Charlie and Kjersten,

Here are our answers on chapter 5. I told Charlie earlier that we will not have the chapter-5 fact check complete until Tuesday (along with fact check on chapter 7).

I will now compile our responses to chapter 7 and send to you by the end of the day.

Charlie - did you get an answer on the remaining graphic to chapter 1?

Kjersten and Charlie - we will also begin fact checking the remaining chapters you sent me (3 6, and 8). Won't like to be able to complete until Wednesday. Please let me know the status of the edits we sent you Friday on the international chapter.

Margot
From: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2002 11:17 AM
To: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC
Subject: FW: Updated Papers
Importance: High

-----Original Message-----
From: Dinan, Linda - D-7
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2001 2:06 PM
To: Hickok, Steven G - D-7; Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC
Cc: McElhaney, Judy - D-7
Subject: Updated Papers
Importance: High

Here are the amended papers, incorporating both Hickok and Stier edits.
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The Honorable Richard Cheney  
Vice President of the United States  
The Old Executive Office Building  
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Mr. Vice President:

I am disturbed by early reports that the Energy Task Force recommendations fail to recognize the need to include a path forward for assuring that this country is capable of providing a reliable and economic source of nuclear fuel for commercial nuclear reactors. As you know, nuclear power is the second largest supplier of electricity generation in the country. Unfortunately, it is not unreasonable to expect that the U.S. could have an OPEC-like dependency on foreign sources of nuclear fuel supplies in the near future. To prevent such a situation, the U.S. needs to deploy cost competitive uranium enrichment technology or we will rely on foreign supplies to meet nearly one quarter of our electricity needs.

There have been adverse consequences to the nation’s energy security as a result of the privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) in July 1998. USEC is the only domestic supplier of uranium enrichment services in the U.S. When it was privatized, USEC operated two gaseous diffusion plants located in Piketon, Ohio and Paducah, Kentucky. However, last June, USEC made the decision to cease operations at the Piketon Gaseous Diffusion Plant (GDP) ignoring the advice of the Departments of Energy and Treasury. The targeted date for turning the key to the “off position” is June 1, 2001.

A Department of Energy report issued on January 19, 2001 describes the need for the U.S. “to be able to reliably meet the continuing demand for approximately 11 million separative work units (SWU) per year.” However, the Paducah plant can only produce approximately 4.5 million SWU per year in an economic manner. The balance of requirements comes from 5.5 million SWU derived from blended down weapons grade uranium imported from Russia under the U.S.-Russia HEU Agreement and some European supplies. It is evident that the operation of a single enrichment plant in the country, coupled with a history of five interruptions in the delivery of enriched uranium under the Highly Enriched Uranium Purchase Agreement with Russia, raises questions about the vulnerability of the U.S. to a disruption in the supply of enriched uranium.
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The need for a secure, domestic uranium enrichment supply is underscored by the fact that nuclear power is enjoying improved operating economics and increased average efficiency of reactors. Demand is likely to remain stable or grow, as approximately 40% of the domestic nuclear reactors are currently seeking license renewals. During a hearing on nuclear power before the Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee on March 27, 2001, there was discussion about building the next generation nuclear reactors in the not-so-distant future. These next generation reactors will require 8-10% U-235 enrichment, compared with the 4-5% levels required for the current generation of boiling water reactors. It is troubling that USEC is closing the Piketon facility which is the only U.S. enrichment plant that is licensed to enrich uranium to 10% assay, when there is a trend toward higher assay fuel.

During the March 27, 2001 Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee hearing, testimony was offered which stated:

"USEC utilized only about 29% of its nameplate GDP capacity in 2000, and over the next year will supply a majority of its customers needs from Russian and U.S. HEU blending." (Testimony of John R. Longenecker, former USEC official).

Mr. Longenecker further states:

"USEC is finding it more profitable to operate as a trader of blended HEU rather than as a primary producer. This approach appears to lead inevitably to USEC exiting the market as a primary producer. As a result, constructing replacement enrichment capacity in the U.S. should be the key focus for the decade ahead."

