I. Arthur Hoekstra, PE

US Vice President Dick Cheney
Office of Vice President
Old Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20501

January 28, 2001

Dear Vice President Cheney,  
Re: Energy conservation

I watched you during the Meet the Press program on January 28, 2001 and I applaud you for a good performance.

I noticed that you are going to generate an energy policy, which will cover all sources of energy: gas, oil, coal, nuclear etc. However you didn’t mention garbage, which has approximately the same heating value as coal, and it is composed mainly of paper and plastics which are innocuous materials. It offers a tremendous source of energy that we mainly waste.

Consider that garbage is an inexhaustible and replaceable energy supply. Typically the generator of the waste pays the cost of incineration. Any power obtained reduces the cost and likewise, any heat recovered reduces the cost. When I hear today’s news about the crisis in CA, I think about how it would be helped if they used my idea to recover heat and water from garbage incineration. This problem exists everywhere in the US.

My method of cleaning the flue gas is exactly the same as occurs in nature where the contaminants are removed by a water wash in the form of condensation and rain. In my process the process occurs much faster and the contaminants are confined and collected for proper disposal rather than allowing them to be dispersed over the landscape. This is why my system is better than any other for both recovering the heat and controlling pollution.

I hope the US energy department can find my files, which will further explain my design for energy recovery.

Yours truly,

I. Arthur Hoekstra

Cc Thomas Daschle
Marc Gephardt
Governor Pataki
United States Patent [10]

Hoekstra

[16] ENERGY AND WATER RECOVERY FROM FLUE GASES

[17] Inventor: L. Arthur Hoekstra, 906 Woodlyn
Dr. N., Cincinnati, Ohio 45220

[21] Appl. No.: 593,404

[22] Filed: Mar. 24, 1984
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[57] ABSTRACT

Energy and water are recovered from flue gases by
cooling them to a temperature sufficiently below the
acid dew point temperature by contact with an aqueous
stream so as to recover the sensible heat and to reduce
the water content of the flue gases by about 50%. The
water by which the aqueous stream is enriched is subse-
quently flashed off to cool the stream back to its original
temperature and the water vapor is then compressed to
generate a higher temperature vapor stream which is
condensed to recover the water and extract heat. The
aqueous stream is continuously enriched with material
such as calcium carbonate to control the pH sufficiently
as to avoid substantial corrosion due to acidic gases
removed from the flue gases and the aqueous stream is
pumped continuously or periodically to remove com-
ponents such as chlorides, calcium sulphates, and fly ash
solids picked up from the flue gases. The system may be
operated in a two stage fashion in which separate aqueous
streams are employed to cool the flue gases in two serial
stages.
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Dear Energy secretary, Spencer Abraham:

1/28/2001

The purpose of this letter is to explain my concerns for our Federal Government's lack of a comprehensive Energy Policy. Twenty-five years ago during the oil embargo which is known as the 1973-75 energy crisis the government promised to put to use the variety of forms of energy and also to put primary emphasis on the development of solar energy, coal and alternative fuels such as renewable fuels. Twenty-five years later the government has failed to accomplish this goal.

You would think with the development of computer technology during this same time that somehow an energy policy would have been developed. Only one of the four presidents holding office during this time has done anything. Instead of an energy policy being created, President Jimmy Carter created The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) in October of 1977. I understand that you are the new Secretary of Energy.

It seems that instead of helping the situation the government has put the brakes on any development of our natural resources, especially oil and coal. I believe the environmentalist have done the country a great disservice by not realizing that you can develop oil and coal and still not harm the environment. If the search for alternative energy had been a priority as the government promised then we would not be in the present situation. OPEC has this country in a precarious situation. We went to war in 1991 to help Kuwait over oil and now ten years later we are at the mercy of OPEC.

When this country experienced the 1973-75 energy crises OPEC had been formed for about 13 years now, this country was only dependent on foreign oil for about 35% of its yearly consumption. Today this nation is dependent on foreign oil for almost 65% of its yearly consumption. California is a good example of what could happen to the rest of the United States if we do not relax some of our policies on the saving the environment.

California is now having blackouts for failure to build any new electrical generating plants. The problem is that one of the effects of the electrical power being cut off is the pump that pumps the oil is also shut off and the effect is a shortage of fuel for automobiles etc.

