1990 levels.

In addition to climate change, the report also talks about the importance of renewable energy. In 1970, the United State imported 24 percent of its oil, and today is importing nearly 70 percent. The United States consumes about 25 percent of the world's oil production despite having only four percent of the world population.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 6:06 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Editorial - Doom and Gloom

when was this written....?

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 3:35 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Editorial - Doom and Gloom

Mark -

Scott has confirmed that the attached editorial is the correct one.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2008 10:06 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Teleprompter Practice

lets throw in some historical speeches as well, thanks..

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2008 11:39 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Teleprompter Practice

[REDACTED]

Kevin from the press shop will be there to run the prompter. He has experience doing this from WIS.

Tom Posey from ETV will be around just to monitor the technical side. He will NOT be in the studio where you're practicing, but will be close by if there are tech issues.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 1:17 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: PLEASE REVIEW - CECAC release

try these changes, though you will need to punctuation, spelling...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 12:00 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: PLEASE REVIEW - CECAC release

Governor Sanford Accepts Climate Report REPORT MAKES 51 SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDUCING GREENHOUSE GASSES, OTHER CLIMATE GOALS

Columbia, S.C. * September 22, 2008 * Governor Mark Sanford today accepted the report of his Climate, Energy and Commerce Advisory Committee (CECAC), a group tasked with reviewing possible climate change impacts in South Carolina and formulating strategies to address those changes going forward.

Governor Sanford formed the group in 2007 as a proactive step toward addressing climate and energy policy in South Carolina in hopes that the state could begin to act on those issues on its own, before being saddled with costly future mandates from Washington, D.C. He believes that looking for ways to lead on this in ways consistent with market principals rather than simple governemtn dictate very important given that if we do nothing Washington will be sure to fill in the blank with new government mandates. He also believes leading on this is imporatat because the cost of inaction will be particualrly felt in a variety of ways ranging from insuarance cost to ocean level rise on the coast of SOuth Carolina. Among the report's recommendations are:

- Carbon Footprint: A voluntary reduction in state carbon emissions to five percent below the 1990 level by 2020.
- Energy: Nuclear fuel reprocessing, focusing on bringing renewable generators to the state, and expanded use of net metering.
- Transportation: Expanded bike and pedestrian opportunities, alternative fuel infrastructure, more mass transit and carpooling options.
- Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Management: Forestland conservation and methane reclamation projects.

"We said from day one that it was important that neither extreme of the political spectrum dominate the discussion on climate change, which is why we appointed a committee with such a broad array of backgrounds and perspectives * and more than anything, I want to thank them for their work," Gov. Sanford said. "Some of these recommendations will make a whole lot of sense for South Carolina and others won't. But we believe this report an excellent place to begin the conversation and debate - and it our sincere hope that many of these findings will be implemented in South Carolina."

South Carolina's gross emissions of Green House Gasses grew by 39 percent between 1990 and 2005, twice the national average of 16 percent, while the state's per-capita emissions increased 15 percent over the same time frame. By 2025 Green House Gas emissions are projected to increase 87 percent over 1990 levels.

In addition to climate change, the report also talks about the importance of renewable energy. In 1970, the United State imported 24 percent of its oil, and today is importing nearly 70 percent. The United States consumes about 25 percent of the world's oil production despite having only four percent of the world population.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 11:13 AM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Sunday Clips

lets discuss point one and four in the am..

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2008 9:20 AM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: Sunday Clips

Need to Know from Today:

- Charles Rowe at the P&C is not sold on the HOT lanes concept*.I will talk to him on Monday
- Tim Smith has a great story looking at Hutto's dealings with DUI cases*would be good example for our exec. order about legislative touches
- Tom Davis response op-ed ran in the Island Packet today
- Converse Chellis went and spoke to rating agencies about our bond ratings. It looks like he tries to take a couple of shots at MS, but he's so clumsy in making points that it doesn't come off that way. Any opportunity to use this stuff in the Board meeting Tuesday??

+++++

Post and Courier editorializes in favor of HOV lanes, not sold on HOT concept
http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/sep/21/speak_out_i_hov_lanes55305/

Investigation into Hutto DUI cases shows Trooper thought he couldn't win
<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080921/NEWS01/809210312/1001/NEWS>

The Buzz lampoons 'change' moniker, needs history lesson on '02 gubernatorial campaign
<http://www.thestate.com/politics/story/531217.html>

Tom Davis responds to Scoppe editorial on education
<http://www.islandpacket.com/opinion/localvoices/story/615895.html>

Plane crash kills four, seriously injures two
<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/530614.html>

Chellis tries to sell bond rates on SC stability
<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080921/BUSINESS/809210301/1001/NEWS>

Katon Dawson resigns from all-white country club
<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/531216.html>

Residents say they want answers about economy
<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/531227.html>

Upstate superintendents decry property tax relief bill of 2006
http://www.goupstate.com/article/20080921/NEWS/809210372/1083/news&title=ACT_388__Property_tax_law_limits_options_for_area_schools

The State editorializes against pork in Richland recreation bond bill

<http://www.thestate.com/opinion/story/531445.html>

Greenville News says PACT shows school are getting better

<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080921/OPINION/809210317/1008>

Times and Democrat editorializes on felons being able to vote

<http://thetandd.com/articles/2008/09/21/opinion/doc48d464697dfe6400572824.txt>

Joel Sawyer

Communications Director

Office of Gov. Mark Sanford

(803) 734-5254 - work

(803) 446-6713 - cell

(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2008 10:25 AM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Saturday Clips

do on the converse thing...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2008 8:39 AM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: Saturday Clips

- Gas prices, gas prices, gas prices. Story is everywhere, we're continuing to urge against panic buying. We'll continue to monitor throughout the day

- Converse Chellis has some bogus study about return on investment from film. We need to get a copy of it.

Post and Courier editorializes against gas price panickers

http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/sep/13/dont_fuel_gas_price_panic54422/

Gas prices soar, drivers claim gouging

<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/523031.html>

http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/sep/13/drivers_claim_price_gouging_at_gas_stati54445/

<http://www.thestate.com/statewire/story/522574.html> (AP)

http://www.goupstate.com/article/20080913/NEWS/809130328/1083/news&title=Gas_prices_soar_drivers_line_up_for_fuel

<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?>

[AID=/20080913/NEWS01/309130002/1001/NEWS](http://www.greenvilleonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080913/NEWS01/309130002/1001/NEWS)

<http://www.andersonindependent.com/news/2008/sep/12/gas-prices-jump-anderson-area/>

<http://www.heraldonline.com/109/story/812658.html>

<http://www.wistv.com/Global/story.asp?S=8993849>

Panel mulls film incentives, Chellis trumpets questionable numbers

http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/sep/13/movie_making_incentives_keep_debate_ragi54449/

<http://www.thestate.com/statewire/story/522126.html> (AP)

Google works to inspire with its story

http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/sep/13/google_works_inspire_its_story54440/

State sharpens focus on HIV

<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/522963.html>

NAACP applauds PACT investigation

http://www.charleston.net/news/2008/sep/13/naacp_applauds_pact_investigation54450/

Greenville News editorializes in favor of national nuke waste site

<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080913/OPINION/809130303/1008>

Joel Sawyer

Communications Director

Office of Gov. Mark Sanford

(803) 734-5254 - work

(803) 446-6713 - cell

(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, September 06, 2008 9:29 AM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: PRESS RELEASE - PLEASE REVIEW

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Saturday, September 06, 2008 9:01 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: PRESS RELEASE - PLEASE REVIEW

Gov. Sanford Thanks Emergency Planners for Being Ready for Hanna
GOVERNOR: SC BEACHES OPEN FOR BUSINESS

Columbia, S.C. * September 6, 2008 * Governor Mark Sanford today issued the following statement after the passage of Tropical Storm Hanna along the South Carolina coast:

"First and foremost, I want to give real credit to emergency planners at the state and local level, as well as to emergency personnel at other state and federal agencies," Gov. Sanford said. "Given that this storm's impact was to have been in the state's northeast corner, we had a number of conversations with Sam Hodge and Randy Webster, who very well represented their respective emergency operations teams in Georgetown and Horry Counties. Had this storm been due to come in further south I would have had the same conversations with the teams from Charleston to Beaufort and I would have seen the same level of professionalism, so I indeed want to give particular credit to local county personnel for the way they so ably represent the first line of defense in any emergency.

Above all else we're all very thankful that damage along the coast was minimal and that's obviously very good news.

"Equally good news is that it looks like it's going to be a great weekend on the Grand Strand. So as we're standing down from the storm, I want everyone to know that our beaches are indeed open for business, and we hope to see you there."

-#####-

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2008 6:51 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: Tomorrow's TV

email me three thoughts on it tonight...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2008 4:26 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Tomorrow's TV
Importance: High

** High Priority **

You may get asked about impressions on McCain's speech first thing tomorrow, FYI...be ready for that. Call me in the AM for thoughts if you'd like.

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2008 10:20 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: FOR TOMORROW PART II - Gustav, Wolf and Palin-Trooper

lets do alask a in the am..bring up with me...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2008 10:25 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FOR TOMORROW PART II - Gustav, Wolf and Palin-Trooper

FIRST LINE TOMORROW

First, don't overplay your last interview with Wolf when you go on. If you want to say something proactively, just make a one-line joke, and move on quickly. Just say something like, "Thanks for having me, and let me just say I hope this interview gets a lot fewer hits on You Tube than my last one did." Move on after that, don't dwell.

HURRICANE

Second, something to use on the question of canceling the convention. This is a candid video of Don Fowler making some really crass remarks about the hurricane bearing down on the Gulf Coast...saying that it must mean that "God is on the Democrats' side."

<http://www.redstate.com/diaries/absentee/2008/aug/30/fowler-fouls-hurricane-is-gods-favor-to-dem/>

If Wolf brings up canceling the convention, you could say something like, "Well, I'm going to leave that question to former DNC chairman Don Fowler, based on his remarks yesterday. Look, we're not going to play politics with this thing...we as a party are going to act appropriately to respond - whatever that means in terms of next week - and that starts with keeping folks in that part of the country in our thoughts and prayers."

These are the talking points re: the Hurricane Gustav from the McCain campaign:

-Out of deep concern and a desire to see firsthand the ongoing preparations in advance of Hurricane Gustav, Senator McCain and Governor Palin will travel to Jackson, Mississippi tomorrow at the invitation of Governor Barbour. They will receive a briefing at the Mississippi Emergency Management Agency - a permanent operations center monitoring hurricane response.

-Regarding the convention re: the hurricane- Senator McCain has always been sensitive to national crisis-in the 2000 race he postponed his announcement because of the situation in the Balkans-and we are monitoring the situation very closely.

PALIN - TROOPER

Third, here is a pretty good encapsulation of the Trooper issue. This does not mention all of the creepy allegations about the trooper in question, whose name is Mike Wooten. Some of the things alleged against him include drunk driving and using a taser on his 11-year-old stepson because the boy "asked to see what it felt like."

<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601087&sid=atjLSNY2Ofms&refer=home>

I've also attached a document entitled "Palin-Trooper" that contains all of the McCain campaign's talking points on the issue.

I don't know that you need to read through this whole thing (it's six pages, somewhat repetitive), but the bottom line is that Monegan - the guy she fired - is clearly on record saying she never told him to fire the Trooper.

"For the record, no one ever said fire Wooten. Not the governor. Not Todd. Not any of the other staff ..." -- Former Public Safety Commissioner Walt Monegan, Anchorage Daily News, 8/30/08

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2008 3:10 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: FROM EMD - PLEASE REVIEW

where is new version...send

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:jsawyer@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2008 12:19 PM
To: [REDACTED]; MCS Road
Subject: FROM EMD - PLEASE REVIEW

Please review...do you need anything more? Does this answer your questions?

Joel Sawyer
Communications Director
Office of Gov. Mark Sanford
(803) 734-5254 - work
(803) 446-6713 - cell
(803) 734-6447 - fax

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 7:16 AM
To: 'John Ling'
Subject: RE: FYI

Wow....I wouldn't doubt it....

Talk soon....M

From: John Ling [mailto:jl原因@commerce.state.sc.us]
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 4:30 AM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: FYI

Was in SC for two weeks and it was nice. Return to Shanghai got delayed in Greenville for two days due to the heavy snow. It was nice to have some down time and see the beauty that mother nature creates. Sorry the interview with Caijing did not work out due to your busy schedule.

Thought you may find it interesting to know that there is a rumor here that John Thornton might be the next US Amb. to China.

Take care,

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.9/1990 - Release Date: 03/09/09 19:20:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 9:17 AM
To: 'John Ling'
Subject: RE: interview request

My apologies, missed this email but will now check and get back to you... M

From: John Ling [mailto:jling@commerce.state.sc.us]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 1:11 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: □□: interview request

Just want to follow up with you re the interview request from Caijing. I understand that we are in the legislative schedule and it is a challenge to pin a time down, especially this year. He will be in SC for 2-3 days and can be flexible with the time. It can also be very brief. Again, this magazine is very influential in China, and has quite an impressive reader base, including senior corporate executives. It would really be a great opportunity to showcase SC. We have been trying to get them to do this for the last two years. We are looking at anytime on Feb. 20-27

Thanks,

John

□□□: John Ling
 □□□□: 2009□2□6□ 3:06
 □□□: [REDACTED]
 □□: interview request

Mark, hope you are doing well. I will be in SC on Feb. 19-30 with two prospects. As you may recall, Joshua Ramo had taken us to an old Chinese house once when you were in BJ and one of the people we met there was a lady who is the editor-in-chief of Caijing. www.english.caijing.com.cn It is the most respected and widely-read business publications in China. They did an interview with you when we first opened our office. Each December, they have a 2-day forum and usually the central bank governors, top economists, CEOs, etc would get together, like a smaller version of Davos. John Thornton usually would go as well and spend a day there.

Its US correspondent. Mr. Li Zengxin, is based out of DC. He has agreed to come to SC to do a story about our efforts in recruiting Chinese investment. He plans to visit some of the Chinese operations here, and would also like to have the opportunity to interview you. I believe this would be a great opportunity to present South Carolina to the Chinese government and business communities and shall help our efforts in China tremendously. Would like to check with you to see how your schedule is for the week of 2/23.

I would really appreciate if you can give this request a serious consideration.

Take care,

7/14/2009

John

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.233 / Virus Database: 270.10.17/1933 - Release Date: 02/03/09 17:48:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 10:32 PM
To: 'John Molnar'; 'Mary Neil Stroud'
Subject: RE: Gov. Sanford

Thanks..

From: John Molnar [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 2:21 PM
To: 'Mary Neil Stroud'
Cc: 'Lori J. Schafer'; 'lori'
Subject: RE: Gov. Sanford

Mary Neil,

Thanks for getting back with me. This is actually pretty timely as my sister will be meeting with Mr. Goodnight on Monday and she could help to facilitate things at that time if not before. Her name is Lori Schafer and I copied her on both her corporate and personal email accounts. Her cell phone is [REDACTED]. It would probably be best if the two of you would touch base some time before her Monday meeting with Mr. Goodnight.

Thanks,

John

John Molnar
843-692-1780 office
[REDACTED] pager

From: Mary Neil Stroud [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 1:05 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Gov. Sanford

Dr. Molnar,

Gov. Sanford forwarded me your e-mail regarding a possible visit with Jim Goodnight. Gov. Sanford would be delighted to meet him sometime. What is the best way to go about this? Should I get in contact with your sister and go from there?

Thanks so much,

Mary Neil

Mary Neil Stroud
Gov. Mark Sanford
803-734-5191

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 10:15 PM
To: 'Ken Jackson'
Subject: RE: TRAC Commission - Ben Zeigler

Thanks...

From: Ken Jackson [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 4:06 PM
To: 'Mark Sanford'
Subject: TRAC Commission - Ben Zeigler

Mark – I know this may not happen but if it does, I would like to ask that you give consideration to appointing Ben Ziegler. Ben is an expert on public finance learned through his role as a bond attorney. He is a fiscal conservative with academic and professional credentials that would make him an excellent person to make recommendations for statewide tax policy. He is a close personal friend and someone I consider to have sterling integrity. You can read more about him at www.hsblawfirm.com/people.php?PeopleID=144
Thanks!

