Can you tell me whether your bill would preempt State jurisdiction on transmission matters if you send such legislation up here?

Secretary ABRAHAM. I am not sure that it would be contained in the same legislation that would deal with electricity restructuring, but as I said in the answers to questions from Congressman Sawyer and Congressman John, we believe that there are an enormous number of bottlenecks that exist in this country where transmission siting is desperately needed. We have no Federal authority to do so.

I would--our first step in the process is going to be to try to evaluate where exactly the most significant needs exist for either additional transmission or interconnectivity. On the basis of that type of an evaluation, we also hope to present legislation that would, in fact, provide the Federal Government with some eminent domain authority to try to address these problems, although, as I said in my earlier comments, I would hope that would be only in a last resort rather than as a first impression.

Mr. DINGELL. Would you give this authority to FERC, which has done an abominable job of implementing current law, or would you vest that authority in someone else?

Secretary ABRAHAM. We have not made a determination.

Mr. DINGELL. The plan also advocates repealing the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. Would you
support consideration of this issue as a part of a comprehensive bill, or do you favor PUHCA repeal on a stand-alone basis?

Secretary ABRAHAM. We support PUHCA repeal. The President indicated that in his campaign, and it is part of his platform. We have not made a determination as to whether or not to include it in—a it would be certainly in the legislation we intend to draft, but I understand that in the Banking Committee of the Senate, it has moved forward as a freestanding vehicle, and I guess it is our intent to try to work with Congress to determine what the most effective way would be to accomplish that objective.

Mr. DINGELL. Now, I would note—

Mr. BARTON. This is going to have to be the gentleman's last question.

Mr. DINGELL. And I thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have been very courteous, and I appreciate your kindness.

I would note that FERC concludes that market power is being exercised or actually abused in California's wholesale markets. Is this a good time to have PUHCA repeal in view of that, because PUHCA has a number of consumer protection provisions in there which apparently need somebody other than FERC to address?

Secretary ABRAHAN. Well, we still support the position with respect to PUHCA repeal. I would say that—and would
note for the record that it is only since February of this
year that we have actually addressed the issues of unjust and
unreasonable prices in California with calls for refunds that
have now totalled some $124 million to those people who have
been forced to pay these unjust and unreasonable rates.

I think that—and the administration supports FERC's
taking its responsibility seriously to, in fact, call for
such refunds, and I would urge them to continue to vigilantly
pursue that.

Mr. DINGELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your
patience.

Mr. BARTON. Thank you.

We are going to recognize Chairman Tauzin. The Chair is
going to announce that Mr. Walden, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Luther and
Mr. Strickland, have you asked questions yet? All of the
Members who are present at 1 p.m. will be given 5 minutes of
oral questions. Any Member that arrives after 1 p.m. will
put their questions into the record, because the Secretary
does have a 1 p.m. appointment. So we are probably going to
end up here till about 1:30.

With that, Mr. Tauzin, the full committee Chairman, is
recognized.

Mr. TAUZIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, let me first remind you something you may
not be aware of. One of the first bills I introduced upon my
entry to this Congress was to repeal PUHCA back in the early 1980s, and the reason then is still the reason now. It is an outdated piece of legislation that inhibits some utility companies, and only some utility companies, from making efficiency investments that are critical to their consumers, and I include in that energy carburetion, which is one of the carburetions that serves the utility consumers of this district who are restricted in their capacity to make necessary efficiency investments. We are not living in the 1930s and 1935, 1940s when that sort of legislation made some sense. Today it doesn't make sense in a marketplace of competition, and I would encourage the administration to stick with that position, and hopefully we can get it done one day.

I want to talk to you a little bit about some of the plans we have in the committee and get your thoughts on it. First of all, we have focused on the higher-than-necessary gasoline prices in our marketplace that consumers are having to deal with. And as part of our plans we hope to address very early what we consider to be an element of a marketplace that is unnecessarily raising gasoline prices for people, and that is the extraordinary number of blends and different blends and seasonal blends of boutique fuels in our country. And we would very much like to introduce and hopefully pass legislation somewhat standardizing that process so that if SIPs clean air requirements of the various communities do
require some boutique fuel to help in the air cleanup, that
they might--they might have a single or several boutique
fuels to choose from, rather than as many grades and
varieties, and, secondly, that there might be some easy way
to go from winter to summer blends without emptying the tanks
one day and having to fill them up the next day and having
consumers face empty fuel tanks when they go to the
marketplace.