Mr. Abraham it is obvious that without an energy policy we will have economic failure similar to that experienced during the late 70’s or greater and for our country to continue to grow we must have a source of oil other than that produced by foreign nations. Our economic industrial complex depends on oil for its survival.
I believe that you as the new Secretary of Energy can have a great influence on the new President and Congress to develop an energy policy. May I suggest that you gather together all the best and most knowledgeable people that deal with energy in all forms. With this forum develop practical ideas for the development of an energy policy covering exploration of renewable energy sources as well as fossil fuels and also a way to stop our dependence on foreign oil.

I have confidence in you as our new Secretary of Energy and the future of our country that some form of energy policy will come from this new administration.

Thank you, for reading my letter and I hope to hear from you regarding your work on an energy policy and where you stand on this issue.

Sincerely,

Ashleigh Turner

Ashleigh Turner
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January 28, 2001

Mr. Spencer Abraham, Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy
Mail Stop 7E-079
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham,

I wrote the attached dissertation on U.S. Energy policy November 2, 2000 to identify and highlight key flaws implemented by your predecessor, Secretary Richardson. This dissertation was reviewed by numerous colleagues and political acquaintances whom I consider experts in power generation and its associated technologies. By an overwhelming majority my colleagues have encouraged me to present to you a copy of my dissertation.

In your new position as Energy Secretary I know and realize that you are extremely busy. However, with a moment of your time, I must highlight three crucial facts from my research:

1. Renewable energy sources will only make up 2% of gross electric generation by the years 2004, and have an average cost of 24 cents (up to 32 cents) per kilo-watt hour (dissertation Charts 2 & 3)
2. Following the path left by Secretary Richardson we will have national electric shortage of 24% by year 2004/05 (Chart 3)
3. Starting or restarting existing nuclear power plants owned by the U.S. government and private utilities will curtail this shortage for 35-50 years.

After years of research into electric power generation technology I fully understand and realize the complexity and importance energy and how these issues relate to U.S. interests. I endorse an energy policy based on a spectrum of available technology e.g. coal, nuclear, hydro, and renewable fuel sources, thus lowering the demand for natural gas and oil. This policy will enable all US citizens to comfortably afford their electricity, lower home heating costs (via less competition for gas & oil), and yield enough time to research and develop new long-term permanent high-energy source (potentially fusion) for our future electric demands.

James P. Langan

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
I congratulate you on your new appointment as Energy Secretary and I sincerely hope that your efforts are appreciated and supported by all Americans. Although I don't have a political resumé, I have a long history of regulatory and industrial research in power generation. I would appreciate your consideration for an appointment to your Secretary of Energy Advisory Board. I will be soon publishing a new article on the US DOE/Russian HEU agreement and its impact on the US Economy, National Security, and DOE reputation. I am willing to travel to Washington at my own expense should you have any questions or require further information. I may be contacted at my home or work (651)430-8470. You and others in the Bush administration are truly inspiring to many, many Americans.

Sincerely,

James P. Langan
"Energy, A New Direction"
James P. Langan
11-2-00

Introduction

This dissertation discusses serious flaws in current United States (US) energy policy set forth by the current US Department of Energy (DOE) and the Clinton/Gore administration. It is not an intention of this document to release secured or classified information regarding US Strategic Defense Initiative or projects administered by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Administration (DARPA) in its discussions relating to National Security. My additional comments and opinions herein are solely based on public declarations of the Clinton/Gore administration and DOE secretaries Ms. Hazel O'Leary (Jan 93 – Mar 97), Mr. Fredrico F. Pe-a (Mar 97 – Aug 98), and Mr. Bill Richardson (Aug 98 – Present). Reader questions and comments may be directed to James P. Langan, 13186 15th Street South, Afton, MN 55001. email jim.langan@dyn-eng.com. Subsequent research into DOE policy and National Security infringement is being conducted and will be the subject of future publication(s).

