May 1, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

We write to request that you ensure continued viability of the domestic uranium enrichment industry as part of the Administration’s review of the U.S.-Russia HEU Agreement and the development of the Administration’s Energy Policy. The sole domestic operating uranium enrichment plant in the U.S. is located in Paducah, Kentucky, and we are interested in your views regarding the best way to balance the national security aspects of the HEU agreement so that they do not jeopardize this component of our energy security.

Without question, the Russian HEU Agreement has had a beneficial impact on the national security of the United States. However, according to a recent GAO report in December 2000 (GAO-01-148), the HEU Agreement appears to be having a negative effect on American energy security. The USEC Privatization Act and the Energy Policy Act of 1992 were crafted so that “neither the privatization of USEC nor the implementation of the HEU Agreement would be harmful to the domestic uranium industry.” The HEU Agreement, coupled with the way the privatization of USEC was implemented, has adversely affected U.S. nuclear fuel production. Unfortunately, the Enrichment Oversight Committee, created by Executive Order in the previous Administration, was largely passive in its responsibilities to prevent or mitigate the negative effects of the HEU Agreement, according to the GAO.

We understand that the National Security Council is reviewing the proposed agreement between USEC and Tenex to import additional enriched uranium from Russia consistent with the recommendations from the GAO. We would encourage the Energy Task Force to examine the domestic energy implications of the loss of the uranium enrichment industry, especially if nuclear power is going to be an important part of the energy portfolio of the United States. Given the concerns raised by GAO about the status of the domestic nuclear fuel industry and the two major reviews underway in the Administration on energy and national security, we seek clarification regarding the Administration’s path forward:

1. What is the status of the review of the HEU Agreement being undertaken by the National Security Council discussed in the February 7, 2001 letter from NSC Chair Condoleezza Rice to the Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Billy Tauzin? Will alternatives to importing additional commercial SWU from Tenex be evaluated?
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2. Testimony before the House Energy and Commerce Committee, as well as several recent reports by the GAO and DOE, indicate that the U.S. is becoming increasingly dependent on the Russians for our supply of nuclear fuel as a result of the HEU Agreement. Moreover, the GAO has identified difficulties in implementation of the HEU Agreement that resulted in five interruptions in shipments. Is the Administration reviewing the extent to which the U.S. is becoming reliant on Russian supplies of nuclear fuel and the consequences to the U.S. economy in the event that such fuel supplies are interrupted? What contingency plans should be put in place to assure energy security?

3. The Gaseous Diffusion Plant at Paducah will soon be the only operating enrichment plant in the U.S. In its review of the HEU Agreement or development of the nuclear option in a new energy policy, is the Administration considering options to keep this plant open and operating until new competitive technology has been fully deployed?

4. Advanced technology is needed to replace the WWII-era gaseous diffusion process upon which the U.S. now depends. Are there sufficient private incentives for the development and deployment of such new technology? Is the Energy Task Force examining future uranium enrichment technology as part of its energy policy development? What options are being considered and under what time frames?

5. The previous Administration suggested that granting Executive Agency status should be linked to operations of the plant at Paducah in the interests of U.S. energy security. Does the Administration agree with that approach and what options are under consideration? If not, how will the U.S. deal with the probability that the U.S. could have no economic enrichment operations by 2003?

6. Russia has proposed to export even more enriched uranium to the United States. We are particularly interested in your evaluation of the effect the proposed import of additional commercial fuel from Tenex will have on the operations and economic viability of the one remaining enrichment plant at Paducah.

Our goal is to balance the need for both national security under the HEU Agreement, and energy security by maintaining an economic and reliable domestic uranium enrichment industry in the U.S. Unfortunately, these goals appear to be in growing conflict. It may require clear and determined policy decisions by the Federal Government to balance the national security and energy security interests to achieve these goals. We hope these concerns will be reflected in the Administration's new energy policy.
Thank you for your careful attention to what we believe are vital concerns. We would request that given the importance of our questions, we receive a response no later than May 15.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

cc: Vice President Richard B. Cheney
cc: National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice
---Original Message---
From: Kellih, Joseph
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 6:49 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: clean coal

Yes in addition. They want something like this (I guess):

---Original Message---
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 6:19 PM
To: Kellih, Joseph; Knowicz, Robert
Cc: Carter, Douglas; DeHoratis, Guido
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 DeHoratis to answer (I note that Bob K. is out today). By when?

