From: michael Goo
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2013 4:59 PM
To: goo.michael@epa.gov
Subject: Fw: InsideEPA

----- Forwarded Message ----- 
From: "Hawkins, Dave" <dhwkins@nrdc.org>
To: [ Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2011 5:22 AM
Subject: InsideEPA

Dawn Reeves at Inside EPA says the following:
"Also im writing this week that the nmps at the white house sets a standard at nat gas combined cycle, sending a signal of no new coal w/o igcc and ccs."

We are not commenting.
Dec 7, 2011, 3:49 PM

What up. See u soon

This is to reassure u guys

Dec 15, 2011, 1:38 PM

Hey. In a meeting. Do I need to step out?

Apr 3, 2012, 12:07 AM

If you want the oil and gas nsps to give fracking a free pass, as OMB would like then don't give us the extension. If you want any hope of regulation of fracking then give us more...
Coequyt

Hope of regulation of fracking then give us more time to try and remove the gun from our head and talk sense into OMB dickheads. Call in am.

Oct 3, 2012, 1:35 PM

I am with lpj. Re decision on naaqs urgent?

Oct 3, 2012, 1:49 PM

Dude. Urgent?

Or pocket dial

Apr 8, 2013, 1:38 PM

Call me if u can before 230. Not urgent if you don't but possibly helpful.
From: Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us>
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 6:40 PM
To: Michael Goo [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Subject: Utility Cash on Balance Sheet Analysis
Attach: ATT31639.txt

Hi Michael-

Attached please find the utility "cash balance" analysis I mentioned. Conclusions: (1) Average net cash balance increased 18x from 1995 to 2010 (in real (2010) dollars). [Note: This does not even adjust for growth in asset value]; (2) As a percent of total assets, average net cash increased from 1.5% to 5.9% over the period.

We are weaving this into a story about the ability of power companies to adjust to the EPA regs: (a) interest rates are at an all-time low, so it is a good time to borrow money for modernization of the fleet; (b) load growth is flat, so there is no better time for outages for retrofits, retirements, etc. to modernize the fleet; and (c) utilities are sitting on an unprecedented amount of cash on their balance sheets meaning that they have the wherewithal to install emissions controls and replacement generation, plus regulations that mobilize this cash and deploy it in the economy will have a stimulative effect on economic activity and job creation.

Lastly, thinking more about the idea we discussed about preceding an NSPS proposal with some sort of process to "air" the issue, we think you need more than a paper by OAR for both substantive and optical reasons. As I mentioned when we spoke, we would recommend some sort of stakeholder discussion process. We agree that an ANPRM would provoke thousands of pages of comments and potentially slow you down too much. But, a talk/listen group -- maybe a reconvening of the BACT CAAC group that has already chewed over some of these issues? -- starting in December running through February with an aggressive schedule of meetings, could allow parties to discuss and build understanding in the best case and create the impression that EPA has taken stakeholder advice in formulating the rule in the worst case. This would also give you a better political read on floating a proposal as well as a better sense of hat button issues and arguments you're likely to hear. EPA could kick it off with a white paper and get reactions and ask organizations with specific proposals to present them and get feedback (e.g., NRDC and us, etc.). It wouldn't be the normal FACA process of producing a report or recommendations. The goal would simply be to allow EPA to have the benefit of this thinking as it crafts its proposal. And, if you lock into a December 2012 date for the final rule, we think industry will take this seriously and participate in the discussion. Here's why: If you lock-in a final rule before the election, they will know it isn't real or that it won't be stringent. But, if you say you are finalizing after the election, they will believe you mean business -- if Obama wins, it will be tough and if Obama loses it will be tough. [The only downside to this is if the R candidate campaigns in coal country saying that Obama has a "December surprise" in store to kill coal.] In any case, if you want to test the politics and potentially draw the venom out of this issue politically, we'd recommend more than a paper. We think you need a process, albeit a very short one. Let's discuss.

Thanks,
CS
Hi Michael-
Hope you all had a good Thanksgiving! Thanks again for setting up the meeting last week. Alex has already followed up with me and the WH has asked for some more information. I would love to grab a few minutes with you to get your initial reactions/feedback to our proposal and strategize about possible ways forward.

Unlike some other proposals, ours is not "take it or leave it". As you could tell, we’ve tailored our proposal according to the specifications we’ve heard from you guys and the folks at the WH. But, if these change or want further refinement, please let us know. And, most importantly, if we are headed down a blind alley, that would be good to know ASAP.

We met with several coal generators on our "winners" list after our meeting with you and are scheduling more meetings for later this week. One of the reactions we got from two companies is that our price impacts are too high because we are taking a historical view of gas price elasticities. [Our electricity price and total costs are almost totally dependent on changes in gas price due to heavier reliance on existing gas plants under our proposal.] They said that the shale boom has changed the game and that comparing gas price elasticities today to the average of the last 15 years is like looking at cotton prices delivered by steam ship in 1880 after cotton was being moved by rail. So, we are hearing that there is a respectable view that the cost impacts of our proposal may be less than we’ve shown and accordingly, we will check in with some other gas analysts and will run a lower gas price sensitivity (as well as devising an "safety valve" or alternative compliance payment to guard against the risk of higher than forecast gas prices).

Let me know when would be a good time to talk, otherwise god knows when I’ll bother you on your cellphone!

Cheers,
CS

Conrad G. Schneider
Advocacy Director
Clean Air Task Force
cschneider@caf.us
www.caf.us
8 Museum Way
Brunswick, Maine 04011
207/721-8676
207/721-8696 (facsimile)
1. CATF works the folks we met with at the WH last week for a meeting with Heather Zichal with the intent of engaging her in helping creating enough space with OMB to let EPA start the party on 111(d).

2. Continue to engage the Energy and Climate/CEQ staff on the details of our policy evolution and keep them apprised of our progress with outreach to coal generators.

How you can help CATF with funders:

1. We can tell foundation program officers that we are engaged in discussions with highly-placed officials in the Obama Administration regarding viable pathways forward on 111(d). That we have presented our redpatch policy proposal to EPA and the WH and there is significant interest in the opportunity for low cost CO2 emission reductions represented by the current underutilized natural gas capacity.

2. CATF’s outreach to coal generators could be very valuable to this process (helping create the political "space" for EPA to issue a meaningful rule) and is unique among environmental NGOs.

3. CATF needs substantial incremental funding to maintain the engagement with EPA and coal generators both in terms of support for staff time but also consultants (e.g., NorthBridge, ICF) as well as the jobs study (on net employment impacts of CSAPR, MATS, and NSPS) that IEC/INFORUM is performing for us and the benefit-cost (i.e., health benefits of reduced coal generation) and SCC analyses we are performing to show that the policy is cost-effective, benefit-cost justified, and below the SCC.

4. I can tell foundation program officers to call you: (a) for your take on the prospects for moving a 111(d) rule; and (b) to vouch for CATF’s value-added in the 111(d) (and 111(b)) processes.

One other thing I can’t remember if I mentioned: we are hearing from several companies (NRG and AEP principally) that NorthBridge’s cost estimates of our 5 percent policy are probably too high. They feel this is due to NorthBridge using historic price elasticities for predicting future natural gas prices under the policy. These folks believe that shale gas is a "game changer" and that the system can absorb 3 TCF of incremental gas with little price impact. (One industry said that using past gas price elasticities today is like pricing cotton based on steam ship transport after the railroads were carrying cotton to market.) We will run a low gas price sensitivity to reflect this. Rather than run a high gas price sensitivity to represent the competing view that we are currently in a gas bubble that will burst and lead to higher than forecast gas prices going forward, our current thought is to devise a "safety valve" mechanism to guard against upside gas price risk. We’ll need to engage with OGC to see if they think something like this can be countenanced under section 111. Be interested in your thoughts about this.

Cheers,
CS
yep-lets talk. just give me a call or text on my cell. Im in an all day retreat tommorrow with the administrator but there may be some moments to talk. Wednesday may also work.....

Hi Michael-
Hope you all had a good Thanksgiving! Thanks again for setting up the meeting last week. Alex has already followed up with me and the WH has asked for some more information. I would love to grab a few minutes with you to get your initial reactions/feedback to our proposal and strategize about possible ways forward.

Unlike some other proposals, ours is not "take it or leave it". As you could tell, we've tailored our proposal according to the specifications we've heard from you guys and the folks at the WH. But, if those change or want further refinement, please let us know. And, most importantly, if we are headed down a blind alley, that would be good to know ASAP.