Ken Jackson
CCIM, CRS, GRI
RE/MAX Professionals
147 N. Irby Street
Florence, SC 29501
(843)669-1045 office
1-866-326-6953 toll free fax
[REDACTED]
www.ForSaleinFlorence.com

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.3/1971 - Release Date: 02/25/09 06:40:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 10:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SC Stimulus Watch

Thanks for your watch of all this....talk soon... mark

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 12:56 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: SC Stimulus Watch

hi Governor Sanford,
thanks for making some great points on FOX news recently. i simply can't believe what we are witnessing with these huge amounts of money congress is borrowing for our kids to pay back. i'm not alone in thinking about liquidating my assets and moving to a place where i won't have to pay for someone else's reckless spending sprees.

i don't know how this stimulus money is supposed to work, but according to the site below, the only cities in South Carolina getting stimulus money are Charleston, Columbia, Hardeeville, Rock Hill, and Sumter. is it just a coincidence that most, if not all, of these mayors are democrats? the upstate pays a large portion of the taxes from South Carolina yet it doesn't have a single project listed here.

http://www.stimuluswatch.org/project/by_state

susan kines
creative communications, inc.
po box 24189
greenville, sc 29616
phone 864/268-1717
fax 864/292-0776
cell [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.3/1971 - Release Date: 02/25/09 06:40:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2008 6:51 AM
To: Kristin Maguire
Subject: RE: how having a charter school district makes a difference

hope you are well...

-----Original Message-----

From: Kristin Maguire [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2008 10:27 AM
To: 'Mark Sanford'
Subject: how having a charter school district makes a difference

<http://www.independentmail.com/news/2008/oct/18/calhoun-falls-charter-school-testing-character-stu/>

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2008 6:54 PM
To: Mary Long
Subject: RE: Your 9-26 piece in the Washington Post and other press

wow...aren't you kind!

I very much appreciated your note and will continue to advance the ball as best I can in this process.

be well and tell Bob hello... Mark

-----Original Message-----

From: Mary Long [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2008 3:59 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Your 9-26 piece in the Washington Post and other press

Dear Mark,

Clearly you continue to benefit from those Darden A&C classes! ☺

Seriously, both Bob and I were impressed at the clarity with which you described the profound governmental philosophical concepts that underlie the current economic situation and its ambiguous resolution. Between Sarbanes-Oxley, easy credit, and the governmental and agency initiatives to increase home ownership percentages which enabled the more-house-than-buyers-could-afford dilemma, we are definitely in a long-term mess. Charlotte in particular will never be the same after the demise of Wachovia, whatever form its remnants take.

Thank you for speaking the truth with such tact and talent that none can fault your delivery or intentions. We hope that you will continue to use your position, contacts and influence to keep these concepts in the forefront of the discussions that will shape the future fundamentals of government policies on the credit markets, etc..

Sincerely,

Mary Roff Long

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 10:03 PM
To: 'Michael Greve'
Subject: RE: Stimulus Bill Unconstitutional

Thanks for sending.... Mark

From: Michael Greve [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 8:51 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: David Gerson
Subject: Stimulus Bill Unconstitutional

Dear Governor Sanford:

I am reluctant to offer gratuitous advice, especially at the risk of telling you something that you already know. But David suggested that I write to inform you of my view that one piece of the fabulous Stimulus Act is flat-out unconstitutional, at least with respect to most states.

The suspect provision, 1607(b), provides (as you know) that if a state Governor should refuse to accept funding under the statute, a concurrent resolution of the legislature shall be sufficient to provide funding. (Apparently, the legislature does not even have to submit the certification required of governors under 1607(a)). It is my understanding that this language was inserted at the request of a SC Congressman and is more or less specifically directed at you and your state.

The Act presents a number of close constitutional questions, but this one has a clear answer. Of course, Congress is perfectly free to specify recipients of federal funds, and to specify what it (or the dispensing agencies) shall regard as a sufficient sign of acceptance. What it may NOT do is amend state constitutions under the cloak of the Spending Power. Thus, unless a state has independently provided for acceptance by means of a concurrent resolution, the constitutional process remains what it is, 1607(b) or not. By way of close analogy: Congress can (and often does) provide for funding to counties or other districts. But if a state decided to abolish or reconfigure counties, Congress would have no power to insist on the pre-existing arrangement (lest its funding formula be scrambled). So here: if a state were to insist on its ordinary constitutional process, Congress would have no power to compel acceptance of the funds.

Perhaps, this is academic; but if it's of the slightest relevance, I would be happy to explain further and to assist in any way that you might deem useful. At any rate, I take the opportunity to vent my anger at the "anything goes" mentality in Washington. As I write, the Congress is (as you know) considering a bill to create, under the District of Columbia Clause, an additional House seat in Utah. Indeed. The same unadorned contempt for the constitutional rules of the game informs Sec. 1607(b).

I am very grateful to you for all you have done in connection with this travesty. You may feel like a voice in the wilderness, but there are those who hear you. Very best wishes, Mike.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.3/1971 - Release Date: 02/25/09 06:40:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2009 7:38 AM
To: 'Michael Royal'
Subject: RE: For the "Education Policy" File

Thanks and agree on this! m

From: Michael Royal [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2009 12:00 PM
To: Mark Sanford; Scott English
Subject: For the "Education Policy" File

Mark and Scott –

Great editorial in WSJ this weekend about the “tragic lost opportunity” caused by education superintendents (following union pressure) placing caps on the number of Teach for America teachers in states around the country. I was shocked to read that 11% of Ivy League seniors applied for the program in 2008. Few are accepted because of the education lobby. Wouldn't it be great to raise or eliminate the caps in SC on these highly motivated, highly educated teachers?

M

Teach for (Some of) America

Too talented for public schools.

Here's a quiz: Which of the following rejected more than 30,000 of the nation's top college seniors this month and put hundreds more on a waitlist? a) Harvard Law School; b) Goldman Sachs; or c) Teach for America.

If you've spent time on university campuses lately, you probably know the answer. Teach for America -- the privately funded program that sends college grads into America's poorest school districts for two years -- received 35,000 applications this year, up 42% from 2008. More than 11% of Ivy League seniors applied, including 35% of African-American seniors at Harvard. Teach for America has been gaining applicants since it was founded in 1990, but its popularity has exploded this year amid a tight job market.

So poor urban and rural school districts must be rejoicing, right? Hardly. Union and bureaucratic opposition is so strong that Teach for America is allotted a mere 3,800 teaching slots nationwide, or a little more than one in 10 of this year's applicants. Districts place a cap on the number of Teach for America teachers they will accept, typically between 10% and 30% of new hires. In the Washington area, that number is about 25% to 30%, but in Chicago, former home of Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, it is an embarrassing 10%.

This is a tragic lost opportunity. Teach for America picks up the \$20,000 tab for the recruitment and training of each teacher, which saves public money. More important, the program feeds high-energy, high-IQ talent into a teaching profession that desperately needs it. Unions claim the recent grads lack the proper experience and commitment to a teaching career. But the Urban Institute has studied the program and found that "TFA status more than offsets any experience effects. Disadvantaged secondary students would be better off with TFA teachers, especially in math and science, than with fully licensed in-field teachers with three or more years of experience."

It's true that only 10% of Teach for America applicants say they would have gone into education through another route, but two-thirds stay in the field after their two years. One program benefit is that its participants don't have to pass the dreadful "education" courses that have nothing to do with what they'll be teaching. Those courses are loved by unions as a credentialing barrier that makes it harder to get into teaching.

Some districts may be wising up. Mississippi's education superintendent has asked Teach for America to double the size of its 250-member corps in the poor Delta region and is encouraging local superintendents to raise hiring caps. Since Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans has also sharply increased the percentage of corps members among its new teachers, to 250.

But why have any caps? Teach for America young people should be able to compete on equal terms with any other new teaching applicant. The fact that they can't is another example of how unions and the education establishment put tenure and power above student achievement.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.1/2071 - Release Date: 04/26/09 09:44:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 08, 2009 8:28 PM
To: 'Nick Kremydas'
Cc: sdenglish@gov.sc.gov
Subject: RE: Impact fee bill Dorchester County-not a good bill

I hear you but no more believe Columbia should decide all local issues than I do Washington...

We have been consistent in this point.

The below is not accurate as we have let plenty of local pieces of legislation go through that had tax increases and other things we strongly disagreed with, but saw it as a jurisdictional issue locals should decide...

From: Nick Kremydas [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2009 4:47 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Cc: Robert Pratt; Scott English; Richard Berger
Subject: Re: Impact fee bill Dorchester County-not a good bill

Dear Governor,

With all due respect, your decision to allow S.235 to become law was completely irresponsible. Your support of adding any cost to the purchase of a home in this economy is incomprehensible and, in my opinion, is as reckless as recent Congressional action on the so-called stimulus bill.

Here's a quote from your website: "We're committed as an Administration to the ideals of limited government and personal freedom. One of the best ways to promote these ideas, we think, is by advocating for lower taxes and lower government spending."

How is giving school boards, with their reckless spending habits, fiscal autonomy to tax new construction advocating for lower taxes and lower spending? I am unable to make sense of this hypocrisy. Do you have any idea how difficult it is for South Carolinians to qualify for a home loan? The economy is in near ruin and you allow a new tax on homes to become law. Spare me the rhetoric about home rule, this legislation is unconstitutional and strikes at the very core of the American Dream.

I'm upset and mad. Quite frankly, you have betrayed the conservative fiscal principles that I hold dear and those to which I believed you subscribed.

Sincerely,

--

Nick E. Kremydas, Esq., RCE
Chief Executive Officer
South Carolina REALTORS

From: Mark Sanford [mailto:[REDACTED]] **Sent:** Wednesday, February 25, 2009 9:57 PM
To: 'Robert L. Pratt, CCIM'

7/14/2009

Subject: RE: Impact fee bill Dorchester County-not a good bill

Will be disappointing you on this...as we are letting this one become law without my signature... for us the home rule issue....tlak soon...

On Wed, Feb 25, 2009 at 4:41 PM, Robert L. Pratt, CCIM [REDACTED] wrote:

Mark,

The impact fee bill for dorchester county is a poorly crafted document. Most citizens want to help the schools, however, most of the same citizens don't want to pay for them. If we have impact fees, it should be consistent and statewide and we should also address all the funding sources for public schools.

Many people today put their children in private schools: Pinewood Preparatory school, Summerville Catholic, and Dorchester Academy are three examples of private schools that will get none of the impact fee this bill asks for.

I know you speak at the Cato Institute and the Heritage foundation, both of which I am a member.

I doubt that either of these conservative groups would favor this type of tax bill on homebuyers. Especially when we should be making it EASIER to buy, not more expensive.

Please veto this bill. The timing is horrific!

Robert Pratt



Robert L. Pratt, CCIM, SIOR

Commercial Real Estate

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2009 8:38 PM
To: 'Ray Maher'
Subject: RE: Special Inspection legislation bill S. 268,

Thanks for the heads up on this.....

From: Ray Maher [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2009 11:50 AM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Special Inspection legislation bill S. 268,

Mark

The Special Inspection legislation bill has been in the works for over 3 years now, which was as a direct result of your meeting with the Charleston Contractors / CSI group open floor discussed in Charleston.

As President of Charleston Contractors Association at the time I carried it forward with AGC and got AIA, CSI and CEFPI on board to take action to improve the situation. I remember AIA commented "they wished the contractor would work with them on more issues as a team". The contractors in the SC have been struggling with the special inspections since it was introduced into law in 2000 and this bill help create an even playing field across the State so that Owners, Architects and Contractor will be dealing with like regulation in every County.

Thank you for your support and help to push it though.

If you have any question about it please let us know.

The real struggle was to avoid the home rule and Glen McConnell help to present it in a managed that the Home Rule was avoided.

Again thanks, if you get a changes invite Glen to lunch with the hope of working with together more, as a team, the power the two of you could have is unimaginable during your remaining term in office.

Ray Maher

Special Inspection Legislation: The Senate gave final approval last week to S. 268, the Special Inspections legislation, which creates a statewide registry for special inspectors. The Building Codes Council, under the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, will use current staff to set up the registration process and publish a list of registrants on their website so that owners and contractors will know who is certified as a Special Inspector in South Carolina.

The bill was also ratified and sent to the governor for his approval. Gov. Sanford will have five days from the date of ratification to take action on the bill. His options are the sign it, veto it, or allow it to become law without his signature.

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2008 8:45 AM
To: Swati Patel
Cc: Patrick Franks
Subject: RE: Port Royal Letter

make sure i deal with this week..

-----Original Message-----

From: Swati Patel [mailto:spatel@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2008 4:39 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Patrick Franks
Subject: Port Royal Letter

Governor,

Per Ben, attached is a draft of the letter regarding the Port Royal property that you may want to work on this weekend. A hard copy is also in your bag.

Swati

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2009 10:12 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: article in Forbes - FYI

From: Barton Swaim [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2009 9:17 AM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: article in Forbes - FYI

This short article appears in the June 22 issue. It's about the populist appeal of saying "no" to federal money. Mentions you.

Link:

<http://www.forbes.com/forbes/2009/0622/tarp-stimulus-states-saying-no-to-government.html>

Saying No to the Government

Joshua Zumbrun, Janet Novack and Nathan Vardi 06.22.09, 12:00 AM ET

It's tough to say no to an overbearing uncle who prints money.

William A. Cooper, the 65-year-old chief executive of \$18 billion (assets) TCF Financial, does things his own way. He worked as a Detroit cop while earning his accounting degree, revived Minnesota's Republican Party when it was considered a lost cause and got a \$105 snowmobile speeding ticket overturned by arguing to a state appeals court that the lower than normal speed limit wasn't posted. (A "Louisiana speed trap," he called it.)

On Apr. 22 TCF Financial became the largest bank to repay the government's TARP bailout money, wiring \$361 million to Uncle Sam. Going his own way paid off for Cooper this time, too. TCF's deposits surged 14% in the first quarter, and much of that influx appears to be the result of its Mar. 2 announcement that it planned to get out of TARP.

The evidence of that? "E-mails. I got one today: Somebody brought \$625,000 over because they liked what we did with the TARP," Cooper reports. "People walked up to me in restaurants to shake my hands. We got hundreds of letters of congratulation." Cooper says TCF took the money originally because it was supposed to be a signal his bank was a survivor. Instead, it became a taint. Worse, "every single day there was a new rule and regulation coming down," gripes Cooper, who after taking TARP money took heat for subsidizing an employee trip to a ski resort.

Rejecting Washington micromanagement has populist appeal, particularly in TCF's markets of Minnesota, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Colorado, Arizona and South Dakota. But it's easier said than done, as both business and state and local leaders are learning once again during the current crisis.

Uncle Sam has the money press and makes the rules. It's hard to sever ties completely. TCF isn't

7/14/2009

forgoing federal deposit insurance, after all, and it's still haggling with the feds on how much it will have to pay to repurchase stock warrants the government got in return for the TARP loan.

At least Cooper is ahead of Kelly S. King, chief executive of BB&T Corp., the nation's 16th-biggest bank, with \$143 billion in assets. He sent in BB&T's application to repay \$3.1 billion in TARP money in May, after the bank passed its stress test. King has raised \$1.7 billion in common equity and \$800 million of senior debt, and cut his dividend to raise cash. But so far the feds haven't taken the money. "I see no reason whatsoever the government should object to allowing a company like ours to pay it off," he says. Other big banks, including Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley and Bank of America, are now trying to repay TARP money, too.

King says he took the cash because regulators told him they expected him to do it, not because BB&T Corp. needed it. Now he has to limit compensation. Being less ornery and a bigger target than Cooper, he reports he also canceled the annual Florida weekend getaway the bank hosts for its best performers, lest he bring down the "wrath of Congress." He wants out before credit decisions are politicized the way pay and employee junkets have been. "That is the nature of the beast," says King. "It's what governments do."

The states? They're so addicted to federal dollars that they can do little but bluster. Some Republican governors (including those of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas) oppose taking some of the unemployment insurance money in the federal stimulus, because it would require their states to expand jobless benefits for part-time or other workers. But most governors have backed off threats to reject other lumps of stimulus cash. Alaska Governor Sarah Palin ended up vetoing just \$29 million in weatherization funds--a tenth of the stimulus funds she said she might turn down. She said taking the weatherization cash would require her to "promote" local building codes, which many Alaska cities don't now have.

South Carolina Governor Mark Sanford rejected \$700 million in education stimulus money because it came with too many strings. But the legislature disagreed, state school administrators sued and now Sanford says he'll ask for the state's share--if the South Carolina Supreme Court tells him to.

In a 2007 study Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the libertarian Cato Institute, detailed how over the decades Congress has used grants to assert ever more control over policy once left to state and local pols. "If you're elected to help the people of your state it's extremely difficult to turn down money," Edwards observes. While more than 20 states have passed resolutions complaining about the testing and other mandates in the 2002 No Child Left Behind Act, not one has turned down the dollars. Hillsdale College in Hillsdale, Mich. is freakish in choosing to keep government off its back by refusing state and federal aid; most colleges are not willing to pay the price for that kind of independence.