In addition, during a June 8, 2000 hearing before the Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, testimony was submitted stating that the front end of the nuclear fuel cycle is endangered:

"Since 1998, expenditures for uranium exploration and mine development have declined by 59%; three uranium processing facilities have closed during 1999 (two in Texas and one in Louisiana); employment in U.S. uranium exploration, mining, milling and processing has decreased by almost 30%. Last year, production at ConverDyn, the sole remaining uranium converter in the U.S. was cut back by 25% and employment was reduced by over 12%." (Testimony of Mr. James Graham, President and CEO of ConverDyn).

If this nation's energy policy is going to place a greater emphasis on nuclear power, it must do so in a comprehensive fashion. An energy policy that ignores the reliability of the front end of the domestic nuclear fuel industry falls short of assuring needed energy security in this country. I urge you to carefully consider the needs of the entire nuclear fuel cycle as you prepare...
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to issue your recommendations for a national energy strategy. I know you will agree that Americans would find it unwise and unacceptable to depend on foreign sources for the second largest supplier of U.S. electricity generation, nuclear power.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Ted Strickland  
Ted Strickland  
Member of Congress

cc:  The Honorable Spencer Abraham  
The Honorable Bob Taft  
The Honorable Mike DeWine  
The Honorable George Voinovich  
The Honorable W. J. “Billy” Tauzin  
The Honorable John Dingell  
The Honorable Joe Barton  
The Honorable Rick Boucher
May 17, 2001

Spencer Abraham, Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20583

Dear Secretary Abraham,

We write today on behalf of the members of the American Institute of Architects Kansas City Chapter, its Committee on the Environment, and the Committees on the Environment from the Boston, San Francisco, and New York chapters of the AIA. We are alarmed by remarks made on April 30 by Vice President Dick Cheney regarding the Bush Administration's energy policy.

The vice president's statement indicates a profound misunderstanding of the potentials of the new high-performance architecture and the technologies available to us today. In fact, the energy policy sketched out by the Vice President sets the stage for the American economy to be left behind. Energy conservation and economic efficiency are essential to U.S. competitiveness within the world marketplace. Aggressive development of emerging technologies is a critical part of a forward-thinking strategy. This implies a creative redesign of our built environment and our use of energy.

As architects, we are increasingly aware of the need to more responsibly design and construct the built environment. We can and should do more with less—we are already finding many ways to use fewer materials and less energy while improving quality and efficiency.

At the policy level, we need a more balanced approach. Efforts toward conservation and efficiency should be a higher priority. We know that even conservation measures that are possible today can make a big difference. Apparently even the administration itself believes that energy conservation has immediate benefits. Three days after the Vice President's comments, President Bush recommended that steps be taken at all federal facilities, especially those in California, to save energy this summer.
Buildings account for nearly 40 percent of U.S. energy consumption. This can be dramatically lowered while improving comfort and quality. As architects and business people, we want to contribute to a built environment that fits the needs of our clients and their communities without compromising the natural environment. We want to work with elected officials at all levels to ensure that this goal is a reachable one.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rick McDermott, AIA, president
AIA Kansas City
representing members of AIA Kansas City

[Signature]

Robert E. Gould, FAIA, chair
AIA Kansas City Committee on the Environment
representing members of the AIA Kansas City
Committee on the Environment, the Boston Society of Architects Committee on the Environment, the AIA San Francisco Committee on the Environment, and the AIA New York Chapter Committee on the Environment, and the AIA Seattle Committee on the Environment

CC:
Paul Goldberger, The New Yorker
Herbert Muschamp, The New York Times
Julie Iovine, The New York Times
Verlyn Klinkenborg, The New York Times
Editors, Time
Editors, Newsweek
Editors, Business Week
Editors, Fortune
Bob Ivy, Architectural Record
Reed Kroloff, Architecture
Rick Hood/Arthur Brisbane, The Kansas City Star
Editors, The Boston Globe
Blair Kamin, Chicago Tribune
Nancy Levinson, Harvard Design Magazine
Christine Saum, Mayor’s Institute on City Design
Susan Szenasy, Metropolis
Kristina Kassler, Urban Land
Jay Walljasper, Utne Reader
Gordon Wright, Building Design & Construction
Alex Wilson, Environmental Building News
Kristen Douglass, Environmental Design & Construction
Katie Sosnowchik, Green@Work
AIA National COTE
John D. Anderson, AIA National President
Stephanie Stubbs, AIA Architect
Phil Simon, American Institute of Architects
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The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
United States Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

The Indiana Chamber of Commerce, and our 4,500 members, is deeply concerned with the energy future of Indiana and the United States. The crisis in California has raised the electric power supply and demand profile in every state, including Indiana.

