Mr. Robert Kripowicz  
Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Kripowicz:

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for your testimony during the June 12, 2001 Committee on Science hearing, "President's National Energy Policy: Clean Coal Technology and Oil and Gas R&D."

Enclosed are additional questions from Members of the Committee, as well as a copy of the hearing transcript. Your responses will be published as part of the official record of the hearing. In addition to a hard copy of your answers, the Committee requires an additional copy, including any supporting graphs or charts, saved on a DOS formatted 3.5 inch diskette, in either Word Perfect, Word or ASCII text. Please send your responses to Tom Hammond of the Committee staff. If you prefer, you may E-mail your responses to tom.hammond@mail.house.gov.

I would appreciate receiving your responses to the enclosed questions by September 17, 2001.

Also enclosed is a copy of the verbatim transcript for your review. The Committee’s rule pertaining to the printing of transcripts is as follows:

The transcripts...shall be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record, as appropriate. Any requests to correct any errors, other than transcription, shall be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted.

The complete revisions to the transcripts submitted for the record must be received by September 17, 2001 and should be sent to Mr. Tom Hammond, Subcommittee on Energy, H2-389 Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Hammond at (202) 225-9662.
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Thank you again for making this hearing successful.  

Sincerely,  

[Signature]  

ROScoe BARTLETT  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Energy  

RB/th  

Enclosures
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

President's National Energy Policy: Clean Coal Technology and Oil and Gas R&D
June 12, 2001

Post-Hearing Questions Submitted to

Mr. Robert Kripowicz, Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy
U.S. DOE Office of Fossil Energy.

Post-Hearing Questions Submitted by Majority Members

Source of the "Energy Crisis"

Q1. What are your perceptions of the current energy shortage? Would you characterize the current situation as an energy supply constraint, an infrastructure constraint, a regulatory constraint, or some combination of the above? Based on your characterization, what is the quickest, most effective way to address energy shortages?

Unconventional Sources of Natural Gas

Q2. It appears that increasing quantities of natural gas are going to come from unconventional sources that may require the development of new technologies. Please describe how technologies may help us develop resources such as tight gas, coalbed methane and gas hydrates.

DOE Research and Oil & Gas Production and Exploration

Q3. Please describe in more detail how [spell out] DOE's research is producing "deeper, faster, smarter and cleaner" ways to explore for and extract petroleum and natural gas.

Q4. Please provide any figures or examples to illustrate the effectiveness of taxpayer's dollars spent on oil and gas R&D over the last 10 or 20 years.

DOE Research on Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel

Q5. The Energy Information Administration recently found that diesel fuel would be in short supply in 2007 after the implementation of the new 15-PPM standard. Yet, many auto manufacturers are relying on a steady, clean supply of diesel to power the next generation of diesel engines, and some are even examining the possibility of reforming ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) for use in fuel cells. What is DOE's research providing, the American public, in terms of technologies to produce ULSD, and what is the future potential of diesel fuel?
Oil Field Life-Extension Technologies

Q6. Please discuss in further detail how the Bakersfield oil lease was brought back to production. Are these technologies site specific, or can they be used at other sites around the country? Is there a down side to field life extension technologies that the Committee should be aware of?
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Post-Hearing Questions Submitted to

Mr. Robert Kripowicz, Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy
U.S. DOE Office of Fossil Energy

Post-Hearing Questions Submitted by Majority Members

Coal Quality, Recoverability and Technology

Q1. There has been a lot of discussion about the quantity of coal we have in the ground, how much is recoverable, and how much is of high enough quality to consider recovery. Can you discuss this, and tell us how technology may perhaps allow us to recover more coal from the mine as well as use lower grades of coal for fuel?

Q2. How do advanced technologies allow us to use coal in ways other than simply burning it in its original form? What advantages do these advanced technologies offer?

Producing Electricity from Coal with de minimus Emissions

Q3. Do you believe that it will be possible to produce electricity from coal with de minimus emissions by 2020 as envisioned by CURC? Do you believe that technology can be developed to accomplish this in the 2020 timeframe?

Other Uses for Coal

Q4. What are some of the other uses for coal? Is it practical to consider coal as a transportation fuel?

Carbon Sequestration Technologies

Q5. Are there any practical cost effective technologies for carbon sequestration available today? Will any become available in the near future?

Potential for Coalbed Methane

Q6. What is the potential for coalbed methane in this country?