Margot

---Original Message---
From: Kellih, Joseph
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 6:16 PM
To: Knowicz, Robert
Cc: Anderson, Margot
Subject: clean coal
Secretary of Energy, Spencer Abraham  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave, SW  
Washington DC 20585

Dear Mr. Abraham  

May 11th, 2001

Approximately 3 months ago, I sent a letter to the Governor of Colorado, Bill Owens, Senators Wayne Allard and Ben Nighthorse-Campbell and United States Representative Joel Heffley. Today I write again, adding our very respected Vice President, Dick Cheney; who is working diligently with a National Energy Task Force. My previous message addressed the concern that I have with escalating prices for electrical power and with the general condition that regardless of who wants to blame, we must take emergency and/or crisis level action to see that the present issues with energy shortfall and rising prices are addressed with long term corrective action and not "band-aids".

I write this letter as both a concerned American and as an Executive in the Semiconductor business with responsibility for a major manufacturing site of Atmel Corp. in Colorado Springs, CO. I believe this problem is as significant as was our need to put men in space ~40 years ago, and to say that we had better treat it in the same manner; with a vision given to the American people as to the real nature and size of the problem. Along with the vision of the problem must come a vision for solutions in the near, intermediate, and long term that allows our economic well-being to remain positive and full of hope in each of those forward looking time periods. This is not a smaller task than putting men in space and on the moon, and in reality it is even more important as it has "everything" to do with the American way of life, and the expectations of opportunity that we would wish all to have.

The issue is ENERGY! And as I stated above, at stake is the standard of living of every American, and those citizens of any other country who aspire for economic freedom and opportunity.

All economic issues, events, or situations are the result of the balance of a myriad of forces, to name some:

- Conservation and/or conservationists  
- Productivity (Producing the most for the least, or preventing the loss of purchasing power by continuously producing at a higher rate than the underlying cost components)  
- Exploration and Development (oil, natural gas, nuclear energy)  
- Producing and Refining  
- Automobiles being manufactured including a range from "lean machine" to "gas guzzler"

If not for a sustained period of low inflation and high productivity in place at this time, the present economic downturn could very easily have been a major recession. We are lucky and "everyone" had best admit it to themselves. In fact, I contend that this current downturn has the potential for greater retrenching if we don't build confidence that we have a plan in both areas of energy and taxes. Yes, tax relief is important, but the optimum solution to our energy situation and its...
potential influence on our economy is much, much more. We had better have the right answer this time, because this issue has only received "lip service" for the past 30 years, and we had better "sell" our "right answer" to the American public as though it is the emergency that it really is.

We have time to be in control of the play-out of all these opposing forces, but there will be "no more time", if we play "games" with the energy situation again.

Let's recognize with the wisdom of many of the prophets of biblical times, that from blessings can come self-confidence that can erode to arrogance, indulgence, greed, and apathy. We are not "above" the nature of humankind.

We in America have come to a point of economic prosperity and superiority that we believe we can "have our cake, and eat it too", that the "good times" will never run out, that at least is what we have come to expect. As a result, we want to believe that we can leverage all the "easy" forces in the equation, and ignore the harder or more distasteful ones.

Some for instances:

- If one SUV is big, then the next supplier makes a bigger one, and what does the consumer do...he follows in like step.
- If one conservationist wants their State to keep out all new power installations because of "their" more precious environment, then let's do it,..."but" we don't want to pay higher prices, or do without the many things electrical power provides.
- Maybe the most classic is..."I want to eat any and all the food I want, but I don't want to gain a single pound".

What's the point? The point is that we don't have the time, nor can we get this done if we only do the "easy stuff". We must be willing to conserve in our homes, we must be willing to give up on these "tanker size" SUV's, we must be willing to give some ground, not in the fashion of compromise, but in order to "optimize" and achieve the end which allows the most economic viability; otherwise we will give it up in our standard of living. How do I know? We are already there. Californian's are suffering brownouts, with both gasoline and utility bills they can ill afford. Many lower income citizens, are giving up medicine, or even foods they might otherwise buy, because of "bills" they are now 30-100% higher than a year or two years ago. The bad news is "at the doorstep".

I'm sure that the talent, skill, and demonstrated qualifications of those on Vice President Cheney's Energy Task Force are very adequate to the task. But I do have some concerns, the primary one being "it's hands off" to have the American citizen forego their existing lifestyle, or in any way require of them more discipline, or live with less options than they do today.