We met with several coal generators on our "winners" list after our meeting with you and are scheduling more meetings for later this week. One of the reactions we got from two companies is that our price impacts are too high because we are taking a historical view of gas price elasticities. [Our electricity price and total costs are almost totally dependent on changes in gas price due to heavier reliance on existing gas plants under our proposal.] They said that the shale boom has changed the game and that comparing gas price elasticities today to the average of the last 15 years is like looking at cotton prices delivered by steam ship in 1880 after cotton was being moved by rail. So, we are hearing that there is a respectable view that the cost impacts of our proposal may be less than we've shown and accordingly, we will check in with some other gas analysts and will run a lower gas price sensitivity (as well as devising an "safety valve" or alternative compliance payment to guard against the risk of higher than forecast gas prices).

Let me know when would be a good time to talk, otherwise god knows when I'll bother you on your cellphne!
From: Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us>
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2012 2:47 PM
To: Michael Goo
Subject: Re: Can I grab 5 minutes of your time this week to hear your reaction to our 111(d) presentation?

O.K. Try me on cell when you can.

CS

Conrad G. Schneider
Advocacy Director
Clean Air Task Force
cschneider@catf.us
www.catf.us
8 Museum Way
Brunswick, Maine 04011
207/721-8676
207/721-8696 (facsimile)

On Nov 27, 2012, at 2:45 PM, Michael Goo wrote:

> Hey dude. Saw you called. Stuck in a retreat. Will call you in a while. Thanks for calling
> 
> Sent from my iPhone
> 
> On Nov 26, 2012, at 6:59 PM, Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us> wrote:
> 
> Hi Michael-
> >> Hope you all had a good Thanksgiving! Thanks again for setting up the meeting last week. Alex has already followed up with me and the WH has asked for some more information. I would love to grab a few minutes with you to get your initial reactions/feedback to our proposal and strategize about possible ways forward.
> >>
> >> Unlike some other proposals, ours is not "take it or leave it". As you could tell, we've tailored our proposal according to the specifications we've heard from you guys and the folks at the WH. But, if those change or want further refinement, please let us know. And, most importantly, if we are headed down a blind alley, that would be good to know ASAP.
> >>
> >> We met with several coal generators on our "winners" list after our meeting with you and are scheduling more meetings for later this week. One of the reactions we got from two companies is that our price impacts are too high because we are taking a historical view of gas price elasticities. [Our electricity price and total costs are almost totally dependent on changes in gas price due to heavier reliance on existing gas plants under our proposal.] They said that the shale boom has changed the game and that comparing gas price elasticities today to the average of the last 15 years is like looking at cotton prices delivered by steam ship in 1880 after cotton was being moved by rail. So, we are hearing that there is a respectable view that the cost impacts of our proposal may be less than we've shown and accordingly, we will check in with some other gas analysts and will run a lower gas price sensitivity (as well as devising an "safety valve" or alternative compliance payment to guard against the risk of higher than forecast gas prices).
From: Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us>
Sent: Saturday, December 1, 2012 11:51 AM
To: Michael Goo
Subject: Recap of our call

Hey Michael–
Thanks for making what time you could to talk yesterday. Here’s my recap. Please let me know if I’ve got anything wrong or if you have anything to add:

Next steps with EPA:

1. Bruce and I get a meeting with the OAR crowd (some configuration of Culligan, Ketcham-Colwill, Beaurevais, Schmidt, Gottman, etc.)

2. Afterwards, if they are not openly hostile, you facilitate a meeting with Bob P and us to present our analysis.

3. Bruce follows up with Dave Evans on modeling issues.

4. I get a price quote from Venkatesh at ICF regarding how much it would cost to refine IPM to be able to accurately estimate the impacts of our redisplay policy. We discuss how to split the costs -- perhaps EPA pays for the model platform upgrade and CATF pays for the runs.

5. We keep you apprised of our progress with outreach to coal generators.

What we want EPA to do:

1. Start the party on 111(d) i.e., send a signal to the world that the process is starting up again.

2. Process might include release of the white paper, empaneling a stakeholder process to socialize the issue, etc.

Next steps with WH:

1. CATF works the folks we met with at the WH last week for a meeting with Heather Orchil with the intent of engaging her in helping creating enough space with OMB to let EPA start the party on 111(d).

2. Continue to engage the Energy and Climate/CEQ staff on the details of our policy evolution and keep them apprised of our progress with outreach to coal generators.

How you can help CATF with funders:

1. We can tell foundation program officers that we are engaged in discussions with highly-placed officials in the Obama Administration regarding viable pathways forward on 111(d). That we have presented our redisplay policy proposal to EPA and the WH and there is significant interest in the opportunity for low cost CO2 reduction represented by the current underutilized natural gas capacity.

2. CATF’s outreach to coal generators could be very valuable to this process (helping create the political “space” for EPA to issue a meaningful rule) and is unique among environmental NGOs.

3. CATF needs substantial incremental funding to maintain the engagement with EPA and coal generators both in
terms of support for staff time but also consultants (e.g., NorthBridge, ICF) as well as the jobs study (on net employment impacts of CSAPR, MATS, and NSPS) that IEc/INFORUM is performing for us and the benefit-cost (i.e., health benefits of reduced coal generation) and SCC analyses we are performing to show that the policy is cost-effective, benefit-cost justified, and below the SCC.

4. I can tell foundation program officers to call you: (a) for your take on the prospects for moving a 111(d) rule; and (b) to vouch for CATF's value-added in the 111(d) and 111(b) processes.

One other thing I can't remember if I mentioned: we are hearing from several companies (NRG and AEP principally) that NorthBridge's cost estimates of our 5 percent policy are probably too high. They feel this is due to NorthBridge using historic price elasticities for predicting future natural gas prices under the policy. These folks believe that shale gas is a "game changer" and that the system can absorb 3 TCF of incremental gas with little gas price impact. (One industry said that using past gas price elasticities today is like pricing cotton based on steam ship transport after the railroads were carrying cotton to market.) We will run a low gas price sensitivity to reflect this. Rather than run a high gas price sensitivity to represent the competing view that we are currently in a gas bubble that will burst and lead to higher than forecast gas price going forward, our current thought is to devise a "safety valve" mechanism to guard against upside gas price risk. We'll need to engage with OGC to see if they think something like this can be countenanced under section 111. Be interested in your thoughts about this.

Cheers,
CS

Conrad G. Schneider
Advocacy Director
Clean Air Task Force
cschneider@catf.us
www.catf.us
8 Museum Way
Brunswick, Maine 04011
207/721-8676
207/721-8696 (facsimile)
From: Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us>
Sent: Sunday, January 6, 2013 5:53 PM
To: Michael Goo Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Subject: POLITICO article on Gregoire for EPA Administrator -- I'm meeting at WH on 1/11. Should I put in a good word for Bob P.?

Hi Michael-
Happy New Year! Bruce Phillips and I are meeting on 1/11 with folks at the WH (Guzy, Duke, McConville, Sammy) for the fourth time since the election on our 111(d) concept. They seem to be taking it pretty seriously. We also met with the OAR folks just before Christmas. We are meeting with some of them again this Friday. I'll be in town Thursday and Friday. Couple of questions for you:

(1) See the POLITICO article below saying Gov. Gregoire is being considered for Lisa's job. Should we put in a good word for Bob P. in our meeting? Is there anything else we can do to help Bob P.?

(2) We discussed getting a meeting with Bob P. on our 111(d) concept. What needs to happen for that to happen? At the last minute, Goffman had to bow out of our OAR meeting. Should we make sure he attends the Friday meeting?

(3) We've been meeting with Alex Barron on the potential for an O&G methane rule. There is a BIG opportunity there for near-term CH4 cuts -- as big or bigger in CO2e than our 111(d) proposal -- and together we think the two rules may get us to the Administration's 17 percent GHG reduction from 2005 levels by 2020 target. But, the net benefit of any 111(d) proposal that relies heavily on coal displacement with natural gas depends on the leak rate from the natural gas system. We aren't in the Howarth camp that natural gas entails more net GHG emissions than coal, but some of the recent field measurements are showing very high leak rates. The two-step here is to tighten up the natural gas system simultaneously with using gas to back out coal generation. CATF represents parties to the litigation challenging the O&G NSPS rule, but Alex and I have discussed testing this up as a positive Obama Administration climate initiative rather than correcting insufficiencies in the rule's response to a lawsuit. Even if we pursue a consent decree on the timeline for a rule, we need to discuss the details of regulatory development here. Anyway, it might make sense for us to discuss this sooner than later.

Please let me know if you have some time to meet/talk on 1/10 or 1/11.

Cheers,
CS

>>>> Gregoire stock rising for EPA top job
>>>> By Darren Samuelsohn and Erica Martinson
>>>> 1/4/13 6:11 PM EST
>>>> Washington Gov. Chris Gregoire may be moving to the front of the pack in the contest to be named the new EPA administrator, according to a source familiar with the transition and a Seattle online newspaper.
>>>> The Seattle Post-Intelligencer on Friday cited a "very private prediction from a very senior source in Washington's congressional delegation" saying she'll soon be nominated to replace Lisa Jackson.
>>>> And a source familiar with the transition told POLITICO that the article naming Gregoire as a leading candidate for the EPA job is "quite real."

