

Jonathan Silver

From: Morgan Wright [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 21, 2011 1:41 PM
To: Jonathan@ [REDACTED].net
Subject: Re;

Ok. She requested I do so since she left her blackberry at the office.

On Aug 21, 2011 1:31 PM, "Jonathan Silver" <Jonathan@[REDACTED].net> wrote:
> Don't ever send an email on doe email with private email addresses. That makes them
supoenable.
> Jonathan Silver
>
> cell: 202 309 [REDACTED]
> Jonathan@[REDACTED].net

11/21/2011



Brandon Hurlbut <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

(no subject)

1 message

Jonathan Silver <Jonathan@[REDACTED].net>
Reply-To: Jonathan@[REDACTED].net
To: Brandon Hurlbut <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Sun, Sep 18, 2011 at 6:14 PM

Does Navin have a private email?

New Idea; how about: listen, this is a fight congress should be having with itself, not the loan program. We just execute congressional intent.

Jonathan Silver

cell: 202 309-[REDACTED]
Jonathan@[REDACTED].net



Brandon Hurlbut <[redacted]@gmail.com>

Fw: Fwd: Strong

1 message

Jonathan Silver <Jonathan@[redacted].net> Wed, Sep 21, 2011 at 11:04 PM
Reply-To: Jonathan@[redacted].net
To: Jeff Navin <[redacted]@hotmail.com>, Brandon Hurlbut <[redacted]@gmail.com>

Read this. Important.

Jonathan Silver

cell: 202.309.[redacted]
Jonathan@[redacted].net

From: "Peter O'Rourke" <[redacted]@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Sep 2011 22:45:26 -0400
To: Jonathan Silver <Jonathan@[redacted].net>
Subject: Fwd: Strong

fyl

----- Forwarded message -----
From: Tim Newell <[redacted]@usregroup.com>
Date: Wed, Sep 21, 2011 at 10:43 PM
Subject: Strong
To: Peter O'Rourke <[redacted]@gmail.com>

Given the message from DOE to us tonight, SolarCity is currently planning to release the story to the media tomorrow. Won't be pretty. My understanding is that they are preparing to make veterans available to media who have been hired to work on the project.

Tim Newell
US Renewables Group
(310) 588-[redacted] Office
(415) 617-[redacted] Mobile
[redacted]@usregroup.com

Evans, Denise

From: David Lane <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2011 12:49 PM
To: Jonathan Silver
Subject: Re: RE: RE:

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Were you happy with the outcome on this? Bill surprised the economic team.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 12, 2011, at 6:06 PM, "Jonathan Silver" <Jonathan@[REDACTED].net> wrote:

- > David,
- >
- > As always, thank you for your time this afternoon.
- >
- > Attached is a short PowerPoint that I think touches on everything we
- > discussed.
- >
- > Key takeaways:
- >
- > A transformational project: makes rooftop solar competitive with big
- > projects in the desert with lots fewer problems
- >
- > Creates a brand new way to finance these projects by creating a
- > secondary market for the project's debt (and there is a ton more
- > liquidity in the secondary market than in the federal government)
- >
- > Complies with every single part of the Recovery Act. There is no
- > stipulation on the amount of time a project should take and we have
- > many that will take nearly as long.
- >
- > Why are the most senior people in the Administration worrying about a
- > \$200 million deal? Don't we have bigger problems?
- >
- > Obama will look like a hero if we do this to a constituency that is
- > now worried about him.
- >
- > Solution: If you think it makes sense, ask Daley to simply call Chu
- > to discuss the deal privately. Chu is a huge supporter, if Daley
- > thinks the deal makes sense, we move forward and after the call,
- > Daley's office can cancel the meeting.
- >
- > If we move this one forward, there is one in a month or so that does
- > the same for military housing and uses returning war vets for labor.
- > If this one dies, that one does, too. DoD is very high on the military solar deal.
- >
- > Let me know what you think. And, again, thank you. It seems odd that
- > things need to get done this way.
- >
- >
- >
- > Jonathan Silver
- > Phone: 202 309-[REDACTED]
- > Fax: 202 333-[REDACTED]

> Email: Jonathan@[REDACTED]@net

>
> The preceding E-mail message contains information that is confidential
> and may be protected by the attorney/client or other applicable
> privileges, and may constitute non-public information. It is intended
> to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not the
> intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender at
> 202/309-3880. Unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or
> reproduction of this message is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

>
>
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: David Lane [mailto:[REDACTED]@gmail.com]

> Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2011 8:31 PM

> To: Jonathan Silver

> Subject: Re: RE:

>

> Jonathan, sorry I failed today. Can we do this between noon and 4 Sunday?

