In response to your e-mail of May 7, the list of the members of National Energy Policy Development Group is contained in the forward to the National Energy Policy Report issued on May 16. This forward is attached. The full report can be accessed through either the White House (www.whitehouse.gov) or the Department of Energy (www.energy.gov) websites.

I hope this information is helpful, although I suspect it comes too late.

Mark D. Friedrichs (PO-2)
Policy Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20585
202-586-1124
Fax: 202-586-3047
Dear,

I am responding to your letter to President Bush which commented on several aspects of the Administration's National Energy Policy released in May. You can obtain more information by visiting the White House website at:
www.whitehouse.gov/energy.

Let me assure you the National Energy Policy is being implemented in a manner that will assure accountability. By Federal law, performance objectives are established for all major programs implemented by the Department of Energy and other Federal agencies, and progress toward achievement of these objectives is regularly tracked and reported.

Your recommendations concerning expanded use of nuclear energy and release of information on development of the National Energy Policy have been conveyed to key decision makers within the Department.

Thank you for writing.

Regards,

Vicky A. Bailey
Assistant Secretary
Office of Policy and International Affairs
TO: DOE
DATE: 8-27-01

We are forwarding the enclosed constituent mail because your agency is best suited to reply. President Bush would like all Federal agencies to respond to constituent mail in 30 days. Please return a copy of your agency response and the original incoming correspondence to me at the White House at the following address:

Mail Analysis
Room 58
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20502

If you have questions about these procedures or need to provide updated contact information, you may reach me at (202) 456-5490; fax at (202) 456-9050; or by email at Gertrude A. Roddick@who.eop.gov

President Bush appreciates your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Trudy Roddick
Director
Mail Analysis
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George W. Bush, President
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Mr. President:

Thanks for the national energy policy :Overview”. Although the content appears to be very comprehensive with a broad stroke approach and some detail in graphic form it fails short of accountability to be held to budgeted dollars and time.

Six of the seven notable recommendations lack definitive timetables and the one that does, on clean coal technology and co-fired biomass credits fails to separate the ‘clean coal’ dollars from the ‘biomass credit’ dollars. Results as measured to a productive program’s timetable is the only way to extract full value from the $2 billion.

Nearly fifty years ago over-fire-air-jets dramatically improved both coal fired efficiency and the reduction of emissions. With 'fluid fuels', pulverized coal and high pressure steam injected, even great efficiencies have been achieved. And, conversion is relatively simple.

While we have made remarkable progress in nuclear powered sub and surface craft technology we refuse to follow the route of nuclear fuels as practiced by France and Japan. As a stop-gap measure to bring flexibility into the electrical energy facet of our crisis coastal regions could be served by nuclear powered systems built into barges to be placed where the need is to cover an emergency or to growth demand situation. And, any new nuclear power plants would be required to adopt the proven 'reuse' technology.

Now then, get that 'saddle burn' removed which has drawn blood. Vice President Cheney should release the names of the people called upon to formulate the energy policy. He is a decent man. That is likely one of the reasons you selected him. He should be allowed/required to perform all of the people’s business in ‘the sunshine’. Just do it. That is all the more compelling now that you are about to appoint a Texas oil man to the F.E.R.C. Them Sessions cast long dark shadows.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

PS: Please push on that investigation of steel imports. If domestic steel production continues to be reduced, in time, this nation will face an economic crisis far greater than the energy crisis.

And, like the energy crisis, we will have contributed to it because we have allowed it to happen. O.P.E.C.? How about S.P.E.C.?
From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 9:55 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: Oil Pipelines

The industry is of two minds on this, but the Association of Oil Pipelines (Ben Cooper, phone 202-408-7970) is doing a study of the problems and attempting to get a consensus on what the industry position is. I understand that they are meeting on this report on April 16th. I am trying to get more information, but you might want to call Ben directly. He was formerly on the Senate Energy Committee staff.