Does your Department agree with us that that is an area
we ought to address sooner than later?

Secretary ABRAHAM. Well, I think it needs to be
addressed, and I would note that in the President's plan, the
Environmental Protection Agency Administrator has asked to
address it. We have talked before about the refinery
capacity limitations that we have as a Nation, the fact that
no new refinery has been built in 25 years, the last one down
in your district.

Mr. TAUZIN. You visited it--.

Secretary ABRAHAM. Which we visited the other day.

Mr. TAUZIN. Thanks for going there.

Secretary ABRAHAM. The problems of strained capacity are
obviously exacerbated to the extent that refineries have to
produce all these, you know, multiplicity of fuels. But the
problem, of course, is that if you have a problem--which we
did in Michigan last summer when a pipeline near Jackson
burst. A neighbor can't borrow from a neighbor, and a
refinery doesn't have the ability to adjust because of these
types of challenges. So we do support moving--.

Mr. TAUZIN. In fact, Daniel Yergen called it the
Balkanization of the American fuel marketplace, because when
somebody runs short, a pipeline breaks or a refinery is down
or a ship has a collision in a harbor, we automatically have
shortages and spikes like we saw in Chicago and Milwaukee
last year, and that some rationalization of that marketplace
would make a lot of sense right now. And we are going to try
to do that. We would ask your support in finding the right
formula that gets us there.

Secretary ABRAHAM. Well, there is no question there is a
market liquidity problem.

Mr. TAUZIN. The second thing is there has been a lot of
political discussion about whether or not this administration
and this Congress is going to support a very deep and broad
conservation effort as part of the energy package. Obviously
you heard the Chairman of the subcommittee announce that we
intended to make it one of the very first things we do in
this committee. The secretary of natural resources in
Louisiana, when asked to comment to the administration on our
recommendations to the national policy, led off with
conservation, with the argument that every Btu of energy
conserved is one you don't have to repeat in production over
time, and that we ought to move to see as much demand
reduction as we can get in a marketplace. Do you concur with
that kind of a strategy?

Secretary ABRAHAM. Yes, I do, and as you and I have
spoken, there is the issue of waste as a consequence of some
of these reliability issues. Some of the reasons--one of the
recommendations in our--in our plan has
the Department of Energy moving immediately to consider
expansion, for instance, in research in areas like
superconductivity, where we believe that conservation
achievements are most realized.

Mr. TAUZIN. In fact, we saw that in Detroit. One of the
electric companies is now deploying superconductive--so they
are here already. We know some of those advances are here.
I am going to see a demonstration later today from Sandia
Labs on a 3-year project that really facilitates net metering
where consumers can put up solar panels and actually sell
electricity back to the grid when they are not using it
instead of trying to store it in batteries. All of that
makes great sense, and our thought is that we ought to move
first with a package that literally brings together as many
good ideas on demand reduction and assistance to energy
supplies through conservation and demand reduction and
alternatives as a lead item in the package, and then follow
it with what else we have to do in all the other more
difficult areas to get agreement on nuclear and other fuel production, including hopefully a clean coal technology bill.

Again, do you endorse that strategy? Do you feel like you can work with us on that kind of a plan?

Secretary ABRAHAM. That is for sure that we can, and I would actually say that as a personal matter--I can't speak for the White House on this, I haven't consulted with them, but I think moving forward in the direction you have just outlined as a first step would certainly be a wise course for the committee to follow. There is a lot of common ground--.

Mr. BARTON. This will have to be the Chairman's last question.

Mr. TAUZIN. I will not have another question. I simply wanted to thank you again. I know this is your first appearance on this side, and we deeply appreciate the time you spent with us, Mr. Secretary. We will spend an awful lot more time together as the months go by.

Secretary ABRAHAM. Thank you. I will look forward to being back.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the Chairman.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania Mr. Doyle is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, welcome. I have several questions. I think what I would like to do is maybe just get them all
asked right up front and then give you some time so that I
don't get one question in, and you give me a 4-1/2-minute
answer, and he bangs the gavel on me. But we do appreciate
you being here.