96% of Indiana’s electricity comes from coal. As a manufacturing state, Indiana is energy intensive and the future of electric power is extremely critical for our state. The last base load power plant in Indiana was built almost twenty years ago. We have gone from an electric reserve of over 35% in 1985 to nearly single digits today with no base load power plants in the planning stages. Our State Utility Forecast Group (SUFG) projects that by 2010, Indiana will need an additional 2250 Megawatts (MW) of power and by 2016, an additional 5400 MW. That is over 1/3 of our current generating capacity and a new base load power plant requires over ten years to construct.

Recognizing Indiana’s grave energy outlook, we believe that the Administration’s energy agenda will be particularly vital to our energy future. With this in mind, we are extending to you an invitation to come to Indiana anytime between June and August to review the national energy policy and discuss the regional and state perspectives. We commit to you all our resources to make your visit a successful one and will also coordinate the attendance and participation of surrounding states.

If you should have any questions or would like to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to contact Vince Griffin, director of environmental and energy policy, at 800-824-6881 or David Holt, director of congressional affairs, at 800-824-6883.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. LaMothe
President & CEO

cc: Indiana Congressional Delegation
Date: May 18, 2001

To: The Honorable Spencer Abraham
   Secretary of Energy

From: Dale Steffes
      Houston Energy Chamber of Commerce
      Tel 713 467 4732

Subject: Request for meeting

This is a request for a brief meeting with you to share some of our efforts on energy. I am a 28 year veteran energy analyst with a publicly documented track record.

I would like to discuss how we might be of service implementing the recommendations of Chapter Eight of the National Energy Policy.

We have proposed a World Energy Ministers Association. This organization would assist with many of that chapter's recommendations. We would like the United States to be one of the founding country members.

I look forward to hearing from your office.

[Signature]

Enclosures: Houston Energy Chamber of Commerce
            World Energy Ministers Association

CC: Juanita and Robin, Fax 202 586 8794
May 18, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to you to express my strong support of your proposed National Energy Policy and to share with you a few thoughts on alleviating the economic strain caused by energy shortages in the western states.

While there is no doubt that a long-term solution is needed to provide for our nation's growing energy needs, and that increased and diversified production is the logical solution, I feel that it is important that we consider a few short-term measures to alleviate the astronomical prices being faced by consumers throughout our country. Such compassionate measures could diminish much of the negative rhetoric that has been circulating since the plan was made public. Partial relief from these high prices may also garner the grass-roots public support necessary for congressional approval of many of the long-term provisions of the plan.

Recently, I spoke with a constituent in Arkansas who proposed a one-year tax deduction for electricity costs in the western states. Under this proposal, yearly electricity costs in excess of the average total electricity costs for the past two years could be deducted from an individual's income taxes. While mindful of the potential cost of this proposal, I think the concept has merit for specifically targeted areas where electricity costs have reached staggering levels that may force the poor and elderly citizens to make difficult financial decisions that may have health risks associated with them.

Please be assured of my continued commitment to working with the Administration and my colleagues in the Senate to win passage of much needed legislation to promote a responsible national energy policy. I thank you for your time and consideration, and I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

Tim Hutchinson
United States Senator

TH:mz
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The Honorable Spencer Abraham  
Secretary, United States Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue SW  
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham,

As the Administration continues the discussion on new source review regulations, I hope that the Tennessee Valley Authority will be invited to participate. I appreciate your consideration of my request.

A suggestion in The National Energy Policy stated:

The NEPD Group recommends that the President direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and other relevant agencies, to review New Source Review regulations, including administrative interpretation and implementation, and report to the President within 90 days on the impact of the regulations on investment in new utility and refinery generation capacity energy efficiency, and environmental protection.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, the nation’s largest public power company, can play both a relevant and significant role in any discussion on new source review regulations. Therefore, I am requesting that they be invited to participate in this conversation.