Edwards slams the "hypocrisy" of Texas Governor Rick Perry, who made a dramatic states rights speech in April and even hinted at support for secession. "He issues a press release every time he can dish out \$5 million or \$10 million in federal money," sniffs Edwards. "If Congress is going to take Texas taxpayers' dollars, we want our fair share back," a spokeswoman for Perry retorts.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.62/2168 - Release Date: 06/10/09 18:30:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 5:54 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: Heritage Foundation: A Principled Path to Rational Health Care Reform

From: Smith, Kisa [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 9:23 AM
To: Smith, Kisa
Subject: Heritage Foundation: A Principled Path to Rational Health Care Reform

A Principled Path to Rational Health Care Reform

<http://www.heritage.org/Research/HealthCare/wm2448.cfm>

by Nina Owcharenko

WebMemo #2448

May 15, 2009

Congress will soon unveil legislation to reform the health care system. The policies outlined by President Obama during his campaign and those being discussed in Congress would centralize control over the health care system in Washington.

May 15, 2009

A Principled Path to Rational Health Care Reform

by Nina Owcharenko

WebMemo #2448

Congress will soon unveil legislation to reform the health care system. The policies outlined by President Obama during his campaign and those being discussed in Congress would centralize control over the health care system in Washington.

The chief danger of this approach is that it would directly interfere in the personal health care decisions of Americans. There is a much better alternative: a system that recognizes diversity across the states and differences in individual health care needs and preferences.

A Consensus on the Problems

There is little disagreement that the current health care system needs an overhaul. Today, health care costs continue to rise while people have fewer choices and are less secure that the coverage they have today will be there tomorrow. The U.S. spends over \$2.4 trillion on health care (almost 17 percent of GDP), and the government accounts for almost one-half of all health care spending.[1]

Premiums continue to rise in the private sector. Employer-based family coverage has increased from an average of \$6,438 in 2000 to \$12,680 in 2008.[2] The government health programs are not faring much better. According to recent CMS Actuary calculations, Medicare and Medicaid spent \$818 billion in 2008 and are projected to reach \$1.7 trillion by 2018.[3]

Americans are also facing fewer choices. Today, 85 percent of all employers offer only one health plan for their employees.[4] Similar restrictions on personal choice face enrollees in government programs. In Medicaid, 23 percent are not accepting new Medicaid patients, and 18 percent are accepting only some.[5] In Medicare, serious legislative efforts are underway that will likely chip away at seniors' access to the private plans they want in Medicare.[6]

Finally, Americans feel less secure about the future of their health care coverage. With the economic recession, Americans recognize they are one paycheck away from losing their health care coverage. Fifteen percent of Americans are without coverage. The uninsured are not a homogeneous group, but they tend to be disproportionately young, a member of a minority group, and working for small firms. Most important, while the percentage of those without coverage remains constant, the individuals are not the same. As a matter of fact, 45 percent of uninsured are uninsured for less than four months; only 16 percent are uninsured for more than 18 months.[7] This churning in the health insurance markets, and the lack of portability, is almost entirely the result of outdated government policies.

Two Competing Health Care Visions

There is also general agreement on the outcomes Americans are looking for in any health care reform proposal: affordability, accessibility, portability, and quality. But there is less agreement on policy path for reform.

On one side, there are those who believe that centralizing power in Washington is the best approach to achieve serious and long-lasting health care reform. Their policy prescriptions call for federalizing and heavily regulating health insurance. Proposals for a new public health plan and a federal health insurance exchange, as well as an individual mandate to purchase a government-approved package of benefits, clarify their intent: Washington control over health care financing and delivery.

The result, regardless of stated intentions to the contrary, is that the Congress would ultimately be in charge of health care decisions. It would result in a massive one-size-fits-all government system, and it would depend on flawed financing schemes, new mandates, and higher taxes to pay for it.

On the other side, there are those who believe that individuals and families should be the key decision-makers in health care and that they should control the flow of health care dollars in a reformed system.

They are concerned that a centralized system of federal decision-making would:

- Diminish individuals' control over their personal health care decisions;
- Directly undermine state autonomy and authority in health policy, undercutting both innovation and experimentation to expand coverage and deliver quality care, especially for the poorest and most vulnerable of our citizens;
- Generate and perpetuate unsustainable federal spending; and
- Ultimately, in the face of serious budget crises, lead to government rationing of care and services.

Key Elements for a Workable Solution

Members of Congress serious about improving the health care system must find a way to bridge the

gap between these two competing visions. There are three critical elements that could bring about a workable solution for lasting health care reform.

1. Tax Equity. The cornerstone of any serious health care reform proposal must address the tax treatment of health insurance. Today, individuals who purchase coverage through their place of work receive an unlimited tax break on the value of their health care benefits. However, those who purchase coverage on their own receive no comparable tax break.

There is broad bipartisan agreement, especially among health care economists and experts, that the current tax treatment of employer-based coverage is inequitable and regressive. Ideally, Congress should replace the current tax exclusion with a system of universal tax credits. Moreover, as a general principle, Congress should provide tax relief for those who purchase coverage on their own and redirect other health care spending to help low-income individuals and families purchase private health insurance coverage.

2. State-Based Reform. The health care challenges vary greatly across the country. Some states face high health care costs, while others face high rates of uninsurance. And, rural states face different challenges than urban states.

Instead of depending on a federal one-size-fits-all solution, Congress should embrace a federal-state partnership that would preserve diversity in the states. The states' role would be to devise the best ways to achieve common national goals--for example, to establish a mechanism for portability. This is in sharp contrast to other state-based approaches where the federal government sets explicit requirements and imposes on the states the onerous task of administering its federal reform. These types of partnerships are little more than a backdoor way to a one-size-fits-all federal plan.

3. Sound Financing. The U.S. spends over \$2.4 trillion on health care. Instead of spending an additional \$1.6 trillion on a plan financed by tax increases and unproven savings from Medicare and Medicaid that may never materialize, Congress should restructure and redirect *existing* health care spending to make it more effective. To address long-term health care costs, Congress must focus on fundamental reform of the tax treatment of health insurance and entitlements. At the very least, Congress should require that savings be realized before appropriating them to any expansions.

Creating a Lasting Health Care Reform

Members of Congress have a choice: Either they can support efforts that expand Washington's control of the health care system, or they can allow the states to develop solutions that will transfer direct control of health care dollars and personal health care decisions back to individuals and families. The choice should not be that hard.

Nina Owcharenko is Deputy Director of the Center for Health Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation.

[1]Andrea Sisko *et al.*, "Health Spending Projections Through 2018: Recession Effects Add

Uncertainty to the Outlook," *Health Affairs*, March/April 2009, at <http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/reprint/28/2/w346> (May 14, 2009).

[2]Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Education Trust, *Employer Health Benefits 2008 Annual Survey*, September 24, 2008, p. 30, at <http://ehbs.kff.org/pdf/7790.pdf> (May 14, 2009).

[3]*Ibid.*

[4]Kaiser, p. 59.

[5]Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, "Community Tracking Study Physician Survey, 2004-2005: [United States]," August 2006, p. 38, at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/cocoon/ICPSR/STUDY/04584.xml> (May 13, 2009).

[6]While the financing system for Medicare Advantage is flawed, some approaches to address these changes would have a negative impact on the highly popular plans. See Robert E. Moffit, "The Success of Medicare Advantage Plans: What Seniors Should Know," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2142, June 13, 2008, at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/HealthCare/bg2142.cfm>.

[7]Congressional Budget Office, "How Many People Lack Health Insurance and For How Long," May 2003, p viii (Figure 2) at <http://www.cbo.gov/fipdocs/42xx/doc4210/05-12-Uninsured.pdf> (May 14, 2009).

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/18/09 06:28:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 9:35 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Rotary Talking Points

Lets watch what we send...

From: tpearson [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 9:29 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Re: Rotary Talking Points

Yes--my computer froze up and sent the wrong document. You should have a follow-up email with the talking points in a format that you can open.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

From: "Mark Sanford"
Date: Sun, 29 Mar 2009 21:28:26 -0400
To: 'Tim Pearson' [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Subject: RE: Rotary Talking Points
What is this...seems like nothing to do with tomorrow.... M

From: Tim Pearson [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 8:36 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Re: Rotary Talking Points

Sorry--I have some newfangled version of Word that apparently makes these difficult to open. Try the version attached here.

On Sun, Mar 29, 2009 at 8:24 PM, Mark Sanford <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I cant open this....

From: Tim Pearson [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 7:58 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Rotary Talking Points

Gov--

Attached are the additional talking points for tomorrow. Let me know if you need anything else.

Tim

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.31/2028 - Release Date: 03/28/09 07:16:00

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.31/2028 - Release Date: 03/28/09 07:16:00

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.31/2028 - Release Date: 03/28/09 07:16:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2009 9:22 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: GOLI - under funded pensions
Attachments: GOLI Intro.pdf; ATT00116.htm; Governing MillerThe OPEB AcidTest05-08-2009.doc; ATT00119.htm

From: Saul Anuzis [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2009 5:34 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Re: GOLI - under funded pensions

Governor,

Per our earlier email exchange, I would like to propose we come out and meet with your state Treasurer on one of the following days...May 27th-28th, or June 15th, 16th or 17th.

You mentioned that you would like to be part of these meetings...and I think that would be very helpful. I have enclosed the summary of the GOLI program for your review and another article that was recently written about the challenges many state and local units of government face.

I will call Scott Richardson and see if any of these dates work.

Thanks again for your interest.

We'll talk soon. Thanks.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/13/09 18:04:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2009 9:16 AM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: "First Steps" Oversight - Need Your Input!

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 24, 2009 7:56 AM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: "First Steps" Oversight - Need Your Input!

Governor...

As you may already be aware, Jill Kelso and Ed McMenamin - both from our area and both major Sanford supporters - have been appointed as two of the three members of the 1st Steps Oversight Panel by Speaker Harrell (Kelso) and Senator McConnell (McMenamin). Both would like to discuss this with you before they embark on their oversight review. They would like an appointment or a conference call with you at your very earliest convenience. Please advise how to set that up. Thanks - and keep the faith.

Tom
[REDACTED]

PS. Jill Kelso = [REDACTED] (cell)
Ed McMenamin = [REDACTED] (cell)

--
Tom Herron

"All that is necessary for evil to succeed is for good men to do nothing." - Sir Edmund Burke
No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.1/2071 - Release Date: 04/24/09 19:04:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2009 6:46 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW:

From: JT Gandolfo [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2009 6:41 PM
To: Mark S
Subject:

Mark

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me last Thursday. The revisions of our Motor Vehicle Franchise Law are important to the entire dealer body any time, but especially during these very uncertain times. I appreciate you letting me present the case for the Association.

On a personal note, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

For what it is worth, I understand and support your position regarding the stimulus. I could be wrong, but I believe there is a compromise out there with our General Assembly: cut the budget and take the money. I am confident you can work it out.

Again, thanks and let's stay in touch.

JT

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.48/2049 - Release Date: 04/09/09 06:09:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 10:24 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: National Endowment for the Arts - \$ 311,500 Grant

What happened with this?

From: henry horowitz [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 8:10 AM
To: 'Mark Sanford'
Subject: RE: National Endowment for the Arts - \$ 311,500 Grant

I appreciate it!

Thanks

HH

From: Mark Sanford [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 7:56 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: National Endowment for the Arts - \$ 311,500 Grant

Will check on this and get back to you today...thanks... Mark

From: henry horowitz [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2009 10:44 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: National Endowment for the Arts - \$ 311,500 Grant

Dear Mark,

Hope you are faring well in this very difficult political and economic environment .

In my role as the SCAC Commissioner , I am taking the liberty of requesting a great favor from you by requesting that you approve Certification to Request Funds from the National Endowment for the Arts for a \$ 311,500 grant to SC Arts Commission.

This one- time award does not require match and it is critical for SCAC to offer grants to various qualified arts organizations in these very difficult times where every dollar counts in preserving many worthwhile programs and arts related employment.

As I understand, in order to receive this very much needed grant , NEA needs your certification as the Governor and delivery to NEA by no later than Friday, April 3, 2009.

The certification document was delivered to Jeff Schilz in your office.

Your assistance in providing this certification is very much appreciated.

Thank You!

7/14/2009

Take Care

Henry Horowitz

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.31/2028 - Release Date: 03/31/09 06:02:00

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.31/2028 - Release Date: 03/31/09 06:02:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 9:35 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: Reason Online on bailout refusal
Attachments: Jackson and Distribution 032409.doc

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, March 28, 2009 4:48 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Fw: Reason Online on bailout refusal

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: "Ethan Allen Institute"
Date: Fri, 27 Mar 2009 15:41:49 -0500
To: Benjamin Fox [REDACTED], Sanford, Jenny [REDACTED]
Subject: Reason Online on bailout refusal
plus my own commentary of tuesday starring Mark
John McClaughry
Ethan Allen Institute
4836 Kirby Mountain Rd.
Concord VT 05824
802 695 1448

You Will Be Stimulated!

Why the states should refuse the stimulus

Brian Doherty | March 20, 2009

Stimulus sweeps the land like a plague, with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act pushing a crushing juggernaut of \$787 billion in enforced federal joy to help with state obligations ranging from welfare to unemployment to education to building guard rails on highways.

While not exactly forming a substantial breakwater to these flooding waves of cash, a few conservative voices have at least drawn some attention by standing athwart the next decade's federal debt, shouting, "Hey, maybe we'll just take *some* of it."

The leading anti-stimulus Scrooge is Republican Gov. Mark Sanford of South Carolina, who petitioned the White House to aim \$700 million of stimulus money toward debt reduction rather than spending. He

was told no, and earlier this week tried to readjust and refocus his intentions. He now hopes to apply \$577 million specifically to education debt. He noted:

This would immediately free up over \$162 million in debt service in the first two years and save roughly \$125 million in interest payments over the next 13 years, which could then be directed towards other educational purposes—just as paying off a mortgage early frees up the typical monthly payment for other uses.

Obviously, such talk is rather unpopular in the midst of this, the worst economic crisis since last month. For his part, Sanford is accused of putting political ambitions before his state's 10 percent unemployment rate. He's merely preening, critics say, before the rump of the GOP's small-government faithful in preparation for a 2012 presidential run. Lots of South Carolina's citizens and legislators think Sanford's out of his gourd, that he's robbing the state of its birthright for a mess of message about fiscal probity. Luckily for them, the stimulus bill actually empowers the legislature to override his intentions. The bill contains a provision, added ironically by South Carolina's own Democratic Rep. James Clyburn, in subsection 1607(b) that holds:

If funds provided to any State in any division of this Act are not accepted for use by the Governor, then acceptance by the State legislature, by means of the adoption of a concurrent resolution, shall be sufficient to provide funding to such State.

But that might well conflict with the spending provisions of several state constitutions, prompting a few thinkers to put forward charming attempts to apply retrograde 10th Amendment thinking to the stimulus bill. As Chapman University law professor Ronald Rotunda suggested in a *Chicago Tribune* op-ed, it's perfectly clear Congress has no legitimate constitutional authority to thusly override state constitutions. Subsection 1607(b), he says, would surely fall to a legal challenge, were one to come up. Rotunda also says Congress was in such a hurry to pass this bill, it appears to have neglected to include a standard "severability" clause that would allow the rest of the bill to stand if that portion were struck down. While it's undoubtedly an eccentric thing to bring up—constitutional limits on congressional power are so 19th century—Rotunda's theory was roughly backed up by a Congressional Research Service report issued this week. (That these arguments will damage the stimulus package in the end seems quite unlikely, of course.)

In addition to Sanford, Texas Gov. Rick Perry, Louisiana rising star—and potential Sanford opponent in a fantasized 2012—Gov. Bobby Jindal, Mississippi Gov. Haley Barbour, and Alabama Gov. Bob Riley have all announced their intentions to refuse part of the stimulus money. Joining them this week was presumptive 2012 next-in-line, Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin.

Perry and Riley are particularly bothered by certain strings attached to the unemployment benefit money. The stimulus bill requires the states to extend unemployment benefits by various means, including extensions to those seeking only part-time employment, those who quit jobs for family reasons, and those who had otherwise exhausted their statutory claim on the benefits.

Buttressing Perry's desire not to get trapped in new federal unemployment demands, this analysis from the Texas Public Policy Foundation finds, for one example, that a stimulus-mandated change in the base period for unemployment benefits would cost Texas \$212 million over five years—and that's in order to get \$185 million from the feds now. In general, stimulus-wary governors fear that the stimulus will lock them into future costs that will weigh on state budgets long after the stimulus money is gone. That's a legitimate worry. As a new study from the Rockefeller Institute notes,

even under the most optimistic of scenarios, state tax collections will not return to pre-recession levels until well after the 2011-2012 fiscal year, when the bulk of new assistance for states will end. At that time, states will once again face severe budget gaps.... When most of the stimulus provisions expire...states could face budget gaps that range from four to six percent of general expenditures—a nationwide total of \$70 billion to more than \$100 billion.

