The Honorable Jeff Bingaman  
Chairman  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:


If we can be of further assistance, please have your staff contact our Congressional Hearing Coordinator, Barbara Barnes at (202) 586-6341.

Sincerely,

Michael Whatley  
Director, Office of Congressional  
Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
Minister of Economy, Trade
and Industry

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
Department of Energy
1000 Independent Avenue, S.W.
Washington D.C., 20585
U.S.A

Dear Mr. Secretary

Thank you very much for your letter dated May 17, 2001. I understand that the National Energy Policy is the outcome of the comprehensive deliberation at the National Energy Policy Development Group chaired by Vice President Cheney and would like to express my sincere respect of it.

Taking into account the fact that the energy policy of the U.S., the largest energy-consuming and-producing country in the world, will have a significant impact on the international energy situation, we would like to follow its development with great interest.

I understand that the U.S. and Japan share many common policy goals including improving energy efficiency, reducing dependence on imported oil and diversifying the energy mix. In particular, I am quite encouraged to find that the role of nuclear energy is emphasized in a positive manner from the viewpoints of both energy security and global warming. I appreciate that the positive reference to nuclear energy in the IEA Ministerial Communiqué was achieved thanks to the close coordination between the U.S. and Japan.

I also share your view that the rapid expansion of the oil consumption of major developing countries in the Asian region needs to be addressed in order to achieve global energy security. I believe that the U.S. and Japan
should closely cooperate in such forums as the IEA and APEC.

The Bush Administration's firm commitment to the environment is very encouraging to us. As pointed out in the National Energy Policy, it is a great challenge to ensure the compatibility of the 3Es, namely, energy security, economic growth and environmental protection. We share a common understanding that technology will play a key role in solving environmental issues including global warming. In this regard, close cooperation between the U.S. and Japan on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis is highly desirable.

Last, but not least, I have great interest in your proposal to hold a meeting of G8 energy ministers. Japan would like to make a constructive contribution to ensure the success of this meeting.

While it was a great pity that we could not meet on the occasion of the IEA Ministerial Governing Board Meeting in May, I am looking forward to an early opportunity to meet with you and enhancing our productive working relationship to tackle the energy problem.

Sincerely yours,

Takeo Hiranuma

Takeo Hiranuma
Minister of Economy, Trade and Industry
Mr. Timothy R. Warfield  
Executive Director  
National Association for Community Services Programs  
400 North Capitol Street, N.W.  
Suite 395  
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Warfield:

This is in response to your letter dated, June 4, 2001, to Secretary Abraham regarding the National Energy Policy Report and its implications for the Department of Energy’s Weatherization Assistance Program, the State Energy Program, and the Department of Health and Human Services’ Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). I have been asked to respond on the Secretary’s behalf.

The strong opposition of you and your colleagues to the National Energy Policy Report recommendation, “that the President support legislation to allow funds dedicated for the Weatherization and State Energy Programs to be transferred to LIHEAP if the Department of Energy deems it appropriate,” is important to us. We share your concern about this provision and have developed an internal Issue Paper that includes a reference to your opposition.

Thank you for your support and the many contributions that the National Association for State Community Services Programs has provided to the Weatherization Assistance Program over the years. I look forward to your continued assistance as we work collaboratively towards meeting the energy needs of low-income Americans.

Sincerely,

Gail McKinley, Director  
Office of Building Technology Assistance  
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
Mr. Frank Bishop  
Executive Director  
National Association of  
State Energy Officials  
1414 Prince Street, Suite 200  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Mr. Bishop:

This is in response to your letter dated June 4, 2001, to Secretary Abraham regarding the National Energy Policy Report and its implications for the Department of Energy’s Weatherization Assistance Program, the State Energy Program, and the Department of Health and Human Services’ Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). I have been asked to respond on the Secretary’s behalf.

The strong opposition of you and your colleagues to the National Energy Policy Report recommendation, "that the President support legislation to allow funds dedicated for the Weatherization and State Energy Programs to be transferred to LIHEAP if the Department of Energy deems it appropriate," is important to us. We share your concern about this provision and have developed an internal Issue Paper that includes a reference to your opposition.

Thank you for your support and the many contributions that the National Association of State Energy Officials has provided to the Weatherization Assistance Program and to the State Energy Program over the years. I look forward to your continued assistance as we work collaboratively towards meeting the energy needs of low-income Americans.