G00-A-0009114
From: Michael Goo  [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Sent: Monday, January 7, 2013 9:47 AM
To: Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us>
Subject: Re: POLITICO article on Gregoire for EPA Administrator -- I'm meeting at WH on 1/11. Should I put in a good word for Bob P.?

Left you a voicemail

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2013, at 5:53 PM, Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us> wrote:

> Hi Michael,
> Happy New Year! Bruce Phillips and I are meeting on 1/11 with folks at the WH (Guzy, Duke, McConville, Sammy) for the fourth time since the election on our 111(d) concept. They seem to be taking it pretty seriously. We also met with the OAR folks just before Christmas. We are meeting with some of them again this Friday. I'll be in town Thursday and Friday. Couple of questions for you:
> (1) See the POLITICO article below saying Gov. Gregoire is being considered for Lisa's job. Should we put in a good word for Bob P. in our meeting? Is there anything else we can do to help Bob P.?
> (2) We discussed getting a meeting with Bob P. on our 111(d) concept. What needs to happen for that to happen? At the last minute, Goffman had to bow out of our OAR meeting. Should we make sure he attends the Friday meeting?
> (3) We've been meeting with Alex Barron on the potential for an O&G methane rule. There is a BIG opportunity there for near-term CH4 cuts -- as big or bigger in CO2e than our 111(d) proposal -- and together we think the two rules may get us to the Administration's 17 percent GHG reduction from 2005 levels by 2020 target. But, the net benefit of any 111(d) proposal that relies heavily on coal displacement with natural gas depends on the leak rate from the natural gas system. We aren't in the Howarth camp that natural gas entails more net GHG emissions than coal, but some of the recent field measurements are showing very high leak rates. The two-step here is to tighten up the natural gas system simultaneously with using gas to back out coal generation. CATF represents parties to the litigation challenging the O&G NSPS rule, but Alex and I have discussed seeing this up as a positive Obama Administration climate initiative rather than correcting insufficiencies in the rule's response to a lawsuit. Even if we pursue a consent decree on the timeline for a rule, we need to discuss the details of regulatory development here. Anyway, it might make sense for us to discuss this sooner than later.
> Please let me know if you have some time to meet/talk on 1/10 or 1/11.
>
> Cheers,
> CS
>
> Gregoire stock rising for EPA top job
> By Darren Samuelsohn and Erica Martinson
>
> 1/4/13 6:11 PM EST
> Washington Gov. Chris Gregoire may be moving to the front of the pack in the contest to be named the new EPA administrator, according to a source familiar with the transition and a Seattle online newspaper.
Hi Michael-

Thank you so much for setting up the meeting with Bob P. All in all, we felt that it went pretty well. We very much appreciated the support from you and Alex.

When you get a minute, I'd like to strategize about next steps. But, in the meantime, I had a question to clarify something Bob P. said. Towards the end of the meeting, he said that we (the royal "we") assume need to reach higher into the WH. He mentioned Cecilia Munoz and the Domestic Policy Council and also Bevin Ashenmiller at CEA. What I didn't get (and didn't have the presence of mind to ask) was whether he thought he would need support at that level to get out a proposal or merely to start up the 111(d) process again (i.e., issue white paper, convene stakeholders). Whatever the answer, I want to strategize with you about what is needed and who we'd need to bring into the process to get meetings with that level of WH folks (and higher). We've gotten some more uptake by companies and there may be a way to have them engage.

Additionally, in our meeting last Friday with Rick Duke and Drew McConnell, we asked them about sending a signal to EPA to end the stop work order on 111(d). They said that Lisa and Gina have already changed their public statements on 111(d) recently. They said that when they are asked, they no longer say, "we have no plans to do 111(d)" but rather "climate change is an important priority for this Administration." They also pointed to statements made in reaction to the release of NRDC's report. We responded that we are talking to companies that haven't gotten the message. The change in rhetoric was too subtle a change in message for utility companies to believe that the Administration is moving forward to start up the regulatory process on 111(d). But, it strikes me that they may also have been saying that the message to EPA has been delivered and received. I'd like to discuss that with you.

Anyway, I'd like to grab a few minutes with you on all this (and more). Doesn't have to be long. Please let me know what day/time would work. Could be after hours or whenever. I'm around on cell.

Thanks again,

Cheers,
CS

Conrad G. Schneider
Advocacy Director
Clean Air Task Force
cschneider@catf.us
www.catf.us
8 Museum Way
Brunswick, Maine 04011
207/721-8676
207/721-8696 (facsimile)
From: Michael Goo
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 9:53 AM
To: Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us>
Subject: Re: What is the best way to contact you?

Conrad
I don't but my EPA email still works and so does this one for now. Happy holidays. Feel free to give me a call
Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2013, at 9:45 AM, Conrad Schneider <cschneider@catf.us> wrote:

> Do you have a DOE phone number and email? I'd like to discuss how DOE might be helpful to EPA on 111(b) and the Upton/Whitfield letter.
> 
> Thanks,
> CS
> 
> Conrad G. Schneider
> Advocacy Director
> Clean Air Task Force
> cschneider@catf.us
> www.catf.us
> 8 Museum Way
> Brunswick, Maine 04011
> 207/721-8676
> 207/721-8696 (facsimile)
From: Michael Goo
Sent: Wednesday, October 9, 2013 2:10 PM
To: Jim Massie <jmassie@alpinegroup.com>
Subject: Re: wh

Thanks for all you did Jim. I really appreciate it. Not unexpected and Utech is a friend and supporter. So overall it's good. I will give you a call later but thanks again.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 9, 2013, at 12:17 PM, Michael Goo wrote:

> Thx. Overall. That is great news.
> 
> Sent from my iPhone
> 
> On Oct 9, 2013, at 11:21 AM, Jim Massie <jmassie@alpinegroup.com> wrote:
> 
> >>
> >> Subject: Job filled
> >>
> >> Utech got it.
> >>
Ps. You might want to think about candidates to replace me in my job as head of policy. I'm thinking of contacting Lisa Moore. Debbie thinks she is doing too well to consider it but maybe she wants to refresh her government contacts. Or maybe there is someone else. The WH should think about having somebody there loyal to them.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 9, 2013, at 11:21 AM, Jim Massie <jmassic@alpinegroup.com> wrote:

> > Subject: Job filled
> > Utach got it.
> >
That's brilliant. Let's talk next week.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2013, at 6:36 PM, Jim Massie <jmassie@alpinegroup.com> wrote:

> Sad to have you turn to doe. But excited for you. MF might want a new job. She is tired of the hill. Let's talk next week. Have a great Sunday!
> >> Sent from my iPad
> >>> On Oct 26, 2013, at 12:18 PM, "Michael Goo" <Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> Ps. You might want to think about candidates to replace me in my job as head of policy. I'm thinking of contacting Lisa Moore. Debbie thinks she is doing too well to consider it but maybe she wants to refresh her government contacts. Or maybe there is someone else. The WH should think about having somebody there loyal to them.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> On Oct 9, 2013, at 11:21 AM, Jim Massie <jmassie@alpinegroup.com> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> Utech got it.
> >>>
From: Michael Goo  
Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 12:15 PM 
To: Chris Miller <emiller@ajw-inc.com> 
Subject: Re: October 24 -- E&E News PM is ready 

Totally the right thing to work on.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 24, 2013, at 5:38 PM, Chris Miller <emiller@ajw-inc.com> wrote:

Hey Master Goo - I'm looking forward to hearing about what you're going to do at DOE and when. Here's the issue that I think DOE can and should be helping with...if you make them. Would definitely help me/the outside campaign working to support the NSPS/EPA regulatory authority.

peace out.

C.

Grid overseer 'gun-shy' on flagging EPA-linked reliability concerns -- FERC commissioner

Hannah Northey, E&E reporter 

Published: Thursday, October 24, 2013

Republican member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission today said the grid's overseer has been "gun-shy" about flagging reliability concerns in the wake of new U.S. EPA rules.

FERC Commissioner Philip Moeller, who was appointed by President George W. Bush and reappointed by President Obama, pledged to support the North American Electric Reliability Corp. (NERC) in raising any reliability issues, regardless of how controversial they may be.

"I will back you up when those messages come out, and I think I have," Moeller said today at NERC's second annual leadership summit in Arlington, Va. "When you look back, it's kind of hard to not say, 'I told you so.'"

Moeller said on the sidelines of the summit that NERC "kind of got burned" when the group
Hey Master Goo - I'm looking forward to hearing about what you're going to do at DOE and when. Here's the issue that I think DOE can and should be helping with...if you make them. Would definitely help me/the outside campaign working to support the NSPS/EPA regulatory authority.

peace out.