Of course, most states—including even those whose governors are in supposed revolt—are more than happy to take the money. They're apparently heedless of the problems down the road, pleading that they've been whacked in the head by an unpredictable fiscal emergency that's completely outside of their control. But as Chris Edwards explains, the states are far from blameless when it comes to budget problems, and far from starved:

Total state and local tax revenues increased 8.4 percent in 2004, 8.9 percent in 2005, 6.6 percent in 2006, and 4.9 percent in 2007. Data for the first quarter of 2008 show that tax revenues are up 3.2 percent over the first quarter of 2007...[while] Spending across the 50 states increased 6.5 percent in 2005, 8.7 percent in 2006, 9.3 percent in 2007, and 5.1 percent in 2008. Spending growth is projected to slow to 1 percent for 2009, but that is certainly no crisis after the orgy of budget expansion in recent years.

The phenomenon of some GOP governors talking the anti-stimulus talk (even walking the anti-stimulus walk, at least as far as their legislatures will allow them to) is encouraging in its own small way. It's refreshing to see that some degree of federalism—backed up with actual thinking about tomorrow's consequences for today's actions—is still alive somewhere on the American political scene.

Sure, looking at the wider picture makes it all seem like just political theater. As Christopher Beam noted in *The Washington Post*, the various governors are presenting weak strategies almost certainly bound to be defeated by their legislatures, combined with incoherent theories that make it unclear why only *portions* of the stimulus should be rejected. But it is good, at least, that some politicians think there is a public out there ready to be attracted to such a stance.

Yes, it's heartening to believe that every small sign of life for federalism helps, even if it's only a little. But in the face of the stimulus juggernaut, the sad conclusion is that this minor, though encouraging, trend isn't likely to do even a small bit of good.

Senior Editor Brian Doherty is author of Radicals for Capitalism (PublicAffairs) and Gun Control on Trial (Cato Institute).

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.31/2028 - Release Date: 03/28/09 07:16:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 9:35 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: from ron brinson--port privatization
Attachments: from ron brinson--port privatization (4.85 KB)

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 8:10 PM
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Cc: senglish@gov.sc.gov
Subject: Fwd: from ron brinson--port privatization

Mike,

Here's a blurb from the editor of the Journal of Commerce. Port privatization, as predicted, is beginning to get some traction in the U.S.

The governor's apparent position is gradually becoming current.

The parade is forming.....please share with the governor and Sen. Davis, et al.

Very interesting.

ron

Virginia is for Port Lovers

Joseph Bonney | 12:13PM GMT

If you thought port privatization was as dead as the rest of this economy, think again. Recently the Port of Oakland granted a Ports America partnership a 50-year concession and lease for five container terminals. Now comes the news that the Virginia Port Authority is taking offers for its cargo facilities.

Rumors had been floating for months that something was in the works in Virginia. During the big rush by private investors to acquire port franchises in 2006-2007, port officials indicated they would consider privatization if the price was right. State lawmakers have discussed the possibility.

An indication that things might be getting serious came in December, when the Virginia Department of Transportation quietly changed its guidelines for public-private partnerships to smooth the approval of such deals.

Also interesting is the timing of the offer that CenterPoint Properties plans to make for rights to the VPA terminals. The offer, expected to be submitted this week, comes less than two weeks after adjournment of the annual session of the Virginia General Assembly. Having a port privatization proposal on the table when lawmakers were in session could have complicated things.

Virginia is among the most attractive U.S. port franchises for potential private investors. It has a 50-foot channel, good intermodal connections, room for expansion and has benefited from years of sound management. Once CenterPoint's offer is on the table, don't be surprised if others follow.

Contact Joseph Bonney at jbonney@joc.com.

A Good Credit Score is 700 or Above. See yours in just 2 easy steps!

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.10/1995 - Release Date: 03/11/09 08:28:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 9:47 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: Veto S.235

From: Earl McLeod [mailto:earl@columbiabuilders.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 6:02 PM
To: mark@governorsanford.com; Mark Sanford
Cc: Barry Davis (E-mail); Bennett Griffin (E-mail); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; David Hilburn (E-mail); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; George Delk (E-mail); [REDACTED]; Karl Haslinger (E-mail); Mark Bostic (E-mail); Mike Lowman (E-mail); Patrick Dunbar (E-mail); mcLeodconstruction@mcleodsc.com; Ron Roe (E-mail); Steve Corboy (E-mail); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Allen Shumaker (Business Fax); Andy White (E-mail); Cecil Brazell (E-mail); Dale Boozer (E-mail); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Frank Clark (E-mail); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Pat Dunbar (E-mail); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Richard Sendler (E-mail); [REDACTED]; Steve Mungo (E-mail); Tim O'Farrell (E-mail); Van McAlister (Business Fax)
Subject: Veto S.235

Dear Governor Sanford:

Following is a letter from the Home Builders Association of South Carolina regarding S.235 a local bill allowing school impact fees which is clearly not allowed by state law. On behalf of the Home Builders Association of Greater Columbia I am requesting you do the right thing and veto this bill.

You are a man of principal and this attempt to legislate locally what is not allowed by state law is wrong. Please do the right thing and stop this madness -

VETO S.235.
 Earl McLeod
 HBA of Greater Columbia
 (803) 256-6238 (803) 556-5788

Dear Governor Sanford,

On behalf of the Home Builders Association of South Carolina we are writing to you to request that you veto S.235. We are distressed that a local bill supporting school impact fees in an unlimited and unaccountable method has made it to your desk. Local governments from across the country are providing relief from impact fees in an effort to encourage economic growth during the current recession. Yet, our General Assembly is promoting additional taxes on home owners.

Unemployment in our state is rapidly approaching 10 percent, foreclosure rates are climbing to unacceptable levels, tax revenue to the state has fallen dramatically, and for the first time in our state's modern history we are experiencing a reduction of home ownership rates. In fact, the median income of

a S.C. family is 12 percent below what is needed to afford a median priced home in S.C.

The solution to our economic downturn is demonstrably and inextricably tied to the housing industry. Dr. Doug Woodward, Director of the Division of Research and Professor of Economics at the Moore School of Business at the University of South Carolina recently stated, "The construction of new homes provides substantial support to local services, retail and wholesale trade, and manufacturing suppliers. These are local jobs, not jobs that can be outsourced to China. The work has to be done locally."

Senator Rose has made the claim that the additional monies are needed to fund the schools, but in fact, the S.C. Budget and Control Board shows that in 2006 Dorchester 2 residents paid \$201,668,810 for public education in the county, almost **\$64 Million** of which was spent on administration alone – that's \$22 million in bureaucratic spending growth since 2000. A mere 46 cents per dollar reaches students in the classroom in the form of instructional spending. As a percentage of the total budget, that is a 7 percent drop since 2000. These are the same people you will be providing an open check book to if you do not veto this bill.

A very recent study by economist Dr. Elliot Eisenberg (the study has been delivered to Scott English) detailed that new housing in the Charleston Trident area (Charleston,

Dorchester and Berkeley counties) pays for all county services and infrastructure costs within seven years – including additional capital costs for local schools.

We want to work with you to help encourage economic development, develop the necessary infrastructure to support economic growth and get our state out of a recession, but an additional tax on home owners is simply not the answer. Homeowners are feeling the pain of the current economic climate and are looking to elected officials for answers. Together, we can put South Carolinians back to work and put our state back on the path to economic prosperity without placing an additional burden on taxpayers. We hope you will look at all the research and consider vetoing S.235.

Sincerely,

Jim Gregorie Mark E. Nix
President, HBA of SC Executive Director, HBA of SC

Earl E. McLeod, Jr.
Executive Director
Home Builders Association of Greater Columbia
P.O. Box 725, Columbia, SC 29202
(803)256-6238 FAX (803)779-0635

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2008 9:58 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: RE: Latest Budget op-ed

thanks..

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick Franks [mailto:pfranks@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2008 9:36 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Latest Budget op-ed

Per your request.

P

Patrick K. Franks
(803)-734-5195

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2009 8:01 AM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: Funding Higher Education In South Carolina

-----Original Message-----

From: Jenny Sanford [mailto:jnsanford@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2009 6:13 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Funding Higher Education In South Carolina

>>> "HEBERT, JAMES" <[REDACTED]> 1/25/2009 12:12:00 AM >>>
Dear Mark & Jenny:

Places that do a good job of supporting education also do a good job of keeping people and their economies healthy. Look no farther than those places in the country (and in other parts of the world) that are doing relatively well in the current economic crisis to understand that higher education holds the key to economic development and well-being of the population. Education; from early in childhood through research-driven post-graduate studies in the physical, life, and biomedical sciences, is strongly linked to indicators of social, economic, environmental, and human health.

The contrast between North Carolina and South Carolina with respect to investing in education and its health and economic indicators is illustrative of what I mean. About 40 years ago North Carolina made a deliberate decision to invest heavily in higher education, setting the stage for the information-based economy that would result. At the time, North and South Carolina were pretty similar on economic, education, and health-related indicators. Now, North Carolina's public universities are among the most highly rated in country (e.g., UNC Chapel Hill is consistently rated in the top 5 on most measures), its economy is much more robust than ours, and health indicators have improved relative to ours. Reflective of its superiority in building health-related infrastructure that improves both health and wealth, North Carolina has three National Cancer Institute-designated Cancer Centers (vs. none in South Carolina) and better performance on any commonly measured quality of life indicator. I am in India right now, working at the largest Cancer Hospital and Research Center in Asia, in part because they have much to teach us about relative investment in education, research, and service.

What South Carolina is doing now in threatening to impose severe cuts on an already-impooverished system of higher education would increase the rate of descent to the bottom of health and economic indicators nationally. Doing so would doom our state to decades of reconstruction - even if the political will to build the infrastructure might ever emerge.

Sincerely,

James R. Hebert, Columbia, SC

James R. Hébert, MSPH, ScD
Fulbright-Nehru Senior Research Fellow
Healis Sekhsaria Institute for Public Health &
Advanced Centre for Research Treatment and Education in Cancer
Navi Mumbai, India

Health Sciences Distinguished Professor
Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
Arnold School of Public Health, University of South Carolina
Director, Statewide Cancer Prevention & Control Program

US Contact: Cancer Prevention and Control Program
915 Greene Street, Suite 241-2
Columbia, SC 29208
Telephone: (803) 576-5666
Fax: (803) 576-5612/ 803-576-5624
Universal e-mail: jhebert@sc.edu <mailto:jhebert@sc.edu>

India Contacts:
Healis (91-22-2757-5487 x203)
ACTREC (via email)
Fulbright Mumbai (91-22-2262-4603)
Fulbright New Delhi (91-11-4209-0909)

We may never be strong enough to be entirely nonviolent in thought, word and deed. But we must keep nonviolence as our goal and make strong progress towards it. Mohandas Gandhi
<<http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/m/mohandasga135041.html>>

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - <http://www.avg.com>
Version: 8.0.176 / Virus Database: 270.10.13/1912 - Release Date: 1/24/2009 8:40 PM

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2009 7:55 AM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: December 08 unemployment rate report
Attachments: EcoDevo 012709.pdf

From: Joe Taylor [mailto:REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2009 10:18 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: December 08 unemployment rate report

From: Joe Taylor [mailto:jtaylor@commerce.state.sc.us]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2009 5:37 PM
To: Joe Taylor
Subject: FW: December 08 unemployment rate report

From: Braden Bunch
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2009 1:00 PM
To: 'Joel Sawyer'; Joe Taylor; Kara Borie
Cc: Rebecca Gunnlaugsson; David Logsdon; Adam Jordan; 'Ben Fox'
Subject: December 08 unemployment rate report

See attached

Braden Bunch
Research Analyst
South Carolina Department of Commerce
(803) 737-0656

Internal Virus Database is out of date.
Checked by AVG - <http://www.avg.com>
Version: 8.0.176 / Virus Database: 270.10.13/1912 - Release Date: 1/24/2009 8:40 PM

thanks...

[REDACTED] did for being a "team player" and not knocking it publicly. [REDACTED] I'm not
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 10:11 PM
To: Ben Fox
Subject: RE: US House Ways and Means Hearing Testimony - DRAFTSattached

I'll take care of it, but we ought to work to a manning officer on weekends I am working
lets discuss...

-----Original Message-----

From: Ben Fox [mailto:bfox@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 9:51 PM
To: [REDACTED]; Mary Neil Stroud
Subject: Re: US House Ways and Means Hearing Testimony - DRAFTSattached

Governor: I just received this email (9:36pm saturday)... Groupwise has been down all day
and 30 emails just came through. I can't tell when you sent this email, but I can bring
hard copies of the congressional hearing testimony drafts to the mansion at some point
tomorrow or even tonight (although we're only talking 3 pages for my extended hearing
draft and 2 from your dictation... The rest was just FYI and stuff you already had copies
of).

I will wait for you to contact me re bringing hard copies by the mansion tonight or
tomorrow- I CAN DO, but don't know if you ended up printing those pages out already, of if
you just recently sent this email. I apologize that emails weren't working (online or
blackberry), thanks.

[REDACTED]

Ben

-----Original Message-----

From: "Mark Sanford" [REDACTED]
To: Ben Fox <bfox@gov.sc.gov>
Creation Date: 10/25 10:54 am
Subject: RE: US House Ways and Means Hearing Testimony - DRAFTS attached

i taker it some one will give me hard copy of this and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] thanks...

-----Original Message-----

From: Ben Fox [mailto:bfox@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2008 8:08 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Jeff Schilz; Mary Neil Stroud; Scott English
Subject: US House Ways and Means Hearing Testimony - DRAFTS attached

Governor:

I am attaching the following:

- your original dictation, unedited (MCS dictation file)
- my edits/fleshing out of this dictation (FOXedit file)
- the original talking points (House hearing TPs file)
- a PDF of your hand-written outline (MCS hand outline file)

- the formal invitation letter from US House Ways and Means (Sanford file)

Thank you,

Ben

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 9:36 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Budget

Interesting....

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 8:41 PM
To: Scott English; [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Budget

are you aware of this

To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Budget

Talked to xxxxxx last night, and he believes Leatherman changed one the HHS amendments in the transfer between the Senate and House. Without me saying anything, he said that he thinks the budget could be overtuned on constitutional grounds. I hope Ned Sloan is ready.

Hotmail® goes with you. Get it on your BlackBerry or iPhone.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/16/09 17:05:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 10:54 AM
To: Ben Fox
Subject: RE: US House Ways and Means Hearing Testimony - DRAFTS attached

i taker it some one will give me hard copy of this [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], thanks...

-----Original Message-----

From: Ben Fox [mailto:bfox@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2008 8:08 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Jeff Schilz; Mary Neil Stroud; Scott English
Subject: US House Ways and Means Hearing Testimony - DRAFTS attached

Governor:

I am attaching the following:

- your original dictation, unedited (MCS dictation file)
- my edits/fleshing out of this dictation (FOXedit file)
- the original talking points (House hearing TPs file)
- a PDF of your hand-written outline (MCS hand outline file)
- the formal invitation letter from US House Ways and Means (Sanford file)

Thank you,

Ben

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2009 6:41 PM
To: 'Joe Taylor'
Subject: RE: RR veto

To be continued and again apologize... Mark

From: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2009 8:17 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RR veto

We need to talk, not sure where your info came from but in my opinion it was one sided and based on incorrect speculation. Most of the same talk is what I heard from Ben Hagood and he had made many incorrect assumptions and he is working for specific clients not for the general public..

You and I need to keep reminding ourself that this situation is being driven by folks who want to sell two pieces of realestate that are under water in todays market. Since they have not been willing to discuss pricing it is my opinion that they are attempting to make their site(s) the only option and therefore control the pricing.
We need to discuss what you want going forward as I have concerns which may or may not be warranted about credibility and consistancy.

Sent using BlackBerry

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/19/09 06:21:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2009 9:55 PM
To: 'Charles Lane'
Subject: RE: Governor offers deal on stimulus - Local / Metro - The State

No go so far...

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles Lane [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2009 5:07 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Governor offers deal on stimulus - Local / Metro - The State

<http://www.thestate.com/local/story/732948.html> What about adding trust funds like the Conservation Bank as part of the deal? You might get that accomplished in 2 days.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.31/2028 - Release Date: 03/31/09 06:02:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 10:04 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Busget-Federal

Thanks for the encouragement!