Sincerely,

Gai McKinley, Director  
Office of Building Technology Assistance  
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
Mr. Mark Wolfe  
Executive Director  
National Energy Assistance Directors’ Association  
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. Wolfe:

This is in response to your letter dated June 4, 2001, to Secretary Abraham regarding the National Energy Policy Report and its implications for the Department of Energy’s Weatherization Assistance Program, the State Energy Program, and the Department of Health and Human Services’ Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). I have been asked to respond on the Secretary’s behalf.

The strong opposition of you and your colleagues to the National Energy Policy Report recommendation, “that the President support legislation to allow funds dedicated for the Weatherization and State Energy Programs to be transferred to LIHEAP if the Department of Energy deems it appropriate,” is important to us. We share your concern about this provision and have developed an internal Issue Paper that includes a reference to your opposition.

Thank you for your support and the many contributions that the National Energy Assistance Directors’ Association provided to the Weatherization Assistance Program over the years. I look forward to your continued assistance as we work collaboratively towards meeting the energy needs of low-income Americans.

Sincerely,

Gail McKinley, Director  
Office of Building Technology Assistance  
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
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The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, S. W.
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Secretary:

On behalf of the Business-Government Relations Council (BGRC); I would like to extend an invitation for you to speak to our group. The BGRC is a non-profit organization whose purpose is to improve business understanding of government policies, methods, and operations, and to increase government officials' awareness of the role of business in government affairs. Our membership consists primarily of executives who run the Washington offices for their corporations. Many also have responsibility for state and international business/government relations.

Former speakers at BGRC have included Members of Congress, Administration officials, Cabinet Secretaries, and Members of the Diplomatic Corps. Traditionally, our speakers address the BGRC at a breakfast or luncheon at the Willard Hotel. We will be happy to accommodate your schedule for the location.

We would be very interested in your views on current energy policy, as well as, the 107th Congress and the Administration. I will call your office in the near future to discuss your potential availability.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joann Piccolo
Corporate Vice President and Director
North America Region
Global Government Relations

cc: Mr. Arnie Havens, CSX Corporation
Representative Mark Green
1218 Longworth House Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Green,

I have read with great interest the report of the National Energy Policy Development Group - National Energy Policy –May 2001. I find the report to be comprehensive, informative, and timely. A statement of our nation's energy policy is much needed.

As an educator I am pleased to see so much information under one cover. Among the many recommendations that I find attractive is the recommendation to develop an educational campaign to communicate the NEPD group's findings. If there is a need for outside consultants to develop educational materials I would like to express my interest and availability. I am currently working as a reservist trainer for FEMA and have enjoyed helping FEMA develop educational materials.

If you can identify any individuals or agencies that I might contact I would appreciate hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Ron Tank
Emeritus Professor of Geology
Lawrence University
Appleton, WI 54912

Encl.: Curriculum Vitae
The Honorable Francis S. Blake  
Deputy Secretary  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Forrestal Building  
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20585  

Dear Deputy Secretary Blake:  

On behalf of the National Governors Association (NGA), we thank you for accepting our invitation to join us at the Natural Resources Committee meeting during the NGA Annual Meeting. The Committee session will take place at the Rhode Island Convention Center in Providence, Rhode Island, on August 6th, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. There will be two topics on the agenda (enclosed); we would like you to do a presentation on the President’s national energy policy, and the role that states will play.  

We would appreciate it if you would speak for approximately 20 minutes, to discuss the President’s energy policy and key energy issues, including improving supply, conservation and efficiency. NGA plans to adopt its own energy policy at this meeting, and your views and perspective will be an invaluable resource to the committee. Following your remarks, time will be scheduled for an informal question and answer session with the Governors.  

We hope you are able to join us and we look forward to hearing from you. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us or Diane S. Shea, Director of the Natural Resources Committee at (202) 624-5389.  

