From:                      > on 01/30/2001 06:09 AM GMT

To:  "President George W. Bush"<president@Whitehouse.GOV>
cc:  Vice-President Richard Cheney <vice.president@Whitehouse.GOV>
Subject:  Shared Energy Corporation

Dear President Bush,

Congratulations on your being elected and sworn in as the nation's 43rd Chief Executive Officer and Commander-in-Chief. I want to personally let you and Mrs. Bush, Vice-President Cheney and Mrs. Cheney, your respective staffs and cabinet members know that I am being obedient to the Word of God and I am indeed in prayer for you, our leaders.

President Bush, I will continue to pray for your health and well-being, that you'll be encouraged, that you'll make the right decisions concerning the country and our neighbors abroad, and that God's favor and protection will surround you like a barrier around a fortress. I also want to express my love and concern for you and all of the aforementioned personnel. Please do a good job for this country, as I know you will, and I believe bigger, better and brighter things will happen for you and this country.

President Bush, I also want to let you know that I am a man of God, with Godly principles and full of the faith that it takes to please God. I'll be in your corner and your supporter. If ever I can provide a word of counsel, comfort or inspiration then I am willing to perform that duty. I wanted to share that information with you so that you would know that there are people that truly care and are really excited about the future that is before us!

President Bush, I also wanted to introduce you to a company that I recently formed named Shared Energy Corporation. I read today on the AP News Wire where you have issued directives on the formation of a Federal Energy Policy. My company was formed to focus on such issues. Our mission will be to reduce energy consumption by utilizing energy management technologies in order to achieve greater levels of energy efficiencies and reduced costs, thereby reducing the production of greenhouse gases and acid rain which greatly affect our environment. Alternative energy sources are also a part of our business plan that we will endeavor to research and develop.

President Bush, I desire that Shared Energy Corporation would play a part or be a working team member in dealing with the aspects of this new energy policy.

Following is the company's contact information:

Shared Energy Corporation
P.O. Box 4726
Marietta, GA 30061-4726
ATTN:  John T. Flack III, President
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I thank you for your time and indulgence in this matter. Together, I believe these problems can be solved and they will be solved. There is nothing that is impossible for us to do when we work together for the solutions.

Thank you again and I wish you God's speed. God bless you.

John T. Flack III
Mr. Bush,

First I would like to congratulate your and Mr. Cheney's ascension to office. I have never done this before, but I think this topic merits attention, especially since you announced that you were about to embark on this task. As you have obliquely mentioned in the past, the USA is in trouble energy wise, as the world itself may be one day as far as fossil fuels are concerned. As you also said, the government should not necessarily try to run everything, but we also know that when the government and the people wish, much can be done more quickly. To the point, we need to develop more green power in the form of wind power, the more constant type of natural renewable resource, compared to solar, and especially in more windy states like Texas (charted to be #2), but in full utility scale wind projects with current improved technology to help ensure our future standard of living. There are two newer projects in West Texas currently running, and more online in other states, but we need much more of this clean power developed, along with the job base it brings, and the internal cash flow to our economies, as well as the energy. And the bottom line is, no, it's still not perfect when the wind is not blowing, but it works and I believe we need more tax credits and other legislative encouragement to get more of these large projects built, the scenario of a wind turbine in everyone's backyard will not be efficient enough to do it. And they can be built quickly, it surely cannot be any worse than the current power scenario in California. I am simply asking that this area be very well scrutinized for I believe it can become a lasting lynchpin of our national energy policy, but look at the newer projects like near Big Springs and Mcamey to truly get an idea of the potential efficiency, the older wind farms are not as so. I also agree with incrementally opening up other previously off limits areas to drilling, and I applaud your grasp and attention of the energy situation we are in, we cannot ignore
these facts.

In closing, I wish the best for your administration, you will all be in our prayers as you lead this nation, and we like the faith charity help plan, fresh ideas are what this country needs.