Hope you are well..

Will take your advice to heart... M

From: Barbara Nielsen [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 3:42 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Busget-Federal

Gov. - you are doing great. I think the republican governor's should have a thermometer type graph (like United Way) that shows the deficit growing - every time more dollars are spent - it gets added up.

I told Joel that yu all should have a "waste of the day" statement. Go through the line items and pork - release one a day - e.g. 52million for green gold carts - then ask the question- Would you borrow money to pay for this if it were your budget?

Hang in there- Barbara

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.3/1971 - Release Date: 02/25/09 06:40:00

Mark Sanford

From: O.L. Thompson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2009 2:33 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: FW: Port Bill

Mark,

The below two e-mails will give you an idea of how my conversations went yesterday with Ken and Rick Todd. I have expressed my displeasure but it is not going to change anything.

I agree with you that the legislative branch is trying to take over the executive branch of our State government. There is supposed to be a balance of power, checks and balances but we are moving away from that.

I can give Ken direction and he insists that he is loyal to you but Rick works for his Chairman and Board. They believe they are getting the politics out of the SPA by going along with this bill but I argued we were doing just the opposite and also moving away from accountability.

Let me know if there is anything I can do,

O.L.

From: Ken Willingham
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2009 1:05 PM
To: O.L. Thompson
Subject: RE: Port Bill

OL,

FYI

Mr. Todd,

Thanks, but you really didn't have to. You know though, you really are good with words, composition, rhetoric, and content,

(What does "uncharacteristically quiet" imply??!!??).

As info, where I am personally is: The SPA is vitally important to our state, and is the primary economic development engine and we need to have that engine up and running in an efficient, apolitical and non-bureaucratic manner.

We sincerely need unanimity between Legislative and Executive Branches ... it is THAT important!!

Thanks again,

Your friend,

Ken

From: Rick Todd [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2009 11:07 AM
To: O.L. Thompson
Subject: Port Bill

OL

As a great friend and dedicated supporter of Governor Sanford, and as employer and great friend of Ken Willingham, I wanted to make it clear what role Ken has had in the SPA "re-structuring" Bill.

Ken, as he has for a good number of years now, has dedicated a tremendous amount of time "lobbying" - basically putting a real-live business person's (normal person's - as opposed to a paid lobbyist's) face on the SCTA lobbying team/effort.

His enthusiasm is contagious, and his interest in and understanding of the process is critical for purposes of our grassroots outreach effort.

He has been a tremendous asset to our efforts - on issues that both SCTA and the governor have been hand-in-hand, side-by-side: Tort, W-comp, DOT, I-C Reforms, etc.

I can tell you that in all honesty, he has been silent on the issue of "removing the at-will firing authority of a governor over the SPA board."

Ken has been respectful of our position for promoting stability, and passing a bill this session to put these issues to rest.

But he has never said: "I support/think you should take away the governor's authority." Nor has he weighed in on the "privatization" issues.

When he has talked to any legislators about the port bill - and it's been rare that I'm aware of, he's stuck to a statement, in effect, "let's settle the issues, and bring closure to it." "Let's move on."

He's sat in/listened in on meetings I've had, and he's been uncharacteristically quiet.

I'm confident that it out of respect for you and your relationship with the governor - and because he basically agrees with Sanford on most - if not all issues.

Frankly, I'm not sure where he is personally on this issue.

Basically, the same can be said of our Chairman's role too - that of Phil Byrd. Except that as a member of the CEO search committee, he's probably come to some conclusions/opinions - but I'd imagine they're the same as the other members of that committee. (The scuttlebutt around the Capitol is that they are at unanimity.)

Phil has always wanted stability, a renewed sense of urgency and a restoration of Charleston's world-class port status.

I hope you understand, and respect our efforts.

If they are "guilty" of anything, it is by their association with me.

As far as the port is concerned, the consensus from members and our retreat is this: it is a God-given asset of the State. Basically, a state-sanctioned monopoly. You don't cede a monopoly to a private entity, the state should control. I like checks and balances - no governor owns the port. He appoints a board, they should be independent after that. We are all stakeholders, and as such, they should be accountable to any and all of us - not to one person.

As for me, I plead the 5th!

Thanks - and with ALL respect,

I remain your humble and loyal servant-leader,

Rick

J. Richards Todd

President

South Carolina Trucking Association, Inc.

PO Box 50166

2425 Devine St.

Columbia, SC 29250

803-799-4306

www.sctrucking.org

Trucking is Everybody's Business!

Mark Sanford

From: Joe Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2009 8:17 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RR veto

We need to talk, not sure where your info came from but in my opinion it was one sided and based on incorrect speculation. Most of the same talk is what I heard from Ben Hagood and he had made many incorrect assumptions and he is working for specific clients not for the general public..

You and I need to keep reminding ourself that this situation is being driven by folks who want to sell two pieces of realestate that are under water in todays market. Since they have not been willing to discuss pricing it is my opinion that they are attempting to make their site(s) the only option and therefore control the pricing.

We need to discuss what you want going forward as I have concerns which may or may not be warranted about credibility and consistancy.

Sent using BlackBerry

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/19/09 06:21:00

Mark Sanford

From: O.L. Thompson [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2009 1:10 PM

To: Mark Sanford

Mark,

I called Paul Campbell after our conversation. Pushed him hard, but don't know if it did any good.

Paul was instrumental in getting Layton Lord past Knotts and Leatherman. He is going to make a good senator.

Let me know if I can be of any help,
O.L.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/21/09 06:22:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, September 06, 2008 8:58 AM
To: Tom Davis
Subject: RE: Jasper Port things

same on conversation...

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Davis [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 12:02 PM
To: bill bethea
Cc: Jim Lientz (assistant); jim lientz; J Balloun; Jiim Balloun
Subject: Jasper Port things

Bill,

This email follows up on our telephone conversation of yesterday afternoon about the JPO and its role, if any, relative to the GPA's application to the Corps for a permit to dredge to its Garden City terminals. I am copying Jim Lientz and Jim Balloun with this email. This email sets forth my personal views; I am not speaking in any official capacity, other than as someone who has been intensely involved in this matter for over two years.

There are two documents that are directly relevant to this discussion: the Term Sheet executed by Gov. Sanford and Gov. Perdue on March 12, 2007, and the Intergovernmental Agreement executed by the GPA, the GDOT and the SCSPA on January 27, 2008. Copies of these documents are attached. Also helpful to the discussion is the proviso of the 2007 Water Resources Development Act wherein Congress instructs the Corps (via the Secretary of the Army) to remove the existing spoil easement from the site of the Jasper Ocean Terminal.

My first point is that I think it would be *improper* for the JPO to oppose the GPA's application to dredge to its Garden City terminal. Paragraph 2 of the Intergovernmental Agreement sets forth the scope of activities to be undertaken by the JPO and all those activities relate to development of the Jasper Ocean Terminal. In my judgment, the JPO's duty to undertake those activities in good faith does *not* extend to opposing the GPA's application.

My opinion in that regard is based on my interpretation of the things to be undertaken by the JPO, as such are stated in the Intergovernmental Agreement, and also on what I believe to be the intent of the two governors, both as formally expressed by them in the Term Sheet and as informally stated at press events.

The governors agree in the Term Sheet on the necessity of port capacity at the Jasper Ocean Terminal *and* the GPA's terminals at Garden City. Although the Term Sheet is not a contract, but rather a conceptual framework prefatory to binding agreements, it has relevance (in my opinion) in regard to the actions that should be undertaken by the JPO, since a large part of what the two governors are trying to accomplish is based on good

faith and their personal friendship.

My second point is that it would also be *improper at this point in time* for the JPO to support the GPA's application to dredge to its Garden City terminal, for two reasons. First, the scope of activities as set forth in paragraph 2 of the Intergovernmental Agreement does not state that the JPO should support that application. At the Palmetto Bluff workshop a few weeks ago, it was suggested by GPA officials that the JPO ought to support that application since it was the most expedient means of getting a 48-foot channel to the Jasper Ocean Terminal.

That may be true; I really don't know. But I still don't think the JPO should support the GPA's application to dredge to its Garden City terminal, at least *not at this point in time*. I gave you the first reason above, the second is that the two governors, in the Term Sheet, expressly stated (in paragraph 4) that their best efforts to obtain a permit from the Corps to dredge to the Garden City terminals *would be expressly predicated upon* "the release, modification or removal of the Easements [the Corps' spoil easement] from the Terminal Site [the site of the Jasper Ocean Terminal]..." and also by the "approval and ratification of the Bi-State Compact by the state legislators and the Congress."

There are two conditions precedent, but I am going to focus in this email only on the former since that is the one the JPO (and the GPA, the SCSPA, the GDOT and the Corps) have control over; the other condition depends on what the legislatures do.

To be blunt, there has always been a deep suspicion on the South Carolina side about whether Georgia was sincere about having a new port built at the Jasper site, about whether Georgia would always work against such a new port in order to protect its terminals in Savannah and Garden City. That concern was candidly discussed by the two governors and it is why tangible evidence of good faith – the actual release of the spoil easement that now prevents development of the Jasper site – was inserted into the Term Sheet as a condition precedent to any assistance by Governor Sanford relative to the GPA's application for a permit to dredge to the Garden City terminals.

The release of that spoil easement from the Jasper site is critical to everything the two governors want to accomplish, and they have risked a tremendous amount of political capital on the idea that the two states can in fact work together to make it happen. Many thought, and still think, that the two states cannot work together, that the idea of a collaborative development of the Jasper Ocean Terminal is pie in the sky. And to be honest, I am discouraged myself at this point. As the attached proviso from WRDA states, the Corps has been directed by Congress to "remove from the proposed Jasper County port site the easements used by the Corps of Engineers for placement of dredged fill materials for the Savannah Harbor Federal navigation project."

But despite this directive, Dan Parrott, the director of civil programs and project management at the Corps' Savannah District, recently said this about relocating the spoil easement in a story published in the Savannah Morning News (copy attached): "There is no lack of possible ideas on that front – the corps has even kicked around the idea of forming the mud into bricks, Parrott said. But an official solution won't come around until after Congress funds a disposal alternatives study it so far has only authorized."

In my judgment, this is not good faith. The GPA and the SCSPA expressly committed

themselves in the Intergovernmental Agreement to funding everything associated with the Corps' relocation of the spoil easement, including the disposal alternatives study, yet here we are, eight months after the Intergovernmental Agreement was signed, and the Corps says it has no money to do a study and will not do one until Congress appropriates it. That is ridiculous and I think the JPO should immediately say this in a joint statement with the GPA, the SCSA and the GDOT:

“The owner of the Jasper Port site has asked for the easement to be released. The two governors have asked for it to be released. The two ports authorities have asked for it to be released. The GDOT, a beneficiary of the easement, has asked for it to be released. The United States Congress has told the Corps to get it released. And yet the local Corps officials search for reasons why they can't get it done, saying they have no money, while completely ignoring what they know perfectly well: the two states have obligated themselves to fund whatever studies and site acquisitions the Corps needs. Why is the Corps stonewalling?”

Unless that statement is made immediately and then followed by real action on the part of the Corps to release the easement, then I think strong arguments will be made (and they are in fact ***already*** being made by some on this side of the river) that Georgia really never wanted the port in Jasper developed, and things might very well become ugly during the public hearings on the EIS for the Garden City application. That would be a disaster for the two states and for the two governors.

The GPA has a tremendous amount of influence with the Corps in regard to releasing that easement. And to be blunt, I do not think the GPA has used that influence (despite having obligated itself to do so in the Intergovernmental Agreement). Get the Corps spoil easement released from the Jasper site and, I think, everything falls into place. Gov. Sanford would then been able to publicly provide the assistance that Jim Lientz recently asked for in regard to the Garden City permit.

But again, the release of that easement was listed as an express condition precedent to that assistance for a very real reason, that is, to make sure that Georgia was sincere about getting a port built at the Jasper site. Now is the time for Georgia, and the GPA in particular, to show that it is sincere.

And although I have not discussed the Bi-State Compact, that is also going to be a chance for Georgia to show its good faith in regard to the Jasper Ocean Terminal. I will hopefully be in the South Carolina State Seante next year and a part of negotiating that compact. But the inclusion of the Bi-State Compact's adoption as a condition precedent to South Carolina's support for the GPA's application to dredge to its Garden City terminals underscores what I believe to be the bedrock understanding of the two governors: that they intend for the two states to press forward in good faith with the Jasper Ocean Terminal as a quid pro quo for Gov. Sanford's support for the harbor deepening to the Garden City terminals.

And to repeat, the most tangible evidence of that good faith is the release of the Corps' spoil easement from the Jasper site. My strong advice is for everyone to focus on making that happen as soon as possible, and to date, nothing has been done. Certainly the GPA has

expended no capital in that regard, and folks over here are starting to wonder why.

I am sorry this email has gone on so long, but as I was typing it one thing lead to another and I wanted you to know everything that I was thinking. I am absolutely convinced that the three of you are committed to the two states building the Jasper Ocean Terminal together, but if that easement is not released, soon, then I honestly see a real chance of this thing turning ugly and for the two governors' vision being defeated.

Tom

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2009 10:44 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: FW: Forwarded email from Speaker Harrell

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2009 9:11 AM
To: Governor
Subject: Fw: Forwarded email from Speaker Harrell

We just received this from the speaker fyi.... Please don't forward.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: SC House Republican Caucus

Date: Mon, 26 Jan 2009 09:04:37 -0500

To: <[REDACTED]>; <[REDACTED]>; <[REDACTED]>;

[illegible]

Subject: Forwarded email from Speaker Harrell

Caucus Members, Speaker Harrell asked me to forward the following email to you all. Please see

below:
-Charles

The following article was in the Greenville News on Saturday, January 24th.

<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/article/20090124/NEWS01/90124010>

The following is a letter I sent to the reporter who wrote the article.

Bobby

From: Bobby Harrell
Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2009 11:45 AM
To: 'ddykes@greenvillenews.com'
Cc: 'GREG FOSTER'; 'bpadgett@greenvillenews.com'
Subject: Article today in the Greenville News

David,

As always, everything about the budget I am stating in this email can be verified by calling the source of this information, the State Budget Office. The director's name is Les Boles. I don't mind you quoting me in articles, but I would rather you not say that this statistical information represents "claims" that I have made, because I am simply passing it on to you from the original source. Instead, you should ask the state budget office so you can say, as you did at the beginning of this article, that these are statistics or information the Greenville News has obtained. That is why I am always careful to give you the source of the information, instead of making the statement without the documentation of the source.

You left out one very important fact in your story today, that I gave to the Greenville News from information I obtained from the State Budget Office. Just last year, the Governor submitted to the General Assembly the biggest budget ever submitted to a General Assembly by a Governor in our state's history. His budget was over \$7.5 Billion. The General Assembly passed a budget that was \$61,000,000 LESS than the Governor submitted. I don't agree with his numbers, but if you use his methodology as described in your article, and the General Assembly had simply adopted his budget, state government would have grown by more than his claims, in fact by \$61 Million more at his request.

He will almost certainly have an excuse for having submitted such a large executive budget, but that misses the point. Regardless of any reason imaginable that he may give, why did he feel the need to submit such a large executive budget request to the General Assembly if he really believes growth has occurred as he claims?

He exaggerates the numbers and then refuses to accept any responsibility, even though his executive budget is higher than what the General Assembly passed. The reason I have challenged him to submit a budget that reflects a 40% cut from the growth he claims, is because his history is to submit a large executive budget, and then be shocked that the General Assembly passed a budget that he claims grew government. If he really believes government has grown like that, why won't he submit a budget that cuts out the 40%? The reason is these claims are really just rhetoric. He should put up a budget that backs up his overgrowth claims or admit that he cannot.

7/14/2009

There really is no need to argue over whether his numbers are right. He should simply back up his rhetoric with an executive budget that eliminates the growth he claims.

His real disagreement is not in the amount of money spent, as evidenced by the size of his executive budgets, but rather in the way the money is spent. For instance, his executive budget called for \$50 million to be set aside so that public money would be used to buy private land in the state for conservation purposes. The General Assembly refused to do that, instead spending money on the priorities of public education, which is not a major concern of Governor Sanford, and on health care instead.

This combination of attacking, blaming others, and refusing to accept any responsibility for problems, is evidenced by the way he is refusing to accept any responsibility for South Carolina's highest unemployment rate in decades, and instead is attacking the Employment Security Commission and others over the unemployment rate; Carroll Campbell would have been focused on the unemployment rate like a laser beam, and solved the problem instead of blaming other people for it.

If you have this conversation with the Governor's office and they say or claim something I should know, please contact me.