Background

During the past 10 years the United States has seen extraordinarily low oil and natural gas prices which have fueled one of the largest booms in our economy in modern history. The reason to me is obvious, the Gulf War. At the conclusion of the Gulf War in 1991 OPEC was in political shambles. Without a unified OPEC, oil was sold at record low prices. Saudi Arabia and Kuwait promised to provide for a significant length of time (approximately 10 years), oil at a reduced price to the US for our participation in their protection and liberation from Iraq in 1990 and 1991. This time has now passed and OPEC has reunited. Once again OPEC is demonstrating its reign as the world oil producer, causing widespread shortages and sharp price increases. This has had a dramatic impact on the US economy by causing as shown in a 70% rise in gasoline prices, a 330 point drop in the DOW on October 13, 2000, and other economic problems yet to come. Because of the current administrations complacency, we are still as dependant on foreign oil as ever (actually more so).

The Clinton/Gore administration has systematically hindered the effectiveness of Department of Energy by destroying its research base, its energy policy, and National Laboratories strategic initiatives.
The Present

Primary electric power generation technology utilized is: 1) Coal 56%, 2) Oil & Natural Gas 11%, 3) Nuclear 24%, and Hydro-electricity 8%. Other forms of electric generation (wind, solar, and geothermal) comprise 1% of the total electric power generation. This yields a combined generating capacity is 3,785 billion kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity in year 2000. The breakdown of domestic electric generation is graphically presented in chart 1.

Electric power generation costs utilizing coal, nuclear, hydro, oil & gas, and other (i.e. wind, solar, geothermal etc...) are: (coal) 3.5 cents/kWh, (nuclear) 4.3 cents/kWh, (hydro) 3.0 cents/kWh (oil) 6.5 cents/kWh, (NG)6.5/kWh, and (other) 28 - 43 cents/kWh, yielding a weighted average of 4.01 cents per kWh. Shown graphically in Chart 2.

Minimal electric power shortages have occurred in year 2000. The impact of these shortages has caused utilities to reduce their load. Primarily this load reduction has come from businesses and other large electric consumers to voluntarily reduce their use of electricity during peak times. For the most part year 2000 has seen few problems related to energy shortages.

Energy Future Under Current DOE Leadership

Currently, the DOE is targeting coal, nuclear and hydroelectric generation sources to be reduced by 20%, 50% and 3% respectively by 2004. These numbers are based on current and future DOE policy statements and Gore/Lieberman campaign statements.

The fact remains that there are no other viable energy sources to make up for reductions in coal, nuclear and hydroelectric power generation. The DOE admits that unconventional electric sources e.g. wind, solar, and geothermal, will only grow to a maximum generation capacity of 2% by 2004. This creates a shortage of electric generation of up to 24%.

Currently, there are four possible solutions to a US
energy shortage. These solutions are: acquire electricity from another country (i.e. Mexico or Canada); generate the shortage from a different source; "live with it"; or further utilize an existing source of power generation (i.e. coal, nuclear, oil, natural gas).

We currently purchase a significant amount of energy from Canada (electricity and natural gas), this power is mostly acquired during high usage times. Canada's hydro and nuclear sources are not able to provide any further electricity for our domestic use. Over the past 7-1/2 years no new large-scale commercial source of energy has been developed. Research into potential high-energy generation technology by the DOE at the National Laboratories has all but stopped. Living without 24% of our electricity would be difficult if not impossible, expensive, and in my opinion, intolerable.

Current DOE policies inhibit further usage of nuclear, hydroelectric, and coal as fuel. Additional use of oil would be an economic nightmare and cause severe shortages in the necessary supply needed for transportation and strategic uses. Utilizing more natural gas for electric generation would cause severe natural gas shortages and a cost increase from 6.5 cents per kWh up to 19.7 cents per kWh. Thus causing the weighted average price per kWh of electricity to increase from 4.01 to 9.8 cents per kWh, an increase of 97% during the next four years. It is easy to display that the existing energy policies of Clinton/Gore under Secretary Richardson are strategically flawed.

A New Direction

With some common sense and practical policy implementations, the make up of domestic electric generation could be changed to the generation make-up shown graphically in Chart 4.

Resulting in a weighted average cost of 4.31 cents per kWh. The reduction from 11% to 5% of oil or natural gas used for power generation will save 405 million barrels of oil per year or 1.865 billion cubic feet of natural gas per year for other uses, thus eliminating fuel shortages in other industries.

The increase in nuclear power generation from 24% to 28% will come from start-ups of existing off-line nuclear power plants. The increase to 28% of the total electric generation from nuclear is very conservative, because there is almost 38% nuclear generating capacity when all off-line power stations are considered. It should be noted that several of these nuclear generating stations are owned by the Federal Government, specifically the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).