You said before that there are wide areas of agreement on
both sides of the aisle on much of what you are trying to do,
and I want to reiterate that. I know that you and I agree
that coal is an important energy resource, and that it is
going to play a key role in our National Energy Policy, and
that we both agree we have to develop more efficient ways to
use the resource. Given the abundance we have in the
country, it just makes good sense to improve the
environmental performance as well as the efficiency of--and
the cost of coal-based technologies.

It used to be a lonely group. I think myself, Ralph
Regula and maybe Alan Mollohan were a small group of Members
that were really enthused about this kind of research, and
today clean coal technology appears to be back in vogue.
Maybe this year we won't have to be fending off so many
cutting amendments from our friend from Vermont, Mr. Sanders.

But that being said, I want to raise a concern about the
lack of support that we are seeing for newer and more
efficient gas turbine generating technologies. I think there
is no question that we are going to need gas turbines as part
of the electricity--electric generating facilities,
regardless of whether we use coal or natural gas as the fuel. In other words, for at least the next generation, the gas turbine is going to be a critical technology in the majority of our electric generating facilities. And I think we need to be mindful of the relationship that exists between clean coal technology and gas turbines. We have to move forward with the development of clean coal technologies, such integrated gasification combined cycle. But as I understand, today's gas turbines are simply not designed to burn that coal gas that would be produced in such a technology.

So many of us view DOE's next-generation gas turbine program as a critical element for the future use of coal, and that being said, I know that you had made a statement that you thought that that gas turbine program is an example of a program that the Federal Government should not be funding. So one of the things I would like to ask you is wouldn't we be much worse off today if we had not funded DOE's successful advanced turbine program, which concluded last year, and might the Department reconsider supporting the next generation of cleaner-burning gas turbines as part of DOE's R&D budget?

Secondly, fuel cells. I want to talk a little bit about this, too, because I think this is another area where we hear some parks and fliers language about--in the national energy report about fuel cells, but when you look at the budget...
request, it causes us some concern. I think that this--the
DOE's cooperative program with industry has resulted in
enormous improvements in efficiency, while the program's
emphasis on driving down cost is also finally beginning to
bear fruit.

And I am particularly proud to have research being done
in my district at--Semens Westinghouse has a manufacturing
facility in the district, and their solid oxide fuel cell
technology, which was jointly developed with support from
DOE, is about to result in 250-kilowatt generators, which can
be sited in small office buildings or shopping centers to
produce electricity with virtually no emissions, and the
efficiencies of these fuel cells will start at 50 percent.

And in combination with a small microturbine, efficiencies
are likely to approach 70 percent. Now, you compare this to
our current fleet that is generating efficiencies around 30
or 35 percent.

But when we look at the fuel cell program, we are falling
several years behind because of shortfalls in funding, and
when you look at the administration's 2002 funding
recommendations, they are $7.5 million less than last year.

So my next question is, you know, why aren't we putting more
money into fuel cell? And we actually need an additional $20
million in that line item, not a $7.5 million cut.

Let me just shift very quickly to one other thing,
methane hydrates. I sponsored a bill last year which would--I was the author of the Methane Hydrates Research and Development Act, which was signed into law last year, and we authorized $47.5 million for funding. We see that the fiscal year 2002 authorization level was 11 million. You know, if we could just find a way to extract 1 percent of the domestic methane hydrate resources in this country, we could double our domestic natural gas resource base and completely eliminate our dependence on foreign oil sources. This is another area where I think we need to have increased funding, not reduced funding.

And finally, I want to invite you--I know you have been to the NETL facility down in Morgantown, West Virginia. We have one in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, too, Mr. Secretary, which I would like to extend an invitation for you to visit so that we can talk about some of the important work that is being done down there. And I look forward to working with you and just hearing your answer on these funding levels.

Mr. BARTON. The gentleman is--.

Mr. DOYLE. How did I do, huh? You wouldn't cut the Secretary off in his answer, would you?

Mr. BARTON. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania set a record. He has literally asked over 5 minutes of pure questions, and I lost count at about the seventh question.

So if you could give us a simple yes or no answer, I will--.
Secretary ABRAHAM. Yes. No. No. No. And yes.

Mr. BARTON. If you can shortly elaborate--.

Secretary ABRAHAM. I will try.