Bobby

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - <http://www.avg.com>

Version: 8.0.176 / Virus Database: 270.10.13/1912 - Release Date: 1/24/2009 8:40 PM

Mark Sanford

From: Nathan Ballentine [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 5:10 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sent to Speaker and caucus communications

If I can help finish up the session/term on higher note next year, just let me know.

See below.

-----Original Message-----

To: SC House Republican Caucus
To: [REDACTED]
To: Bobby Harrell
Subject: Re: Statehouse Report #20
Sent: Jun 9, 2009 4:58 PM

When will it stop?

I know our state is getting sick of the constant back/forth between Gov and us....(and I know both bear blame) but we really need to put a stop to it all.

For what it's worth, I agree with the overrides (payday and Buy SC) in the release below but do we need to continue separating us and Gov?

Just a simple, here's my thoughts on vetoes (without referencing governor, etc) is enough to help members share "their" opinions with constituents.

Granted this release isn't "that bad" as some we've had this year; but still it gives appearance of legislative v executive.

I also read some "jobs" release that is obviously not gonna help the tension either.

If I can help mediate between the two bodies (legislative/executive) please let me know.

We need to work together - somehow - and check egos at the door and finish this session with some real accomplishments for our citizens.

Y'all know how to reach me if you want to.

-----Original Message-----

From: SC House Republican Caucus
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Statehouse Report #20
Sent: Jun 9, 2009 4:33 PM

REPUBLICAN STATEHOUSE REPORT No. 20
June 4, 2009

Reasonable "Payday" Lending Rules Vetoed The governor received 65 final pieces of legislation last week, signing 42, allowing 13 to become law without his signature, and vetoing 10. Two of those vetoes were troubling to me and many of my colleagues. The governor vetoed the hotly debated "payday lending" bill that many in the General Assembly believed was one of the most important issues we considered this year. The payday lending reforms approved by legislators limit payday loans to one at a time, and established a database to keep track of the loans. The bill implemented several other protections for consumers, including giving the borrower the right to void the loan within 24 hours. These reforms were needed to end the practice of "flipping loans," by which consumers take out additional loans to pay off a loan they couldn't pay on time. This frequently leads to a vicious cycle where people can't break free of the high interest rates charged by these loans - trapping the borrowers.

We have been debating this bill for two years. The big issue was: What constitutes fair regulation of an industry that many believe unfairly takes advantage of people who can least afford it? And where is the line between responsible government regulation and an unfair intrusion into the free market?

Legislators on both sides, activists, and the payday lending industry reached a breakthrough last month, in an example of how difficult issues can be settled when all sides come together to work on a solution.

While the governor vetoed the bill, the biggest thing to consider is that these reasonable reforms were agreed to by the payday lending industry.

Payday lending is a \$155 million-a-year industry in South Carolina, and started in our state in 1998. One of the biggest names in the industry, Advance America, is based in Spartanburg. Supporters of the industry say payday lending helps provide liquidity to many people who will not qualify for conventional bank loans. But that liquidity comes at a steep price, which the industry claims is justified because of the high risk of the loans. As a conservative, I can see both sides of this issue, but government can, and does, provide consumer protections when companies are abusing the public. Government regulation can, and frequently does, go too far. That's why the industry was involved in these discussions. I believe the veto will be overridden, since the payday lending bill passed the House by a vote of 102-6 and the Senate 41-4. The other veto I found troubling was the veto of the "Buy S.C." legislation. This bill requires that the state give preference in purchasing to companies based in South Carolina. I am sympathetic to the governor's argument that it could make some government services more expensive. However, I believe there is no harm in simply giving our local companies preference when we're spending our tax dollars - especially in a soft economy. In fact, it could give large contracts to in-state companies that could spur more employment. This is, at its essence, a jobs bill.

Other bills vetoed by the governor include the reforms to the state ports authority - an issue I wrote about several weeks ago.

The legislature will return on June 16th to consider overriding or sustaining the 10 vetoes issued by the governor.

As always, thank you for the privilege of serving you in Columbia. If I can ever be of assistance to you, or if you have ideas on issues you want me to share with the rest of the General Assembly, please don't hesitate to contact me at XXXXXXXXXXXX.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry. This is my preferred email for political correspondence.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.62/2168 - Release Date: 06/10/09 18:30:00

Mark Sanford

From: Tom Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2009 12:59 PM
To: Scott English; Joel Sawyer; Swati Patel; Jeff Schilz; marisa crawford; Grant Gillespie; Ben Fox
Subject: final draft of oped for your review

Guys,

I have worked on the piece a bit more. Here is the final draft I intend to submit unless you have any further edits. Does it do what you want it to do? I need to send this in. Thanks.

Tom

FACT, FICTION AND A PLAN FOR “STIMULUS” FUNDS

By Tom Davis

For weeks, South Carolinians have been barraged by news stories about the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, also known as the federal stimulus. Many constituents have contacted me alarmed by what the consequences might be from either spending or not spending the stimulus money that is targeted for South Carolina.

I have spent the last weeks gathering and studying information about the stimulus to help my constituents sort out the confusion, and offer some insight about the most fiscally responsible way to manage the funds.

Gov. Sanford has timely certified the \$8 billion in federal stimulus allocated for our state. All but \$700 million of that money will flow directly from the federal government either to our legislature for appropriation or to state agencies for spending, without the necessity of further action by the governor.

The governor's certification of that \$8 billion, however, does not mean the remaining \$700 million – the portion of the stimulus referred to as “budget stabilization funds” – will be released yet. His certification only preserved South Carolina's eligibility for that money; the governor still needs to apply for it.

The current public debate is in regard to if, when and how he makes that application. Gov. Sanford says he will apply for the \$700 million in budget stabilization funds is money only if the legislature passes a budget that pays down a corresponding amount of our state's debt, which is on a per capita basis is the fourth- highest in the nation.

Senior legislative leaders, however, are refusing to pay down the debt, and want to use this one-time money to pay for critical recurring programs such as education and law enforcement. They claim that if we don't spend that money to pay teachers, we will have to fire them because there is nowhere else to cut state spending.

That is simply not true. This year's state budget, even without the budget stabilization funds, will deal with about \$21 billion – a billion dollars *more* than last year's. Families are being forced to do more with less in these tough economic times, and so should our state government, especially when (unlike most families) it has one billion more to spend this year than it did last.

But instead of making tough decisions, our legislative leaders are playing political games with the budget. A few days ago, the Senate Finance Chairman told us what our state budget would look like if \$350 million of the budget stabilization funds (the half available for this fiscal year) was not used to fund recurring state items. Thousands of teachers laid off, prisons closed and poor people cut off from Medicaid – the parade of horrors outlined by him went on and on.

But that budget excluded not only the \$350 million in one-time federal money the governor has he will not allow to fund recurring needs, but also \$578 million in federal stimulus money that the governor has always said he would accept, and which was properly included in the House's budget.

Presenting a sham budget designed to scare people and grab headlines is not a constructive legislative response to the governor's stated position. Neither is threatening legal action, passing resolutions of condemnation or orchestrating rallies for government workers at the statehouse.

I may be a freshman senator, but I know this governor better than most, and I think the first step to resolving the impasse over the \$700 million is for the legislature to work with the governor to find ways to fund critical programs, cut lesser ones, address outstanding liabilities and reduce debt – in short, to pass a responsible budget.

If the legislature does that, then it could go to Gov. Sanford and say: "We passed a budget that pays for recurring items with recurring revenues. We did not rely upon one-time budget stabilization funds. We made the cuts you suggested. We did what we could to pay down debt. We worked with you in good faith."

And at that point, it would up to Gov. Sanford to decide whether to reconsider his dollar-for-dollar debt reduction condition to applying for the \$700 million in budget stabilization funds, something he might be open to since the federal stimulus act permits him to use that money for non-recurring expenses such as capital projects in the areas of education and law enforcement.

Neither I nor any other legislator knows what Gov. Sanford will ultimately decide to do. But as legislators, we can't lapse into playing a guessing game on what he might or might not do. We need to do our job, and then let the chips fall.

The author represents Beaufort County in the S.C. Senate.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.48/2049 - Release Date: 04/09/09 06:09:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2008 8:35 PM
To: Chad Walldorf
Subject: RE: The era of cheap government borrowing is likely over

like it...

-----Original Message-----

From: Chad Walldorf [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2008 4:37 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Cc: Scott English
Subject: The era of cheap government borrowing is likely over

There was an article in today's Myrtle paper about your efforts to freeze issuance of capital improvement bonds – and the resistance from the BCB and Coastal Carolina. I think you can use the event's of the last two weeks which has led to turmoil in the muni bond market to amplify this issue....maybe even call on the Treasurer's office to at least halt temporarily halt issuance until it can be revisited at the next BCB meeting given the crisis conditions with general fund revenue and increasing costs of borrowing.

You know, in that whole "putting first things first" vein about the first thing to do when trying to get out of a hole is to stop digging. It's just a quick thought - I don't know what other states or doing or if the Treasurer's office has anything pending in the next couple of weeks.

The article below contains some really good bad stuff. It must be so much more fun to be you when the financial world really is collapsing,

CW

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/01/business/01muni.html?_r=1&ref=business&oref=slogin

The New York Times

October 1, 2008

Under Strain, Cities Are Cutting Back Projects

By MARY WILLIAMS WALSH

Cities, states and other local governments have been effectively shut out of the bond markets for the last two weeks, raising the cost of day-to-day operations, threatening longer-term projects and dampening a broad source of jobs and stability at a time when other parts of the economy are weakening.

The sudden loss of credit, one of the ripple effects of the current financial turmoil, is affecting local governments in all parts of the country, rich and poor alike. In New York, a real estate boom has suddenly gone bust. Washington has shelved a planned bond offering to pay for terminal expansion and parking garages already under construction at Dulles and Reagan National Airports. Billings, Mont., is struggling to come up with \$70 million more for a new emergency room. And Maine has been unable to raise \$50 million for highway repairs.

“We really are in terra incognita here,” said Robert O. Lenna, executive director of the Maine Municipal Bond Bank, which helps that state’s towns and school districts raise money. He said he had worked in public finance for 34 years and had never seen credit evaporate so completely.

Maine had already begun some of its road work when the bond markets stopped functioning, so now it is scrambling for bank loans to keep the dump trucks rolling. If money does not start flowing soon, Mr. Lenna said, Maine will have to cancel some of its road and bridge projects.

The only alternative would be what New York City did on Monday: Go into the locked-up markets and whip up demand by offering to pay investors a very high return.

Analysts said the dysfunction in the municipal bond markets appeared to signal the end of an era of relatively cheap money for governments and, probably, the start of an era of tough choices for communities. When the market starts moving again, they said, it will look a lot like the municipal bond market of 10 years ago, before the arrival of financial wizardry in the form of structured-finance products, which lowered borrowing costs but added big new risks. Instead, governments will probably be issuing plain-vanilla bonds with fixed rates of interest, higher than they are accustomed to.

And higher rates suggest some degree of belt-tightening, especially difficult in places where tax revenues are being squeezed because of falling real estate values and the slowing economy.

Municipalities will probably be able to function, but may not expand services, said John V. Miller, chief investment officer at Nuveen Asset Management, a municipal bond investment firm. “For some, the level of service they provide will decline.”

Some governments, already straining to balance their budgets, will have to cut payrolls, he said, and others may decide to raise taxes.

Last year, governments across the country issued about \$23 billion of fixed-rate municipal bonds in September. This September they issued \$15 billion — all

but about \$2.2 billion of it in the first two weeks of the month, according to Municipal Market Advisors, a research and strategy firm.

Tight money is already becoming apparent in some states. In Montana, officials had planned to sell \$130 million of bonds to the public last December to pay for a new emergency room, cancer center and improvements at the Billings Clinic, a 272-bed hospital in the state's largest city. But they were dissuaded by higher interest rates even then.

"I've been second-guessing it since then," said Michelle Barstad, executive director of the Montana Facility Finance Authority. "Things just keep getting worse and worse."

The authority borrowed \$60 million of the total cost from private lenders in May, but is now unsure where to get the remaining \$70 million. Ms. Barstad said one option under consideration was to borrow about \$20 million from local banks and scale back the project, at least for now.

"We're just sitting on our hands like everybody else, trying to figure out what to do and how we do it," said Ms. Barstad, adding that she would welcome a return of the days of simple, fixed-rate bonds.

The credit crisis caused Athens-Clarke County, Ga., to delay a \$221 million bond issue planned for the day Lehman Brothers declared bankruptcy. The county has been planning for 10 years to upgrade three sewage treatment plants built more than 40 years ago when the population was much smaller. The county's finance director, John Culpepper, said he had delayed the issue rather than raise the monthly sewer bills to the system's 39,000 customers. "We're going to wait it out for the next month or two, until the market returns to more normal conditions," he said.

The Washington Metropolitan Airports Authority has already begun construction of a bigger international arrivals building at Dulles, a new parking deck at Reagan National and other major projects, and said it intended to forge ahead using cash and commercial paper.

New York City decided to brave the markets on Monday and ended up having the whole place to itself. It managed to issue \$300 million of bonds for public schools, the only issue of the day. The New York Transitional Finance Authority will pay 5.75 percent on those 30-year bonds, the equivalent of a 10.5 percent interest rate to New York City residents, who will not have to pay city, state and federal tax on the income.

Yet even with that rate, the issue was not completely sold, said Mr. Miller of Nuveen.

"This is for a very well-liked name, a very well-known name," said Mr. Miller,

explaining that New York City's bonds usually sell out quickly.

Mr. Lenna said Maine's advisers had warned that it might end up paying interest as high as 10 percent if it brought its highway bonds to market now.

"We're not going to go out and incur these costs," he said.

The municipal bond markets had already hiccupped before the latest turmoil. But analysts say the gridlock began in mid-September, when Lehman Brothers declared bankruptcy.

Lehman Brothers was one of several Wall Street firms that had created structured-finance products for municipalities for the past few years. These products could be hybrids, allowing a local government to issue what seemed like a fixed-rate bond that could in turn be bought by an investor who received a variable rate of interest.

Governments generally prefer fixed-rate bonds because the cost is predictable — but variable-rate bonds were attractive because of their generally lower rates. Securities firms tried to merge the best of both worlds by linking derivatives contracts to municipal bonds. One structured product was a variable-rate demand note, which gave the investor the option of putting the note back to the securities firm if the investor decided the rate was too low.

The notes were often bought by mutual funds for their tax-exempt bond funds. The booming demand for those funds, in turn, held down the price of borrowing for states and cities, at least for a while. But when Lehman collapsed, the mutual funds suddenly perceived a risk: the securities firms that had created the products might go out of business. So, owners of the notes put them back to the securities firms that had sold them.

The prices investors were willing to pay for the notes plunged, driving up short-term rates for municipal bonds. Securities firms, under pressure, unwound the notes and reconstituted them as old-fashioned fixed-rate bonds.

None of this had anything to do with the behavior of local governments or their ability to repay their debts, but it brought the municipal bond market to a halt. Thomas G. Doe, president of Municipal Market Advisors, said his firm was fielding calls this week from government contractors asking how much credit might be available next year. For insight, he pointed to municipal bond data from the 1930s.

"During the first few years after the '29 crash, municipal issuance dropped 24 percent," he said. "It wouldn't be unreasonable to think that we could see municipal issuance go from a total of \$430 billion last year, to something like \$350 billion next year, which would be a drop of 25 or 30 percent."

This would not mean widespread bond defaults, he said, just greatly narrowed

local budgets.

“It’s no different from a family budget,” he said. “We’re not going to go out to dinner any more. We’re not going to buy a new car. That’s the similarity.”

Nick Bunkley contributed reporting.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2009 6:00 PM
To: 'Denny Thomas'
Subject: RE: SPA Legislation

Denny,

Thank you for doing this. Much appreciated. Mark

From: Denny Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2009 4:33 PM
To: JIM MERRILL
Cc: Grooms, Sen. Larry
Subject: SPA Legislation

Dear Representative Merrill,

I read today in the Daniel Island News that you oppose Governor Sanford's veto of the SPA bill and plan to vote to override. That is very disappointing to me, mainly on the issue of further restricting the governor's office to manage our state. More and more, it is obvious to me and many I talk with that this state, in which I have lived and worked in for over 50 years, is way behind the times in efficient government structure. I am most disappointed that the legislature cannot seem to realize that much of the excess cost of government is due to this poor structure. We desperately need a structure that recognizes that there are three branches of government with distinct rights and powers. Now we have basically one branch that makes all the decisions and my feeling is that it is leading us continually down the path of economic doom with attendant higher taxes.

Even more disappointing is that Republicans, who control this branch for now cannot change our structure.