Three changes must be made to DOE policy to keep current nuclear plants on-line and to get the off-line plants started up.

Energy, A New Direction, by James P. Langan
November 2, 2000 Revision 29
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1. The Yucca Mountain nuclear storage facility must be opened to accept commercial spent fuel. This opening of Yucca Mountain will uphold the DOE's commitment to nuclear utilities who have been taxed $700 – $900 million dollars for spent fuel storage. We know that this type of storage is safe and accepted by the DOE. Under the HEU agreement with Russia, the DOE has committed to take up to 400 metric tons of Russian nuclear weapons material. This 400 metric tons of HEU will produce as much as 320 metric tons of useless highly radioactive waste that is destined for permanent storage at WIPPS (Waste Isolation Pilot Plant) in New Mexico. WIPPS has already received and permanently accepted and stored 80 metric tons of this Russian waste. The WIPPS precedent proves ground storage of highly radioactive waste is safe and accepted practice.

2. Oak Ridge National Laboratory must be redirected to fulfill its original mission of nuclear fuel recycling. When ORNL was commissioned, its original mission target was to recycle up to 50% of nuclear spent fuel, thus, further reducing the amount of nuclear storage area by 50%. Since its commissioning ORNL has provided research into the enrichment, safe handling, transportation and purification of nuclear material. During Clinton/Gore most of these important tasks and projects have been terminated and ORNL is on a minimal budget simply to maintain its existence and some of its personnel. Important high-energy physics experiments must be restarted to provide the research necessary to be able to recycle up to 70% of nuclear spent fuel. These fiscally responsible research projects will predominantly be self-funded via the recycled nuclear fuel sold to utilities in addition to nuclear fuel processing and storage fees.

3. Many nuclear facilities 40 year operating licenses will expire in the early 2000s. If these plants are allowed to close almost 70% of the electricity generated by nuclear power plants will be unavailable. Electric supply shortages will result having grave consequences nationwide. Deliberate DOE research cancellations have caused a significant lack of data to support safe and reliable nuclear operating license extensions. By performing some modest research and reviewing and accepting private research already performed by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) reasonable federal regulations can be put in place to responsibly address nuclear power license extensions to cover at least 5 more decades.

Other Necessary DOE Changes

Energy research needs to be accelerated in the areas of high-energy physics, fusion, hydrogen plasma research, and fuel cells. Energy research must include improving the efficiency of existing infrastructure technologies, e.g. higher efficiency turbines, superconductivity, and higher efficiency heat-exchanging technology. The DOE should identify technologies that have been developed by the National Laboratories that could be licensed or sold to US commercial industries. This revenue could help our National Laboratories budget money for more risky and long term technology such as commercial implementations of fusion and such portable applications as higher performance fuel cells.
US energy policy must be modified to further utilize and develop US oil reserves, including the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge Area and offshore sites. In addition, reducing oil and natural gas as fuel for electric generation will: 1) extend these and existing oil reserves for many years beyond current projections; 2) lower the price per barrel of crude oil for transportation needs; 3) lower air/water emissions; 4) preserve fuel for transportation, home heating and strategic military operations; and 5) significantly reduce our national trade deficit.
Assumptions and Models used in this paper:

1) Oil & Natural Gas are considered interchangeable fuels.

2) The amount of oil consumed for electric generation were calculated according to equations 1.1 – 1.5.

3) The amount of natural gas consumed for electric generation were calculated according to equations 2.1 – 2.5.

4) During the time period of 2000 – 2004 the average use of electricity in the United States remains constant. Note: that if US electric consumption increases the total electric use increases, however, only the shortage section grows, proportionally the generation percentages decrease. This is based on a fixed electric power generating capacity.

5) These models do not consider new electric power generating stations currently under construction. A composite list of current utility construction projects could not be confirmed.

6) The calculated average cost of electric generation is based solely on the weighted average of the generation by each fuel. Regional locations and peak load costs are not factored into these costs. Therefore, the calculated costs are different than costs observed by the electric consumer.