Benefits of the Clean Coal Technology Program

Q7. Are you aware of any industry estimates that quantify the benefits derived
from clean coal technology? Do they correlate with DOE's internal estimates?

Q8. The President's National Energy Policy proposes $2 billion in spending on clean coal technology. How do you see this money being used, and how can we guarantee that taxpayers get the most "bang for the buck?"

DOE R&D Programs

Q9. Please describe DOE's advanced turbine and other high efficiency technologies and how these designs may be incorporated with next generation power plant designs. Can we reasonably expect efficiency to increase as much as CURC estimates?

Q10. Controlling emissions is critical to the success of any power plant technology. Can you give specific examples of DOE's research efforts to reduce stack emissions and recycling ash and other scrubbed stack pollutants?

Coal as a Source for Hydrogen

Q11. Can coal be used to competitively generate hydrogen or as a hydrogen carrier for fuel cells?

Relative Transportation Efficiencies between Coal and Electricity

Q12. Is it more efficient to generate electricity from coal in Utah and transport it to California on the grid — with its associated line loss — or is it more efficient to mine and ship coal to California and generate electricity closer to the user? How do infrastructure and air quality considerations influence these decisions?
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The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary
US Department of Energy (7E-079)
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

The Technology Experience to Accelerate Markets for Utility Photovoltaics (TEAM-UP) is one of the most successful public/private renewable energy partnerships supported by the US Department of Energy (DOE). TEAM-UP is the only partnership between the electric power industry and solar energy industry. The program has positively impacted the photovoltaics (PV) marketplace over its seven-year lifespan. Seventy-five percent of the PV produced in the U.S. is exported, and in the President’s budget, TEAM-UP is the only program aimed at domestic grid-connected PV deployment. TEAM-UP has contributed to approximately 60% of all commercial grid-tied PV deployments nationwide. Companies participating in TEAM-UP provide a cost-share ratio of roughly 4-to-1, one of the highest ratios of any program that DOE offers.

DOE and industry must define pathways that fully engage the energy service provider community and other important stakeholders in order to accomplish the ultimate goal: a self-sustaining role for PV as part of the U.S. electricity portfolio. Investments in PV R&D without programs focused on domestic commercial deployment and barriers to PV market expansion will not benefit the nation.

The TEAM-UP program is administered through the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) and Solar Electric Power Association (SEPA). EEI’s members generate about three-quarters of all the electricity generated by electric companies in the nation and serve about 70 percent of all ultimate customers in the nation. SEPA’s broad membership consists of 118 utilities, energy service providers, and PV industry members.

We would like to request a meeting with you in July to discuss this program and its relationship to the Administration’s National Energy Plan. Please have someone from your office contact me at (202) 966-5851 to set up an appointment.

Sincerely,

Murray Liebman

Murray Liebman

4413 Lowell Street, NW • Washington, D.C. 20016 • (202) 966-5851 • (202) 966-5641 - Fax

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
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Mr. Michael Whatley
Director of Congressional Affairs
Department of Energy
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Whatley:

Enclosed is a copy of correspondence I have received from Doyne Loyd. I believe you will find it self-explanatory.

Your reviewing this material and providing any assistance or information possible under the governing statutes and regulations will be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your attention in this matter. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

ST/hk
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Dear Secretary Abraham:

The Technology Experience toAccelerate Markets for Utility Photovoltaics (TEAM-UP) is one of the most successful public/private renewable energy partnerships supported by the US Department of Energy (DOE). TEAM-UP is the only partnership between the electric power industry and solar energy industry. The program has positively impacted the photovoltaics (PV) marketplace over its seven-year lifespan. Seventy-five percent of the PV produced in the U.S. is exported, and in the President's budget, TEAM-UP is the only program aimed at domestic grid-connected PV deployment. TEAM-UP has contributed to approximately 60% of all commercial grid-tied PV deployments nationwide. Companies participating in TEAM-UP provide a cost-share ratio of roughly 4-to-1, one of the highest ratios of any program that DOE offers.

DOE and industry must define pathways that fully engage the energy service provider community and other important stakeholders in order to accomplish the ultimate goal: a self-sustaining role for PV as part of the U.S. electricity portfolio. Investments in PV R&D without programs focused on domestic commercial deployment and barriers to PV market expansion will not benefit the nation.