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

> On Jun 11, 2011, at 9:52 AM, "Jonathan Silver"

> <Jonathan@[REDACTED]@net>

> wrote:

>

>> To make sure you saw the cell number below: 202 809-[REDACTED]

>>

>>

>> Jonathan Silver

>> Phone: 202 309-[REDACTED]

>> Fax: 202 339-[REDACTED]

>> Email: Jonathan@[REDACTED]@net

>>

>> The preceding E-mail message contains information that is
>> confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client or other
>> applicable privileges,

> and

>> may constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed
>> only

> to

>> the designated recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient of
>> this message, please notify the sender at 202/309-3880. Unauthorized
>> use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message is
>> strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

>>

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: David Lane [mailto:[REDACTED]@gmail.com]

>> Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2011 9:31 AM

>> To: Jonathan@[REDACTED]@net

>> Subject: Re:

>>

>> I was at an offsite all day yesterday. What's your cellphone? I can

>> call

> as

>> I drive this afternoon?

>>

>> Sent from my iPhone

>>

>> On Jun 10, 2011, at 6:57 AM, "Jonathan Silver "

>> <Jonathan@[REDACTED]@net> wrote:

>>

>>> David,
>>> I'd really like to speak with you this morning. Do you have ten minutes?
>> Concerns a monday meeting.
>>> Thanks,
>>> J
>>>
>>>
>>> Jonathan Silver
>>>
>>> cell: 202 309- [REDACTED]
>>> Jonathan@ [REDACTED] net
>> <Jonathan Silver (Jonathan@ [REDACTED] net)
> (Jonathan@ [REDACTED] net).vcf>
> <Jonathan Silver (Jonathan@ [REDACTED] net)
> (Jonathan@ [REDACTED] et).vcf>
> <Amp Briefing for 6-15-11 (12 June v).pptx>

Jonathan Silver

From: Peter O'Rourke ([REDACTED]@gmail.com)

Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:40 PM

To: Jonathan@([REDACTED])net

Cc: Matt Winters

Subject: Re:

Yeah, even more so given that Geitner actually chimed in. Kind of nuts that Chu defeated Treas Sec, OMB head, and NEC head.

Thanks very much to both of you for all the time you put into getting this through the gauntlet. I know your plates are very full, so your time is appreciated by all of the deal team.

peter

On Thu, Jun 16, 2011 at 8:28 PM, Jonathan Silver <jonathan@[REDACTED]net> wrote:
Chu is right not to gloat publicly, but, the full deal going forward minus a year, is a close to an annihilation of the economic team's position as you could actually possibly hope for. Its actually daley giving them a fig leaf. Think about it.
Let's do some serious gloating when I get back.
Total victory.

Jonathan Silver

cell: 202 309-[REDACTED]

jonathan@[REDACTED]net

11/21/2011

JMS-002155

Evans, Denise

From: Shikany, Ann [REDACTED]@Hq.Doe.Gov] on behalf of Silver, Jonathan [REDACTED]@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 1:17 PM
To: 'Jonathan@[REDACTED].net'
Subject: FW: Draft LPO slides for POTUS meeting

From: Hurlbut, Brandon
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 12:14 PM
To: SCHU
Cc: Adams, Ian; Poneman, Daniel; Winters, Matthew; Carlson, Jalme; Silver, Jonathan; Navin, Jeff
Subject: Re: Draft LPO slides for POTUS meeting

I am in a CRB for the next half hour - they need me for quorum - I will call you when this meeting ends.