Calculations 1.1 – 1.5

1.1) kWh generated by oil or natural gas

\[ \text{1.1) } 1 \text{ kWh} = 0.11 \times 3.785 \text{ billion kWh} / \text{416 billion kWh} \]

1.2) BTU / Barrel of crude

\[ \text{1.2) } 1 \text{ Barrel} = 5,800,000 \]

1.3) 1 kWh

\[ \text{1.3) } 1 \text{ kWh} = \text{3412 BTU} \]

1.4) 1 Barrel of crude oil

\[ \text{1.4) } 1 \text{ Barrel} = 5,800,000 / 3412 \]
\[ \text{1.4) } 1 \text{ Barrel} = 1,709.4 \text{ kWh} \]
\[ \text{1.4) } 1 \text{ Barrel} = X \text{ (efficiency)} \times \frac{33\%}{500.7 \text{ kWh}} \]

1.5) Barrels per year

\[ \text{1.5) } \text{Barrels per year} = \frac{416.4 \text{ billion kWh}}{580.7 \text{ kWh/Barrel}} = \text{742.8 million barrels} \]

Calculations 2.1 – 2.5

2.1) 1 cubic foot, natural gas

\[ \text{2.1) } 1 \text{ cubic foot} = 1050 \text{ BTU} \]

2.2) 1 kWh

\[ \text{2.2) } 1 \text{ kWh} = 3412 \text{ BTU} \]

2.3) 1 cubic foot

\[ \text{2.3) } 1 \text{ cubic foot} = \frac{1050}{3412} \]
\[ \text{2.3) } 1 \text{ cubic foot} = 0.307 \text{ kWh} \]
\[ \text{2.3) } 1 \text{ cubic foot} = X \times 0.33 \text{ (efficiency)} \times \frac{33\%}{101 \text{ kWh}} \]

2.4) 1 cubic foot

\[ \text{2.4) } 1 \text{ cubic foot} = 9.90 \text{ cubic feet} \]

2.5) Cubic feet per year

\[ \text{2.5) } \text{Cubic feet per year} = 0.90 \times 416.4 \text{ billion kWh} = 4.122 \text{ billion cubic feet} \]
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James P. Langan is a seasoned electrical engineer with 19 years of experience and significant education and experience in nuclear engineering.

Mr. Langan has specialized in nuclear safety research, research published by Langan was nationally and internationally presented at conferences in 1988/89. In 1990 the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Department of Energy (DOE) indoctrinated a nuclear safety testing practice into law that was developed and proven from Langan’s research. This research resulted from a US NRC Small Business Innovation (SBIR) contract awarded to Langan’s company.

Since its acceptance, this testing practice has saved US nuclear utilities millions of dollars in testing costs and increased the safety margins of operating US nuclear power plants. In 1988/89 Langan was the recipient of a special award entitled “Wisconsin Innovation and Research Award” presented by Wisconsin, Governor Tommy Thompson.
Fax Memo to Vice President Cheney

Date: Jan 30, 2001
To: The Honorable Dick Cheney, Vice President
From: Dale W. Steffes, Tel
Subject: Formation of United States Energy Policy

Congratuations to President Bush and you on your election.

Also congratulations on your designation to lead a committee to address the need for an United States Energy Policy.

I have worked on this problem for more years than I care to admit. But I would like to share some input that might be a help to your new committee. Secretary of Energy O'Leary attempted a similar effort early in her administration. I followed that effort very closely and tried to help it by publishing the Oil Security Newsletter.

Included is some documentation for background information. See 7 22 94 letter that was sent to the attached list requesting their input on national oil supply security.

The whole effort started with the Domestic Natural Gas and Oil Initiative of Dec. 1993. It was a noble effort on her part, but she couldn't get her fellow departments to go along. See newsletter No. 9, Dec. 15, 1995 which more or less summarizes this effort.

I previously sent you a copy of the energy proposal I submitted to the Clinton Administration the day he took office (Jan 21, 93). Your copy should have arrived the day you took office (Jan 20,01)

My advice to your committee is that they will not be able to make energy policy with today's energy models and data. Current energy models in use today do not factor in cost adequately. The general public still does not understand the energy industry, especially the costs

Finally, I ask you not to distort the energy price signals. They are the most valuable data we have

I would be honored to share my 15 year experience working for a National Energy Stability Policy with you and your committee. Let me know how I can be of assistance.