Sincerely,  

Governor Tom Vilsack  
Chair  
Committee on Natural Resources  

Governor Frank Keating  
Vice Chair  
Committee on Natural Resources  

Enclosure  

Hall of the States  
444 North Capitol Street  
Suite 267  
Washington, D.C. 20001-1512  
Telephone (202) 634-5300  
Fax (202) 634-5313  
www.nga.org  
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10:00 A.M. Welcome and Introductory Remarks
Governor Tom Vilsack, Iowa, Chair
Governor Frank Keating, Oklahoma, Vice-Chair

10:10 Applications of Biotechnology to Crops: Benefits & Risks

Guests:
Sally McCammon, Science Advisor
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Dr. Gwen Acton, Assistant Director
Functional Genomics Program
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Whitehead Institute

Dr. Robert Paarlberg, Professor of Political Science
Wellesley College

10:40 Questions and Discussion

10:50 National Energy Policy: The Administration’s View

Guest:
The Honorable Francis S. Blake
Deputy Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy

11:10 Questions and Discussion

11:20 Consideration of Policy Proposals

11:25 Other Committee Business

11:30 Concluding Remarks and Adjourn
July 23, 2001

Vice President Richard Cheney
Chairman, Energy Task Force
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Re: National Energy Policy

Dear Vice President Cheney:

Congratulations on your rational and sound energy policy, including national exploration of natural resources to develop energy self-sufficiency. I also admire President Bush's and your stand regarding the global warming issue and withholding your support of the Kyoto Agreement.

Having over 40 years management experience in the energy field, including overseeing the development of new and renewable energy technologies at the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) and being a resident of California, it is really painful to witness the political mismanagement of energy resources in this state. This government created crisis has been long in the making by our Democrat controlled Legislature and their politically appointed committees, and more recently promulgated by our elected Democratic Governor Davis. The California "crisis" could have been easily resolved by letting the prices rise, which would have resulted in an immediate decrease in demand and increase in supply of electricity in the absence of political interference. Instead, Governor Davis elected to opt for the political expediency of price controls, government regulation and market interference, while blaming everyone but his own mismanagement for the problem.

Unfortunately, the press and the public have accommodated his position and most voters believe that there is no energy problem other than the one created by the "greedy" energy companies, supported by the Bush Administration. The result is a widely held perception that deregulation and the power industry are to blame, even though we only had quasi deregulation at the energy supply side, while maintaining full PUC regulation at the retail level and of new power plant...
construction. Most importantly, this debacle and associated rhetoric have provided fuel for the opposition of your administration's energy policy. At the same time, the environmental political forces have faulted your administration for not supporting renewable energy resources development and the international global warming treaty.

Based upon my extensive experience in the RD&D of renewable energy technologies, to include: solar thermal, photovoltaics, wind, ocean thermal, geothermal, and fusion, I have long ago concluded that these technologies are far too expensive in cost and much too limited in reliability of supply. This is due to their low energy density and intermittent availability. Consequently, the advocates for deployment of these renewable resources cannot make a serious case for displacing most of the conventional resources available.

Fortunately, there is a new technology in the advanced stages of development which has the potential to greatly improve the overall energy efficiency of converting conventional depletable energy resources, oil and gas, while at the same time reducing and eliminating harmful emissions. This technology is the fuel cell, which has achieved significant progress during the last several years and has the ability to significantly improve the overall conversion efficiency of natural gas, propane gas, and oil derivatives.

The fuel cell can provide both electric and thermal energy, operating as small co-generators located at dispersed customer sites (residences, commercial buildings). The waste products are pure water and reduced carbon dioxide. Subsequently, when the cost have significantly been reduced through large-scale production for these small-scale stationary applications, these fuel cell systems can be incorporated into hybrid electric cars, with the potential of obtaining fuel efficiencies of 100 mpg. As you can readily surmise, more than doubling the conversion efficiency of scarce energy resources, while simultaneously eliminating harmful emissions, for both stationary and mobile applications, is a two-fold political and economic winner.

As an independent consultant, with over 25 years of experience in fuel cell development, I have conducted a great number of studies relating to the commercialization of this important 21st century technology and presented my findings as invited speaker at various national and international energy symposia and workshops. For your information, I have included a few select presentations addressing the commercialization and market opportunities of small-scale fuel cells.

To further the commercialization of fuel cells, I formed a potential users group (Small-scale Fuel Cell Commercialization Group) several years ago. This group
To further the commercialization of fuel cells, I formed a potential users group (Small-scale Fuel Cell Commercialization Group) several years ago. This group issued a Market Opportunity Notice (MON) with market-derived technical and cost specifications for small distributed market residential fuel cell systems, which has become a de facto strawman for fuel cell developers.