I appreciate your devoted work as a member of the National Energy Policy Development Group and look forward to your response to my request.

Sincerely,

Roger F. Wicker  
Member of Congress
May 21, 2001

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

We have received copies of your proposal to deal with America's long term energy needs. Many of the proposals contained in the plan would affect laws within the jurisdiction of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Any relevant legislation to implement those proposals would therefore require Committee consideration prior to full Senate action. Before any possible Committee action on such legislation, we would appreciate receiving further information regarding the plan and its effects.

First, we request that you provide further details regarding any of the plan's recommendations that fall under the Committee's jurisdiction. In particular, please provide details, including criteria for agency consideration, regarding your recommendations:

A. To pursue multipollutant legislation to regulate power plant emissions.

B. To expand the Energy Star program. In particular, please describe the funding recommendations necessary to support this expansion.

C. To promote combined heat and power through flexibility in environmental permitting. In particular, what changes in permitting requirements are envisioned?

D. To take actions to remove constraints on the interstate transmission grid.

E. To direct the EPA to study opportunities to alter the reformulated gas program under the Clean Air Act.

F. To direct the EPA and the Department of Energy to streamline the permitting process for oil refineries.

G. To direct the EPA and the Department of Energy to adopt comprehensive regulations regarding refineries and consider the cumulative impacts and benefits of such regulations. In particular, please state the legal authorities for the regulations.
H. To direct the Attorney General to review existing enforcement actions under the New Source Review provisions to ensure they are consistent with the Clean Air Act and its regulations. In particular, please clarify how these actions may be inconsistent in view of the extensive case law on the subject, including Wisconsin Electric Power Co. v. Reilly, 893 F.2d 901 (7th Cir. 1990) and Alabama Power Co. v. Costle, 636 F.2d 323 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

I. To direct the Secretary of Interior to examine land status and lease stipulation impediments to federal oil and gas leasing, and to modify those impediments where they exist. In particular, please describe in detail contemplated modifications that relate to fish, wildlife, plants and their habitat regardless of whether changes would require legislative authorization.

J. To direct the Secretary of Interior to re-examine the federal legal and policy regime to determine whether changes to that regime would be required to site energy facilities in the coastal zone and on the Outer Continental Shelf.

In addition, for the purposes of Senate consideration of the relevant legislative elements of that plan, we would appreciate technical and analytical assistance from the Energy Information Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the Departments of State, Defense, Justice, Treasury, Interior and Transportation, and other Federal agencies with expertise. We ask that you direct the aforementioned agencies to provide us with answers to the following questions, and that they should assume in responding that the proposed plan is enacted by the end of this session of Congress:

1. What impact will the plan have on crude oil, natural gas, gasoline, diesel, and electricity prices paid by wholesale and retail consumers in the next 2 years?

2. What impact will the plan have on crude oil, natural gas, gasoline, diesel, and electricity prices paid by wholesale and retail consumers in the next 5 years?

3. How many barrels of crude oil, that would have otherwise been consumed under a business as usual scenario (i.e. the Department of Energy’s Annual Energy Outlook), will be displaced annually by 2006 due to the plan?

4. How many tons of criteria (including PM-2.5) and hazardous air pollutants and greenhouse gases will be emitted in each of the years 2002-2006 due to enactment of the plan versus the amount of each pollutant or substance that would have been emitted if the plan were not enacted?

5. What impact would the plan have on jobs and different sectors of the economy, including small businesses?
6. How would the plan impact general environmental quality, including air quality, and ground and surface water resources, including ocean waters?

7. How will the plan bring us closer to compliance with our Senate-ratified treaty commitment of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels? When will that target be reached?

8. Please identify how, if at all, enactment would affect or implement relevant international treaty commitments, particularly those affecting relations with Canada and Mexico, including air and water quality.

9. What will be the increase in electricity generated from renewable resources by 2006 due to the plan? Please estimate the projected electricity generation capacity for each fuel in that year, and increases in distributed generation.