C.

Grid overseer 'gun-shy' on flagging EPA-linked reliability concerns -- FERC commissioner

Hannah Northey, E&E reporter

Published: Thursday, October 24, 2013

Republican member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission today said the grid's overseer has been "gun-shy" about flagging reliability concerns in the wake of new U.S. EPA rules.

FERC Commissioner Philip Moeller, who was appointed by President George W. Bush and reappointed by President Obama, pledged to support the North American Electric Reliability Corp. (NERC) in raising any reliability issues, regardless of how controversial they may be.

"I will back you up when those messages come out, and I think I have," Moeller said today at NERC's second annual leadership summit in Arlington, Va. "When you look back, it's kind of hard to not say, 'I told you so.'"

Moeller said on the sidelines of the summit that NERC "kind of got burned" when the group warned of reliability concerns three years ago.

At issue is NERC's release of a report that found reliability issues could surface if up to 70 gigawatts -- 7.2 percent of U.S. power capacity -- were to retire under EPA regulations on cooling water intake, coal ash disposal, clean air transport and using maximum achievable control technology (MACT) for air pollutants (E&E News PM, Oct. 28, 2010).
From: Duxbury, Peggy <peggy@bloomberg.org>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2013 1:39 PM
To: 'Michael Goo' <Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy>
Subject: RE: The Cool kids

---Original Message---
From: Michael Goo [mailto: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2013 1:37 PM
To: Duxbury, Peggy
Subject: Re: The Cool kids

Sounds good! Have a happy thanksgiving. You guys going out of town?

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 18, 2013, at 12:34 PM, "Duxbury, Peggy" <peggy@bloomberg.org> wrote:

> How about after Thanksgiving? Lots of travel for me between now and then.
> Eager to chat about your new role, and how DOE might be able to help with other agency climate efforts. Seems like you would have some good ideas about this.
> Peggy
> >
> >---Original Message---
> >From: Michael Goo [mailto: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
> >Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2013 6:29 PM
> >To: Duxbury, Peggy
> >Subject: Re: The Cool kids
> >Me too. You around after the thanksgiving break? Or even during the break? Let's get together either time.
> >Sent from my iPhone
> >On Nov 14, 2013, at 11:44 AM, "Duxbury, Peggy" <peggy@bloomberg.org> wrote:
> >>> Hope this is a cool as they make this sound! Eager to catch up and hear how its all going.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>'Cool kids' jump to Moniz's new policy shop
Thanks

Tom Lawler
Lawler Strategies
(202) 340-1960

On Sep 25, 2011, at 10:56 PM, michael Goo wrote:

ok i will call number on text message

Yeah a phone call would probably be best. Can you talk at 8?

Tom Lawler
Lawler Strategies
(202) 340-1960

On Sep 25, 2011, at 9:57 PM, michael Goo wrote:

not sure what response to this you are looking for. Some of it might be right and some of it is definitely wrong.....we should talk in the am maybe. Not sure where you got this from or what you will do with it so cant really comment.....thanks for sharing

I feel like I need to start training for the Gooman 600. Sounds like a really tough race. Memo below. If I didn't have to have some answers by 9 tomorrow morning I wouldnt be bothering you today. Sorry.
I feel like I need to start training for the Gooman 600. Sounds like a really tough race. Memo below. If I didn't have to have some answers by 9 tomorrow morning I wouldn't be bothering you today. Sorry.

EPA Air Program staff have been asked to prepare both 30 day and 60 day extension schedules for the September 30th court ordered deadline for proposal of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for Electric Generating Units (EGU).

Further, there are strong indications that the EPA political team is leaning toward issuing a proposed rule only for "new sources," [CAA Section 111 (b)], while an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) would be issued for "existing sources* [CAA Section 111 (d)].

EPA has not yet secured agreement from the litigants (NRDC, EDF, Sierra Club, et al) to the potential schedule delay, but there are some indications that the litigants will not fight a 30-60 day delay if EPA sticks to the deadline for a final rule of May 26, 2012.

No New Coal

The GHG NSPS proposal for new sources would effectively eliminate future coal fired EGU*. The new source standards will be based on GHG emissions from Combined Cycle Natural Gas and are likely be about 1100 lbs. CO2/MWh. The best performing *Super Critical* coal plants achieve roughly 1700-1800 lbs. CO2/MWh and many are closer to 2100-2200 lbs. CO2/MWh. IGCC plants would likely need to achieve very high rates of carbon sequestration in order to be permitted.

Reasonable Standards for Existing Units

In contrast, the ANPRM for existing sources will contain a "menu* of energy efficiency improvements, from which EGU* could choose in order to achieve a roughly 5-8% efficiency improvement. The cost and potential benefit of each option will be described in some detail. States will be given substantial flexibility in determining how existing units achieve compliance.

A critical unresolved question involves a group of about 15 "transitional plants* * those which have received some degree of permit approval but have not yet commenced construction. Since "commercial construction* is likely to be defined as the date of the proposed rule for new sources, EPA management must still decide how to treat these "transitional sources."
Laura Vaught very up to speed on this. She thinks we work from behind the scenes only. She will call you. You can call her.
Hi Michael, it's Nat. Can you give me a quick call if you are available now? Thanks.
From: Kathleen.Barron@exeloncorp.com
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 4:47 PM
To: Ex. 6 - Michael Goo
Subject: WSJ Weekend Interview potential quotes relating to EPA

"And I was the carbon bandit," Mr. Rowe continues, with his matter-of-fact candor. "I was the champion of climate regulation in the utility industry, and we are the people who back EPA regulation."

"What we are trying to do," Mr. Rowe argues, "partly out of self-interest and partly to avoid sticking our customers with things that are really expensive, is to push for some sort of orderly environmental framework on the markets." He concedes that "we can make some money" on the EPA rules because Exelon has little coal in its energy mix "and we don't apologize for trying to make money on having cleaner energy."

On EPA: "a lot better than to have every political party picking its favorite technology, and either subsidizing the hell out of it with government money or asking the utility to subsidize the hell out of it on customers."

Has EPA been orderly: "The current leadership of EPA rightly or wrongly, largely rightly, sees cleaning up the energy fleet as its reason for being," he explains. "It wouldn't shock me at all if in some places they overdo it. It also wouldn't shock me if at some places, they see the [traditional] criteria pollutants as a way of substituting for the carbon regulation they wanted to do and didn't get. Both, all of those things are probably true, and yet it's also true that people with the old coal plants are gaming the system."

The "real enemy here," Mr. Rowe continues, isn't the EPA. "It's what a whole lot of people who call themselves entrepreneurs, but really are living on their lobbyist, are doing getting legislators around the country to require utilities to buy power from stuff that has no connection with the economics at all."

The market will choose "the technology of choice when it becomes economic," which will almost certainly be gas.

Obama "will continue to make concessions on the environmental front, because in truth it's not one of his"
big priorities. It's [EPA chief] Lisa Jackson's priority, but not the president. I don't think he will collapse on it. He will hold the line on the hazardous air pollutants, I believe."

****************************************************************************** This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain Exelon Corporation proprietary information, which is privileged, confidential, or subject to copyright belonging to the Exelon Corporation family of Companies. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or action taken in relation to the contents of and attachments to this e-mail is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout. Thank You.******************************************************************************
WSJ Weekend Interview potential quotes relating to EPA

And I was the carbon bandit, Mr. Rowe continues, with his matter-of-fact candor. I was the champion of climate regulation in the utility industry, and we are the people who back EPA regulation.

What we are trying to do, Mr. Rowe argues, partly out of self-interest and partly to avoid sticking our customers with things that are really expensive, is to push for some sort of orderly environmental framework on the markets. He concedes that we can make some money on the EPA rules because Exelon has little coal in its energy mix and we don't apologize for trying to make money on having cleaner energy.

On EPA: a lot better than to have every political party picking its favorite technology, and either subsidizing the hell out of it with government money or asking the utility to subsidize the hell out of it on customers.

Has EPA been orderly? The current leadership of EPA rightly or wrongly, largely rightly, sees cleaning up the energy fleet as its reason for being, he explains. It wouldn't shock me at all if in some places they overdo it. It also wouldn't shock me if at some places, they see the [traditional] criteria pollutants as a way of substituting for the carbon regulation they wanted to do and didn't get. Both, all of those things are probably true, and yet it's also true that people with the old coal plants are gaming the system.

The real enemy here, Mr. Rowe continues, isn't the EPA. It's what a whole lot of people who call themselves entrepreneurs, but really are living on their lobbyist, are doing getting legislators around the country to require utilities to buy power from stuff that has no connection with the economics at all.

the market will choose the technology of choice when it becomes economic, which will almost certainly be gas.