Unfortunately, the DOE has politically focussed its fuel cell program on the much lower value automotive applications. Since cars are relatively cheap per unit weight, the fuel cell for this application has a market-derived value of only one-twenty-fifth of that for the much higher market value small-scale stationary residential and commercial applications ($80/kW versus $2,000/kW, respectively). Consequently, the initial market entry of fuel cells is projected to be the much higher value stationary applications. Only when the fuel cell costs have been decreased sufficiently, as a result of continued production learning and innovation, will the mobile applications become market viable.

Both these stationary and subsequent mobile markets have the potential to reduce energy consumption of depletable oil and gas resources at least two-fold, while essentially eliminating harmful emissions associated with the current conversions of these resources.

Obviously, the economic and political benefits of this fuel cell technology are enormous for this country and the world. Your inclusion of this technology development and deployment in your energy plan will have tremendous political implications. This inclusion will simultaneously reduce our foreign energy dependency, with the associated balance of trade and national security benefits, while eliminating harmful emissions, including substantially reducing the CO₂ emissions. The former being the concern of many environmental activist groups critical of your administration’s policy and the latter deflating the arguments against the industrialized nations for contributing to the real or alleged global warming.

Furthermore, this technology can facilitate off-the-grid distributed energy systems for residential and commercial applications, which will reduce the customer dependency on centrally generated power. For example, if available, these systems would have realized tremendous market expansion during the recent and future energy rotating blackouts in California. Obviously, the potential impact of this technology on the deregulation of energy is very large.

In addition, the fuel cell systems will provide clean electrical power with extremely high reliability, both attributes being extremely important to the Silicon Valley and other high technology industries. Consequently, these distributed fuel cell systems, when developed in the United States, can be successfully exported.
especially to those countries without the financial resources to develop the very expensive power grids associated with central power generation. This technology export will again significantly benefit the trade balance of the U.S.

In view of the above, I strongly urge you to consider inclusion of this strategically very important fuel cell energy technology in your energy plan and, thus, reflect a fully integrated and environmentally conscious approach by your administration. Obviously, the full impact of a new technology will not be immediate, since all new product or technology market penetration occurs logistically ("S-shaped") over time.

Currently, as an independent consultant, I have no specific financial interest in any fuel cell company, however, I do have a great personal interest and ambition in bringing this technology into the market. Therefore, I hope that you will perceive this important information as an unbiased assessment of an energy development opportunity and benefit for this country and the world, as well as provide significant political ammunition in response to the various vocal critics of your administration's policy. This fuel cell development is the technology of the 21st century and you can greatly facilitate in making its commercialization happen. In this context, if I can be of further assistance to you, I will be available to offer you my experience and consulting services at your convenience. I have included my biographical summary for your information.

Sincerely,

Peter B. Bos
President
Polydyne, Inc.

Enclosures.
Peter B. Bos
President, Polydyne, Inc.

Mr. Bos is the founder and President of Polydyne, Inc., a multi-disciplinary management consulting company, located in Pacific Palisades, California. Since its incorporation in 1981, Polydyne, Inc. has consulted with a large number of private companies and public agencies, specializing in integrated, market-oriented assessment of clean, innovative energy technologies for stationary and mobile applications.

With over forty years of management experience, Mr. Bos has extensive experience in the interdisciplinary synthesis of energy systems to include technology development and transfer, market analysis and penetration, energy investment and policy analysis, utility interfacing and regulatory considerations, and private and public sector interaction. He has been an invited speaker at various national and international symposia and workshops.

Mr. Bos has been involved in fuel cell research, development, and commercialization efforts since 1975, starting with the early attempts to commercialize the United Technology Corporation phosphoric acid fuel cell, which efforts are currently organized under the International Fuel Cells Corporation/ONSI (IFC/ONSI). Several years ago, Mr. Bos founded and currently is Managing Director of the Small-scale Fuel Cell Commercialization Group, Inc. (SFCCG, Inc.), a consortium of major electric and gas utilities in the U.S. and Canada, which is chartered to commercialize small-scale fuel cell systems following a market-driven commercialization strategy.