--- Original Message ---
From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 2:32 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert; Anderson, Arlene
Subject: Oil Pipelines
Importance: High
---Original Message-----
From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 9:29 AM
To: Faulkner, Doug
Subject: RE: SEP

---Original Message-----
From: Faulkner, Doug
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 8:49 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: SEP

on this and the previous message from you: can I share with the program to discuss? when do you need answers? have a couple of other questions, so maybe we should talk for couple minutes?

---Original Message-----
From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2001 3:48 PM
To: Faulkner, Doug
Subject: SEP
From: Faulkner, Doug
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2001 9:11 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Hutto, Chase
Subject: RE: reliability/superconductivity r&d funding

---Original Message---
From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 8:36 PM
To: Faulkner, Doug; Hutto, Chase
Subject: reliability/superconductivity r&d funding
-----Original Message-----
From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2001 12:43 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: regional reality check

-----Original Message-----
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2001 12:25 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: regional reality check

Joe,

Margot << File: secreg.doc >>
Don't every say that in Iowa:

Propane is used on 660,000 farms for irrigation pumps, grain dryers, standby generators and other farm equipment. It is an essential fuel for crop drying, flame cultivation, fruit opening, space and water heating and food refrigeration. More than 14 million families, many in rural areas not served by natural gas infrastructures, use propane to fuel their furnaces, water heaters, air conditioners, outdoor grills, fire places, dryers and range tops.
From: Phillip Tseng
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 3:22 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Haspel, Abe; Zimmerman, MaryBeth
Subject: Section 1602 of EPACT92

Joc:

Phillip
Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

-----Original Message-----
From: Vagts, Ken
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2001 2:33 PM
To: Burdette, Michael
Subject: FW: fact check

As discussed.

-----Original Message-----
From: O'Donovan, Kevin
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2001 1:26 PM
To: Vagts, Ken
Subject: FW: fact check

Can you have someone fact check this and respond to Joe Kelliher?
Thanks!

-----Original Message-----
From: Joseph Kelliher at HQ-EXCH at X40PD
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2001 12:33 PM
To: O'Donovan, Kevin
Subject: fact check

Kevin, can you confirm this and get back to me and Karen? Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov [mailto:Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2001 10:26 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: can you ask some to verify this for me?
Dear Charles,

I sent Karen Knutson and Matt Macmanus comments on Chapter 10 yesterday. I know that Margot Anderson is gathering comments from here at DOE, but I had wanted to give Karen and Matt a heads up on mine. Do you have a deadline on receiving comments? (I am helping Margot gather IA's comments here at DOE since we are the only ones other than Policy here likely to have any comments).

I am attaching the text of my email to Karen below.

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions or comments.

Karen,

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

With best regards,

Veronica Angulo
Karen,  

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.  

With best regards,  

Veronica Angulo
From: Carrier, Paul
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2001 2:38 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: FERC hydro projects

Importance: High

Joe.

-----Original Message-----
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2001 9:03 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Carrier, Paul
Subject: RE: FERC hydro projects

Paul,

Can you clarify for Joe?

Margot

-----Original Message-----
From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2001 8:55 AM
To: Carrier, Paul
CC: Anderson, Margot
Subject: FERC hydro projects
Spencer Abraham, Member Cheney’s
Interagency Energy-Policy Task Force
1000 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

I’m confident that you, Secretary Abraham, as one of the seven members of the Cheney’s Interagency energy-policy task force, agree that nuclear power should account for a higher percentage of U.S. electricity than the current level of 20%. However, Leader Cheney has acknowledged that the task force hasn’t figured out what to do with the nuclear waste. The attached document presenting the production-proven PURE process provides that answer.

Eleven years ago Admiral James D. Watkins, President George H. Bush’s Secretary of Energy, also acknowledged this nuclear waste problem; he did something about it. With his in-depth knowledge of and hands-on nuclear power experience, Admiral Watkins acted decisively in 1990 and ordered an immediate thorough evaluation of the PURE-process alternative to the troubled Yucca Mountain Repository Project.