Obama will continue to make concessions on the environmental front, because in truth it's not one of his big priorities. It's [EPA chief] Lisa Jackson's priority, but not the president. I don't think he will collapse on it. He will hold the line on the hazardous air pollutants, I believe.
Hey michael - check your yahoo - just sent a couple quotes I might want to use
I might want to use a few of these in my story. Here they are. Let me know if they are OK. I'd attribute as a 'former house democratic aide' if that works for you.

Expect Obama to stay away from specific ideas over the next year for a second term given the current political climate. "You need to be very careful about articulating that," a former House Democratic aide said.

At the White House level, Obama's energy policies have largely been run out of the chief of staff's office since Carol Browner left last year. "You don't have a champion for that kind of thing," said a former House Democratic aide.

The long shot prospects of getting back to climate would require winning back control of the House and keeping the Senate, though even then the dynamics of 2009-10 remain. "You'd have to take back the moderate seats to gain the House back. And those guys are not going to be happy about being BTU'd or Waxman-Markeyed," the former House Democratic aide said. "You've got a lot of uphill battles to get that passed."
Sure. Maybe say former Senate democratic aide. Thx

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 25, 2012, at 11:10 PM, Darren Samuelsohn <dsamuelsohn@politico.com> wrote:

I might want to use a few of these in my story. Here they are. Let me know if they are OK. I'd attribute as a *former house democratic aide* if that works for you.

Expect Obama to stay away from specific ideas over the next year for a second term given the current political climate. "You need to be very careful about articulating that," a former House Democratic aide said.

At the White House level, Obama's energy policies have largely been run out of the chief of staff's office since Carol Browner left last year. "You don't have a champion for that kind of thing," said a former House Democratic aide.

The long shot prospects of getting back to climate would require winning back control of the House and keeping the Senate, though even then the dynamics of 2009-10 remain. "You'd have to take back the moderate seats to gain the House back. And those guys are not going to be happy about being BTU'd or Waxman-Markeyed," the former House Democratic aide said.
Sure thing. Thanks for the quick turn around. Great chatting with you. Let’s try for a lunch on a Monday or Friday when Congress isn’t around.

On 1/25/12 11:17 PM, "Michael Goo" wrote:

Sure. Maybe say former Senate democratic aide. Thx

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 25, 2012, at 11:10 PM, Darren Samuelsohn <dsamuelsohn@politico.com> wrote:

A few things I might want to use a few of these in my story. Here they are. Let me know if they are OK. I’d attribute as a ‘former house democratic aide’ if that works for you.

Expect Obama to stay away from specific ideas over the next year for a second term given the current political climate. "You need to be very careful about articulating that," a former House Democratic aide said.

At the White House level, Obama’s energy policies have largely been run out of the chief of staff’s office since Carol Browner left last year. "You don’t have a champion for that kind of thing," said a former House Democratic aide.

The long shot prospects of getting back to climate would require winning back control of the House and keeping the Senate,
though even then the dynamics of 2009-10 remain. "You'd have to take back the moderate seats to gain the House back. And those guys are not going to be happy about being BTU'd or Waxman-Markeyed," the former House Democratic aide said. "You've got a lot of uphill battles to get that passed."
From: Michael Goo

Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2012 3:31 AM

To: Darren Samuelsohn <dsamuelsohn@politico.com>

Subject: Re: A few things

Yes let's get lunch soon. Btw send me the story if you would. In retrospect I'm sort of hoping you didn't use the second quote about the lack of a champion. Some people might be touchy about that. Anyway the next recess lets have lunch.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 25, 2012, at 11:19 PM, Darren Samuelsohn <dsamuelsohn@politico.com> wrote:

Sure thing. Thanks for the quick turn around. Great chatting with you. Let's try for a lunch on a Monday or Friday when Congress isn't around.

On 1/25/12 11:17 PM, "Michael Goo" <Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy> wrote:

Sure. Maybe say former
Senate democratic aide. Thx

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 25, 2012, at 11:10 PM, Darren Samuelsohn <dsamuelsohn@politico.com> wrote:

A few things I might want to use a few of these in my story. Here they are. Let me know if they are OK. I'd attribute as a *former house democratic aide* if that works for you.

Expect Obama to stay away from specific ideas over the next year for a second term given the current political climate. "You need to be very careful about articulating that," a former House Democratic aide said.
From: Darren Samuelsohn <dsamuelsohn@politico.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 7, 2012 12:07 AM
To: Michael Goo
Subject: Re: A few things

Hey Michael,

How's it going over there? Just a quick hello. Don't know if you heard but I've moved over to the White House beat — on and up in the world and no longer just covering energy. On that note, got any deep background insight on Cass S? Know who'd be good to talk with? Digging around — heard he's holding up the Great Lakes compact b/c of cost-benefit.

DS

On 1/26/12 3:30 AM, "Michael Goo" wrote:

Yes let's get lunch soon. Btw send me the story if you would. In retrospect I'm sort of hoping you didn't use the second quote about the lack of a champion. Some people might be touchy about that. Anyway the next recess lets have lunch.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 25, 2012, at 11:19 PM, Darren Samuelsohn <dsamuelsohn@politico.com> wrote:

Re: A few things Sure thing. Thanks for the quick turn around. Great chatting with you. Let's try for a lunch on a Monday or Friday when Congress isn't around.

On 1/25/12 11:17 PM, "Michael Goo" wrote:

Sure. Maybe say former
Senate democratic aide. Thx

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 25, 2012, at 11:10 PM, Darren Samuelsohn <dsamuelsohn@politico.com> wrote:

A few things I might want to use a few of these in my story. Here they are. Let me know if they are OK. I'd attribute as a 'former house democratic aide' if that works for
you.

Expect Obama to stay away from specific ideas over the next year for a second term given the current political climate. "You need to be very careful about articulating that," a former House Democratic aide said.

At the White House level, Obama’s energy policies have largely been run out of the chief of staff’s office since Carol Browner left last year. "You don’t have a champion for that kind of thing," said a former House Democratic aide.

The long shot prospects of getting back to climate would require winning back control of the House and keeping the Senate, though even then the dynamics of 2009-10 remain. "You’d have to take back the moderate seats to gain the House back. And those guys are not going to be happy about being BTU’d or Waxman-Markeyed," the former House Democratic aide said. "You’ve got a lot of uphill battles to get that passed."
Hey Michael,

Putting on my energy hat for a minute, any way you can confirm on background (as a Senior Admin Official?) the key point in the NYT story today that Obama and the EPA will be pursuing regulations for existing power plants and that this process needs to get moving by end of year to be finished before the term is up?

Thanks,
Darren Samuelsohn
Politico
2022775399
Hello, I'm working on a story about your new office and writing about all the well known staff heading over there. I'm listing the five divisions and writing about the deputy directors, but I'd like to mention where you'll be working. Can you tell me your division and title? Also your start date? The story will probably run next week.

Thank you!

Robin
From: Robin Bravender  
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 1:54 PM  
To: Michael Goo  
Subject: Re: Coffee?

Thanks. Congrats on being one of the cool kids. I hope your first week goes well. (whenever that may be...)

On Wed, Nov 13, 2013 at 10:43 AM, Michael Goo wrote:

Nice story. Thx.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 4, 2013, at 5:03 PM, Michael Goo wrote:

Great. Thx. See you then.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 4, 2013, at 4:12 PM, Robin Bravender wrote:

Excellent, thanks. 11 is fine by me. I'll see you then.

On Mon, Nov 4, 2013 at 3:51 PM, Michael Goo wrote:

Sure. I'm going to be downtown at Marriott across freedom plaza from EPA at 10. I could meet you there or around there at 9 or 11. 11 allows me to be slightly lazier but 9 is pretty relaxed for a usual work day so that is no problem either.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 4, 2013, at 2:10 PM, Robin Bravender wrote:

Hi Michael,
Does tomorrow still work for you? I can head out to Virginia if that's easiest for you. Anywhere near a Metro would be fine. Maybe 9 a.m.?

Thanks,

Robin

On Thu, Oct 31, 2013 at 7:11 PM, Robin Bravender
[Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy] wrote:

Tuesday is perfect. Is morning good for you? Just let me know where and when.

On Thu, Oct 31, 2013 at 6:54 PM, Michael Goo
[Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy] wrote:

Probably not tommorrow. Maybe next week? Monday I'm on annual leave canvassing. Maybe Tuesday?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 31, 2013, at 5:21 PM, Robin Bravender
[Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy] wrote:

> Hi Michael,
> 
> > Any chance you're up for a cup of coffee tomorrow afternoon or sometime next week? I'd be happy to meet you anywhere that's convenient.
> >
> > Thanks,
> >
> > Robin Bravender
Hi Michael,
I hope you had a good weekend. I'm going to be following up on this export about OIRA that the Post wrote about yesterday. Are you available for a few minutes on Monday morning to chat on background about specific rules that were delayed?