This market-driven strategy was originated by Polydyne, Inc. for the development of stationary and mobile technologies that have the potential for mitigating resource constraints and environmental problems for a large spectrum of commercial applications. This includes the identification of high value entry markets for and commercialization of fuel cells and batteries for both stationary and mobile applications. These high value entry markets identified are the distributed power stationary residential and small commercial markets and the remote telecommunications markets. To facilitate these efforts, Mr. Bos has developed several proprietary computer programs, to include Market Assessment and Penetration Models, Fuel Cell Design and Production Costing Program, Advanced Vehicle Design and Simulation Model, Financial Simulation Models, and the commercially available Financial Software: FAST 123 (Financial Analysis Standard).

Prior to founding Polydyne, Inc., Mr. Bos was Director of the Department for New Energy Resources Development at the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) and was responsible for planning, direction, and control of the utility-sponsored new energy technology programs including solar, photovoltaics, wind, geothermal and fusion. Overall accomplishments at EPRI include management of major demonstration projects throughout the United States and authorship of numerous articles and reports. He has participated in many advisory committees and workshops and has contributed to significant program decisions on a national level. As a consequence, Mr. Bos is widely known throughout the utility and vendor industries, the U.S. Department of Energy and associated laboratories and in the energy community in general.

Mr. Bos holds an MBA degree from the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of California, Los Angeles, and an Engineering degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Polydyne, Inc.
19638 Callia Haleigh
Pacific Palisades, California 90272

Tel: (310) 230-6083
Fax: (310) 230-6084
E-Mail: pbbos@aol.com
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CALIFORNIA HYDROGEN BUSINESS COUNCIL

July 23, 2001

Dear Mr. Secretary,

As a member of the Republican Party in Orange County, California I was invited to attend your presentation today. By way of preparation, I obtained a copy of the speech you made earlier in San Francisco to the Bay Area Council. I was very pleased with its content. And I was particularly pleased with your comments regarding distributed energy, fuel cells and hydrogen. I am currently a member of the DOE Hydrogen Technical Advisory Panel (HTAP) and as such was doubly pleased with your emphasis on these new technologies.

One of the things that those of us who are believers in the future of hydrogen as an energy carrier have done in California is to establish an organization called the California Hydrogen Business Council. This organization currently has more than 50 member companies who are interested in a wide variety of applications of hydrogen. We have even had requests from other states to join with us. Rather than doing this, we have urged them to form their own State Hydrogen Business Council. Hawaii has decided that they wish to be a chapter associated with us and they are underway. Various individuals in Nevada, Florida and New York are also discussing similar steps. So we shall all be helping you in your major task of energy diversity and energy independence.

Many of us who read the President's Energy Plan were disappointed that it lacked the diversity it needed initially. However, the newspapers as well as your comments today tell us that diversity is being added. Many of us would like to see the recent areas of discussion added to a comprehensive revised Energy Plan. Will a comprehensive new Plan be issued instead of simply addendum's?

Again, enjoyed your comments. Keep up the good work.

Henry W. Wedaa
President
California Hydrogen Business Council
PO Box 980
Yorba Linda, CA 92885
714-779-1604
hwedaa@bigfoot.com
YOU ARE CORDIALLY INVITED TO ATTEND A LUNCHEON BRIEFING ON:

“What the Bush Energy Plan Means for America”

Featuring

MARK WILSON  
Research Fellow, The Heritage Foundation

REA HEDERMAN  
Manager of Operations, Center for Data Analysis  
The Heritage Foundation

CHARLI COON,  
Senior Policy Analyst, Energy & Environment  
The Heritage Foundation

President Bush’s National Energy Plan calls for significant changes to energy supply and demand over the next 30 years. Many critics of the plan, however, have characterized it as “radical” and “environmentally unsound.” What exactly does the National Energy Plan contain?

The Heritage Foundation energy team has spent the past two months analyzing President Bush’s National Energy Plan in great detail. They will unveil the results of their analysis at this Heritage luncheon.

Learn what will happen to electricity and petroleum prices over the next 10 years. Learn how the NEP slowly but steadily changes consumption of electricity and alters the national energy distribution system. What does the NEP have in store for the nuclear power industry? What are the long-term forecasts for electricity and gasoline demand in California, New York, Texas, and each of the other states?

This event continues the Heritage-sponsored series of policy or process-oriented briefings for political appointees. These sessions are designed to be topical, timely and helpful to you and your colleagues, while providing a forum where you can interact with fellow appointees.