John W. Bartlett, Director of DOE’s Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, was charged with carrying out Admiral Watkins’ orders for a prompt evaluation of the PURE alternative. Within three months Director Bartlett’s ten-man Ad Hoc team reported back that the PURE process was technically feasible and economically attractive and should be studied in-depth by DOE’s Washington-based research department.

Shortly thereafter the Clinton Administration took office: further evaluation of the PURE alternative to the Yucca Mountain Repository Project got lost within the bureaucratic maze.

You, as a member of Cheney’s seven-person energy Task Force are in an enviable position to capitalize on Admiral Watkins’ 1990 vision; you can be instrumental in implementing this production-proven PURE process alternative which resolves the nuclear waste issue.

Respectfully yours,
"I’m a strategy builder, I love strategies and I believe a strategy is critical," declared retired Admiral James D. Watkins in responding to his appointment in January 1989 by President George H. Bush to be Secretary of Energy. It was a typical approach for this can-do, full-steam-ahead submariner from Hyman Rickover’s rigorous nuclear navy. Watkins brought a strong support and knowledge of nuclear power to compliment President George H. Bush’s knowledge in-depth of the oil and gas issues.

Upon completing his first year as Energy Secretary in shaping a “national energy strategy” that would give President George H. Bush some policy options in the future, Admiral Watkins had discovered that being a strategy builder has its limits especially when dealing with conflicting missions and the pressures of national politics.

In discussions with John Sununu, President Bush’s Chief-of-Staff, Admiral Watkins became aware of a process alternative to the Yucca Mountain project, called PURE - Plutonium Recovery and Recycle, that removes one hundred percent of the plutonium from the spent fuels; this essentially zero-cost recovered plutonium could replace the expensive uranium-235 as the fuel for nuclear power reactors.

Admiral Watkins noted a major advantage to the PURE process over the Yucca Mountain Project in that with the plutonium removed, the remaining radioisotopes in the spent fuels would decay to trace levels within five hundred years. These residual wastes could be safely stored in titanium cylinders for that five hundred-year period of time thereby greatly reducing the long-term demands for a waste repository. He ordered an immediate thorough evaluation of this PURE alternative.

John W. Bartlett, Director of DOE’s Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, was charged with carrying out Admiral Watkins’ orders for this prompt and thorough evaluation of the PURE alternative. Director Bartlett immediately formalized a ten-man evaluation task-force; a few months later they reported back that the PURE process was technically feasible and should be studied in-depth by DOE’s Washington-based research department.

Shortly thereafter, the Clinton Administration took office. Hazel O’Leary, who had no experience or knowledge of nuclear
energy, was appointed Secretary of Energy. Further evaluation of the PURE alternative to the Yucca Mountain Repository Project got lost within DOE's bureaucratic maze.

These then are the plutonium and nuclear waste problems left by the previous administration that are facing Vice President Cheney's interagency task force as they evaluate nuclear energy options for meeting the Nation's energy needs.

**PLUTONIUM PROLIFERATION - WORLDWIDE**

Every nation or group that has access to a nuclear reactor, whatever its type, has a readily available inventory of plutonium. For terrorist or rogue nations, the readily available spent fuel being discharged annually from power reactors is an easy way to accumulate plutonium for bomb purposes.

Contrary to today's politically motivated consensus, recovery of this plutonium can be readily implemented by a conventional process requiring only commercially available equipment. It can be implemented by any group having a basic knowledge of chemistry. They do not need the hazardous, multi-cycle reprocessing facilities currently employed by the developed countries. Instead, by holding these spent fuels for five years following reactor discharge, natural radiation decay reduces the radiation level by one thousand-fold. Plutonium can then be recovered by a simple, well-known, one-step, anionic resin extraction process.