I'll be at if you're free to chat.

Thanks a lot.

Robin
Hi Michael,

I hope you're having a good summer.

Is there any chance you could send along Secretary Moniz's email announcing Deputy Secretary Poneman's departure this fall? I won't need to cite it to you, I would just say an email "obtained by E&E."

Many thanks,

Robin

On Mon, Jan 6, 2014 at 5:14 PM, Robin Bravender wrote:

Whenever you're ready, please call my cell instead. Thanks.

On Mon, Jan 6, 2014 at 4:25 PM, Michael Goo wrote:

Sure

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2014, at 3:46 PM, Robin Bravender wrote:

Sure, that's great. Do you want to call me when you're free?

On Mon, Jan 6, 2014 at 3:45 PM, Michael Goo wrote:

How bout around 5?

Sent from my iPhone
On Jan 6, 2014, at 9:32 AM, Robin Bravender wrote:

Absolutely. What time is good for you?

On Sun, Jan 5, 2014 at 12:10 AM, Michael Goo wrote:

Let's talk Monday if that works. Thx

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 3, 2014, at 12:35 PM, Robin Bravender wrote:

> Happy New Year!
> 
> I'm working on a story that includes five staffers who are influential behind the scenes at our various agencies and offices (EPA, DOE, Interior, the White House, Congress) and I wonder if you have a few minutes to chat on background. I want to make sure I'm including folks who are actually influential, which is hard to discern as an outsider.
> 
> Do you have some time today or Monday?
> 
> Thanks a ton. How's the new job going?
> 
> Robin
I have raised this with senior leadership and we are preparing to respond to the Izzo request for a meeting and also we are working on the impingement issue....also dont assume i check this email much so if you want to have an offline chat just let me know you are using this channel....thanks

---

As follow up to our conversations, below is additional detail on the CSAPR and GHG NSPS

CSAPR
As discussed, we have been having a series of conversations with EPA about many of the CEG companies* concerns on the final state budgets under the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR). While the companies want to remain supportive of the final CSAPR, the state budgets for NY, NJ, and FL were significantly reduced in the final rule. These changes are making supporting the implementation of the rule as currently written very difficult. While we understand EPA is willing to make technical adjustments to state budgets based on new technical information, we are concerned that despite efforts to provide EPA with additional information, EPA is not inclined to adjust those state budgets until after October 7th* the deadline for when petitions for reconsideration and petitions to the DC Circuit are due. Since the rule*s release about 10 weeks ago, we have been working to explain the concerns we have with certain state budgets and highlight the technical errors that result from using the IPM model and not taking into account the transmission system constraints that are unique to certain areas in the U.S. Following Eric Svenson*s outreach to Gina McCarthy regarding PSEG*s concerns, we have had several discussions with Joe Goffman and Sam Napolitano on the NJ state budget. Compared to the proposed budget, New Jersey*s final annual NOx budget was reduced by 39 percent, the ozone season NOx budget was reduced by 36 percent, and New Jersey*s SO2 budget was reduced by 51 percent. With fewer allowances available to the state, several of PSEG*s generating units are projected to be short allowances beginning in 2012, despite having advanced pollution control equipment installed and operating. Additionally, since PSEG*s generating fleet is generally well controlled, there are limited opportunities for further emissions reductions between now and 2012.
Michael,

Below is the message I have sent to Gina and Joe. I can be reached before 10:00 AM eastern time tomorrow morning and after 3:30 PM when I arrive in DC.

Michael

Joe,

Would you please send this email on to Gina for me? I would have sent it to her directly with a cc to you but I don't have a private email address for her and would prefer to not use an official email address. Your calls to Eric and Bob were very helpful in reassuring them that EPA is looking to be responsive to their State budget concerns but time is becoming an issue and others within PSEG and NGrid are pushing for a clear resolution in the very near term. Thanks.

Gina,

As you know, many of the CEG companies have been having a series of conversations with EPA
So apparently there is one more meeting with Cass this morning at 10 am with EEI and Cass. Not sure if letter actually went.

Below is the central message of the EEI letter calling for the Section 112 President to issue an Executive Order for additional time. Please do not circulate or indicate where this info came from.

As members of EEI, we support the consensus view of our membership that the President should issue an Executive Order under section 112 of the Clean Air Act to provide additional time, as necessary, for power plants to achieve compliance with the utility MACT rule. This Executive Order should be issued at the time the MACT is finalized so that planning, evaluation and implementation for plants likely to need additional time can be undertaken expeditiously on a forward-looking basis.

Congress recognized that the availability of technology and national security interests are legitimate and justifiable reasons to extend a MACT deadline. Clean Air Act section 112(i)(4) allows the President to grant an exemption (i.e., an extension of time) to the utility MACT deadlines for up to two years based on a finding that (1) the technology to implement such standard is not available, and (2) it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so.

We represent the seven companies that were charged by EEI’s Executive Committee with leading industry MACT discussions with both the Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency.
Michael,

The NERC Board approved the NERC Reliability Report today with revisions that show 316B causing the vast majority of the retirements and that the air regulations have a minor impact. It is scheduled to be released next Tuesday in advance of the FERC workshop. If you would like a copy of the report let me know. CEG will be issuing a press statement to point out that the weaknesses in the analysis as well as to spin the results as somewhat favorable. I will send you the press statement tomorrow.

As you are aware EEI is pushing very hard for the categorical 1 year extension as well as for the 2 year Presidential extension. EEI will be convening a CEO call early next week to agree on a strategy to convince the Administration to accept their proposed revisions which will entail making calls to Lisa and possibly a request for another EEI CEO meeting with Lisa. It would be useful if we could touch base tomorrow to discuss how best to manage these dynamics. We have a number of efforts planned for next week and it would be good to get your input.

I plan to be in the office until noon tomorrow and then can be reached on my cell.

Michael
Michael

As follow up to our discussion, below are the key concerns that we have with the NODA based on our current understanding of the NODA.

In general, I see two key objectives with the NODA:
1) Make clear to the industry and stakeholders that EPA is changing course for the IM standard and will require units to comply with a technology-based standard rather than a numeric standard.
2) Provide enough certainty so that stakeholders can clearly agree that the rule will not drive a significant number of retirements causing reliability concerns predicted by NERC, for example.

Based on our conversations, we understand that the NODA will indicate that BTA is defined as:
- modified traveling screens, such as Ristroph screens or equivalent modified traveling screens, with a fish return system;
- approach velocity of 0.5 feet/second (fps) (the point of measurement is an issue we can continue to discuss with the Water Office once the NODA is released); or
- closed-cycle cooling. (For closed-cycle cooling, the definition and inclusion of cooling ponds is an outstanding issue that we understand will not be addressed in the NODA as any changes in the final rule will be a logical outgrowth of the proposal. As we have discussed, it will be important to continue to discuss the appropriate definition once the NODA is released.)

We would recommend that the NODA indicate that facilities relying on one of the three options above are required to operate that technology consistent with best management practices and manufacturers specifications. CEG would oppose a requirement to perform annual or monthly tests to demonstrate optimization of that technology. Rather, the five year permit review process should serve as a process to ensure that the
sooner than later.

Please let me know if you have some time to meet/talk on 1/10 or 1/11.

Cheers,
CS

>>>> Gregoire stock rising for EPA top job
>>>>
>>>> By Darren Samuelsohn and Erica Martinson
>>>>
>>>> 1/4/13 6:11 PM EST
>>>> Washington Gov. Chris Gregoire may be moving to the front of the pack in the contest to be named the new EPA administrator, according to a source familiar with the transition and a Seattle online newspaper.
>>>>
>>>> The Seattle Post-Intelligencer on Friday cited a very private prediction from a very senior source in Washington's congressional delegation saying she'll soon be nominated to replace Lisa Jackson.
>>>>
>>>> And a source familiar with the transition told POLITICO that the article naming Gregoire as a leading candidate for the EPA job is "quite real."
>>>>
>>>> Gregoire was an early backer of President Barack Obama and has received past support herself from Kansas Gov. Kathleen Sebelius and Arizona Gov. Janet Napolitano, both of whom became part of the president's Cabinet.
>>>>
>>>> The outgoing Washington governor's name has been circulated inside the Obama White House for a second term post, including EPA and the Interior Department, a job that traditionally goes to a Westerner, according to the source familiar with the transition.
>>>>
>>>> Her name has been on the list, said the source. She's looking for a spot and she's likely to get a spot.
>>>>
>>>> Others inside the Obama administration also have been vying for the EPA spot, including the agency's top air pollution official, Gina McCarthy, and the White House's top energy and climate adviser Heather Zichal. Bob Perciasepe, the current No. 2 at EPA, has also been named among the list of possible EPA candidates and is set to serve as the agency's acting chief pending the confirmation of Jackson's successor.
>>>>
>>>> We have not heard anything from the administration on such an offer, Gregoire's spokesman Cory Curtis said in an email response to a query.
>>>>
>>>> The White House declined comment.
>>>>
>>>> "She certainly would be an eminently qualified person," said Bill Ruckelshaus,
From: Michael Bradley <mbradley@mjbradley.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 3, 2012 8:36 PM
To: EEI
Subject: EEI

Michael,

I learned late today that EEI will be attempting to set up a meeting with you to go through the list of 316(B) revisions they are looking for. I believe you're going to receive an email from Amy Trojecki from Exelon requesting the meeting. I want to be clear that the EEI reps do not represent the CEG perspective on 316(B).