From: SCHU
To: Hurlbut, Brandon
Cc: Adams, Ian; Poneman, Daniel; Winters, Matthew; Carlson, Jalme; Silver, Jonathan; Navin, Jeff
Sent: Fri Jun 24 12:08:21 2011
Subject: RE: Draft LPO slides for POTUS meeting

Brandon,

This is missing important information: what could have been improved, why did the loans take so long, and why was there so much interagency angst. Below is the "plunk, truthful" version.

We need to tell the President the truth, as we see it. We need to also present the other side's point of view as fairly as possible.

- 1) Treasury, and often OMB felt that the all the allowed subsidies, when added together, permitted to loan applicants too large a ROI. ("Unjust enrichment"). We could not agree on even the underlying assumptions of how much a subsidy was worth. Give one example of a deal that we could not agree on and the particulars of that deal.
- 2) Many times, they felt that a "better deal" could have been brokered by DOE and asked us to re-negotiate.
- 3) I heard that OMB assigned very few people to review the loans. Would they acknowledge that?
- 4) Throughout the loan program, DOE was asked to respond to multiple inquiries on virtually all loans, amounting to thousands of pages of questions. Many times they specifically refused to have in-person briefings.
- 5) Other agencies would sometimes argue that a particular loan is "not in the spirit of the Recovery Act"
- 6) Principles in OMB and especially Treasury would often times rely on lower level staffers -- e.g. acting deputy assistant secretary -- and back them without understanding the details of the loan. The staffers would cite numerous initial objections, and as we explained the loan, their objections shifted to other reasons. Throughout the process, they believed that were taking "principled stands."

12/2/2011

7)

Steyon Chu
Department of Energy

From: Hurlbut, Brandon

Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 11:35 AM

To: SCHU

Cc: Adams, Ian; Poneman, Daniel; Winters, Matthew; Carlson, Jaime; Silver, Jonathan; Navin, Jeff

Subject: Draft LPO slides for POTUS meeting

Attached are the draft slides for the daily economic briefing with the President on Monday where you will discuss the status of LPO. The WH was very direct about what should be included in the slides so we don't have much flexibility. They want:

- 3 slides that describe the status of the program and explain why the President hears so much about it. The President actually hears about it because at official events and political events he interacts with business community and Congressional members - many of them have some affiliation or interest in the numerous applications we have received that involve substantial funds. As a result, the President has likely heard a wide range of feedback on the program and wants to know its status.
- 1 slide on status of Cape Wind (because he has heard from Gov. Patrick a few times - they are close friends)
- 1 slide on USEC (I think Gov. Kasich brought it up when he golfed with the President last weekend).

During the meeting, you will have an opportunity to verbally raise CEEDA and any other thoughts on clean energy finance. You have a lengthy pre-brief scheduled on Monday morning to discuss that aspect of the meeting.

Please let us know what you think - the WH has asked that we send a draft early afternoon so they can review and make any necessary changes to get in the President's book for the weekend.

Brandon Hurlbut
Department of Energy
Office: 202.586. [REDACTED]
Cell: 202.281. [REDACTED]

12/2/2011

JMS-002220

Jonathan Silver

From: Morgan Wright [REDACTED]@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 9:21 PM

To: Jonathan@[REDACTED].net

Subject: Re:

Talked to Andrew. They're leaving on the red eye tonight. Argonaut, Rockport, and Madrone are leaving in the morning (they were all there today). He said they made good progress and the tone has changed. Both in the sense of mgmt's perspective and the investors appetite to continue. They're going to set up a call with us at 1pm tomorrow to walk through everything, and will send us the revised model, which should be closer to 35mw/quarter. Mitchell indicated he would recommend to the trustees to fund another week assuming the ProLogis order is tied down tomorrow (which it should be). All in all it sounded fairly positive.

On 23 August 2011 20:31, Morgan Wright <[REDACTED]@gmail.com> wrote:

Agreed. Trying to get ahold of Andrew for an update this evening.

Did you get back in the building?

On 23 August 2011 19:34, Jonathan Silver <jonathan@[REDACTED].net> wrote:

If we seem to be making progress with steve, I want you to set him up with scott stephens, who is impressive as hell.

Scott needs to be briefed/prepped on what his mission is, but I bet steve walks away from that mtg thinking our guy is smarter than his are.

Jonathan Silver

cell: 202 309-[REDACTED]

jonathan@[REDACTED].net