

SC ETV Natural Resources Society Debate
Orangeburg Technical College - Tuesday, Nov. 3, 2009

Watch the video at:

http://www.scetv.org/index.php/video/live_event/gubernatorial_primary_debate/

Question (3:06): Do you think man is responsible for global warming, and if so, as Governor how would you address this issue? If not, explain your position.

Sheheen: Global warming is a real phenomenon. It's important for SC to play a role as a state. It's a much bigger issue than just SC. Nationally we have to come up with a plan. I think as Governor I would be able to work with the utilities and the legislature in our state to formulate a plan to try to play a legitimate and important role in the national discussion, and using that to create jobs within this state. I'll give you a few examples. We've got a great opportunity with wind energy offshore in SC- to not only reduce our output of energy that pollutes but also to create jobs in this state. We're already helping to build turbines in Greenville and Sumter Counties. There are also potentials with biofuels in our more rural areas like where I represent. A governor can help put together a comprehensive energy package for SC that not only helps reduce global warming but also creates jobs for our state.

Barrett: I think global warming is a problem but when you think about what's coming down the pike in terms of federal legislation it could be a detriment to SC, and don't take my word for it. Take the Heritage's word. We could lose 18,000 jobs and the average power bill in SC could go up \$1,400 per year, and add an extra \$1.27 per gallon of gas. What I would do as governor is concentrate on alternatives- one of them being nuclear energy. There are four nuclear reactors on the board right now in SC, and that could represent over a \$30 billion investment that brings real jobs, real growth and is good for my economy and my environment.

Bauer: I agree with Congressman Barrett about nuclear. We have to expand our opportunities so we're also viable in the near future for businesses to grow and expand in SC. But we ought to look at messages we can send as a state. For example, the dirtiest fuel burnt is diesel #5 that all container ships coming into the state of SC are burning. We ought to offer some type of incentive where they burn biofuels and they come to SC purely because they're incentivized to do so versus other ports. It would give us a leg up and allow us to take back some of that business that we quite frankly lost over the last several years, and we could send the message that we ought to be a green state. And I say that because if you're a green business, and if the Legislature could deem what green actually is, we would then say that you have 0 corporate taxes and we'd be known as the green capital of the world. And any green job, whether it be research and development or production, anyone that located in SC would know that their corporate taxes would be exempt. That would be a great way to draw in investment throughout the world to SC.

Drake: I think the science is clear that global warming does exist, and I don't see that as a gloom and doom thing for us to deal with. I see it as an opportunity for us to take advantage of creating jobs to deal with that issue. I think that we also have to deal with

the issue from a national defense standpoint, because having spent a year of my life in Vietnam, I don't want to see any more oil wars and see young men having to go to Iraq and the other countries in that part of the world. So it's a national defense issue as well as a global warming issue that we have to deal with, but we can do it and create jobs here. We're already doing it some. We can take advantage of the nuclear industry that's here because the nuclear, the wind, the biomass and other alternate fuels have to be a part of the mix. But we have to do it in a way to create jobs for the 250,000 people in this state that are unemployed.

Ford: I would depend on the General Assembly to work with the Congressional delegation to deal with that. But my thing is that we've got national resources in SC that we have to take advantage of. I would create the largest film movie industry, which does not pollute- no pollution whatsoever- the largest film movie industry in the country. I call that part of my platform, "SC the Beautiful." Take advantage of what we've got. Use that movie industry to create jobs. I'm talking about 100,000 new jobs because every part of SC could do films and movies on a daily basis. That would employ our people to have good jobs, and the scientists and United States Congressmen and the President could fight about global warming while we create jobs in SC using what we've got.

Grooms: We need SC solutions for SC problems, and if the issue is global warming- well, some folks say it's global cooling. This very auditorium, we'll find out in fossil records, was underwater at some point. Did man contribute to the ocean receding all the way back to Charleston? Probably not. Is man contributing to global cooling or global warming right now? I think that they should continue. But one thing I want to be certain about is that we don't shut down SC industries. We don't shut down SC jobs. We don't create a wonderful working environment for the folks over in China at the expense of SC. At Nucor Steel in my district, the average wage they paid last year was \$84,000. There's a quality of life issue that many folks are now enduring, and to shut that plant down in the name of some unproven science, I think would be ridiculous.

Haley: I think the one thing the Governor needs to do is keep us on message, and I think part of that is understanding that SC needs to be competitive. Global warming is an issue that we need to look at. It is something that is very real, but at the same time for SC we need to look at what will keep us competitive. What will make sure that businesses stay in this state and continue to thrive in this state? What will make new businesses come to our state and make sure that when they get here that we can turn the lights on? And that means that we expand energy and that we make sure we look at nuclear and we make sure we're being healthy about it, and it's the balance at the end of the day that will make us thrive as a state.