PS. I worked with the Commerce Secretary's dad 30 years ago hosting in Houston one the first national seminars on energy. It was for the country's National Association of Business Economists. About 200 business economists attended. We would have had another 50 attend but they elected to go to Washington to hear the next phase in President Nixon's wage and price controls. The third person who served on our committee was the chief economist for Exxon USA

CC: Tammy Blair
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The Honorable Spencer Abraham  
United States Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave  
Washington DC 20585  

January 30, 2001  

Dear Mr. Secretary:  

Enclosed is my resume. Because of my experience in the electrical utility industry and extensive knowledge of the energy business I would like to offer my services in helping to develop a National Energy Policy. I write not asking for a job and certainly have no interest in relocating to Washington DC but do think that I could be helpful working on a committee or a task force.  

I am thoroughly familiar with the fuels available for the generation of electricity and the environmental impact, actual and perceived of each. Also, I am aware of the political, consumer, and public relations aspects of each.  

I have supported every Republican nominee since I was old enough to vote. My wife and I gave the maximum allowable to George W. Bush. I have been a member of the Presidential Roundtable and attended the 1996 Convention in San Diego. I was a member of the task force that traveled to Scranton to campaign for George W. and Congressman Don Sherwood.  

I am eager to serve if you so desire.  

Sincerely,  

Robert J. Martin  

Robert T. Martin
EDUCATION:
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
Bachelor of Science, Mechanical Engineering-1948

EMPLOYMENT:
1991-present ROMAR OIL, INC. (small family oil company), President
Engaged in community and public service activities
1989-1991 Retired (engaged in community and public service activities
1984-1983 HILL AND KNOWLTON (international public relations firm), Senior Consultant
1965-1983 TEXAS ELECTRIC SERVICE COMPANY, Fort Worth, Texas, Vice President. Held various corporate jobs. Elected Vice President in 1971 with responsibilities for public relations, public affairs, employee and customer communications, consumer affairs and personnel relations. Involved in corporate planning to diversify fuel supplies for power plants. Responsible for initial contact and continuing successful efforts to gain public acceptance of Comanche Peak Nuclear Power plant. Member of Texas Utilities Public Relations committee. For a time was Chairman of Edison Electric Institute’s Consumer Affairs Committee.
1961-1964 MOLONEY ELECTRIC COMPANY, Regional Sales Manager for power equipment
1948-1960 WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION, Graduate Student Training program, Generation, transmission, and distribution sales responsibilities in Los Angeles and Dallas.

MILITARY SERVICE
1943-1946 United States Navy, Navy V-12 program resulting in Commission. Served as Engineering Officer on the USS Casa Grande. Honorably discharged after 3 years service.

PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY SERVICE
Fort Worth Community Development Council- served 6 years
Texas Real Estate Commission- served 6 years
DFW Airport Board- served 4 years
Member and Past Chairman-Fort Worth Streams and Valleys Committee
Life Member of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce
Past Chairman of the Fort Worth Museum of Science and History
Past Chairman of the Longhorn Council of the Boy Scouts of America
Board Member of the Moncrief Radiation Center
Board Member of Junior Achievement of Tarrant County

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS
Registered professional engineer
Life member of the Texas and National Societies of Professional Engineers
Senior member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers

PERSONAL
Married to Marilyn McDavid since 1949, two children
Deacon at McKinney Memorial Church- Founded and chaired Local Mission Board
From: Robert F. Tulloch
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2001 2:52 PM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Consumer Information Comment Form

NAME: Robert F. Tulloch
SUBJECT: Nuclear Generation
ZIP: 49768
CITY: Munith
PARM.1: TO:the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
SUBJECT: Consumer Information Comment Form
STATE: MI
TOPIC: Nuclear Energy
Submit: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: USA
MESSAGE: Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy: I moved to Ann Arbor, Michigan from Berkeley, California in 1972 to do engineering on the Midland Nuclear Plant. I have always had a great interest in nuclear energy and been a great supporter. The current state of energy policy in our country is appalling and has been for many, many years. We had and still have an opportunity to lead the world in nuclear energy as long as we have an administration that is supportive. I watched a nightline show several years ago and decided to contact the DOE. Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002.
I am honored to write a letter to you regarding our national energy policy and hope you have time to read it. I'll try to keep it short.