Mr. BARTON. --and then we will go--I think that Mr.---

Secretary ABRAHAM. First of all, I welcome the

invitation to Pittsburgh. We actually at the facility in

Morgantown had the Pittsburgh employees on a closed-circuit

TV hookup, and we got to see each other sort of from a
distance over that, but I would like to do that.

Second, with respect to gas turbines, the issue that we

confront in the budget process this year which I asked for

further clarification about has to do with what the next
generation of turbine research would constitute. The

previous program came to an end on large turbine generation.

The focus of the second stage was to be mid-sized turbines of

a variety that I happen to believe have been already

technologically advanced, are in the marketplace, and

As I understand it, there is a huge backlog even exists

for these sort of--the second stage of research that at least

I believe was being proposed at least during our budget

process.

Now, we are looking at all based on

recommendations. Again, I mentioned earlier, because of the
time frame in which the budget was developed versus the
energy plan, we now have more guidance, which would include
some of these areas for us to reconsider. But at least in
terms of mid-sized turbines, a lot of the technology already
exists. There is a multiyear backup in terms of orders from
gas turbine issuers. But I will be glad to follow up on the gas turbine issue
that relates to the coal gasification question that you
raised.

Third, with respect to fuel cell funding, as you noted,
we have a slight decrease in the budget, about $7 million out
of 50 plus million dollars, but it does not reflect a lack of
interest or commitment in terms of the future in this area.
I would share your view that distributed energy fuel cell
technology, hydrogen research are areas of real promise in
terms of R&D funding. And as part of the process that I
mentioned earlier with regard to the review that is going on
between now and July 10th, and the subsequent review through
the end of August for 2002, as well as 2003 funding, these
will be areas of prime focus as part of that process, and we
look forward to getting your input on that as well.
Mr. DOYLE. We look forward to helping you plus those numbers up.

Mr. BARTON. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, the Northwest Power Planning Council's latest electricity analysis shows that there remains a 17 percent loss of load probability this coming winter in the Pacific Northwest. As you know, stream flows as measured at The Dalles Dam on the Columbia system are about 53 percent of normal due to the drought. Accordingly, Bonneville and other Federal operating agencies in the Columbia Basin need to ensure reservoirs refilled by the end of summer--provided we get any moisture--so that sufficient water will be available to generate electricity this winter.

Do you anticipate the need to issue any secretarial orders this summer, such as mandatory power transfers to California, that would not allow this basin to refill its reservoirs?

Secretary ABRAHAM. No.

Mr. WALDEN. Thank you.

There is also a concern, obviously, about Bonneville's aging electrical transmission grid. They say they need about 775 million in additional Federal Treasury borrowing authority. Does the administration plan to support that
request or some level of increase in their borrowing
authority?

Secretary ABRAHAM. We have recommended in the task force report in the President’s plan a two-step process with respect to the transmission needs of BPA. One is the call in this for an assessment of the--as part of our broader assessment of transmission deficiencies, for a determination to be made. We at the Department, I would just say, based on the work we have done with Steve Wright and others at BPA, believe that there is, in fact, infrastructure needs there, and then based on the conclusions as to the assessment, a reevaluation of the debt service or debt limitation matters. But both of those are called for--both those evaluations, we would expect to complete them fairly expeditiously and make recommendations to OMB accordingly.

Mr. WALDEN. Perfect. Thank you.

I would also like to follow up on the issue of the 4(h)(10)(c) fish credits that Bonneville is going to need to access. As you know, by law 27 percent of the cost of fish recovery requirements in the Federal Columbia system are the responsibility of the U.S. taxpayer, the ratepayers picking up the remainder.

Does the administration support Bonneville’s ability to access those fish credits, especially in this year?

Secretary ABRAHAM. Right. And we are analyzing in a
variety of ways, as I think you know, the challenge that we face. Just for the record, we are committed to long-term contracts, as you are aware, that were entered into last October to supply, starting this October, some 2- to 3,000 more megawatts of electricity than we are capable of generating from within the system. We are looking at a variety of ways to address that differential because of the implications it has for rates that will be reset this fall. The fish mitigation issue is part of that set of issues we are looking at. The issues of trying to buy down some of the demand have already begun to be addressed, and we are pleased with the process we are making. And so we will continue to work, you know, through BPA to--and with them to try to come up with a resolution.