Folks, this is serious: we had best not leave one element aside that can be a contributing factor in this race. Also, is there anyone reading this that agrees with my position that this "is" bigger than a "man in space", and is just as daunting in the magnitude of issues that we face whether technically, socially, or otherwise? We need to make this a "National Endeavor" and sell the vision of both the problem and the solution, and get our nation behind the program.

Some "must do's":

- Allow and encourage coal-fired power generating installations, by moderating/optimizing the amount of cost of capital equipment with less strict EPA regulations for the next 3-5 years.
- Have each State project both their planned use and capacity of electrical power from both public and private sources. Where critical gaps exist in some States, insure that there are
solutions that can be implemented to close those gaps: as a minimum, understand "where" the problems are and what is being done to remove them.

- Almost every area of the country has seen natural gas prices "double" over the past year. With a combined task force of government and energy company officials, require a composite look at the demand and capacity projected forward; what is required to bring forces into place, from all aspects—exploration, development, transport, delivery; that will mitigate this current rise, or as a minimum insure the present accelerated price trend is moderated. Insure, everything is "on the table", there should be no predatory pricing, or gouging, because of the present demand/supply scenario. If so, it's no different than the abhorrent looting that goes on in the aftermath of a tornado, or hurricane.

- Do the same thing for electrical power installations and generation, what's the plan, where are the gaps, how do we "head them off"?

- Do the same for oil, we face a much higher probability that oil supply shortfall compromises our economy and/or standard of living, than any potential military action.

So far, I've limited this discussion to the existing fossil fuel constraint; when it (fossil fuel) is gone ("fini"), the above arguments get really serious. The thoughts presented above only deal with the short and intermediate term, so why does anyone think that 30-50 years from now (when my grandkids are in their prime) isn't as demanding upon science and technology as was/is the effort by NASA and any associated enterprises in the era of space exploration? Sometimes I get the feeling that we have seen so many technological miracles that we find the one of delivering energy to our homes for heating and cooling in very different ways, or the one of providing fuel to an automobile, that is no longer oil based as a very boring and unimportant endeavor. Quite the opposite, this is as important as any key event in the history of our country, because left undone, it takes away our ability to continue the "productivity" curve such that "every American" has the opportunity before them.

Now, let me address another side of the coin. The last area our politicians want to take action in is the market place, i.e. influence or control prices. Let me touch on three areas where something can be done (if the courage is there to do it):

1) As individuals, families, or business enterprises, we are facing ludicrous increases in electrical rates in the year 2000/2001. Please refer to the attached chart, which depicts the price for the Colorado Springs Utilities to purchase power from other sources when used to supplement the existing power capacity available from this very efficient and well run public utilities provider. I think it goes without saying that from 1985 through 1999 those providers of supplemental power were operating on what they considered an acceptable profitability. So what happened? First of all natural gas prices increased, therefore that cost must be passed on. Secondly, nothing else happened except the power providers in the American west saw an opportunity with the California situation to "gouge" the consumer and industrial users of electricity. In fact, the Atmel site here in Colorado Springs will pay an additional $1M for power in 2001 than even that in 2000. How many jobs does $1m account for? At least 25-30 jobs. Why is it so unreasonable to give a Presidential order that no company in an unstable market environment can have greater than a 100% margin against their cost? The result of such an order would reduce the 2001 rate on the attached chart to less than ½ of that depicted, and for our new President, such an order would likely increase votes on his behalf in 2004 in California by a significant amount. That should not be President Bush's motivation, but regardless, it's a very likely result.
2) Now for gasoline, the present prices are ludicrous and predatory. A year ago oil prices went to $37 per barrel, and gasoline prices went up dramatically: supposedly because of this huge price increase in basic supply, the many blends and regulations placed on refined gasoline, and the shortage of capacity to actually produce at the rates demanded. One year later, when the oil supply cost is at $27-28 per barrel, and all other things are basically equal, the price for gasoline is far beyond it's peaks of last year, even though we are only early in the expanded driving season. In a period where consolidation of major "oil" corporations is rampant, due diligence requires the excessive profit rates of these corporations to be reviewed. Why is it that most of our high tech corporations are suffering serious revenue, profit, and stock value setbacks in a time that the major oil firms are more profitable than ever? Please don't try to convince me that we are seeing a huge increase in the "productivity" of our oil firms...they don't even understand the word.