I read in the news today that we proposing to encourage more domestic oil exploration and less dependence upon foreign oil. One reason this issue has been discussed is the energy crisis in California. I think the goal our your proposal is good (energy independence), but I respectfully disagree with your proposal to widen o
Fax Memo to Vice President Cheney

Date: Jan 30, 2001
To: The Honorable Dick Cheney, Vice President
From: Dale W. Steffes
Subject: Formation of United States Energy Policy

Page 1 of 4

Congratulations to President Bush and you on your election.

Also congratulations on your designation to lead a committee to address the need for an United States Energy Policy.

I have worked on this problem for more years than I care to admit. But I would like to share some input that might be a help to your new committee. Secretary of Energy O'Leary attempted a similar effort early in her administration. I followed that effort very closely and tried to help it by publishing the Oil Security Newsletter.

Included is some documentation for background information. See 7 22 94 letter that was sent to the attached list requesting their input on national oil supply security.

The whole effort started with the Domestic Natural Gas and Oil Initiative of Dec. 1993. It was a noble effort on her part, but she couldn't get her fellow departments to go along. See newsletter No. 9, Dec. 15, 1995 which more or less summarizes that effort.

I previously sent you a copy of the energy proposal I submitted to the Clinton Administration the day he took office (Jan 21, 93). Your copy should have arrived the day you took office (Jan 20, 01)

My advice to your committee is that they will not be able to make energy policy with today's energy models and data. Current energy models in use today do not factor in cost adequately. The general public still does not understand the energy industry, especially the costs

Finally, I ask you not to distort the energy price signals. They are the most valuable data we have.

I would be honored to share my 15 year experience working for a National Energy Stability Policy with you and your committee. Let me know how I can be of assistance.

PS. I worked with the Commerce Secretary's dad 30 years ago hosting in Houston one the first national seminars on energy. It was for the country's National Association of Business Economists. About 200 business economists attended. We would have had another 50 attend but they elected to go to Washington to hear the next phase in President Nixon's wage and price controls. The third person who served on our committee was the chief economist for Exxon USA

CC: Tammy Blair
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From:  

To: "George W. Bush" <president@Whitehouse.GOV>
cc: 
Subject: Please do not destroy the planet

Mr. Bush--

I write urging you to look beyond your roots as an oil company executive, and take a different approach to energy policy.

The US consumes a share of the global resources far in excess of its tiny fraction of the global population. I'd call this pretty unfair as well as a pretty big problem. Your predecessor at the White House was an anti-environmental fanatic. Yes, he got some favorable press for preserving a few tracts of land here and there, but most people just ignore his disastrous forest policies, his torpedoing of the Kyoto Treaty, and his careful maintenance of the US average fuel economy at the 1990 level. Really, not much different from your father.

I figure you want to make Clinton look bad by comparison to you, and I think a great way would be to boot Mr. Cheney (another oilman - don't you guys talk to anyone else?) from the task force on energy policy, protect all US lands in perpetuity from the catastrophes wrought by oil drilling, and save us all from foreign domination by imposing rationing and forcing everyone to consume LESS instead of MORE. That last part alone would instantly earn you a unique and beloved place in US and world history. If we didn't waste so much, there would be no "energy crisis". Oil is a pointless pollution increase. Why not go after the root problem?

I always thought conservatism ought to have something to do with conservationism. Why not abandon the tired old, earth destroying solutions of the past and make a new name for yourself and your party? That way you can thumb your nose at Mr. Clinton and his ilk and leave a planet to your children as well. What do you say?

--Jamie Pehling
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To: president@Whitehouse.GOV
cc: 
Subject: Energy Policy

I am astounded and disappointed to hear your first words on an energy policy to be: Find More Oil, generate more electricity. No word on conservation policy or on the pollution problems inherent to burning more fossil fuel.

The last sensible policy I heard on energy was Bill Clinton's BTU tax. Raising the price of any commodity will encourage conservation.

A F DELAJOYE
From: Louis Liebhaber

President Bush:

Dear President Bush,

You have assembled a group of advisors who are smart and highly experienced. Surely given the enormous talent of that team you can find more responsible ways to assure that this nation has the energy resources it needs than to seek out oil and gas in the sacred wilderness of our country.