Since speaking with you this afternoon we have discussed the current delay with CEQ staff and your suspicion of EEI sending a message of hold back until all the key issues are resolved has been confirmed. I will be speaking with Lew Hay again tomorrow morning to discuss how best to get this back on track. I will be suggesting that we ask Tom Kuhn to call OMB to voice support for finalizing the NODA. I will let you know how this effort works out.

MJB
Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 3, 2012, at 8:36 PM, Michael Bradley <mbradley@mjb Bradley.com> wrote:

Michael,

I learned late today that EEI will be attempting to set up a meeting with you to go through the list of 316(B) revisions they are looking for. I believe you're going to receive an email from Amy Trojecki from Exelon requesting the meeting. I want to be clear that the EEI reps do not represent the CEG perspective on 316(B).

Since speaking with you this afternoon we have discussed the current delay with CEQ staff and your suspicion of EEI sending a message of hold back until all the key issues are resolved has been confirmed. I will be speaking with Lew Hay again tomorrow morning to discuss how best to get this back on track. I will be suggesting that we ask Tom Kuhn to call OMB to voice support for finalizing the NODA. I will let you know how this effort works out.

MJB
Michael Bradley <mbradley@mjb Bradley.com>

Thursday, April 5, 2012 10:27 AM

To: Ex. 6 - Michael Goo

Subject: FW: 316(b) Update

See the EEI email below which claims that they want the NODA published expeditiously. Dominion, PSEG, NextEra as well as other companies have contacted to request that OMB the NODA be published ASAP.

From: Shea, Quin [mailto:QShea@nei.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 9:27 AM
To: Bozek, Richard; Dominguez, Joseph (joseph.dominguez@exeloncorp.com); Labauve, Randy (randall_r labauve@ptl.com); Svenson, Eric (Eric. Svenson@pseg.com); Lavinson, Melissa (melissa.lavinson@pge-corp.com); Mutty, Bob (Robert Mutty@exeloncorp.com); Donohue, William J. (William.Donohue@exeloncorp.com); Trojecki, Amy M. (Amy.Trojecki@exeloncorp.com); Ludecke, Kristen; Strickland, Mark F. (Mark.Strickland@pseg.com); Butts, Rayburn (Ray.Butts@ptl.com); Boyce, Cani (Cani.boyce@pennmail.com); Loomis, Ann W (ann_w looming@td.com); jdu@nei.org; Shainon_Banaga@pseg.com; Foster, Christopher
Cc: Bulletin, Kristy (kbulliet@hunton.com); Carne Jenks; Simone, Hannah (hss@nei.org); Skaff Ph. D., William (wgs@nei.org); Obenshain, Karen; Bartholomot, Henry; Hunt, Meg; Baill, Sarah; Holdsworth, Eric
Subject: 316(b) Update
Importance: High

I hope you are enjoying some quality down time with your families during the Congressional recess and holiday season, both of which would be a little more enjoyable if we had some solid intelligence on where things stand with the NODA and our key issues. The balance of this note provides a few snippets for your consideration, as well as an initial draft of a new outreach piece developed with Congressional audiences in mind.

All of you likely are aware that last month’s CEO meetings went well; our principals were on message and had done their homework, and Joe was like a fact-generating machine. Our subsequent game plan was to wait for the NODA to be issued—presumably within a couple of weeks of our meetings—and then to comment on same, to determine what additional analytical tasks might be appropriate, to pursue staff-level meetings with key agency staff, and to set up another round of CEO-level meetings. However, the NODA has been held up in part because of OMB objections and the recess/holiday schedule isn’t helping matters. Importantly, several of us have heard in the past few days from our Administration colleagues that it’s unclear to them
whether industry wants the NODA to come out. I’m not sure about the basis for that comment as it is contrary to specific conversations that occurred during the CEO meetings and in more recent conversations with key agency and WH staff. It would be useful to compare notes on this point. For its part, EEI is seeking expeditious issuance of the NODA within the parameters requested by the CEOs, i.e., a de facto supplemental proposal that focuses on eliciting input on key substantive issues, but that is devoid of any outcome-determinative language that may have existed in the EPA draft. Finally, it’s our understanding that there is an internal EPA meeting today to discuss the 316(b) issue, so hopefully we will get some clarification thereafter.

Separately, attached for your consideration is a draft document for Congressional audiences that perhaps also could be used in other forums. It is intended to be a very simple, clean messaging document that nonetheless is consistent with our core tenets.

Thanks for everyone’s continued efforts on this important issue. I suggest sharing new information within the group as it becomes available.
From: michael Goo [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2012 6:22 PM
To: cjenks@mjb Bradley.com
Subject: Fw: NODAs
Attach: EO12866_2040-AE95_Cooling water intake NODA 2 053112.clean.docx;
EO12866_2040-AE95_Cooling water intake NODA 1_clean_053012.docx

Pls delete the nodas on stated preference upon receipt....both docs on need to know basis

----- Forwarded Message -----From: Michael Goo <Goo.Michael@epamail.epa.gov>
To: [Ex. 6 - Michael Goo]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2012 6:20 PM
Subject: Fw: NODAs

----- Forwarded by Michael Goo/DC/USEPA/US on 06/31/2012 06:20 PM -----From: Paul Beierkopf/DC/USEPA/US
To: Michael Goo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 05/31/2012 06:13 PM
Subject: Fw: NODAs

just in case, here are both NODAs. Obv, NODA 1 is titled "NODA_1" and is the flexibility changes. NODA 2 is the stated preference and is titled "NODA_2"

Paul

(See attached file: EO12866_2040-AE95_Cooling water intake NODA 2 053112.clean.docx)(See attached file: EO12866_2040-AE95_Cooling water intake NODA 1_clean_053012.docx)
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 122, 123, 124, and 125

[EPA-HQ-OW-2008-0667, FRL – 9681-5]

RIN 2040–AE95

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System — Proposed Regulations to Establish Requirements for Cooling Water Intake Structures at Existing Facilities and Amend Requirements at Phase I Facilities; Notice of Data Availability

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Data Availability.

SUMMARY: On April 20, 2011, EPA published proposed standards for cooling water intake structures at all existing power generating, manufacturing, and industrial facilities as part of implementing section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA). This notice presents a summary of new information EPA has developed since the rule proposal. The information results from a stated preference survey that EPA conducted after the proposed rule was published. Stated preference surveys are an attempt to determine the economic value of goods or services by means other than by assessing the effects of changes in the market for the goods and services. In this notice EPA solicits comment on the information presented in this notice and on what role, if any, it should play in EPA’s assessment of the benefits of regulatory options for the final rule, pending completion of the survey and external peer review.
Will do. Yes. Thank you.

Pls delete the noda on stated preference upon receipt.....both does on need to know basis

just in case, here are both NODAs. Obv, NODA 1 is titled "NODA_1" and is the flexibility changes. NODA 2 is the stated preference and is titled "NODA_2"

Paul

(See attached file: EO12866 2040-0E95 Cooling water intake NODA 2 053112.clean.docx)(See attached file: EO12866 2040-0E95 Cooling water intake NODA 1 clean 053012.docx)
From: Carrie Jenks <cjenks@mjbradley.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2012 8:13 PM
To: michael Goo
Subject: RE: NODAs

The NODA is up on the web so that I what I am circulating widely now to CEG. Thanks for your help earlier.

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: michael Goo <Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy>
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2012 6:22 PM
To: Carrie Jenks
Subject: Fw: NODAs

Pls delete the noda on stated preference upon receipt...both docs on need to know basis

--- Forwarded by Michael Goo on 06/31/2012 06:23 PM ---

From: Paul Baker<DCUSEPA-US>
To: Michael Goo<DCUSEPA-US@EPA>
Date: 05/31/2012 16:13 PM
Subject: Fw: NODAs

just in case, here are both NODAs. Obv, NODA 1 is titled 'NODA_1' and is the flexibility changes. NODA 2 is the stated preference and is titled 'NODA_2'

Paul

(See attached file: EO12866 2040-AE95_Cooling water intake NODA 2 053112.clean.docx)(See attached file: EO12866 2040-AE95_Cooling water intake NODA 1 clean_053012.docx)
Includes Goo apparently. I don’t have his new email so not sure if he’ll get this. Imagine how great this article would be with some good photos or video from Goo Fest.