3) On the other side, the American people still "wants it's cake and eat it too". I've attached two website renditions of the ever increasing SUV size. We are facing a terribly bleak picture in the near term for gasoline prices and for any real solutions to mitigate this issue to be found. Give an EPA mandate that "all" personal or family vehicles delivered in the year 2003 or 4, achieve 25 mpg on highway, and you will see things change. Will this really "cost" the American public anything? Not really. I myself actually own a 1997 Jeep Grand Cherokee, purchased well before I could read enough material to understand the current scenario being played out. Really, my concern is not with $1.79-2.00 gas prices, my concern is that unless we do something our economy and our standard of living will be more like many countries around the world than the one that exceeds all expectations ever conceived. By the way, my Grand Cherokee is up for sale!

We are a proud nation, the "land of opportunity", where at some point "all" people will be limited only by their own desire, and personal drive. We face a real crisis and yes, we can't afford to "scare the public", but tell us, the American people, the truth, a complete picture. Show us what really happens if we don't act. Show us what can be done if we do. Show us the options and why you choose to do what you propose to do, we can come together when we "have to", when we must....as a Nation we always have.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ralph Bohannon
Sr. Vice President
Atmel Corp.

Cc: Dick Cheney
Jero Heffley
Ben Nighthorse Campbell
Wayne Allard
George Perlegas
Bill O'Reilly

Vice President of the United States
House Representative
U.S. Senator
U.S. Senator
President & Chief Executive Officer,
Atmel Corporation
Fox News Channel
Annual Purchase Power Prices
### Dimensions & Specs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engine Type</td>
<td>AWD - High Output LQ9 6.0L OHV V8 2WD - 5.3L OHV V8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Delivery</td>
<td>AWD - Sequential fuel injection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>AWD - 364 / 5967 (cm³) 2WD - 327 / 5328 (cm³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression Ratio</td>
<td>AWD - 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsepower/Torque (lb-ft)</td>
<td>AWD - 345 @ 5200 rpm 380 @ 4000 rpm 2WD - 285 @ 5200 rpm 325 @ 4000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>AWD - 4L60-E HD 2WD - Four-speed electronic-shift overdrive automatic with torque converter clutch, 4L60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towing Capacity</td>
<td>AWD - 8,500 lbs. 2WD - 7,700 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Drive Ratio</td>
<td>AWD - 3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fuel Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA Estimated MPG</td>
<td>AWD - 12 City/16 highway 2WD - 14 City/18 highway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chassis Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheelbase</td>
<td>116.0 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tread (f/r)</td>
<td>65 in. /66 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Diameter</td>
<td>39.54 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Envoy/4WD/SLT

Engine:
- Vortec™ 4.2L V6 engine
- Fuel type: Gasoline
- Capacity: 4.2 liters
- Bore and Stroke (mm): 102 x 102
- Compression Ratio: 10.1
- Valve Train: Double-overhead-cams with four valves per cylinder
- Fuel Delivery: Sequential fuel injection
- SAE Net Horsepower @ RPM (auto transmission): 270 @ 4800
- SAE Net Torque @ RPM (RPM): 275 @ 3600

Transmission:
- 4L60-E HydraMatic 4-speed automatic with overdrive
- Powertrain: available with and without traction control

Specifications:
- Overall Length: 191.8"
- Overall Height: 71.5"
- Overall Width: 74.7"
- Wheelbase: 113.0"
- Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR): 5,750 lbs
- Front Suspension: Double-A arm
- Front Axle capacity (load limit): 3,300 lbs
- Rear Suspension: 5 link
- Rear Axle capacity (load limit): 3,200 lbs
- Rear Spring capacity (load limit): 3,200 lbs
- Brakes: Ventilated 4-wheel disc with anti-lock braking system
- Fuel Tank Capacity (gallons): 20.7
- Battery: OPzs Freedom Standard Heavy-duty
- Cold Cranking AMPS rating: 120 AMPS
- Alternator: 8.200
- Maximum Towing Weight (LBS): 3,425
- Towing Weight: 10% - 15% of vehicle weight up to 750 lbs