The TEAM-UP program is administered through the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) and Solar Electric Power Association (SEPA). EEI's members generate about three-quarters of all the electricity generated by electric companies in the nation and serve about 70 percent of all ultimate customers in the nation. SEPA's broad membership consists of 118 utilities, energy service providers, and PV industry members.

We would like to request a meeting with you in July to discuss this program and its relationship to the Administration's National Energy Plan. Please have someone from your office contact me at (202) 966-5851 to set up an appointment.

Sincerely,

Murray Liebman

4413 Lowell Street, NW • Washington, D.C. 20016 • (202) 966-5851 • (202) 966-5641 • Fax
Michigan House of Representatives

June 12, 2001

President of the United States
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We wish to congratulate you on the leadership you have shown through the National Energy Policy that was recently released. We believe that this is a solid plan, a plan that looks into the future and will help provide added security for our country.

There are a number of additional issues dealing with high gasoline prices that we wish to bring to your attention that have some bearing on the situation in the Midwest and especially in Michigan. These high prices are creating a very difficult situation for Michigan consumers and will have a negative effect on Michigan’s economy.

We believe that the Federal government must standardize the number of reformulated gasoline formulas that are used in the United States. There are fifteen types of “boutique” fuels sold in the United States. Michigan, while not mandated to use reformulated gasoline, receives 86% its gasoline supply from the Chicago area, an area mandated to use reformulated gas. Due to the variety of mandated standards, the supply of gasoline is very tight. Any disruption in the supply could drive gasoline prices to record high levels. Cutting to two or three different formulas could still meet the requirements set forth in the Clean Air Act and ease the burden of the tight gasoline supply in Michigan. This decision can only be made at the federal level.

The yearly change-over from winter to summer fuels also tightens the supply in the Midwest. EPA regulations prohibit the selling of a “blended” mix of winter and summer fuel. This presents a large logistical challenge. With inventories already low at the start of the year, there was a twelve-cent price jump. Perhaps allowing a two-week time period that will allow refineries to transition from winter to summer fuels could ease the logistical burden to the Midwest gas supply.

We support the sections of the National Energy Policy that will help to streamline the permitting process for energy production. Particularly, the directive to federal agencies to expedite permits will be very helpful to Michigan. Over the past 20 years, seven refineries have closed in our state – leaving one refinery in operation. The main reason for their closure is the numerous regulations involved with the permits for expansions and/or maintenance on those facilities. Streamlining this process will help encourage new refineries to start up. This in turn will help increase the supply of gasoline within our state.
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We also support directives to the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Energy to improve dialogue among energy producing and consuming nations. By improving relations with energy producing nations outside of the OPEC alliance, the United States will be less susceptible to collusion by the OPEC countries.

In addition, we applaud your call for more energy conservation in our country. The sections of the policy that direct federal agencies to take appropriate actions to conserve energy in their facilities, the call for increased funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency research, and the tax credit for consumers who purchase hybrid and fuel cell vehicles are excellent ideas. We have started to follow your example already, by adding similar language to our fiscal year 2002 budget bills. It is proper that we, as public officials, lead by example in conserving our energy resources.

Lastly, we support U.S. Representative Nick Smith’s (R-Michigan) bill that will temporarily suspend the 4.3 cent per gallon tax increase that was enacted under the Clinton Administration. In 1994, this increase was passed for deficit reduction. However, with the Federal government running high surpluses – even in tough economic times, there is no reason this increase cannot be removed to provide immediate relief at the gas pump for the people of the United States. We believe that this small part of the federal gas tax can be suspended without reduction to the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

On May 9, 2001 – our Governor, John Engler, wrote Vice President Cheney about the gasoline situation in Michigan. In that letter he wrote, “We did not arrive at the current situation overnight, and we recognized that there are no simple short term solutions to address this problem ... The gasoline supply issue in the Midwest exemplifies the problems we face because our nation lacks a comprehensive national energy policy.” Your leadership in creating a National Energy Policy Task Force is helping to generate an energy policy for the future. We applaud your continuing efforts and thank you for undertaking this daunting challenge.