Mr. WALDEN. Let's go to the RTO West issue. I understand you sent a letter in April to Chairman Abair expressing your support for an RTO West proposal that would include the Pacific Northwest States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Montana, and also include Nevada and Utah. In that correspondence you argue for a separate regional RTO for these States, RTO West that is separate, but at the same time coordinated with an RTO that might include California.

I guess my question really involves how all that comes together. For example, has BPA been instructed to ensure that an RTO has the ability to relieve not only constraints
between flow paths, but also the flow paths themselves?

Secretary ABRAHAM. Well, we haven't actually engaged in
that level of--at least in my office, between the Acting
Administrator and I and so on, as to instructions with
respect to the role it would play as a participant in a
regional RTO. We did feel that there was a benefit to having
that participation, which was the basis for the
recommendation that I sent to FERC. But as I said in an
answer to an earlier question--I think it might have been Mr.
Sawyer's--you know, we view RTO as being a source of promise
with respect to addressing some of the reliability issues and
transmission constraint problems. I can't say today that
mandating people's participation is called for, as I
mentioned earlier, but we haven't--and it is to my
knowledge--made any specific instructions as to positions on
the issues.

Mr. WALDEN. I think there are some issues beginning to
surface about how the ability to transfer--emit power over
these systems is sold, managed, and whether there is created
economic bottlenecks that can result in congestion pricing
that maybe isn't necessarily a reflection of actual market
forces, perhaps lending itself to manipulation that I know
you and your agency will be keeping a close eye on.

Let me switch to one other topic, and that is open-loop
biomass projects. There is a facility out in Oregon that
generates power by combusting the methane in a garbage--in a solid waste facility, storage facility I guess. Given the administration's new focus on tax credits to spur energy production, would it make sense to extend renewable energy tax credits to open-loop biomass facilities?

Secretary ABRAHAM. That is a very technical question, Congressman.

Mr. WALDEN. It sure is. I was hoping you would have the answer to it.

Secretary ABRAHAM. This administration is already on record as supporting both closed as well as open-loop tax incentives.

Mr. WALDEN. Okay. Very good.

Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary ABRAHAM. Thank you.

Mr. BARTON. The gentleman from Minnesota Mr. Luther is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUTHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Mr. Secretary.

As you know, there has been considerable discussion about the prospects of oil and gas drilling in the Great Lakes, and it is my understanding that you have stated your opposition to offshore vertical drilling in the past. Is this also the official administration position with regard to onshore slant
drilling?

Secretary ABRAHAM. Congressman, the comments I made were related to my personal views at the confirmation hearing that was conducted on the Senate side as to Great Lakes drilling. Without any specificity as to the methodology that would be employed, it reflects my view. It was not at the direction of any previous administration policy. In fact, since the hearing happened before we took office, I guess there couldn't have been. But the position that I took that day reflects my opinion.

I would note that we put no recommendations with respect to drilling in the Great Lakes into the energy report, and so to--since this would be under the Interior Department's portfolio, I am not sure if they have taken a position or not.

Mr. LUTHER. Does your personal position also include onshore slant drilling, that you oppose that personally?

Secretary ABRAHAM. I have personally taken a position that I don't support Great Lakes drilling in a broad way. I have not--I have honestly not investigated the science or the characterizations of the various forms of drilling, and I don't want to take your time, so I will just say that as a general matter or principle, I don't know much about some of research that has been recently conducted.

Mr. LUTHER. Do you know if the administration has a
position on either vertical or slant drilling?

Secretary ABRAHAM. I don't know that they do. It was not one of the recommendations in the report, but I would be happy to forward an inquiry to the Interior Department.

Mr. LUTHER. That would be great. I know that during the fall Presidential campaign, Vice President Cheney indicated that technological improvements were making it easier to drill in sensitive areas without damaging the environment.

Do you believe that he was including--he was making any reference to areas like the Great Lakes in making those kinds of comments?

Secretary ABRAHAM. I don't know the context in which he made the statement. I mean, it is clearly the case that our Department has invested a fair amount of money in research over a long period of time, although I would say that we have actually reduced the proposal in that area for some of these technology investments, because we think the private sector could be doing this rather than the taxpayers. But I don't know at the same time--I don't know what he referenced. It might have been--I don't know of any statement on the Great Lakes that he has made. It might have been in the context of ANWR or some of the other areas which have been more Federal-focused areas of discussion.