10. What amount of additional spent nuclear fuel will have been generated by 2015 and by 2025, as a result of the plan's nuclear power recommendations, beyond the 70,000 metric ton storage capacity of the proposed Yucca Mountain repository?

11. What changes, if any, in rules, regulations or Federal law regarding the acquisition of private property interests, including any plan to delegate Federal eminent domain powers to quasi-public or other non-governmental entities, are necessary to implement the plan?

12. Please quantify the improvements in efficiency of electricity and motor fuel consumption and production that the plan will stimulate for each of the next five years.

13. How many additional acres of Federal land, not currently in use or eligible for use for resource extraction (oil, natural gas, etc.), would have been brought into energy resource production by 2006? What specific Federal lands are likely to be affected? How many acres of Federal lands that currently receive statutory or regulatory protection from energy exploration will be opened to resource development and/or extraction?

14. What impact will the plan have on the ability to protect and recover threatened and endangered species, including aquatic species such as salmon?

15. How will the plan promote oil and gas drilling on public lands without harming fragile ecosystems such as wetlands, tundra, deserts, and coasts?

16. How many new refineries and electricity generating power plants (greater than 100 MW) would be built by 2006? What will the primary source of fuel be for those power plants?

17. How will the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies protect consumers against price gouging?
18. What statutes would have to be amended in order to implement the plan? In addition, please specifically note each case where plan implementation would require any form of expedited or modified Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, or other Federal regulatory approvals or authorizations. What regulatory mechanisms will be used for these expedited processes?

Thank you for your consideration of our request. We look forward to a lively debate on the important matter of national energy policy. The facts and estimates provided in your response will ensure that Congress' deliberations will be well-informed. It would be helpful if the agencies' responses included details on any additional assumptions made in answering these questions. To expedite Committee and Senate consideration of these matters, we would appreciate a response no later than June 7, 2001. Please contact us if you have comments or questions about our request.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
Dear Secretary of Housing and Urban Affairs Mel Martinez,

Enclosed is an open letter to the American public about the nation's energy future. The letter is from Scientists for a Sustainable Energy Future, a group of natural and social scientists who study the connections among energy, the environment, and society, and who are concerned with the direction of the nation's energy policy. The letter has more than 270 signatories, including members of the National Academy of Sciences and many of the nation's foremost experts on these subjects.

I urge you to read this letter and to consider its positions carefully as we move forward in the debate about the nation's energy policy.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Cutler J. Cleveland

Sincerely,

Cutler J. Cleveland
Scientists for a Sustainable Energy Future*  

An Open Letter to the American People

May 18, 2001

Dear Fellow Citizens,

We are natural and social scientists who study the connections among energy, the environment, and society. We write to you out of grave concern with the turn the nation’s energy policy has taken. Decisions taken today about the supply and use of energy have far reaching implications for our economic prosperity and for the health of our environment. Since the first “energy crisis” almost thirty years ago, a large body of research in the nation’s universities, national laboratories, think tanks, and private sector has produced large advances in our understanding of energy issues. We would like to share some of this information with you because the current direction of the nation’s energy policy is inconsistent with much of this work.

Conventional forms of energy have grabbed the policy spotlight in recent months, but this emphasis is misplaced, and, ultimately, counterproductive. We produce slightly less than half of the oil we consume; by 2020 we will produce just 35 percent. Can a policy to encourage domestic oil extraction reduce dependence on imported oil and maintain the price of gasoline and home heating oil at reasonable levels? The simple answer is no, because the domestic oil resource base is depleted to the extent that large investments in drilling cannot generate a commensurate increase in oil supply. Extraction and proven reserves of oil have dropped considerably since their peaks in 1970 despite a massive drilling campaign in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Because domestic oil sources are more costly than overseas alternatives, incentives to encourage exploration and development will hurt the economy in the same way they did 20 years ago when the oil price shocks produced record rates of drilling. A large diversion of capital investment and profits to the oil industry ensued, but oil extraction continued to decline, as it has to this day. There is every reason to believe that the same scenario will play out if political decisions are made to promote domestic extraction.

Opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil exploration will not improve our energy security, nor will it have any impact on the price of gasoline. The economically recoverable amount of oil in the Refuge is just 152 days of supply for the nation. More importantly, if we started drilling in the Refuge today, the Department of Energy projects that by 2020 it could supply 1.4 million barrels per day. By then world oil production will be in the range of 100 million barrels per day. The Refuge would amount to about 1 percent of global oil supply, and thus have a trivial influence on the ability of oil exporters to influence prices.

Nuclear power faces formidable obstacles. Experience of the last several decades has shown that electricity from nuclear power plants is an expensive form of power when all public and private

---

* http://www.bu.edu/ees/openerletter.html.  Contact: Cutler J. Cleveland, Professor and Director, Center for Energy and Environmental Studies, Boston University, 675 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA, 02215.  617.353.3083.  cutler@bu.edu.
and renewable technologies. We also must lead the effort to help less fortunate nations find and fund the path of development that improves their quality of life with minimal de-stabilization of the Earth’s climate.

There has been a lot of talk in Washington about the need for renewables and conservation, but action seriously lags behind the rhetoric. The budget submitted to Congress last month calls for a large cut in funding for these technologies while proposing greater incentives for conventional fuels. This would speed us in the direction opposite from one that would improve our energy security, reduce pollution, help stabilize the Earth’s climate, and maximize our economic flexibility. We urge you to join us in the campaign for a sensible and sustainable energy future.
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May 21, 2001

Mr. Kyle McSlarrow  
Chief of Staff  
United States Department of Energy  
Washington, DC

Kyle,

I would like to request a meeting for our client Enron and you for this Wednesday, May 23, 2001. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the President's National Energy Policy report and potential legislative activities in Congress.

In addition to myself, Rick Shapiro, Senior Vice President of Government Affairs, Houston and Linda Robertson, Vice President of Government Affairs, Washington, will be attending the meeting.

I will follow up with your assistant later today to see if a meeting is possible for Wednesday. In the interim, please feel free to contact me on 202-457-1110 if you should have any questions.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David R. Lugar

1133 Connecticut Avenue NW  •  Fifth Floor  •  Washington, DC 20036  •  (202) 457-1110  •  (202) 457-1130 fax  
www.quinngillespie.com
May 22, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Spencer:

On July 24-25, 2001, the Senatorial Trust will convene in Washington, D.C., for its national summer meeting. As you know, this exclusive group is comprised of business and community leaders throughout the country that play an integral role in supporting our Party.

I hope you will accept my invitation to participate in a panel discussion on America's energy policy on Wednesday, July 25, 2001. The specific details are as follows:

Wednesday, July 25, 2001
The Reserve Officers Association
1 Constitution Avenue, NE, 5th Floor
8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.

Your participation would significantly contribute to the meeting's success. Our members would be enlightened to hear from you, and I hope you will consider joining us.

Please have a member of your staff contact Fraley Marshall in Special Events at the NRSC at 202-478-4432 to confirm your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Bill
Senator Bill Frist, M.D.
Chairman, NRSC
May 22, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
Attn: Mr. Kyle McSlarrow

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We applaud the President’s initiative in proposing an active national energy policy. We are very pleased at the National Energy Policy Development Group’s affirmation of the importance of significant expansion of Low-Income Weatherization. This sends a strong signal to low-income families and communities regarding the importance the President attaches to their needs, their concerns, and long-term solutions to their problems.

However, as you may be aware, that initiative is already in real trouble on Capitol Hill. Our organization works on behalf of the local Community Action Agencies who deliver most of the Weatherization services and a large share of LIHEAP assistance. We are encountering bi-partisan resistance to any real shift in past Department of Energy funding priorities.

We would like the work closely with your team to keep the momentum up as we approach the first test for your proposal in the early June meetings of the Appropriations subcommittees. I would appreciate the opportunity to strategize with whomever you have put in charge of making those proposals happen as soon as possible.

We have some other ideas on longer range initiatives that could provide significant help to moderate-income, as well as low-income, consumers by next winter - ideas involving policy rather than spending. We would also welcome a chance to establish an ongoing dialogue in search of common solutions to our shared concerns regarding low-income families.

Sincerely,

David Bradley

David A. Bradley
Executive Director