
From: MARKLUB@aol.com [mailto:MARKLUB@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 6:53 PM
To: Keith Benman
Subject: misc

Kieth -

Sorry to trouble you again with what will, no doubt, be too long an e-mail. But in our conversation this morning you raised the specter of this scurrilous charge that somehow my involvement w this project taints it **or** me. This is infuriating and I want to express myself fully in case you are entertaining the idea of featuring it.

The people who push this innuendo are sneaky and evil. They lurk around at the edges of good and honest work attempting to damage it by collateral character assassination. Their weapons are a collection of false statements and the malicious twisting of facts to create a dark story. The facts are the defense; and they should be enough.

So, to repeat what I think I said on the phone ...

1. I gave the governor the year of service he asked for. I did that at not insignificant financial sacrifice and out of a sense of duty to my state and loyalty to my friend. I left the office at the end of December 2005.
2. I had **NO** involvement in development of energy policy while I was in the gov's office. (Incidentally, I would bet that the D/S Energy package came straight out of the so-called "Roadmap" that was developed during the 2004 campaign. This was a set of robust policy initiatives -- far more robust than most campaigns ever have -- that were set for implementation if elected.)
3. My involvement with the LUK project stemmed 100% from my relationship with Bill Rosenberg, NOT from anyone in the Administration. I never heard of the project before a phone call from Bill Rosenberg in late March 2006.
4. My involvement w LUK occurred AFTER they had already met with the Gov and his energy people, and AFTER he had already indicated his support --- which is to say that my involvement had **NOTHING** to do with Gov Daniels supporting the project. Indeed, I would have never become involved IF the gov was not already on board -- I have never been a lobbyist and have no interest in that work. And with regard to Gov Daniels in particular, I would never have agreed to leverage my personal relationship with him for ANY 3rd party, especially because the governor has utter contempt for people who attempt this, which I would not risk in this 35 year friendship.
5. I should also mention that my role as the Indiana Project Director included **NO** lobbying -- by MY choice. I hired two lobbyists to help with passage of the 2007 legislation. Any contact I had from time to time with officials in the Daniels Administration was in the nature of interactions between the state and an economic development prospect. At the time, ours was the largest green-field capital project ever to be landed by the state, and with the

exception of the BP refinery expansion, the largest ever, green or brown-field.

6. Finally, w/ respect to the legislative history. My wife, who was then a state senator, certainly did NOT abstain from voting on the 2006 energy legislation, and would have had no reason to. The 2007 legislation was statutory language required to execute a 3 Party Covenant deal. She took care NOT to vote on the legislation in 2007 or other technical amendments in future years -- each time disclosing my involvement to the project and being officially excused from voting. It is important to note that the 2007 legislation was warmly embraced by the General Assembly, passing by 84-11 in the House and 41-4 in the Senate. And the various future amendments to the 3 Party Covenant legislation were passed by even larger majorities -- which is to say that the idea spoke for itself and needed no help from me.

The people trafficking in this innuendo hope like crazy to entice your interest in this tabloid angle --- for the reasons cited above. There is no cause for it. Thanks for reading this.

Mark Lubbers