

From: Baker, Josh <JoshBaker@gov.sc.gov>
To: Adams, Chaney <ChaneyAdams@gov.sc.gov>
Glaccum, David <DavidGlaccum@gov.sc.gov>
CC: Godfrey, Rob <RobGodfrey@gov.sc.gov>
Patel, Swati <SwatiPatel@gov.sc.gov>
Date: 5/10/2016 10:26:55 AM
Subject: RE: Question re: Santee Cooper

I think that we shouldn't get in the middle of this but if Leighton is going to aggressively weigh-in on this, I think that Swati should have a conversation with him about synching her appointees approach to solar.

From: Adams, Chaney
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 10:22 AM
To: Baker, Josh; Glaccum, David
Cc: Godfrey, Rob
Subject: Fwd: Question re: Santee Cooper

Josh and David- what do you think here?

From: "Pardue, Doug" <dpardue@postandcourier.com>
Date: May 10, 2016 at 10:13:09 AM EDT
To: "Adams, Chaney" <ChaneyAdams@gov.sc.gov>
Subject: RE: Question re: Santee Cooper

Chaney,

I hope the Governor has some response to my question from last week about Santee Cooper. You might also ask her reaction to Santee Cooper's decisions that contributed to the loss of 300 jobs at Century Aluminum's Mount Holly plant and the potential loss of 300 more if the plant closes. Seems to be at odds with one of Santee Cooper's founding purposes – to bring development and jobs to rural South Carolina.

Thanks,
Doug

PS You might also want to look at what Duke Energy is doing: See the attached link. Here's part of what the link above says: "Duke Energy owns and operates more than 2,600 MW of wind and solar energy – enough to power 720,000 average homes at peak production. The company has invested more than \$4 billion in renewable energy and plans to invest another \$3 billion over the next five years."

From: Pardue, Doug
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2016 12:21 PM
To: 'Adams, Chaney'
Subject: Question re: Santee Cooper

Chaney,

If possible, perhaps by early next week, can I get a reaction from Gov. Haley to Santee Cooper's position and actions as they relate to solar energy and the state's efforts, through its 2-year-old landmark reusable energy bill, to encourage use of solar, to expand SC's energy resources and to promote a new multi-million dollar industry.

We ran a story last Sunday revealing how Santee Cooper's positions on solar stifle solar expansion in

Santee Cooper's direct service areas in Berkeley County, the Pee Dee and the Grand Strand – especially as it relates to solar leasing. We showed that Santee Cooper's formula for dealing with roof-top solar makes it financially unattractive for most homeowners and solar leasing companies, that are expanding throughout the service areas of SCE&G and Duke.

Here's the story I wrote about Santee Cooper's solar positions. It ran in last Sunday's Post and Courier:

<http://www.postandcourier.com/20160430/160509988/santee-cooper-policies-cast-cloud-over-solar>

Here's an editorial the P&C published today about Santee Cooper's solar policies, how they run counter to the state's purpose in adopting and enacting its reusable energy bill two years ago and how Gov. Haley should let them know "their policies are hurting customers and likely hurting the state's image in the process."

<http://www.postandcourier.com/20160506/160509617/lighten-up-on-solar-users>

And here's Santee Cooper's position and reaction to our story as presented in a letter-to-the-editor by W. Leighton Lord, Chairman of the Board of Directors of Santee Cooper. It ran in today's P&C:

<http://www.postandcourier.com/20160506/160509625/letter-net-metering-is-bad-business>

Thanks,

Doug