May God Bless

Sincerely,

Karen Lafoon
Mr. President and Mr. Vice President,

Your energy policy that was put forth yesterday is an offense to any long term thinking American. Using the California crisis to push an unsound policy that has little or nothing to do with California power concerns is deceitful at best and a tragedy at worst. Continued reliance on non renewable resources such as gas and oil at the expense of the environment will only exacerbate an already dangerous problem. Your intentions to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and granting waivers to states that run older power plants, even if they VIOLATE clean air standards crosses the line to criminal activity and reveals a flagrant disregard for future safety of this country's air, water, and land. Producing policies whose main beneficiaries are oil companies, who would obviously love to see weakened environmental controls in exchange for more profit, shows an administration who would put the wealthy before even the SAFETY of the American people, not to mention our neighbors who must deal with the fallout of our environment policies. The answer doesn't lie with oil but in alternative renewable power sources. The United States should, and eventually must, put its energy and money into research to get us out of the crippling fiasco of an economy is too bound up with a resource that will eventually run out. If it's not futile enough to tie our future to a dead end, then at least refrain from destroying the environment in which we all have to live in the process. Try looking for solutions that have long term benefits that future generations can appreciate and enjoy rather than running over the same tired ground that we know one day will fail. If we don't invest in alternatives now, before more energy crises show up in the headlines, you will doom us to a country whose land, air, and water were ravaged in a quest for greed and short term solutions. I hope that you both would like a more noble legacy than that for your administration.

Sincerely,

Tom Benham

- att1.htm

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
Dear Mr. President:

My family and I are strongly opposed to any reductions in the requirements or enforcement of the Clean Air Act. Our current energy problems are not best solved by allowing more pollution to our life giving air. Further, we are also profoundly against any proposals to open up ANWR for drilling, mining or any other form of extraction. Our future generations should never be robbed of this pristine national treasure for the short term gain of today. We urge you to look at sustainable solutions to our energy problems and to keep our invaluable public health and rare unaltered environments protected for us and our children.

Sincerely,
Angela Jones
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Dear Mr. Abraham,  

Re: Energy Policy  

The Wall Street Journal of January 29, 2001 has an excellent article about you and your task of creating an energy policy. It also says you are going to encourage the construction of new clean-burning coal-fired power plants. I have several patents on this subject which have now expired but I believe the concept is useful.

I will enclose a letter I sent to VP Dick Cheney on energy policy.

Let me repeat 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.

And if the generator pays the cost of disposal, the resulting energy is FREE. Can you match that?

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 had contacted Geo. Lewett of the energy department in 1989 so you may have a file on my proposed system which you can review. I hope this will help you in your new task.

Yours truly,  

I. Arthur Hoekstra  
Cc VP Dick Cheney  

Energy secretary, Spencer Abraham  
1000 Independence Ave. SW  
Washington, DC 20585-0001  

January 30, 2001
Good morning Secretary Abraham, from Corpus Christi, Texas:

My name is Tom Anderson, and my resume was forwarded to you by Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison. The Transition Office also has my resume and application.

I am writing because I have a definite interest in working with you in the establishment of a National Energy Policy. My view is that the policy will have three facets: A near term policy to address our acute problems in the price and availability of oil, natural gas, and electricity. A midrange policy, centered on fossil fuels and lessening our dependence on foreign sourcing. And a long range policy, acknowledging our fossil fuel infrastructure, but evolving the nation into utilization of alternative and renewable energy.

As anticipated, the President has established a task force, under Vice President Cheney, to deal with the issue. That task force consists of cabinet level individuals, of which you are one. But you will need considerable assistance in doing the research, formulating the ideas, and getting the work done.

I am an electrical engineer, in private practice, serving the process industries. I also do work in photovoltaics, co-generation, and have ties to an Australian developed process that provides extremely clean burning coal. I am writing to you in hopes I can provide some assistance in what will be one of the most important aspects of the Bush Administration. Please let me hear from you.

Yours truly,

Thomas A. Anderson, P.E.

Office: 361.653.1234
E-mail: [removed]

For Reference at the Transition Office: SSN: [removed]
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 nightly show several times.
Dear Mr. President,

As a Floridian who votes, I have a few questions. I understand the politics going on today but for the life of me I can't understand why we are in this energy crisis. For those Americans who don't see it, they are just blind. It is possible that within the next few years, or months even, that we could experience shortages like we have never seen before.

Why are you and our government, Democrats and especially Republicans, pushing for any tax cut at all when we now have the opportunity to devote these financial resources to creating a responsible energy policy that could ultimately save the entire planet from the stranglehold of non-renewable, dirty energy? Doesn't our gov't have the duty to serve the public in a manner that is consistent with the premise of equality and the promise of doing all that is necessary to insure continued quality of life for every American?