Today in the United States, the "politically correct" burial method for disposing of power reactor plutonium is a sham. In January 1999, the Government Accounting Office, GAO, issued a report, GAO/OCG-00-6 stating:

DOE has spent $6.5 billion over 15 years for a permanent disposal site for highly radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. This project is currently 12 years behind schedule, and DOE has not yet determined whether the site is suitable for a repository.

Regardless of the problems with the Yucca Mountain Project, any rogue group, using the Yucca Mountain example, can justify accumulating plutonium in its spent fuel form. Easy recovery of the plutonium can be anytime five years following spent fuel discharge from the reactor. That would not require constructing a complex repository; the fuel could even be held in the reactor storage basin for the five years cooling that facilitates plutonium recovery.

**DEFINING THE PROBLEM**

---
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Over fifty years ago our country’s political, scientific and engineering leaders coalesced around the Manhattan Project in an all-out team effort to produce the world’s first atomic bomb. In their view our national security was at stake. Within three years following President Roosevelt establishing the Project team, kilogram quantities of plutonium were being produced.

Plutonium production started out fifty years ago as a closely guarded military program with a limited objective. The world’s attention is now focused on controlling so-called “weapons-type” plutonium as exemplified by the Test Ban Treaty negotiations.

Today, plutonium produced in light water power reactors is being falsely defined as separate and distinct from weapons-type plutonium produced in graphite moderated reactors. The truth is that bombs have been constructed and successfully tested using plutonium produced in light water power reactors. Our national leaders are either unaware of, or choose to ignore, that by far the greatest risk to our national security is the plutonium being produced in the 436 licensed nuclear power reactors operating in the world today.

The most recent example of our blindness to this threat is our financing of two light water moderated reactors for North Korea in exchange for their promise to shut down their existing graphite moderated reactor.

The facts are that the bomb quality of the plutonium produced in any type reactor is directly related to the total exposure time of the fuel in the reactor. In today’s power reactors that residence time is normally about four years and yields a product containing 80 percent of the fissionable form of plutonium. Shorten the fuel cycle time and the fissionable quality of the plutonium will be improved proportionately. The only known way to eliminate plutonium by peaceful means is to convert it into useful energy. As the leader of the world, it is imperative that the United States show the way in this critical mission.

It is disturbing today to find proposals being advanced to extend and even double the forty year service life of existing power reactors. Such actions fly in the face of common sense. You cannot inspect in safety; you can only build it in at time of construction. Ocean freighters, airplanes, trucks and railroad locomotive respect this fundamental truth. They are routinely retired at the end of their design life to be replaced by safer, more efficient equipment. Common sense would seem to dictate that the well-known catastrophic consequences of a reactor failure, such as Chernobyl, would dictate at least equal caution in dealing with nuclear reactors.
RESOLVING THE PROBLEM

As a basic part of a plutonium elimination program, existing reactor and fuel designs will have to be replaced. New plutonium-consuming, power producing reactors, specifically designed for efficiently destroying plutonium can and must be built.

Such design philosophy is in marked contrast to existing reactor and fuel designs where fission fuel efficiency is the dominant theme. Critics will abound. What type of reasoning can possibly justify such a total departure from today’s nuclear concepts? There are four primary facts that mandate a full and complete review of this proposal. They are:

1. The world-wide accumulation of plutonium by any group, including rogue Nations and terrorist groups, that has access to nuclear power reactors.

2. The ease with which plutonium can be recovered from the spent fuels discharged annually from these reactors.

3. The well recognized capability of producing bomb quality plutonium in each and every one of the 436 licensed nuclear power reactors operating in the world today.

4. With essentially complete recovery of the 24,300 year half-life plutonium, the remaining radioactivity in the spent fuels decays to trace levels within five hundred years. Containment in titanium capsules for that period of time would resolve the long-term nuclear waste disposal problem.