McLeod: I appreciate the question, and it really demonstrates one of the reasons why I'm running for governor. I am convinced that there are two things that are holding our state back: the politics and the rhetoric. And for our next governor I think that it's critical that he or she be from the private sector when they go to Columbia, forego running for other office and take the politics and rhetoric out of the equation so we can move our state forward. The only people debating global warming are the politicians. It ain't the

scientists. Absolutely global warming is a problem, and in SC we need to be on the forefront. And as governor the main thing we can do to impact that is with green jobs. We're sitting here tonight at a technical school. I've already come out with a plan that we need to read to our technical schools to prepare for green jobs, so the labor force is ready when industry comes.

McMaster: Whether scientists agree on whether man is causing it or not, we still need to take action, and we need to move to nuclear power in SC. We can have a whole cluster of industries just like we have with aeronautics and with BMW, with nuclear. We've got six or seven reactors now, and we have four on the drawing board, and the path to prosperity in SC is lit with nuclear power. Consider, if we go to nuclear power and we have the capacity to do it in these other alternatives ways to fuel the things we do, we can quit sending a billion dollars a day to those people in the Middle East, and we can create energy independence here to get rid of our addiction to foreign oil and our national security will be stronger.

Rex: Well if we put a wind turbine in front of this stage we could solve a lot of the energy needs of our state, and I'm including myself in that. This is a false choice. We can understand that we have global warming. The science is clear on that. That is not a death knell for our economy or anyone else's. We have technologies in our state that have begun that need to be supported by the next governor. We have efficiencies that we ought to be working on. We are one of the worst users of energy per capita in the nation so efficiency would help us also. So, it's a false choice. We can accept global warming and we can still have an innovative, sustainable economy, and SC should be leading that effort.

Question (12:15): There is a battle brewing when it comes to water. In the debate between North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, how do you protect our state's interest?

Question (19:17): Recently senior Senator Lindsey Graham expressed support for comprehensive energy reform at the federal level, and did so with Sen. John Kerry, much to the chagrin of many people in the Republican Party. He did so on the basis of decreasing our dependence on foreign oil. He wants more homegrown energy resources. He does this in the name of national security, and yet he has taken an awful lot of abuse from members of his own party. Are you willing to stand next to Sen. Graham in support of that bill that he is proposing in the Senate today?

Bauer: No. To make us competitively at a disadvantage with other countries is wrong, and we continue to do that with policies to allow other countries to continue to get ahead of us. If we want to see jobs continue to leave the United States, then we can support those types of policies. While I'm adamantly opposed to it, I think we ought to all be conservationists. I'm a Teddy Roosevelt Republican. I believe that a conservative means you conserve in all facets of life, not just monetarily. However, to put our state at a disadvantage and our country at a disadvantage to countries like China, I do not support whatsoever, and especially not on the backs of business.

Drake: I'm aware of the proposal and I support it. I admire Sen. Graham for reaching out in a bipartisan fashion and trying to fashion legislative solutions to a long-standing problem. I do not think that it's going to bring this country to ruin. I think it is going to go far in solving the problem. I applaud him for it, and I support him entirely.

Ford: My proposal in the State Senate is S.42, which is offshore drilling, and I'm from the Pelican State originally- Louisiana. In Louisiana we've proven that we can have safe, clean energy. We protect the pelicans in Louisiana and we have offshore drilling. We can do the same thing in South Carolina. I'm going to let the national politicians deal with those national and international issues. The governor of SC needs to have vision for SC by working with the General Assembly to do things to benefit our state, and of course work with Georgia and North Carolina without suing them every chance we get.

Grooms: I consider myself to be an environmentalist. I love this state. I love our natural resources. And I can't think of a worse environmental atmosphere than for SC to be cold, dark and unemployed. I'm opposed to cap and trade because it takes the wealth in SC and transfers it to other parts of this country. We need SC solutions to SC problems. Any time we shut down a coal-fired plant in SC, five or six open up in China. If we're trying to come to a carbon-constrained economy it needs to be global. We don't need to be putting our people out of work and not seeing any type of benefit from it.

Haley: I think it's very important that we stay competitive, not just as a state, but also nationally. We have India and China on our heels trying to catch up and what Sen. Graham has proposed is allowing them to do that. I'm absolutely against it. When we have the economy that we have and the unemployment that we have, to tax our businesses, to increase household taxes by \$800 a year is not what we need right now. I'm disappointed that he's done that. I don't think it's healthy for our state. I don't think it's healthy for our country, and it's absolutely sending us in the wrong direction.

McLeod: This is rhetoric. This is the problem. For so long people have treated jobs and the environment as mutually exclusive, and they aren't. It takes coordination, it takes planning, and it takes resources to move our state forward. To think that we want clean air and somehow that will cost us jobs- I don't agree with that. I think to have incentives that will produce clean air- that makes perfect sense to me, and I don't know why the two have to be mutually exclusive.