.../specs.cgi?brand=envoy&model1=Envoy&trim1=SLT&option1_1=4WD&option1_2=&eng=05/06/2001
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From: Kelisher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 6:16 PM
To: Klopowicz, Robert
Cc: Anderson, Margot
Subject: clean coal
TO: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ACTION REQUESTED: INFO COPY ONLY/NO ACTION NECESSARY
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MEDIA: LETTER, DATED MAY 23, 2001
TO: PRESIDENT BUSH
FROM: THE HONORABLE MIKE THOMPSON
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
SUBJECT: REQUESTS THE PRESIDENT TO IMPLEMENT THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS DIRECING FEDERAL FACILITIES TO TAKE CONSERVATION MEASURES BY ISSUING AN EXECUTIVE ORDER
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OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT - THE WHITE HOUSE

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
DATE RECEIVED: 05/25/2001

NAME OF CORRESPONDENT: THE HONORABLE MIKE THOMPSON

SUBJECT: REQUESTS THE PRESIDENT TO IMPLEMENT THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS DIRECTING FEDERAL FACILITIES TO TAKE CONSERVATION MEASURES BY ISSUING AN EXECUTIVE ORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE TO: OFFICE/AGENCY</th>
<th>(STAFF NAME)</th>
<th>ACTION CODE</th>
<th>DATE YY/MM/DD</th>
<th>TYPE RESP</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>COMPLETED YY/MM/DD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS</td>
<td>NICK CALIO</td>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>2001/05/25</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>05/25/01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTION COMMENTS: Reply sent to addressed agency

ACTION COMMENTS:

ACTION COMMENTS:

ACTION COMMENTS:

COMMENTS

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENTS: 0

MEDIA: LETTER

INDIVIDUAL CODES:

REPORT CODES:

USER CODE: 19 SIGNEEs

ACTION CODES:

A - APPROPRIATE ACTION
C - COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION
D - DRAFT RESPONSE
F - FURNISH FACT SHEET
I - INFO COPYING ACT NECESSARY
R - DIRECT REPLY W/COPY
S - FOR SIGNATURE
X - INTERM REPLY

DISPOSITION CODES:

A - ANSWERED
B - NON-SEP/REFERRAL
C - COMPLETED
S - SUSPENDED

OUTGOING CORRESPONDENCE:

TYPE RESP + INITIALS OF SIGNER
CODE + A
COMPLETED + DATE OF OUTGOING

REFER QUESTIONS AND ROUTING UPDATES TO RECORDS MANAGEMENT (ROOM 72, OEOB) EXT 42588
KEEP THIS WORKSHEET ATTACHED TO THE ORIGINAL INCOMING LETTER AT ALL TIMES AND SEND COMPLETED RECORD TO RECORDS MANAGEMENT.
June 6, 2001

Dear Representative Thompson:

Thank you for your recent letter urging the Administration to implement your recommendations to ameliorate electricity shortages by Executive Order as soon as possible. The President certainly appreciates your concern and suggestions.

I have shared your letter with the President's energy policy advisors and the Energy Task Force who are formulating policy recommendations in this area. Your comments are receiving their close and careful attention.

Thanks again for your letter on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Nicholas E. Calio
Assistant to the President and
Director of Legislative Affairs

The Honorable Mike Thompson
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Bcc w/ copy for appropriate action: VPTF
For Information: DP, DOE
May 23, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As members concerned about the energy crisis that is deepening in the Western United States, we would like to call to your attention additional measures that will help ameliorate electricity shortages anticipated this summer.

Experts widely believe that there will not be enough new generation online this summer to meet demand. Current estimates show that during these summer months California alone may experience shortages of 3,000 to 6,000 megawatts, which will likely lead to wider and longer-lasting rolling blackouts. Power supplies elsewhere in the Western region will be also extremely tight. And expected drought conditions will curtail generation capabilities while heat conditions will add to demand.

Your Executive Order directing Federal facilities to take conservation measures will help reduce energy usage and is, in our view, an important first step in fashioning near term solutions. But we strongly believe the federal government can and should do more.

The Department of Defense, for example, can further reduce its reliance on the civilian electric grid. It is the largest single consumer of electricity in California, accounting for about one percent or 420 megawatts of the state's peak load. According to a General Accounting Office (GAO) study completed at our request, the Department could immediately provide between 16 MW and 90 MW of additional generation capacity.