I urge you to support the restructuring of the state's executive branch and bring to the state a more efficient and cost effective government.

Thank You,

Brantley D. Thomas, Jr.
414 Brown Pelican Drive
Wando, S. C. 29492
[REDACTED]

You can't help getting older, but you don't have to get old.

George Burns

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 10:32 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: McConnell Op-Ed Update

have them get it to me tonight...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 10:09 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: McConnell Op-Ed Update

I have confirmed that he DID do an op-ed, but I have not seen it. I will get a copy asap.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 10:21 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: McConnell Op-Ed Update

thank you and why am i now looking in speech book with nothing in it on tue pm? where is it?

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 10:09 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: McConnell Op-Ed Update

I have confirmed that he DID do an op-ed, but I have not seen it. I will get a copy asap.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 11:54 PM
To: Joel Sawyer
Subject: RE: McConnell Op-Ed Update

have him grab me in the morning...we talked humor and I see nothing as there is nothing on the speech over all....

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 11:00 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: McConnell Op-Ed Update

I'm not sure which issue this was in reference to but -

1. Barton is certain everything you discussed on the VA speech is in the book. please call if there's more you're looking for.
2. I will have a copy of the McConnell editorial in the morning. I wasn't able to run it down tonight.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: McConnell Op-Ed Update
Date: Sat, 25 Oct 2008 22:31:33 -0400

have them get it to me tonight...

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel Sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2008 10:09 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: McConnell Op-Ed Update

I have confirmed that he DID do an op-ed, but I have not seen it. I will get a copy asap.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2008 8:50 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: RE: Talking points for Harrell/McConnell Call

please print all this for me to look at in the am...

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick Franks [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2008 5:43 PM
To: [REDACTED]@gov.sc.gov; [REDACTED]
Subject: Talking points for Harrell/McConnell Call

MS â€œ call to McConnell and Harrell

- Purpose: Give a heads-up about participating in the press event on Wednesday because they complain about you not doing that. Offer to meet to discuss how to accomplish the goal, if you want, since they also complain about you not meeting directly with them on important issues.
- Press Event: About the importance of transparency and the need for more roll call voting. You plan to support Nikki Haley's and McConnell's idea to have more roll call voting.
- Invite them to attend: We are working on details of where and when the events will take place. (Harrell is very much against more roll call voting.)
- Some possible push-back:
 - The General Assembly already allows anyone to request a roll call vote. However, this practice is clearly uncommon because only 5% of bills passed received a recorded vote.
 - Taking more roll call votes will cost the General Assembly more money. It's money well-spent if it means legislators will be held accountable for their decisions, especially decisions to spend taxpayer dollars.
- *Staff doesn't feel need to go into detail about who is traveling with you b/c they may do some arm-twisting.*
- *Please see attached points and chart if you need to give arguments about why this is important*

#####

**VOTING HISTORY ON MAJOR BILLS
2003-2008**

A. Findings:

- 1) We looked at 33 **major bills** that were adopted by the General Assembly during our Administration (2003 – 2008). **Major bills are bills that expend significant amounts of state funds, have a significant impact on the state's debt obligations, affect economic soil conditions (e.g. Tort Reform, Workers' Comp Reform, Small Business Tax Relief), affect quality of life (e.g. DUI Reform, Domestic Violence Prevention). *This is not an all-inclusive list, but includes a large majority of significant bills since 2003.*
- 2) The House and Senate took roll call votes less than half of the time on these 33 major pieces of legislation we identified.
- 3) The Senate rarely records a final vote on major bills – 4 **roll call votes out of 33**. Some roll call votes were taken on amendments to a major bill, but those votes are for small parts of a large bill, like the appropriations bills or to table an amendment.
- 4) The House records final votes on major bills far more **often** than the Senate. The House takes roll call votes on conference reports and free conference reports far more often than the Senate. The House took a roll call vote on 19 **out of 33** major bills.
- 5) The House has recorded a roll call vote on the past six Appropriation Bills. However, on a bill that spends almost \$7 billion in state tax dollars, the Senate has only recorded a roll call vote on one of those six (Appropriations Bill passed in 2007).

B. Conclusions:

- 1) We need much more sunshine and accountability in the legislative process.
- 2) The House deserves credit for standing up and being counted on many of these major bills, like the appropriations bills, DUI Reform, Immigration Reform.
- 3) However, the Senate clearly is making many decisions behind closed doors – in recess – which deprives the public of open debate and an understanding of where each legislator stands on a bill or an important amendment.
- 4) Right now, it is hard for the public to check how a legislator voted on a bill. The process is muddy and informal, especially in the Senate due to many decisions being made out of public view. There needs to be more clarity and uniformity in their voting process.
- 5) Those bills that result in an economic benefit to some legislators, including lawyer-legislators, must receive a roll call vote so that constituents know whether legislators are voting for their own interests or their constituents' interests. Eg. appropriations bills/amendments, DUI Reform.

#####

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 10:47 PM
To: Patrick Franks
Subject: RE: Calls for Tonight

lets do am..

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick Franks [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2008 6:19 PM
To: [REDACTED]@gov.sc.gov; [REDACTED]
Subject: Calls for Tonight

Speaker Harrell

cell: [REDACTED]

Home: [REDACTED]

Buff Chase (RM after you left tonight)

cell [REDACTED]

home [REDACTED]

Leland Rentz

cell [REDACTED]

Mike McShane

cell [REDACTED]

Hank Scott

cell [REDACTED]

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2009 10:05 PM
To: 'O.L. Thompson'
Subject: RE: Meeting with Harrell

Will do these things but let me assure you we are not 95 percent there as during our first dinner together he told me if you got to grow government to grow the economy he would gladly do so – that led to an hours plus dinner conversation on how the conservative message was how private enterprise could never grow hand in hand with govt – one always grows at the expense of the other....wont rehash that tomorrow though....

From: O.L. Thompson [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2009 5:21 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: FW: Meeting with Harrell

Here are my talking points for tomorrow. It is not complicated. If it works great, if not I appreciate you doing what you could. It is an effort that will make me feel better.

- 1) This needs to be **beneficial to both or it will not work**
- 2) How will it play politically?
- 3) Neither needs to alter their agenda's. **Don't give up your principals.**
- 4) 95% of agendas are the same. **Concentrate on the positive, don't emphasize the differences.**
- 5) **Work together but agree to disagree when needed.**
- 6) **Direct communications and show more respect publicly for each other.**
- 7) **Meet face to face without** staff or anyone with an agenda.
- 8) **Meet on a regularly scheduled basis.** On our construction projects we have regularly scheduled meetings. If you have not produce or have not lived up to what was planned, you have to face it at the next meeting. No arguments, but it adds structure and accountability to the relationship.
- 9) The dire financial times are **good justification to work together for the common good of the State.**
- 10) How money is spent has been an issue in the past. The next two years will be financially tight and a good time to work on laws to control future spending and streamlining programs and agencies.
- 11) The press loves controversy. Don't let them play you against each other. Need tough skin, don't take everything written as gospel, give the other the benefit of doubt, don't be lead into derogatory statements about the other. Working together does not play well in the media, controversy does.
- 12) Try to keep egos out of relationship. Don't always dictate; give the other a chance to offer his position before setting your position in stone. **LISTEN: IT SHOWS RESPECT FOR ONE'S THOUGHTS AND IDEAS.**
- 13) Respect comes only after there is trust. Don't look for reasons not to work with each other, look for ways to make it work.
- 14) Don't be quick to judge, relationships with each other is like being married; everyday is not a great day but the overall relationship should be good for both of you. Don't believe what someone says the other's position or statement is, talk to the other directly.

7/14/2009

15) Be seen together but without an apparent pretense. Hard times are on us. Make the people feel that you are working together to solve the problem.

16) Next step: Do you want to include anyone else in this movement? McConnell?

On all/any of this the other could have another motive for his actions but as long as it moves the agenda forward, it needs to fall out as it will.

Thanks for being my friend and I do appreciate you doing this.
O.L.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.5/1978 - Release Date: 03/03/09 07:25:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 9:51 PM
To: 'Tom Davis'
Subject: RE: Budget veto and stimulus money

Thanks....

From: Tom Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 1:11 PM
To: Mick Mulvaney; [REDACTED]; jmschilz [REDACTED]
joel_sawyer [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Budget veto and stimulus money

Thanks, Mick.

From: Mick Mulvaney <[REDACTED]>
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED];
joel_sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 12:54:48 PM
Subject: Re: Budget veto and stimulus money

TD:

My only suggestion: "Paying down debt" doesn't sell well outside the limited group that understands economics at the government level.

However "contributing the money to the unemployment insurance fund" might. We know it is the same thing. Most folks do not. The impression will be that we tried to help the unemployed.

One-sentence message: "If the Legislature would commit to putting \$____mm into the unemployment insurance fund this year and next, the Governor will accept the stimulus funds."

And here's looking forward to the day when we don't have to operate in that one-sentence world.

And, all of that said, I am growing more convinced that taking the money at all is fraught with repercussions that most haven't begun to contemplate. California tried to cut wages on health care workers last week. The Obama Administration responded by threatening to yank CA stimulus funds. That is the brave new world we face. One can only wonder what Washington might threaten us with.

Mick M.

7/14/2009

Sen. Mick Mulvaney

From: Tom Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2009 2:14 PM
To: Mark Sanford; Scott English; Jeff Schilz; Joel Sawyer
Subject: Budget veto and stimulus money

Guys,

I think the budget veto is Mark's last chance to leverage the stimulus money toward having the legislature pass a more responsible budget. My recommendation is that he veto all of Part I and Part III and also selected provisos, and include within that veto message an ironclad commitment to apply for the \$700 million of stimulus money if:

- a) vetoes in regard to Part I and Part III are sustained;
- b) a new budget is passed that pays down debt this fiscal year by \$200 million; and
- c) a concurrent resolution is passed citing the legislature's intent to pay down an additional \$200 million in debt next fiscal year.

In addition to setting forth those conditions, Mark could point out that the Davis-Ryberg budget provided a template on how such a new budget could be passed *without* the extra \$350 million in stimulus money and that the additional \$350 million, which the Davis-Ryberg budget did not appropriate, could be appropriate by the legislature for education and law enforcement funding, thus freeing up funds to be allocated elsewhere. Mark could also point out that:

- a) he is backing off his initial request that his application for stimulus money must be matched dollar-for-dollar by debt reduction;
- b) he is allowing the legislature to appropriate the stimulus money;
- b) he is relying on the good faith of the legislature in regard to the additional debt relief for the next fiscal year; and
- c) this deal would avoid a lengthy and costly legal battle.

If the vetoes are qualified with that indicated commitment to apply for the stimulus money (if the state conditions were met), then I think we have a shot at picking up the additional three votes we need to have the vetoes sustained -- though it will still be a battle and Mark would have to meet with some senators and work them hard, and threaten to involve himself in their races in three years if they don't commit to sustain. Here are the senators that I think would be susceptible to such "influence":

David Thomas
Harvey Peeler
John Courson
Wes Hayes
Mike Fair

Larry Martin
Billy O'Dell

As I said earlier, I think this is Mark's last chance to leverage the stimulus money into getting a more responsible budget. In my judgment, there is no chance whatsoever of picking up the additional votes we need to have the vetoes sustained without including something along the lines of what I have outlined above.

Tom

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/16/09 17:05:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: nikki_haley [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 05, 2009 8:31 AM
To: Governor
Subject: Food for thought...

Mark,

I'm not sure what you're feeling today. I hope its some relief that this issue has come to an end. I don't want to assume how you are feeling but I hope that you will allow me respectfully to tell you how I see it from a "gut" perspective which is what I often do.

The media will and is portraying this as a defeat. Many of your supporters are feeling the same way. You have a real opportunity to move a mountain here.

This is a perfect example of your fight for the last several years. This is the ultimate in examples of why we need to change as a state so that this never happens. Restructuring is not about random changes, its not about one person, its about moving SC into the 21st century.

People often refer to SC as a good ole boy system. This was proof that it is. And those good ole boys sit in the statehouse, make decisions in back rooms, and won't show their votes on the record.

This was a plot to keep their power and to show it to you and future governors. The people have a real opportunity with this example to make change and no longer allow us to be "that state" everyone refers to when they talk about SC.

I think that you should put out an agenda of blatant no brainers to work on in the next few months that they can't say no to.

They all need to be related to the accountability of the good ole boys that want and hold the power:

Examples are all votes on the record, income disclosure, online check registers and possibly term limits. They don't relate to spending but they do go to the heart of the honest intentions of the legislators. Now what will they say: its not about you. Its turning the tables and making it about them.

That takes the argument to:

"Fine. You have made your point. You want the power and won't give it away. But if this is how you are going to force govt you owe these things to the people to be accountable." Challenge the legislators on this.

All of this is just a thought when you may not want to even think about it. I just believe you have an amazing opportunity to define your legacy by bringing truths out that can't be denied. If you do that you will get your due when you walk out of those doors.

Enjoy your weekend.

N-
Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.62/2168 - Release Date: 06/10/09 18:30:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2008 10:57 PM
To: Jon Ozmint
Subject: RE: Budget mess op-ed.draft

thank you for taking the time to do this.

I love it word for word - and that is not like me as I am the king of edits..

This whole thing has soured me that much more on politics in that while the position of the administration may be proven right it wont matter as a lot of people will still be hurt in the process and the likely outcome is the safe and do it again senerio you suggest for the people who got us in this.

For example Harrel has been driving Copper's train and will be held completely harmless.

Thanks for being a friend and ally in this whole thing.. M

-----Original Message-----

From: Jon Ozmint [mailto:Ozmint.Jon@doc.state.sc.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2008 10:38 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Budget mess op-ed.draft

Boss,

I think this general idea could get legs. Lawmakers need someone to blame for cuts and they cannot blame you. They may be eager to point the finger.

I spoke with Joel and Ben about this idea. Neither is sold on it but they are going to bring it up and Joel asked me to put something on paper. I did not have Joel's home email, so I am sending directly to you.

This is my first and only draft. If you can get someone to submit it, this is intended to be a starting point: it is still a little harsh.

Anyway, you have won a significant battle on the cuts issue. Congratulations! There may be a window of opportunity to accomplish more. At the very least, this would plant some seeds of doubt for the future.

Spoke to Steven Davis today. He asked about you. He is recovering from herniated disk repair. You may want to give him a call.

Anyway, I told him that as always, you are my hero.

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 03, 2009 12:23 AM
To: 'Chad Walldorf'
Subject: RE: If 16 Senators

Lets discuss...you are the man on thinking...

-----Original Message-----

From: Chad Walldorf [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2009 11:03 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: If 16 Senators

Will agree to uphold \$350 million a year (or \$250 million if you will compromise) in budget vetoes until debt is paid down then you should be able to sign off on taking the funds. Just trying to lessen the threshold for pulling a deal together.

FYI, we are getting killed message-wise and even folks who really support you are worried you have lost your mind.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.35/2034 - Release Date: 04/02/09 06:09:00

Mark Sanford

From: Mark Sanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 10:18 PM
To: 'Chad Walldorf'
Subject: RE: South Carolina Research Authority

You are kind - long week... M

-----Original Message-----

From: Chad Walldorf [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 10:05 PM
To: Mark Sanford; Grant Gillespie
Subject: FW: South Carolina Research Authority

Great email from Hayne Hipp below on the SCRA/Bill Masters veto. Hayne sent it to most of the Greenville delegation as well as all of the legislators in the Liberty Fellowship - which includes Sheheen (who told Hayne he will likely vote to sustain) and Lourie in the Senate.

Mark, I won't bug you with other responses if we get them but it was such a nice change to read that Mike Fair is on our side that I wanted to pass this one along. I think our core 12 Senators combined with your outreach efforts to those mushy - middle R's could pay some real dividends this week. This could also pay dividends later as the press is really buying into the notion that there is some bad stuff going on at SCRA that Bobby and company is trying to cover up.

Thought that the veto message was stellar as always...

Chad

-----Original Message-----

From: Hayne Hipp [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 7:03 PM
To: MIKE FAIR
Subject: RE: South Carolina Research Authority

Good luck. I am with you on this one.

Hayne Hipp
135 South Main St., Ste. 1000
Greenville SC 29601
864.241.5432 PHONE
864.241.5429 FAX
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: MIKE FAIR [mailto:FAIRM@scsenate.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 6:10 PM
To: Hayne Hipp
Subject: Re: South Carolina Research Authority

Hi Hayne,

It was the Speaker's move and could have been all of the above as motivation. We will have two chances if needed to sustain the veto of the proviso. It goes to the House first and if they fail then we get a chance to sustain.

The Greenville guys in the House think they will sustain. I am certain that we will. The House will take up vetoes tomorrow.