McMaster: I think cap and trade takes us in the wrong direction, and that's probably the bill you're referring to. It's nothing but a very expensive tax, and I think the direction in which we should be going is to get the federal government to loosen up on the requirements and the time it takes to build a nuclear plant. Nuclear is clean. Now if we have a problem with Harry Reid out in Nevada, if we can get him to loosen up and open up Yucca Mountain then we'll have some place to store the stuff. We need to work on that and the problems we have, but nuclear is the answer to the power needs of SC. We're ahead of the rest of the country, and we ought to take advantage of it.

Rex: I don't understand why we don't believe you can be clean and green and competitive. That's the direction the entire planet is heading. It has to. There's no doubt about that, and saying that SC has to have SC solutions for SC problems doesn't make sense when you're talking about air that moves across borders or water that moves across borders. There's no way to solve these except at the national and ultimately at the international level, and saying to every other country, "You go first" means nobody moves, and that would be a devastation. You can't have a healthy economy unless you have a healthy population.

Sheheen: What I'm hearing is that SC needs to be a polluter and not a problem solver. We need to be on the cutting edge of the new technology. We can do it. I know we can do it. We really need a new generation of leadership emerging in this state. The key is that we are recognized for the investment we've made in nuclear energy. It does not emit global warming gases. It's a key to our future. It should be a part in any international discussion. We can go grow green jobs. Being on the green side of things doesn't have to cost us.

Barrett: Lindsey and I usually agree, but I disagree with him on this issue. I said earlier that a cap and trade tax would cost 18,000 jobs in SC and add about \$1,400 per year annually on power bills. I think what it does promote though, is for SC to be first and foremost in the nation when it comes to nuclear power production. It's good for our state. It's good for our nation, but it's more than nuclear. It's alternatives. It's renewables. It's production or at least exploration off our coast, into our natural resources like the natural gas that's out there. We were talking about it earlier. Imagine a nuclear reactor that drives the desalinization process in SC- so not only do you have power for your people, but you also have clean, fresh drinking water.

Question (25:52): DHEC is responsible for regulating everything from coal plants to flu vaccination programs. Over the years, however, its staff has been cut from about 6,000 people in the 1990s to about 3,800 now. Given its important responsibilities, if elected governor, what would you do about DHEC?

Drake: First of all, we have to make sure that the next governor understands the importance of DHEC, and that in order to do their job properly they have to have a great deal more support than they've had in the past. While in the past I've had some reservations about the restructuring of DHEC, I've come to the conclusion that for both businesses and for those who have an interest in the permitting process, that the process is just too slow the way it works now. The time has come to change that. I would support legislation to make the head of that agency part of the governor's cabinet. That's not going to solve all of the problems, but I think it would expedite the process. I think it would more importantly give the public a great deal more confidence in the operations of that department. So, change the structure of it. That's not going to solve all the problems, but I support doing that as a first step, and providing that department with the support that it needs to make sure we have a healthy population and a clean environment.

Ford: As a state senator, I've been a part of the DHEC screening, and for 18 years it's come to our Judiciary Committee. In SC we have 4 million people, and we have a lot of everyday, common citizens in this state that need jobs. We've got to have jobs. Restructuring DHEC, taking the power away from the people of SC, which is the General Assembly, is not going to solve our problems. We need to try to get members of the General Assembly and the Governor working together to create what this state needs most, and that's jobs. We cannot blame DHEC because they lost 7,000 employees. We have to have the vision to work with the right agencies and members of the General Assembly as governor being head of the ship to make sure our people are protected and have good jobs. We don't need restructuring, because we always get good members to serve on the DHEC Board. The problem is we never could find the necessary jobs we need for everyday people of SC. That's what I think the Governor should do.

Grooms: We have a jobs problem in SC. We have a jobs problem today. We have to do more to make sure that South Carolinians have access to good high-paying jobs, and we do have a problem in DHEC. Part of the problem is we're not issuing permits on a timely basis. It shouldn't take a year. It shouldn't take six months. It shouldn't take hardly any time to understand whether a certain process meets or does not meet our air and water quality standards. We have some of the best air and water quality standards in the nation. I wouldn't propose changing them. If anything, we may need to strengthen them. It doesn't take a year to understand if a certain process violates our air and water quality standards. There are folks today with capital today who want to put it in the ground. They want to put our people to work, but they can't get the permits in a timely fashion. As governor, I'll make sure that permits are handled in a timely fashion and that our people are put to work.