The dedicated team effort of the Manhattan Project’s political, scientific and engineering leaders fifty years ago created plutonium. In the ensuing years, political and nuclear energy corporate leaders have usurped control and allowed plutonium production to get out-of-control. Based on their legislated decisions, the politicians appear to lack even a basic understanding of the consequences of their actions. At the same time the nuclear energy corporate leaders studiously avoid any responsibility for disposing of the spent fuels with their contained plutonium. They lobby intensely and at length to keep that as a government responsibility.

Today, an equally dedicated project team similar to the Manhattan Project of fifty years ago is needed to first, clearly identify this out-of-control threat posed by power reactor produced plutonium and second, formulate an integrated effort to eliminate it. Outstanding scientists, engineers and environmentalists, free of both internal corporate influence and political pressures, are required to bring this about.
What is needed to "put the show on the road" is a leader who can maintain complete separation of the corporate and governmental executives with their vested interests and the scientific-engineering-environmental personnel who are required to implement the program.

The author’s credentials that qualify him to speak on this issue include three major plutonium patents and one fail-safe nuclear reactor patent. He has had eight years of on-site experience and served as the Head of the Redox Hanford Plant Ruthenium Emissions Task Force, HW-32465, and chairman of the Hanford Seven-Year Waste Management Program, HW-58329. Other nuclear-related activities include serving as an expert witness in Congressional Hearings, serving as an expert witness for Nebraska Public Power in its successful lawsuit against General Electric, and being a consultant to the California Energy Commission in formulating its nuclear legislation.
The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham,

During your interview last Sunday on This Week, you confirmed that cutting funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs by as much as 30 percent is being considered. I assume that this is happening, at least in part, in an Energy Task Force headed by Vice President Cheney. My concern, based on your further remarks, is that you and this task force are not receiving the information necessary to make well-informed decisions. "We're going to look at these programs which have been widely scorned and criticized of not having returned a very good investment for the taxpayers..." I know of program examples that deserve scorn and criticism however; I also know of programs that have demonstrated great present and potential future value. My concern is that the only group being heard is a group that has only scorn and criticism.

"Your goal is appropriate (U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Energy Summit), "...to make sure that America's energy needs of the next 20 years are met; that we succeed in confronting that challenge." You also indicated the need for a diverse energy supply policy; "It will be founded on the understanding that diversity of supply means security of supply ... and that a broad mix of supply options - from coal to windmills, nuclear to natural gas - will help protect consumers against price spikes and supply disruptions." This timeframe is also appropriate for further development of diverse energy supplies. I have direct experience with photovoltaic programs that have been highly successful. Photovoltaic power generation has unique benefits including supplying clean power at the point of use during times of peak demand. Photovoltaic power generation is in its infancy relative to all other energy options. Even so, photovoltaic technology has demonstrated successes for present energy generation and, more importantly, demonstrated development successes indicating that photovoltaic technology will continue to meet DOE near-term and long-term (20 year) goals.

I request your support in all possible ways to insure well-informed decisions regarding our energy future. The photovoltaic option is one of multiple renewable energy technologies that deserve to be considered in the broad mix of energy supply options.

Best regards,

April 8, 2001

2001-010085 4/12/01 3:40
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Joe -

If this doesn't work, please email or call me at x66684.

Doug

Can you fill this is for Joe Kelliher?
If this doesn't work, please email or call me at x69584.

Doug

---Original Message---
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 8:28 AM
To: Carter, Douglas
Subject: FW: clean coal

Doug,

Can you fill this is for Joe Kelliher?

margot

---Original Message---
From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 6:49 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: clean coal

Joe,

Is this beyond what we already sent them (from FE) a few hours ago? If so, we should ask Doug Carter and/or Guido DeHoralis to answer (I note that Bob K. is out today). By when?

Margot

4867

DOE008-1010
Joe:

Charlie
Charlie

Subject: Chapter 7 requirements