DOE:

'Cool kids' jump to Moniz's new policy shop
Robin Bravender and Katherine Ling, E&E reporters
Published: Tuesday, November 12, 2013

There's a new office generating buzz and big expectations at the Department of Energy.

Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, who launched the policy shop as part of a larger DOE overhaul, is stocking it with top talent from the climate and energy arenas and is giving it big responsibilities for carrying out President Obama's climate change plan.

"It's where all the cool kids on the block are going," said a former DOE senior staff member who's now an energy consultant. "They are the rock stars of DOE."

At the helm of the new Office of Energy Policy and Systems Analysis is Melanie Kenderdine, who worked with Moniz at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Energy Initiative as well as at DOE during the Clinton administration. She's expected to have a lot of clout with the secretary.

"In addition to their close, personal association at MIT, Melanie is someone who I would put in the top three or four people who has an ability to know all the fuels," said Charles Ebinger, director of the Energy Security Initiative at the Brookings Institution. He noted her broad-based expertise that includes subjects like natural gas, renewable energy and nuclear power.

Kenderdine is assembling a savvy team that includes battle-hardened veterans of the failed congressional efforts to pass climate legislation. With prospects for major climate and energy bills all but dead, the new staffers are hoping to have a big impact on energy policy through the executive branch.

"A lot of great people have left the Hill because they can see that Congress for the time being is not going to be on the cutting edge of these issues," said Manik Roy, vice president for strategic outreach at the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions. "There are some bigger-ticket items now in the executive branch."

Former U.S. EPA senior official Michael Goo is one of the latest recruits to join Kenderdine's team. Goo comes from a post as associate administrator for EPA's Office of Policy, where he was charged with overseeing
From: Wayland, Karen <Karen.Wayland@Hq.DoC.Gov>
Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2013 4:22 PM
To: Ex. 6 - Michael Goo
Subject: Re: Fwd: E and C letter

Thx. Am on it. B/c you don’t have a DOE email yet I don’t think I can cc you on an internal email chain but will touch base with you tomorrow as I get responses. Am in Orlando today and tomorrow for NARUC annual meeting. Be back Monday night.

From: Michael Goo [mailto: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2013 01:13 PM
To: Wayland, Karen
Subject: Fwd: E and C letter

Hi Karen,

Not knowing protocol and being in between I will rely on you to figure how to handle things but

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Talk to you soon.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:
From: Ex. 6 - Jessica Holliday
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2013 2:16 PM
To: Michael Goo Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Subject: Re: Supplement the record & get back to the single standard

Good. Just got back from Comcast. Hopefully they will fix my landline tomorrow. :-)
Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael Goo Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2013 14:13:26
To: Jessica Holliday Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Subject: Re: Supplement the record & get back to the single standard

Yep. Thx. Will check it out. Thanks for alerting me to this whole thing. I was first on the ball over there at DOE.
It's since gone into channels and I'm hearing back indirectly but still am working on it.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 18, 2013, at 10:41 AM, Jessica Holliday Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy wrote:

> Hi kiddo. So EPA can supplement the record w/examples of CCS that are not DOE projects. Given that they
reproposed, any way to get back to single standard for coal and gas plants? Also see if you can find at least the
Wyoming PUC proceeding where Pacificorp is proposing to burn natural gas in their coal plant. In other words, not
build new gas plant or switch to existing gas plant.
>
> My land line has gone down -- who knows why -- and I will have to visit Comcast today.
Hi kiddo. So EPA can supplement the record w/examples of CCS that are not DOE projects. Given that they repurposed, any way to get back to single standard for coal and gas plants? Also see if you can find at least the Wyoming PUC proceeding where PacifiCorp is proposing to burn natural gas in their coal plant. In other words, not build new gas plant or switch to existing gas plant.

My land line has gone down -- who knows why -- and I will have to visit Comcast today.
From: Michael Goo (Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy)
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 6:20 PM
To: Karen Wayland <Karen.Wayland@Hq.Doe.Gov>
Subject: Fwd: E and C letter

So this is the issue. I will look into it.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Michael Goo (Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy)
Date: November 15, 2013, 6:18:25 PM EST
To: "goo.michael@epa.gov" <goo.michael@epa.gov>
Subject: E and C letter

From: Energy and Commerce News [mailto:EnergyandCommerceNews@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 4:14 PM
Subject: Committee Leaders Request Withdrawal of EPA’s Proposed Power Plant Standards Citing Prohibition Under Energy Policy Act

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 15, 2013

CONTACT: Press Office
(202) 225-4972

Committee Leaders Request Withdrawal of EPA’s
Hi Karen.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Talk to you soon.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Goo, Michael" <Goo.Michael@epa.gov>
Date: November 17, 2013, 12:57:28 PM EST
To: Ex. 5 - Michael Goo
Subject: Fw: E and C letter

From: Schmidt, Lorie
Sent: Saturday, November 16, 2013 12:59:54 PM
To: Goo, Michael
Subject: Re: E and C letter

Ex. 5 - Deliberative & ACP

From: Goo, Michael
Sent: Saturday, November 16, 2013 11:31:28 AM
To: Schmidt, Lorie
Subject: Fw: E and C letter

Ex. 5 - Deliberative & ACP

From: Michael Goo
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 6:18:25 PM
To: Goo, Michael
Subject: E and C letter

From: Energy and Commerce News [mailto:EnergyandCommerceNews@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 4:14 PM
Subject: Committee Leaders Request Withdrawal of EPA’s Proposed Power Plant Standards Citing Prohibition Under Energy Policy Act

E & C
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
Chairman Fred Upton
113th Congress

GGO-A-0012494
From: Goo, Michael <Michael.Goo@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 10:37 PM
To: Unruh-Cohen, Ana <Ana.UnruhCohen@mail.house.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal <Michal.Freedhoff@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Michael Goo
Subject: RE: rough draft questions
Attach: markeysunsteinquestions.doc

Here are some questions—not totally sure we should go into clean air act specifics but here are some questions on boiler mact and cement kiln rule which might be useful if we need to go on defense for these rules....i will forward the backup docs including a draft supplemental memo that alexandra shared with me—you may already have it.

From: Unruh-Cohen, Ana
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 4:55 PM
To: Goo, Michael; Ex. 6 - Michael Goo
Subject: Fw: rough draft questions

If you can help fill this in, this is all we've got right now.

Ana
Ana Unruh Cohen, Ph.D.
202 494 1954

From: Freedhoff, Michal
To: Duncan, Jeff; Unruh-Cohen, Ana
Sent: Tue Jan 25 14:29:39 2011
Subject: rough draft questions

Here is a very rough draft. OMB is supposed to send me more, including some suggestions from Sunstein, a bit later. Their leg people had never heard of many of the regs I said might be raised in the hearing (coal ash, toxics etc). this could be scary. I'm going to end up having to finish these later tonight but would appreciate suggestions/edits in the meantime. Any and all help welcomed, as I've been pretty focused on getting the spill bill together today and haven't had a ton of time to devote to these.

Thanks.
Thanks. The qs I have thus far are not specific but sort of like "Epa said a bazillion small sources are not gonna have to have permits. Is that consistent with the executive order to impose the least burden on society and maximize the net benefits"

I will try to work these in similarly.

Michael Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Policy Director
Office of Representative Edward J. Markey
2108 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-2836

Sent using BlackBerry

----------

From: Goo, Michael
To: Unruh-Cohen, Ana
Cc: Freedhoff, Michal
Sent: Tue Jan 25 22:37:20 2011
Subject: RE: rough draft questions

Here are some questions—not totally sure we should go into clean air act specifics but here are some questions on boiler mact and cement kiln rule which might be useful if we need to go on defense for these rules...i will forward the backup docs including a draft supplemental memo that alexandra shared with me—you may already have it

----------

From: Unruh-Cohen, Ana
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 4:55 PM
To: Goo, Michael
Subject: Fw: rough draft questions

If you can help fill this in, this is all we've got right now.

Ana

Ana Unruh Cohen, Ph.D.
202 444 1954
Questions, Edward J. Markey (D-MA)
Hearing, Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee
“The Views of the Administration on Regulatory Reform”
January 26, 2011

Questions for Cass Sunstein, Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB

I can’t help but feel like I’m in the movie “Groundhog Day.” In the 1990s, when Republicans took over Congress, we heard that regulations would lead to widespread job losses and economic devastation. Today, we are hearing the identical arguments, evidence to the contrary notwithstanding. Mr. Waxman illustrated this using the example of the Obama Administration’s landmark 2009 fuel economy deal. This deal, which was basically the