

From: Glaccum, David <DavidGlaccum@gov.sc.gov>  
To: Adams, Chaney <ChaneyAdams@gov.sc.gov>  
Patel, Swati <SwatiPatel@gov.sc.gov>  
Date: 9/26/2016 2:29:12 PM  
Subject: RE: Question

---

There should be no change in our position.

This lawsuit is based on the legal authority of the EPA to pass this kind of regulation and the harm it causes on states. Regardless of the benefits that could come out of the plan, we do not support governing by Executive fiat in lieu of Congressional inaction and that is exactly what the CPP is attempting to do. As the lawsuit states: "This case involves an unprecedented, unlawful attempt by an environmental regulator to reorganize the nation's energy grid."

As for the harm or benefit to South Carolina specifically, states and the market should decide which energy policy is most beneficial, not federal regulators picking winners and losers.

---

From: Adams, Chaney  
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 11:20 AM  
To: Glaccum, David; Patel, Swati  
Subject: FW: Question

David- can you come talk to us about this?

---

From: Pardue, Doug [<mailto:dpardue@postandcourier.com>]  
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 11:18 AM  
To: Adams, Chaney  
Subject: Question

Chaney,

Gov. Haley has stated that she believes the EPA's proposed carbon dioxide regulations, called the Clean Power Plan, are bad for the state and will hurt business. Implementation of that plan has been put on hold by the Supreme Court until lawsuits, of which South Carolina is a part, are resolved.

Does the Governor still feel that way in light of a recent Duke University study titled, "Ongoing evolution of the electricity industry: effects of market conditions and the clean power plan on states." The study shows that South Carolina, with its two new nuclear power reactors on-line, would be a major earner of Emission Rate Credits. Based on the various compliance means in the EPA plan, South Carolina would earn credits no matter which plan it uses. The study shows that South Carolina would be able to sell anywhere from \$48.9 million to \$280 million worth of emission credits a year by 2030 when the regulations would go into effect.

That money would be expected to be returned to homeowners and other ratepayers in electricity cost reductions. The Duke study reflects similar findings in South Carolina's State Energy Plan.

As South Carolina continues to shift its electricity production away from coal, to less greenhouse gas producing natural gas and non-greenhouse gas producing nuclear and alternative fuels, such as solar and wind, has the Governor changed her position on the EPA's efforts to restrict CO2 emissions?

Doug

Doug Pardue  
Project Reporter  
The Post and Courier  
Cell (843) 708-4513  
Office (843) 937-5558

[dpardue@postandcourier.com](mailto:dpardue@postandcourier.com)

@dpardue1

Read my stories at:

<http://www.postandcourier.com/apps/pbcs.dll/personalia?ID=64>



**The Post and Courier**  
2015 PULITZER PRIZE WINNER