As an elected official and a leader of the greatest nation on the face of the earth, you have an obligation to promote the long term view, not cave in to the avarice of the those who would create a sense of hysteria over the current electricity shortage in California. How could you even consider invading the sanctity of areas which support tranquility, endangered wildlife and a refuge of all men now and in future generations? What about a responsible position promoting conservation of energy and the responsible development of alternative energy sources? Surely with all of the money and talent we have in the country we can see beyond today's craving and sacrifice a bit to assure that we BOTH have our energy needs met for the future AND we have wilderness areas for our future posterity.

What do you want your legacy to be? The Exxon Valdez? The Galapagos spill? or new sources of responsible energy and places for your grandchildren to explore the wonders of nature?

Do the right thing! Not the expedient thing - that's the mark of a true leader.

Sincerely,

Louis Liebhaber

Sincerely,

29550
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Dear Mr. President,

I strongly support a change from the status quo of our energy policy (or lack thereof) and I have a few suggestions that seem glaringly obvious but that have been largely ignored.

First I want to point out that our current energy distribution system is negligently one-sided. We rely almost solely on fossil fuels to meet our energy needs. As we are finding in California and elsewhere, this is disastrously shortsighted. The primary goal of any new energy policy must be to remove our dependence on fossil fuels. Much as been made of the your desire to decrease our dependence on foreign oil by developing domestic sources. This is grossly insufficient and completely ignores the problem of our dependence on oil itself.

Estimates of remaining fossil fuel supplies abound and can be used to support any point of view, depending on which estimate one chooses. There are, however, a few facts that do not rely on estimates. First, all fossil fuel sources are limited. Only the self-deluded pretend that fossil fuels can continue to meet our energy needs indefinitely. Next, the development of fossil fuel resources causes extensive environmental damage. Companies claim that they can obtain oil in an environmentally friendly way. This is simply not true. I've worked around many oil fields and have yet to see a single one that didn't resemble a war zone. Then, of course, are the devastating methods we use to obtain coal. Unlike their petroleum counterparts, coal companies at least have the decency not to attempt to dupe us into believing that their methods are environmentally benign.

Finally, the use of fossil fuels causes problems for humans and the environment everywhere on the planet. Global warming is already causing vast financial losses from increasingly erratic and violent weather systems. Even the seemingly localized air pollution of our metropolitan centers is dispersing across relatively pristine regional areas causing stress to multiple environmental systems. This is not merely a problem of aesthetics; human-induced stresses on environmental systems always cause unanticipated problems. History shows quite clearly that harming the environment ultimately harms us.

So any energy policy that perpetuates our reliance on fossil fuels is self-defeating and not worth pursuing. On the other hand, we are clearly reliant in the near term on these fossil fuels. What, then, are we to do? Perhaps the most important thing to keep in mind while pondering this question is that, in the long term, we do not have to rely on fossil fuels to meet any of our energy needs! With a little intelligent planning, existing fossil fuel sources can be sufficient to supply all of our near
term energy needs while we transition to a sustainable energy solution. The only sustainable solution available to us is the same one that has been obvious for decades: renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, geothermal, and tidal. Ultimately, it is clear that we will have to rely on a multifaceted energy distribution system that is primarily dependent on a variety of renewable energy sources. Anything less exacerbates our energy problems.

I believe, however, that merely changing our energy dependency from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources is not the complete answer. Along with this switch must come increases in energy efficiencies. This has the added benefit of decreasing our reliance on foreign sources of petroleum without developing new domestic sources. Any complete energy policy must include incentives and/or regulatory requirements for substantial increases in energy efficiencies in our appliances and vehicles.

In the final analysis, the only good energy policy is one that increases energy efficiencies and lays a short path towards a multifaceted, renewable-based energy distribution system. Please write to me and explain how you will work towards the above stated goals. A solid, renewable-based energy system will allow our country to continue to lead the world economically, environmentally, and energetically.

Sincerely,

Kurt D. Anderson

PS. As I completed this letter, I found that the your own brother has sent a letter to the Interior Department in an attempt to prevent any consideration of developing off-shore petroleum sources near Florida. In this letter, Governor Bush stated, "I am confident that the new administration will recognize the need to protect sensitive natural resources located both offshore and along Florida's coastline for the benefit of the entire nation." I sincerely hope your administration will take this keen understanding to heart and prevent the abuse of natural areas merely to perpetuate an antiquated and problematic fossil fuel-based energy system.