MONDAY, JULY 30, 2001  
12:00 – 1:30 P.M.  
THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION, VAN ANDEL CENTER  
214 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE  
PLEASE, RSVP by July 28th TO (202) 608-6078  
OR BY EMAIL TO crystal.gibson@heritage.org
July 24, 2001

Hon. Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
United States Department of Energy
7A-257
Forestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20585-1000

Dear Secretary Abraham,

I want to tell you how much we valued the opportunity to organize the program for you in Boston last June, and we want to thank you for thinking of us for this. It was an honor for us to be able to do this. Your presentation was excellent; you did a superb job of presenting the drivers and essential elements of the energy policy; and you very concretely outlined the role of technology. You really made a major impact.

We very much enjoyed collaborating with you and your team. The whole joint team all very smoothly got a lot done in short order!

I was also, personally, very glad to work with you, and indeed appreciated both your gracious words -- and your graciousness about The Prize. I was very touched.

I hope you have had a good summer, and that you found a little time to loaf.

With kind regards and best wishes.

Cordially,

Dan Yergin

CAMBRIDGE ENERGY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
Cambridge, Massachusetts • Paris • Oslo • Oakland, California • Washington, DC
Moscow • Seoul • Mexico City • Bangkok • Calgary • Beijing • São Paulo
1133 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 903 Washington, DC 20036, USA
Mr. Urvan R. Sternfelds  
President  
National Petrochemical and Refiners Association  
1899 L Street, NW  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20036-3896

Dear Mr. Sternfelds:

Thank you for your letter of May 14, 2001, to Secretary Abraham in which you respond to the Secretary’s request for your member’s recommendations concerning the short and long-term responses to petroleum product price and supply constraints. These recommendations will be helpful as the Administration begins the process of developing strategies to achieve the goals of the President’s National Energy Policy (NEP). The goals of the NEP as they relate to your members industries are:

- to maintain or improve the environmental benefits of state and local clean fuel programs while increasing the flexibility of the fuels distributions infrastructure, improve fungibility, and provide added gasoline market liquidity,
- to provide regulatory certainty, and streamline the permitting process,
- and consider the cumulative impacts and benefits of rules to ensure that America has adequate refining capacity.

Currently the Department is working with the relevant agencies in evaluating the New Source Review program, “boutique fuels”, the Mobile Source Air Toxics rule, energy system impacts of an MTBE ban, and the reevaluating the implementation strategy of the on-road diesel rule.
We appreciate your input on these important issues affecting U.S. refinery industry and look forward to any additional input your members may have in the future.

Sincerely,

Margo Anderson
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Policy and International Affairs
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Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585
July 24, 2001

Mr. Steve Saland
New York State Senate
President-elect, National Conference of State Legislatures
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 515
Washington D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Saland:

Thank you for your letter of June 6, 2001, addressed to President Bush, conveying the support of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) for the President’s National Energy Policy (NEP). We have read your comments with interest and take note of the NCSL recommendations in areas where it believes that the NEP can be strengthened.

We take particular note of the NCSL stated principle that: “A national energy policy should ensure adequate supplies of affordably priced energy.” The President’s NEP released on May 17, 2001, is put forward with this principle clearly in mind and with the recognition of the role of State authorities in the implementation of an effective national energy strategy.

We agree, as some of your recommendations suggest, that further discussion may be appropriate in defining the methods by which the NEP would be implemented. The President has taken a major step toward the NEP’s implementation by sending his supporting legislative initiatives to the Congress on June 28, for action. We would encourage and see continued assessment by the NCSL on the initiatives of interest to the organization as a positive contribution to the national energy debate.

Thank you for the comments provided by the NCSL. If you would like to discuss these topics further please have NCSL staff contact Mr. Michael Whatley, Director, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, (202) 586-5450.

Sincerely,

Margaret Anderson
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Policy and International Affairs
Mr. Clifton Below  
New Hampshire State Senate  
Chair, National Conference of State Legislatures  
444 North Capitol Street, NW  
Suite 515  
Washington D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Below:

Thank you for your letter of June 6, 2001, addressed to President Bush, conveying the support of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) for the President's National Energy Policy (NEP). We have read your comments with interest and take note of the NCSL recommendations in areas where it believes that the NEP can be strengthened.