Sincerely,

Speaker Rick Johnson
Rep. Laura Toy
Rep. Bruce Patterson
Rep. Jason Allen
Rep. Patricia Birkholz
Rep. Clark Bisbee
The President
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Rep. Mike Bishop
Rep. Nancy Cassis
Rep. Larry DeVuyst
Rep. Stephen Ehardt
Rep. Jud Gilbert
Rep. Lauren Hager
Rep. Mark Lansen
Rep. Larry Julian
Rep. Mike Kowall

Rep. Ken Bradstreet
Rep. Sandy Caul
Rep. Paul DeWeese
Rep. Jennifer Faunce
Rep. Patricia Godchaux
Rep. Doug Hart
Rep. Ron Jelinek
Rep. James Koetje
Rep. Wayne Kuipers

Rep. Cameron Brown
Rep. Gene DeRosset
Rep. Leon Drolet
Rep. Tom George
Rep. Robert Goslin
Rep. Jim Howell
Rep. Ruth Johnson
Rep. Jerry Kooiman
Rep. Charles LaSata
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Rep. David Mead
Rep. Tom Meyer
Rep. Mary Ann Middaugh
Rep. Mickey Mortimer
Rep. Gary Newell
Rep. John Pappageorge
Rep. Mike Pumford
Rep. Andrew Raczkowski
Rep. Randy Richardville
Rep. Andrew Richner
Rep. Sal Rocca
Rep. Alan Sanborn
Rep. Judith Scranton
Rep. Scott Shackleton
Rep. Marc Shulman
Rep. Tony Stamas
Rep. John Stewart
Rep. Susan Tabor
Rep. Jerry Vander Roest
Rep. Barbara Vander Vecht
Rep. Gerald Van Woerkom
Rep. Steve Vear
Rep. Joanne Voorhees
Rep. Gary Woronchak

cc: The Honorable Richard Cheney
    The Honorable Spencer Abraham
    The Honorable Christine Todd Whitman
June 13, 2001

Mr. Karl Rove
Senior Advisor to the President
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Karl,

I am pleased to inform you that on June 4, 2001, Associated Builders and Contractor’s Board of Directors unanimously and enthusiastically voted to endorse the National Energy Policy. ABC’s 23,000 member companies nationwide are gravely concerned about the impact of skyrocketing energy costs, rolling blackouts and aging energy infrastructure on all Americans. We believe the energy policy will safely and effectively promote new energy supplies and improved infrastructure while at the same time protecting our environment and conserving our natural resources. Our members stand ready to help provide reliable, efficient, and environmentally sound energy to all Americans by building and improving our nation’s infrastructure capability.

All new federal construction will be subject to Executive Order 13202, and therefore will be built utilizing full and open competition. ABC once again commends the Bush Administration for issuing this Order, which ensures federal taxpayer’s dollars are spent in the most cost-effective and fair manner. This Order will ensure that all new federal construction resulting from the energy policy will be built with full and open competition.

As the various energy bills move through Congress, ABC will be vigilant to ensure that any new construction will not have Davis-Bacon requirements attached to it. As you know, Davis-Bacon requirements inflate the cost of construction by 5 to 39 percent. The inevitable result of cost inflation will be less money for construction; therefore fewer plants, pipelines, and power lines will be built if Davis-Bacon requirements are imposed. Our nation’s infrastructure is in desperate need of repair and upgrade. We cannot afford to needlessly waste much-needed funds for these purposes. ABC urges you to stand firm against any attempts to expand Davis-Bacon to any new construction associated with the Energy Policy.

ABC commends the Bush Administration for its commitment to providing reliable, affordable, and environmentally sound energy to all Americans with free enterprise and open competition. We look forward to working with you to achieve this end.

Sincerely,

Bill Spencer
William B. Spencer
Vice President, Government Affairs

TO: The Honorable Spencer Abraham
   Andrew Card
   Joshua Bolten
   Kirk Blalock
   Ken Mehlman
   Andrew Lundquist

1300 North Seventeenth Street • Rosslyn, Virginia 22209 • (703) 812-2000

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
Resolution

Whereas Associated Builders and Contractors recognizes the desperate need for a national energy policy that combines environmental protections, increased supply, and infrastructure upgrade and modernization built with free, fair and open competition; and

Whereas the country is currently in the midst of an energy crisis marked by widespread rolling blackouts and skyrocketing gas and electricity costs that are expected to worsen in the coming months; and

Whereas the National Energy Policy as laid out by the National Energy Policy Development Group recommends measures to promote increased energy efficiency and conservation, encourage construction of new power plants and transmission lines, and upgrade and rehabilitate existing production and transmission infrastructure in order to ensure reliable and affordable energy for all Americans;