Mike

>>> "Hayne Hipp" <[REDACTED]> 5/19/2009 6:09 PM >>>
Mike,

What's happening? Why the one-liner taking away from the Governor the appointee power for the Chair of South Carolina Research Authority (SCRA)? The Governor's appointee, Bill Masters, is well qualified. I was part of Bill's financing group when he started his company back in the 70's. He is a straight arrow, self-made, true entrepreneur who built his business from scratch, is very competitive and understands as well as anyone the sophisticated playing field on which SCRA plays. He is a perfect complement to Bill Mahoney. These two together will give South Carolina one of the strongest teams, if not the strongest team in the country.

First, let's put aside specific personalities and focus on the generic. The public has to be saying is there a possibility that SCRA is trying to cover up something, have there been some shenanigans, some financial maneuverings going on there. I don't think so because I have read the Legislative Audit that was conducted when Jennie Johnson, Liberty Fellowship's Executive Director, was Chair of SCRA. And David Moody who followed her as Chair is equally astute. SCRA is or until recently has been a very clean agency. But certainly this plants the seed of public perception of misdeeds.

Second, let's focus on the Governor's appointive powers, not on Mark Sanford's appointive powers. There is just no way anyone can manage a positive entity (government) much less produce positive growth (economic development) if he or she cannot appoint their Secretary of Defense, Treasurer or whatever. The public has to look on this as a petty, small power grab by the Legislature. I don't think that's true because this is such a trivial item, and there are such big issues with which the Legislature must deal. Why would we use up points on this?

Third, is this a low- state, mid-state spat about an Upstater getting an appointment? I don't think so because we are too big for that. But the Upstate has to look at it this way. Why is the Legislature dumping on this guy from Greenville?

Back to my opening sentence. If there is nothing inappropriate going on at SCRA, if this is not a vendetta against a specific Governor, Mark Sanford, or a geographical power grab, what's happening? If "what's happening" is of significance then shouldn't there be a debate on it, a passage of law rather than a last minute line item budget change? It doesn't feel good out here, and I am certainly puzzled.

Hayne Hipp

135 South Main St., Suite 1000

Greenville SC 29601

864-241-5432 PHONE

864-241-5429 FAX
[REDACTED]

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.339 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/19/09 06:21:00

Mark Sanford

From: Tom Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2009 2:14 PM
To: Mark Sanford; Scott English; Jeff Schilz; Joel Sawyer
Subject: Budget veto and stimulus money

Guys,

I think the budget veto is Mark's last chance to leverage the stimulus money toward having the legislature pass a more responsible budget. My recommendation is that he veto all of Part I and Part III and also selected provisos, and include within that veto message an ironclad commitment to apply for the \$700 million of stimulus money if:

- a) vetoes in regard to Part I and Part III are sustained;
- b) a new budget is passed that pays down debt this fiscal year by \$200 million; and
- c) a concurrent resolution is passed citing the legislature's intent to pay down an additional \$200 million in debt next fiscal year.

In addition to setting forth those conditions, Mark could point out that the Davis-Ryberg budget provided a template on how such a new budget could be passed *without* the extra \$350 million in stimulus money and that the additional \$350 million, which the Davis-Ryberg budget did not appropriate, could be appropriate by the legislature for education and law enforcement funding, thus freeing up funds to be allocated elsewhere. Mark could also point out that:

- a) he is backing off his initial request that his application for stimulus money must be matched dollar-for-dollar by debt reduction;
- b) he is allowing the legislature to appropriate the stimulus money;
- b) he is relying on the good faith of the legislature in regard to the additional debt relief for the next fiscal year; and
- c) this deal would avoid a lengthy and costly legal battle.

If the vetoes are qualified with that indicated commitment to apply for the stimulus money (if the state conditions were met), then I think we have a shot at picking up the additional three votes we need to have the vetoes sustained -- though it will still be a battle and Mark would have to meet with some senators and work them hard, and threaten to involve himself in their races in three years if they don't commit to sustain. Here are the senators that I think would be susceptible to such "influence":

David Thomas
 Harvey Peeler
 John Courson
 Wes Hayes
 Mike Fair
 Larry Martin
 Billy O'Dell

As I said earlier, I think this is Mark's last chance to leverage the stimulus money into getting a more responsible budget. In my judgment, there is no chance whatsoever of picking up the additional votes we need to have the vetoes sustained without including something along the lines of what I have

outlined above.

Tom

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/15/09 06:16:00

Mark Sanford

From: Tom Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 1:11 PM
To: Mick Mulvaney; [REDACTED]; scott_english [REDACTED]; jmschilz [REDACTED]; joel_sawyer [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Budget veto and stimulus money

Thanks, Mick.

From: Mick Mulvaney <[REDACTED]>
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; scott_english [REDACTED]; jmschilz [REDACTED]; joel_sawyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 12:54:48 PM
Subject: Re: Budget veto and stimulus money

TD:

My only suggestion: "Paying down debt" doesn't sell well outside the limited group that understands economics at the government level.

However "contributing the money to the unemployment insurance fund" might. We know it is the same thing. Most folks do not. The impression will be that we tried to help the unemployed.

One-sentence message: "If the Legislature would commit to putting \$____mm into the unemployment insurance fund this year and next, the Governor will accept the stimulus funds."

And here's looking forward to the day when we don't have to operate in that one-sentence world.

And, all of that said, I am growing more convinced that taking the money at all is fraught with repercussions that most haven't begun to contemplate. California tried to cut wages on health care workers last week. The Obama Administration responded by threatening to yank CA stimulus funds. That is the brave new world we face. One can only wonder what Washington might threaten us with.

Mick M.

PS: Text of my e-mail you wanted follows:

If you are receiving this e-mail you have written me in the last couple of weeks regarding the 2009-2010 South Carolina state budget. First off, I thank you for taking a direct interest in what happens in Columbia. I thought you would appreciate an update. (And as I have received literally hundreds of e-mails on this topic, I hope you excuse this form response.)

7/14/2009

Here is what happened with the budget yesterday:

The Senate took up the proposed "final" budget, which came to us from the House. Believe it or not, that budget spent over \$40,000,000 MORE than the Senate budget which was passed just the week before last. Where did that money come from? Apparently, some money was taken from health care funds; some was obtained by raiding a state insurance trust fund; and some was just magically "found."

But that wasn't the most disturbing thing about the budget. Yes, I was extraordinarily suspicious of money that "magically" appears, and stealing money from trust funds violates some of my most basic principles. But those objections pale in comparison to my problems with how the money was spent.

Many of you who have written to me to encourage me to support yesterday's budget are teachers and parents. You may be interested to know, then, that not a penny, NOT ONE, of that \$40,000,000 was spent on K-12 education yesterday. Just two weeks ago many legislators were wailing and gnashing their teeth over how underfunded K-12 education was, how many teachers were going to be laid off, and how large class sizes were going to get...yet when another \$40,000,000 appeared, those lamentations were apparently forgotten.

Just as importantly, two weeks ago I supported an alternative budget that would have increased funding for both Lancaster and Fort Mill schools by about \$2,000,000 each. I did this despite the fact that many members of the local education community wrote or called to try to convince me to vote against that alternative budget. When I pointed out that that extra money would prevent the layoffs of a single teacher, many of those same folks argued that it was wrong, or even illegal, to take money from health care funds to do that. Well, the budget those same folks asked me to support yesterday took that exact same health care money, but didn't spend it on schools.

Against that backdrop, you might imagine my disgust with the fact that, while yesterday's budget completely ignored K-12 education with the extra \$40 million, it did find money to create a tax exemption for season football tickets at Clemson and USC. It also gave the SC house an additional \$7 million for its own operation.

Why would the Legislature do this? Why would lawmakers bemoan the eminent layoff of teachers and closure of prisons, and then give a tax exemption for football season tickets? Why would they vote against (as they did) my amendment to move money from the state farmer's market to state law enforcement? A more cynical person might say that some lawmakers are willing to play politics with jobs and prisons...and that the desire by some people to discredit the Governor outweighs their concerns about schools and public safety. I am not that cynical...yet. I simply believe that what we are seeing is just government being government: where for some reason people lose grasp of common sense when they find themselves in charge of billions of dollars of "other peoples' money."

Finally, many of you who have written have suggested that by passing yesterday's budget the Governor will be forced to take the stimulus money. This, simply, is not accurate. The only thing it might do is allow the Supreme Court to take up the issue... but I think everyone acknowledges that regardless of what budget passes, the issue of the stimulus money is headed to the courts.

For those reasons, I voted against the budget. Under the circumstances, I saw no other choice.

Sen. Mick Mulvaney

From: Tom Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2009 2:14 PM
To: Mark Sanford; Scott English; Jeff Schilz; Joel Sawyer
Subject: Budget veto and stimulus money

Guys,

I think the budget veto is Mark's last chance to leverage the stimulus money toward having the legislature pass a more responsible budget. My recommendation is that he veto all of Part I and Part III and also selected provisos, and include within that veto message an ironclad commitment to apply for the \$700 million of stimulus money if:

- a) vetoes in regard to Part I and Part III are sustained;
- b) a new budget is passed that pays down debt this fiscal year by \$200 million; and
- c) a concurrent resolution is passed citing the legislature's intent to pay down an additional \$200 million in debt next fiscal year.

In addition to setting forth those conditions, Mark could point out that the Davis-Ryberg budget provided a template on how such a new budget could be passed *without* the extra \$350 million in stimulus money and that the additional \$350 million, which the Davis-Ryberg budget did not appropriate, could be appropriate by the legislature for education and law enforcement funding, thus freeing up funds to be allocated elsewhere. Mark could also point out that:

- a) he is backing off his initial request that his application for stimulus money must be matched dollar-for-dollar by debt reduction;
- b) he is allowing the legislature to appropriate the stimulus money;
- b) he is relying on the good faith of the legislature in regard to the additional debt relief for the next fiscal year; and
- c) this deal would avoid a lengthy and costly legal battle.

If the vetoes are qualified with that indicated commitment to apply for the stimulus money (if the state conditions were met), then I think we have a shot at picking up the additional three votes we need to have the vetoes sustained -- though it will still be a battle and Mark would have to meet with some senators and work them hard, and threaten to involve himself in their races in three years if they don't commit to sustain. Here are the senators that I think would be susceptible to such "influence":

David Thomas
 Harvey Peeler
 John Courson

Wes Hayes
Mike Fair
Larry Martin
Billy O'Dell

As I said earlier, I think this is Mark's last chance to leverage the stimulus money into getting a more responsible budget. In my judgment, there is no chance whatsoever of picking up the additional votes we need to have the vetoes sustained without including something along the lines of what I have outlined above.

Tom

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/16/09 17:05:00

Mark Sanford

From: Chris Drummond [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2009 11:43 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: RE: Budget and Stimulus

Never veto the whole thing... you tried that and it got you no where. Veto the offensive stuff and those items that are consistent with your executive budget. Force the General Assembly to deal with your vetos one at a time. It again allows you to highlight waste in spending. Don't lose touch with the average guy and remind your staff as well... it's about the little guy.

Chris Drummond
Drummond Communications Group LLC
Columbia and Charleston
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Fax 801-788-5701

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Budget and Stimulus
From: "Mark Sanford" <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, May 14, 2009 10:54 pm
To: "Chris Drummond" <[REDACTED]>

Thanks...

1. veto whole or part?
2. coosaw encamp?

Talk soon...

From: Chris Drummond [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2009 7:06 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Budget and Stimulus

Mark-

I couple of quick thoughts...

- Your CNN interview- when you reference the 70-million dollars, viewers inside and outside of South Carolina recognize that's a lot of money. I think to many people believe you are refusing all of the money. You should always reference that we are only talking about ten percent of federal dollars. Remind folks how much money the state has received so far. Create the distinction so the viewer/reader knows the facts!
- Regarding the Dillion school- remind folks the state does not build or operate public schools... locals do. Remind voters that local school boards, local elected officials make

those decisions, not Columbia and not Washington, DC.

- While I was watching CNN (Communist News Network) they referenced that every dollar the federal government currently spends, they have to borrow 46-cents. Have your office check that but if it is true, it's a powerful reference that average folks will relate to.

The state budget:

Since there is so much attention by average citizens to the budget regarding what you will or won't do, they have no idea how the process works or the antics by the General Assembly in the past. I know you know this but keep in mind that average citizens have no clue and if they do they have short memories of past budgets.

- Remind voters the General Assembly has rolled these budget lines so tight it is nearly impossible to find pork, earmarks, special projects, etc. This will also allow you to talk about transparency and the fraud on behalf of those legislators who publicly support transparency but act otherwise.

- Since the General Assembly did not thoroughly review the budget before it was approved, most will not know the details other than what the leadership has told them. I've noticed some of your public comments are reflecting this but you must be concise in your public statements.

- We know the General Assembly will probably process a dozen or so vetoes at a time in an effort to save time as they have done before. Throw down markers now in your public comments and ask voters to contact their legislator and ask them to read your veto message before voting. Do conference calls with editorial board writers, block some time for the daily papers one day and the weekly another. Get on talk radio and other friendly ones like TJ Phillips at WEZL also have someone in your office start on your op-ed in addition to having other folks write letters to the editor and calling to talk radio. Have this stuff lined up now so you can easily pull the trigger.

- I also believe you and your office need to stay away from any reference to dollar amounts in regards to proposed reductions in education or law enforcement. Instead use percentages and tie it back to the sacrifices South Carolinians are making while they reduce their home budgets.

Remember to keep your words to a level so an average person who is not familiar with the details of the budget process in Columbia can understand it.

As you would say, take care and thanks!

Chris Drummond
Drummond Communications Group LLC
Columbia and Charleston

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Fax 801-788-5701

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/14/09 06:28:00

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/14/09 06:28:00

Mark Sanford

From: Chris Drummond [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2009 7:06 PM
To: Mark Sanford
Subject: Budget and Stimulus

Mark-

I couple of quick thoughts...

- Your CNN interview- when you reference the 70-million dollars, viewers inside and outside of South Carolina recognize that's a lot of money. I think to many people believe you are refusing all of the money. You should always reference that we are only talking about ten percent of federal dollars. Remind folks how much money the state has received so far. Create the distinction so the viewer/reader knows the facts!

- Regarding the Dillion school- remind folks the state does not build or operate public schools... locals do. Remind voters that local school boards, local elected officials make those decisions, not Columbia and not Washington, DC.

- While I was watching CNN (Communist News Network) they referenced that every dollar the federal government currently spends, they have to borrow 46-cents. Have your office check that but if it is true, it's a powerful reference that average folks will relate to.

The state budget:

Since there is so much attention by average citizens to the budget regarding what you will or won't do, they have no idea how the process works or the antics by the General Assembly in the past. I know you know this but keep in mind that average citizens have no clue and if they do the have short memories of past budgets.

- Remind voters the General Assembly has rolled these budget lines so tight it is nearly impossible to find pork, earmarks, special projects, etc. This will also allow you to talk about transparency and the fraud on behalf of those legislators who publicly support transparency but act otherwise.

- Since the General Assembly did not thoroughly review the budget before it was approved, most will not know the details other than what the leadership as told them. I've noticed some of your public comments are reflecting this but you must be concise in your public statements.

- We know the General Assembly will probably process a dozen or so vetoes at a time in an effort to save time as they have done before. Throw down markers now in your public comments and ask voters to contact their legislator and ask them to read your veto message before voting. Do conference calls with editorial board writers, block some time for the daily papers one day and the weekly another. Get on talk radio and other friendlys like TJ Phillips at WEZL also have someone in your office start on your op-ed in addition to having other folks write letters to the editor and calling to talk radio. Have this stuff lined up now so you can easily pull the trigger.

- I also believe you and your office need to stay away from any reference to dollar amounts in regards to proposed reductions in education or law enforcement. Instead use percentages and tie it back to the sacrifices South Carolinians are making while they reduce their home budgets. Remember to keep your words to a level so an average person who is not familiar with the details of the budget process in Columbia can understand it.

As you would say, take care and thanks!

Chris Drummond
 Drummond Communications Group LLC
 Columbia and Charleston
 [REDACTED]
 843-709-5701

7/14/2009

Fax 801-788-5701

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/14/09 06:28:00

7/14/2009

Mark Sanford

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 8:41 PM
To: Scott English; [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Budget

are you aware of this

To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Budget

Talked to xxxxxx last night, and he believes Leatherman changed one the HHS amendments in the transfer between the Senate and House. Without me saying anything, he said that he thinks the budget could be overtuned on constitutional grounds. I hope Ned Sloan is ready.

Hotmail® goes with you. Get it on your BlackBerry or iPhone.

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.329 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/16/09 17:05:00

7/14/2009