Haley: DHEC needs to be handled like every agency that we have in this state. The governor needs to make sure that the agency actually works for the constituents it serves. When you look at our state right now, we have a lot of people who are trying to start businesses and invest in this state. They start working through DHEC, and DHEC has become a stall tactic. What happens is they end up going through the permitting process. It slows them down. There's an appeal. It slows them down again, and it's a continuous red tape that doesn't need to happen. We need to look at the DMV. Look at what we did when we turned around and streamlined that. Constituents are now greeted at the door. They're checked to see if they have all their paperwork. They go there and they make sure they're in and out in 10 or 15 minutes so they can quickly get to where they need to go. With DHEC, we need to do the same thing. We need to make sure there's a permitting process with a start and an end, and it's not used as a stall tactic. I think we need to look at DHEC to make sure that it's working for the businesses that go in front of it and working for anyone that needs to get a permit, and that it's not slowing down the process, and it's actually helping SC in a productive way.

McLeod: I mentioned earlier that I'm convinced the politics and rhetoric are holding our state back. Coming from the private sector, you ask, "Who's in charge of DHEC?" Obviously, their mission statement is to promote the public health and environment. Do we have a medical doctor in that position? No. Do we have someone from the research

and scientific community? No. Do we have someone from the environmental engineering community? No. We have a former lobbyist. That's the way business is being done in Columbia, and until that changes, this state will continue to go sideways or it will continue to go backwards, and that's why I'm running for governor.

McMaster: I don't think we really have a restructuring problem at DHEC. We could change it. I would not change it. It used to be two separate entities. It used to be the Department of Health and Pollution Control. We put it together years ago to make it a one-stop shop for business, and we need to remember that that's one of its functions. But I don't think we have a restructuring problem. I think we have a leadership problem, and a governor who is strong and sets the pace and the tone of protecting the environment and promoting business can make DHEC work. That's what I would do.

Rex: In my present role I've had a chance to work with DHEC on the health side. We're doing vaccinations throughout the state in our schools for the H1N1 virus. I've been satisfied with what I've seen. On the environmental side we have the natural conflict between businesses and investment that need and want quick decisions and sciences and citizens who want to be sure that the natural resources in this state are protected. Those are very difficult issues. I don't think a simple answer that's wrong, like restructuring, is going to take care of it. I think the next governor will have to make sure we have good leadership at the agency level and good people appointed to that commission to be sure we deal with those diverse needs that that agency tries valiantly, in most cases, responds to.

Sheheen: I think we all know that our state government, right now, is dysfunctional. It's dysfunctional in its leadership and it's dysfunctional in its structure. It's easy to talk about how things should be, but what are we doing to fix that? I've got a strong record on reforming state government- changing the way it's structured, and DHEC is part of that. I've introduced legislation that would change the way DHEC works. It needs to be changed. It would make it a part of the Governor's cabinet so there is accountability- so we can know that we are getting our tax dollars-worth out of the agency. There's much more we need to do for state government. DHEC is a part of that.

Barrett: Whether it's DHEC or any state agency, the key word is "restructuring." It's a top-down type of look of everything that we do in our state. We've got businesses and industries that are operating in the 21st century. Bob Castellani from Greenville, SC is one of them. I said, "Bob, tell me about your business plan," and he said, "No, Gresham. It's business *plans*." There's no way SC can keep up with the Bob Castellanis. We've got literally, a government operating in the 18th century. Part of that solution is restructuring, whether it's DHEC or any other type of agency out there. It has to be a top-down approach.

Bauer: I took over an agency from another agency. The Department of Aging used to be under Health and Human Services, and we've changed the whole way business is transacted in that office. We actually had 23% in cuts just this year, and only 2% were felt by seniors. It's an overall approach. Just putting it under the governor's perview

doesn't change the structure. It doesn't change how it functions. Quite frankly, we've continued to hear that the governor has no power in this state, which I think is totally a misnomer. It's about how you conduct your business, how you work with the General Assembly and how you work with people in agencies. So, it's not at all just being able to appoint a cabinet agency head, and overnight you see a change, but in fact you have several appointees on it- I believe it's seven- that you can appoint. I believe you want the agency to be directed in a certain way. We've got to send a better message, not only to people currently doing business in SC. Right now there's a bad message that there's a stalled process and an inefficient way to getting permitting done, and it turns companies away.

Agri-business Summit

Charleston - November 13, 2009

Moderator: Conservation easements are an important tool for protecting prime farmland and re-investing in agriculture. Do you view funding for the Conservation Bank as a luxury for 'good times' or a necessity?

McLeod: The purpose of the Conservation Bank is to protect land for the future. I support it.

Sheheen: Yes. It's great. It needs more money for easements and purchases. Forests are critical and easements preserve private forests.

Bauer: I'm going to cut the Conservation Bank to provide necessities.

Drake: We're in hard times. I'll cut the Conservation Bank next year because we have to educate our children. Education is more important.

McMaster: The Conservation Bank is a necessity. The last dollar should go to law enforcement. We'll never have extra money and we need an integrated economic development plan, but we can't play one against the other.