Whereas the policy calls for the building of substantial new infrastructure, which will be built using full and open competition and government neutrality in contracting as prescribed in Executive Order 13202;

Be it Resolved

That Associated Builders and Contractors proudly endorses the National Energy Policy as recommended by the National Energy Policy Development Group; and

That ABC believes the National Energy Policy will have a positive impact on the construction industry through the creation of thousands of new jobs that will be awarded on the basis of open competition and government neutrality; and

That ABC believes the National Energy Policy will benefit all Americans through more reliable, affordable, and environmentally-sound energy; and

That ABC members stand ready to meet the challenges set forth in the National Energy Policy.
June 13, 2001

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

Dear Secretary Abraham:

I have enclosed a copy of House Resolution 385 that passed in the Illinois House of Representatives on Thursday, May 31, 2001, by a unanimous vote. This resolution has been sent to President Bush and members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation to promote the production and use of ethanol and bio-diesel by providing these fuels a prominent place in our national energy policy.

Thank you for your consideration and support of our renewable fuels.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donald L. Moffitt  
State Representative  
94th District

DLM:mcw  
Enclosure
WHEREAS, The United States currently faces its most serious energy shortage since the oil embargoes of the 1970's; and
WHEREAS, The United States' energy consumption is expected to increase by approximately 32% by the year 2020; and
WHEREAS, Domestic, renewable, and alternative fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel offer hope for America's future; and
WHEREAS, President Bush's National Energy Policy recommends that a sound national energy policy should encourage a clean and diverse portfolio of domestic energy supplies so that future generations of Americans will have access to the energy they need; and
WHEREAS, The continued growth of renewable energy will continue to be important in delivering larger supplies of clean, domestic power for America's growing economy; and
WHEREAS, President Bush's National Energy Policy recommends increased funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency research and development programs that are performance-based and cost-shared, and
WHEREAS, Biomass, unlike other renewable energy sources, can be converted directly into liquid fuels, called biofuels, to meet our transportation needs; the two most common are ethanol and biodiesel; and
WHEREAS, The development of biomass benefits rural economies that produce crops used for biomass, particularly ethanol and biomass electricity generation; and
WHEREAS, Ethanol is the most widely used biofuel, and its production has increased sharply since 1980, rising from 200 million gallons per year to 1.9 billion gallons; and
WHEREAS, There are currently approximately 450,000 alternative fuel vehicles in the United States, and more than 1.5 million flexible-fuel vehicles that can use gasoline or a mixture of ethanol and gasoline; and
WHEREAS, The State of Illinois is considering eliminating the use of MTBE which will likely increase our reliance on ethanol; and
WHEREAS, Alternative fuels not only reduce dependence on petroleum transportation fuels, they also reduce or entirely eliminate harmful emissions; and
WHEREAS, The National Energy Policy Development Group recommends that the President direct the Secretary of Treasury to work with Congress to continue the ethanol excise tax exemption; therefore be it
RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we urge the President of the United States and the United States Congress to ensure ethanol and biodiesel are included as part of any lasting energy policy; and be it further
RESOLVED, That we urge the President of the United States and the United States Congress to promote the production and use of ethanol and biodiesel by providing these fuels a prominent place in national energy policy; and be it further
RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be delivered to the President of the United States and to each member of the Illinois congressional delegation.


Michael J. Madigan, Speaker of the House

Anthony D. Rossi, Clerk of the House
June 14, 2001

Mr. Jean Gaulin  
Chairman  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
Ultramar Diamond Shamrock Corporation  
P.O. Box 696000  
San Antonio, Texas  78269-6000

Dear Mr Gaulin:

Thank you for your thoughtful letter concerning the need to focus on the continuing importance of petroleum products and refinery capacity as part of our National Energy Policy (NEP). As you are well aware at this point, the National Energy Policy Development Group gave specific attention to a number of the issues raised in your letter. In addition, the President, Vice President and other members of the Administration, as well as the national media, have paid significant attention to clean fuels and refining issues in the past few months.

Underlying this attention is a recognition, as suggested in your letter, that this country will remain dependent, for a long time, on petroleum products and that we need to take steps to assure that we will have a reliable supply of affordable, clean petroleum products. This does not mean that we should ignore the environmental and economic opportunities that alternatives to petroleum fuels for transportation may offer. However, I share your view that the contribution these alternatives can make is limited in the near term and that reality has to inform our overall energy policy approach.