We take particular note of the NCSL stated principle that: "A national energy policy should ensure adequate supplies of affordably priced energy." The President's NEP released on May 17, 2001, is put forward with this principle clearly in mind and with the recognition of the role of State authorities in the implementation of an effective national energy strategy.

We agree, as some of your recommendations suggest, that further discussion may be appropriate in defining the methods by which the NEP would be implemented. The President has taken a major step toward the NEP's implementation by sending his supporting legislative initiatives to the Congress on June 28, for action. We would encourage and see continued assessment by the NCSL on the initiatives of interest to the organization as a positive contribution to the national energy debate.

Thank you for the comments provided by the NCSL. If you would like to discuss these topics further please have NCSL staff contact Mr. Michael Whatley, Director, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, (202) 586-5450.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Margot Anderson  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Office of Policy and International Affairs
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

July 26, 2001

Mr. Jim Costa
California State Senate
President, National Conference of State Legislatures
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 515
Washington D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Costa:

Thank you for your letter of June 6, 2001, addressed to President Bush, conveying the support of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) for the President’s National Energy Policy (NEP). We have read your comments with interest and take note of the NCSL recommendations in areas where it believes that the NEP can be strengthened.

We take particular note of the NCSL stated principle that: “A national energy policy should ensure adequate supplies of affordably priced energy.” The President’s NEP released on May 17, 2001, is put forward with this principle clearly in mind and with the recognition of the role of State authorities in the implementation of an effective national energy strategy.

We agree, as some of your recommendations suggest, that further discussion may be appropriate in defining the methods by which the NEP would be implemented. The President has taken a major step toward the NEP’s implementation by sending his supporting legislative initiatives to the Congress on June 28, for action. We would encourage and see continued assessment by the NCSL on the initiatives of interest to the organization as a positive contribution to the national energy debate.

Thank you for the comments provided by the NCSL. If you would like to discuss these topics further please have NCSL staff contact Mr. Michael Whatley, Director, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, (202) 586-5450.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Margot Anderson
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Policy and International Affairs
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Dear Mr.-Secretary:

I have the honor of presenting to you the enclosed letter from Federal Minister for Economics and Technology Dr. Werner Müller.

A courtesy translation is attached.

Respectfully yours,

Wolfgang Ischinger
Appointed Ambassador

Washington, D. C., July 26, 2001

The Honorable
Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20585
The Honorable Strom Thurmond
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Thurmond:

I am responding to your letter of June 12, 2001, asking Mr. Michael Whatley of the Department of Energy to review a April 25 letter from Dr. Doyne Loyd, (referencing case #468079). Mr. Loyd’s letter expressed his serious concerns about the lack of a coherent energy policy and our continued dependence on imported oil.

To address the many energy issues facing the Nation, one of President Bush’s first acts was to create a National Energy Policy Development Group, headed by Vice President Cheney. This Group was charged with developing recommendations to help the private sector and government at all levels promote reliable, affordable, and environmentally sound energy for America’s future. On May 16, 2001, Vice President Cheney sent to the President the recommendations of this group, together with a National Energy Policy report.

The report of the National Energy Policy Development Group describes a comprehensive long-term strategy that uses leading edge technology to produce an integrated energy, environmental and economic policy. The National Energy Policy it proposes follows three basic principles:

- The Policy is a long-term, comprehensive strategy. Our energy crisis has been years in the making, and will take years to put fully behind us.
- The Policy will advance new, environmentally friendly technologies to increase energy supplies and encourage cleaner, more efficient energy use.
- The Policy seeks to raise the living standards of the American people, recognizing that to do so our country must fully integrate its energy, environmental, and economic policies.

To achieve a 21st century quality of life – enhanced by reliable energy and a clean environment – it recommends 105 actions to modernize conservation, modernize our infrastructure, increase our energy supplies, including renewables, accelerate the protection and improvement of our environment, and increase our energy security.

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
The President has already taken actions to implement many of the report's recommendations. Over the coming months, further actions will be taken by the President, individual Federal agencies and the Congress. These actions, once fully implemented, will help minimize future energy prices, while assuring that energy supplies are reliable and the environment is protected.

A full copy of the National Energy Policy report, with the specific recommendations to the President, is available on the White House webpage, www.whitehouse.gov, or on the webpage of the U.S. Department of Energy, www.energy.gov.

I hope this information is helpful. Thank you for writing.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Margot Anderson
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Policy
and International Affairs