Mr. LUTHER. To then follow up on what your personal position is on this kind of drilling, will you be making a
recommendation to the--to the administration, to the
President or the Vice President, with respect to drilling?

Secretary ABRAHAM. It is my understanding that there is
legislation that has been introduced--you may well be a
sponsor of it. I am not sure. As to what the administration
might do with respect to commenting on the legislation, I
can't say. I have not been part of any discus-- I ar,
although I guess the legislation is fairly recently
introduced, at least in the Senate, I think. But I don't
know. It would typically not be in our portfolio, although
we might be asked to comment.

Mr. LUTHER. You may know that Canada does allow offshore
drilling. Is there anything that you could do with respect
to Canada in terms of encouraging them not to expand or to
outright ban Great Lakes drilling?

Secretary ABRAHAM. I have no idea what the relevant
interaction is there. It would seem to me the International
Joint Commission has responsibility over these kinds of
matters, not this Department. And, again, in the absence of
clarity in terms of where the administration's portfolio on
this is, I can't say, but I do think it is probably the
International Joint Commission that has the jurisdiction.

Mr. LUTHER. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTON. Thank you, Congressman.

Last but not least, we go to Mr. Strickland of Ohio for 5
minutes, and would by unanimous consent ask that he restrict
his questions only to the Portsmouth plant. Actually, you
can ask anything you want.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Thank you. And, Mr. Chairman, do I
understand that we have the privilege of submitting questions
which we don’t--.

Mr. BARTON. Yes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. --have time to--.

Mr. BARTON. You and all the Members that are present.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. You have been kind and patient
with all of us, and I certainly appreciate that.

I have here, Mr. Secretary, hundreds of signatures of
employees from the Portsmouth gaseous diffusion plant, Mr.
Chairman.

Mr. BARTON. Just out of the blue, I could have guessed
that.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Secretary, you came to Ohio on March
the 1st to announce the DOE’s 125.7 million 2-year package
for cold standby at the facility, and at that time you made a
commitment for $20 million to be used for worker and
community transition. The press also reported that $20
million figure. These petitions have been sent to me because
there are workers there who have been terminated who feel
that they are not getting what was promised and what they
have a right to expect. I might say that as a first step, the committee should approve the DOE's request to reprogram and re prioritize $59 million in fiscal year 2001 funds for cold standby winterization worker transition.

Then on October the 4th, a month later, only 8.4 million was re programmed for worker transition, and 2.6 million was allocated for community transition. According to my calculations, that is about $9 million short of the promised $20 million, and I was wondering if you could tell me if or when we would receive the additional $9 million of that resource?

Secretary ABRAHAM. Well, as a first matter, I don't know that any of the monies have been worked out because of the ongoing negotiations that are taking place between USEC and the--and the union. We have been trying to be helpful to that process and obviously have worked with your office, Senator DeWine's and Senator Voinovich's.

In terms of the dollar amounts, I am aware that in this fiscal year, we have approximately 11- to $12 million that are available. I am not sure that I can comment as to whether there would be an additional $8 million. I guess there must be--there may be some discrepancy as to the terminology used with regard to what budget item that comes from.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I guess what puzzles me is the--what I
think was widely perceived to be a promise of $20 million for this purpose, and what I would like to ask you is, can the community and the workers expect that, or has there been some change in the thinking of--.

   Secretary ABRAHAM. Well, I am not sure. I would have to review for you what the numbers are. What I do recall was making the commitment that--on February 27th, I believe you and I met, along with Senators DeWine and Voinovich. I believe Governor Taft was there.

   Mr. STRICKLAND. Yes.

   Secretary ABRAHAM. And you all asked us to act as quickly as we could to try to free up money to make it possible for us to both move the facility to cold standby and to winterize it, as well as to try to act to get more money into the system for purposes of community transition matters and other things. The number we talked about was around $125 million in the short run, and we were able to do that. In fact, we will be able to announce it within about 48 hours, working very hard to get OMB to do so.

   As to the allocation of that money, I guess I would have to reexamine what our records show, because the numbers I am familiar with are the 8.4 and the 2.9, I believe. But I would be happy to get back to you.

   Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Secretary, I am going to be very tenacious on this point, because there are lots of men and