Your letter raised several specific issues that I would like to address:

- First, you noted that future efforts to reduce emissions must rely on both fuel and vehicle changes. Federal Tier 2 emission reduction programs as well as reduced sulfur requirements for gasoline and diesel have placed significant new requirements on light and heavy duty vehicle emissions. Balancing these requirements, and any additional requirements that States may impose, with their impacts on the cost and supply of fuels is an area which the Department has and will continue to focus significant resources.

- Second, you commented on the delays associated with certain aspects of environmental permitting. The NEP directed the EPA, working with the Department, to review the New Source Review regulations and to report within 90 days on the impact of those regulations on energy capacity including investment in new refining facilities. I am hopeful this process
will address the problem you raised.

- Third, your letter raised the question of the merit of the oxygenate requirement for reformulated gasoline. This is a difficult issue in that Congress had a number of purposes in mind when it established the oxygenate requirement. Any change made in that requirement, whether by Congress or through regulatory action, is going to have to balance those competing needs. The Department’s concern and responsibility is focused on the fuel supply implications of any changes and we view the various limitations, being pursued by States and in Congress, on the use of the oxygenate Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether to likely have a far greater negative impact that the oxygenate requirement per se:

- Fourth, you raised the “boutique fuels” issue, pointing out that various areas’ differing air quality needs are most efficiently met with fuels of differing qualities. But, your also letter noted that this approach can place some stress on the distribution infrastructure that requires attention. The Department will be working with the EPA in their assessment of the “boutique fuels” situation, as directed by the NEP, and we look forward to your input into this study. We share your concern that alternatives solutions to distribution problems, like a national fuel, can bring their own set of problems and costs.

We look forward to working with you and others in the refining industry as we address both our NEP initiatives and our ongoing efforts to assure a continuing adequate supply of clean, reasonably-priced fuels to American consumers.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Margot Anderson
Acting Director
Office of Policy
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The Honorable Richard Cheney  
Vice President of the United States of America  
Old Executive Office Building  
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Mr. Vice President,

The National Grocers Association was pleased to attend your recent briefing on the Administration's national energy policy. We strongly support that policy and will work to see it implemented. It is visionary and comprehensive as well as pragmatic. We agree that a national energy policy should focus on developing more diversified and efficient sources of supply as well as encourage greater conservation.

Next to the cost of labor, energy is the second biggest expense to the grocery industry. Historically, grocers have implemented a series of practices to conserve energy. For example, they include:

- Dimming lights to save on electricity consumption without compromising customer safety,
- Retrofitting incandescent light bulbs with compact fluorescent lights,
- Replacing old HVAC systems with new energy-efficient systems,
- Installing time clocks or setback-programmable thermostats to maximize efficiency,
- Installing locking covers on thermostats to prevent tampering with temperature settings,
Performing scheduled maintenance on units including cleaning condenser coils, replacing air filters regularly and checking ducts and pipe insulation for damage,

Keeping refrigerator evaporator coils clean and free of ice or debris build-up,

Using night covers on display cases,

Urging the installation of auto door-closers and strip curtains on walk-in freezers and coolers, and

Reducing air conditioning.

Mr. Vice President, it is clear that food retailers, although large consumers of power, are also sensitive to the importance of being efficient energy users. The grocery industry, including retail stores, distribution centers and transportation fleets, plays a key role in the energy market today. N.G.A. members have a vital role in the national economy and food chain, and are facing the challenge of providing consumers with a reliable, plentiful and safe supply of fresh food and grocery products year round. To do so requires the use of a considerable amount of electric power, which is required to cool and freeze products to ensure safety and freshness, to light the store, to provide heating and air conditioning and to run food preparation equipment and many other appliances throughout the store.

In this quest to be responsible energy consumers, N.G.A. supports the Administration’s energy policy. Please let us know how we can assist in promoting its success.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas K. Zaucha
President and CEO

cc: President George W. Bush
    Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham
June 14, 2001

The Hon. Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

Thank you for your letter of March 26 and for your efforts on behalf of the U.S. fusion energy program. We are very heartened by your support for a comprehensive long-range energy strategy.