Based on the GAO findings, we ask that the Department of Defense provide additional assistance in mitigating some of the impacts of this energy crisis in three ways:

First, the military should fully utilize all of the on-site power plants located on western military bases in order to decrease demand on the western power grid. As a result of work requested by Congress, the GAO has identified about 16 MW of available generation which is not fully utilized (13.4 MW natural gas-fired and 2.6 MW diesel...
fueled; 16 MW is available from 5 power plants: Vandenberg, Onizuka and Beale Air Force Bases and Naval Air Station North Island) out of the total of about 109 MW located across the West. With the dire predictions of summer shortages, it is imperative that the military take all necessary steps to make this generating capacity available to California.

Second, the Department should conserve energy, in all forms, this summer across the West by eliminating all non-essential activities that do not jeopardize mission preparedness or public health and safety. Reduced energy consumption by the military could benefit the electricity market by reducing overall demand. This reduced consumption could increase the amount of supplemental energy available from military-owned power plants, above and beyond the 16 MW identified by GAO.

Third, the Department should develop a plan to deploy available mobile generation facilities, estimated by GAO to equal about 74 MW of capacity, in the event of a serious energy emergency this summer. This plan should: (1) assure that units remain available for deployment to California in least-cost ways; (2) identify and prepare sites and interconnection facilities to permit their operation in environmentally and operationally optimal ways; (3) coordinate with the California Independent System Operator (ISO) to develop operational and management agreements to provide the ISO with maximum flexibility; (4) summarize actions required by the state and federal government to deploy and provide compensation for the use of these units; and (5) develop environmental proposals or arrangements to allow these facilities to be used in the state.

While these measures will not solve the energy crisis, the additional energy saved and generated can help reduce and prevent electricity disruptions in the West this summer.

Mr. President, this a matter of great urgency, and we request that you implement these recommendations immediately by Executive Order.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Signature]
Mr. Andrew Lundquist  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Energy Task Force  
Forestal Building  
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Lundquist:

I am extending an invitation for you to join me in Midland, Texas, during the July District Work Period when I will be meeting with local oil and gas producers to discuss President Bush’s National Energy Policy. This portion of my district is in the heart of the oilpatch and would be excited to hear from you about the National Energy Policy, and in particular, the NEPD Group recommendation to the Secretaries of Energy and the Interior to promote enhanced oil and gas recovery from existing wells through new technology. Like many of the fields in the U.S., those in the Permian Basin region are mature and declining, but operators there are already doing much to keep existing wells productive. I believe the meeting, and especially your participation, would be a good opportunity to exchange information about enhanced oil and gas recovery efforts and technologies, and how they can help the U.S. meet its energy needs.

I would be glad to work with you if you are interested in a mutually agreeable date to travel to Midland. Please contact Shauna Brown of my staff to indicate whether you will be able to join me, or if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Larry Combest
Margot -

----Original Message-----
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2001 12:36 PM
To: Vemet, Jean
Cc: Carter, Douglas; Conti, John; Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: NSR

Margot

Bottom line:
Jean

-----Original Message-----
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2001 9:15 AM
To: Vernet, Jean
Subject: RE: NSR

Thanks. I won't be there. I am swamped with WH orders for the NEP. I called Joe to tell him. Unless he insists, I am tying myself to my computer.

-----Original Message-----
From: Vernet, Jean
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2001 8:55 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NSR

See you then.

-----Original Message-----
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2001 8:42 AM
To: Vernet, Jean
Subject: RE: NSR

Nope. Just Joe's note.

-----Original Message-----
From: Vernet, Jean
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2001 8:37 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NSR

Certainly. Do we have any more info?

-----Original Message-----
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2001 8:35 AM
To: Vernet, Jean
Subject: RE: NSR

Can you attend the meeting in Joe's office at 10:00?
I'm here.

Original Message
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2001 5:37 PM
To: Vemet, Jean
Subject: FW: NSR
Importance: High

Jean,

You going to be around in the morning?

Margot

Original Message
From: Kellner, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2001 5:35 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: NSR
Importance: High

Who is our smartest NSR person? Can you and that person (and it may well be you, be frank and admit it if that is the case) be in my office at 10 tomorrow for a conference call with our brothers at EPA on NSR? Let me know. They just called about this. Thanks.
Charlie
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From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov\internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 4:42 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Robert_C._McNally@oa.eop.gov\internet
Cc: Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov\internet; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov\internet; Kjersten_S._Drager@ovp.eop.gov\internet
Subject: Clean up of Chapter 1