This letter is to invite you to present a talk of about 30 minutes on the subject of U.S. National Energy Policy at Fusion Power Associates annual meeting and symposium, September 25 at the Canadian Embassy auditorium in Washington, DC. A copy of the preliminary program is enclosed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Stephen O. Dean

Encl.
FUSION POWER ASSOCIATES
ANNUAL MEETING AND SYMPOSIUM

Frontiers in Fusion Research

September 25-26
At the
Canadian Embassy
Fifth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

September 25

7:30 Registration
8:00 Welcome
- Canadian Ambassador to the United States
8:15 Opening Remarks and Presentation of Awards
- Dr. Stephen O. Dean, President, Fusion Power Associates
8:30 U. S. National Energy Policy - Speakers to be Announced
10:00 Break
10:30 Science, Energy and the US National Economy
- John Hambor, Director, Office of Microeconomic Analysis
  U.S. Dept. of the Treasury (invited)
11:00 The Role of PCAST in National Science and Energy Policy - Speaker to be Announced
11:30 Fusion at the US Department of Energy - Speaker to be Announced
12:00 Lunch
1:00 The Science Frontier of Burning Plasma Physics
- Prof. Gerald Navratil, Columbia U.
1:30 Burning Plasma Physics Experimental Options
- Prof. Ronald Parker, MIT (invited)
2:00 Status of International Planning for ITER
- Dr. Robert Aymar, ITER Director (invited)
2:30 Status of Sites for ITER
- Peter Bannard, Director, Iter Canada
- Reps from Japan and Europe (invited)
3:30 Break
4:00 Status of FIRE Design Study
- Dr. Dale Meade, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory
4:30 Frontiers in Computational Plasma and Fusion Physics
- Dr. William Tang, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory
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The Honorable Richard Cheney  
Vice President of the United States  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20510

June 15, 2001

Re: The U.S. Energy Policy and  
Global Climate Change

Dear Mr. Vice President:

You and I have met briefly and casually when you were a resident of Dallas. I am a longtime member of the Dallas Petroleum Club and have been a practicing professional petroleum engineer and geologist for over 50 years. This letter will be as direct and as short as I can make it in anticipation that it may get to your desk and you may take time to read it. If it becomes of interest to you, I will be glad to provide significant backup confirming factual scientific evidence and data to you or your staff.

This year I completed a study and article based on known historical geologic and measured physical data entitled "Beware of Global Cooling." This was sent to you. The title is regrettable. It is not a throwback to the 1970's scientific concepts. It questions the assumed infallibility of (mathematical) Global Climate Models used by UN-IPCC and also presents the need for a practical energy policy.

Subsequent to that, the AAPG recently published a 372-page book titled Geological Perspectives of Global Climate Change, which includes 18 chapters written by 33 qualified scientific authors -- all chapters peer reviewed.

Only Chapter 4 -- entitled "Are we headed for a Thermohaline Catastrophe?" by Wallace S. Broecker of the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory -- seems to partially agree with and utilize certain interpretations or conclusions reached in the Report for the UN-IPCC Kyoto Meeting and Protocol. He bases his opinions on the findings using GCM's as the "best guide," in direct opposition to the findings of Dr. Richard Lindzen of MIT, whose interpretations are derived from actual natural past performance of the atmosphere and climate. In all other respects, my 10-page article is in general scientific agreement with this new major AAPG publication.

It seems the President and his Administration (you?) are utilizing the recent report on Climate Change prepared by the National Academy of Sciences to assist in making
decisions on both Climate Change (cooling or warming) and our Energy Policy. If the UN-IPCC GCM's are wrong, inappropriate or risky science, then the Academy studies are also subject to question because they are both based on the same limited set of computer-derived data that is not in agreement with past or current actual atmospheric performance.

In considering the reasons for a need for additional studies, for instance, in the case of your efforts on developing a usable Energy Policy, it is assumed your efforts have utilized an expected future U.S. demand and availability of 30 trillion cubic feet of gas per year. There is serious geologic and engineering question if such a deliverability is economically possible even with the availability of ANWR and the western U.S. lands for exploration. Your plan of conservation and additional supply is the only solution to our future requirements.

It appears to me additional independent studies are necessary for your use -- by qualified scientists who are not politicized or environmentalized or on record in behalf of the concepts of UN-IPCC sponsored "Global Warming." Cooling may be a more realistic future scientifically-derived expectation, and it would have a more severe effect on humanity than warming.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
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