It seems to me, if we were to devote a significant portion of the surplus to expanding the R & D of renewable, clean, and safe energy, the middle and long term benefit would be immense, much greater than the short term benefit of reduced taxes to a few. We would not only remove our incredible dependence on a volatile part of the world but would also create something that could be exported. It would not only save money, but would make money too!

As the stated leaders of the world, we do have a duty to act responsibly in our actions. If everyone sees us as greedy users, and I think we are, than we are not fulfilling our highest and best purpose. With the amount of physical power we now enjoy, we could be the country that eliminates the 'bully' from most of history's powerful countries labels. Let's change our reputation and really think about how we are projecting ourselves to the rest of the world. Greedy really stinks as a reputation.

Doesn't our government care about the future generations who will inherit what we leave behind? If all we do is consume with little mind for giving back, our legacy will be not unlike that of the former Soviets. Eventually the damage will be so great that even enormous amounts of money will not be able to correct it. This is our opportunity to really make a difference, here and abroad, and it makes me sick seeing what we are doing.

We are the only country in the world who has this chance, though it will benefit everyone in every country. Oil is not the long term answer, it can't be. It is a finite resource. With the dollars at our disposal now, we can find a long term answer, without any more Exxon Valdez disasters.

A concerned citizen,
John Doelman

Email

- att1.htm
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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
February 1, 2001

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

RE: Swartout National Energy
Policy & Petrol-Fee

Dear Mr. Abraham,

I would like to congratulate you on your appointment and confirmation as new United States Secretary of Energy.

I am enclosing a copy of the National Energy Policy that my father and I have developed and worked on for the past 25 years. We would be glad to help you implement it if you have any questions or want our assistance.

Thank you and Best Wishes,

SINCERELY,

Dennis B. Swartout
SWARTOUT ENERGY POLICY (SWEP) FOR AMERICA

Petroleum Fuel Consumption Fee (PETROL-FEE) October 31, 2000

America’s National Energy Policy should include a $1.00 per gallon fee on consumption of petroleum fuel. To minimize economic disruption and provide an orderly transition to the new “post-petrol” economy, the fee should be phased in $.10 cents per year for 10 years beginning a year after enactment. No fee would be imposed on petroleum-based products, materials or other energy forms.

Petrol-fee is not a tax. Revenues will be used for, and paid back into, the source of the revenue. Thus, giving value received for payment made. For example, revenue collected at the gas pump can be used to fund transportation infrastructure. Building bridges, roads and highways. Fees collected on heating oil can be used for making homes more energy efficient and for converting furnaces to gas or alternate fuels. Revenue collected from electric utilities could be used for technology and research developing alternate energy sources. Electric utility companies would soon convert to gas, fuel cells, flywheel energy storage, solar, wind, geo-thermal or coal to avoid paying the fee.

ADVANTAGES:

1. CONSERVATION WITHOUT GOVERNMENT CONTROL: Supply and demand. The more oil costs, the less demand, the more conserved.
2. ENCOURAGE ALTERNATE ENERGY USE AND R&D: Higher cost petroleum makes alternate energy more competitive and profitable. That makes more R&D possible and financing available. Fuel cells, energy storage, recuperators, waste heat boilers, solar, wind and geo-thermal. All need more R&D. Cheap oil prices have discouraged and retarded alternate energy development.
3. ENERGY INDEPENDENCE – REDUCE FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS: The Swartout policy (SWEP) would soon make our country independent of foreign oil imports. The price of foreign oil should start dropping the day congress enacts SWEP.
4. REDUCE TRADE DEFICIT: Petroleum import reduction will contribute to a stronger trade balance of payments ratio with our world trading partners.
5. REDUCE AIR POLLUTION, THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT AND OZONE DEPLETION: Largely caused by burning petroleum fuel.
6. PROLONG SUPPLY OF EXHAUSTIBLE RESOURCE: Someday petroleum reserves will be depleted. We should start looking for alternate energy sources now. SWEP will provide motivation to locate and develop new gas fields, deep geo-thermal wells and to perfect clean coal technology.
7. REBUILD THE NATION’S HIGHWAYS: Many of our country’s roads and bridges are in shambles. State and local government can use this revenue to replace aging infrastructure.
8. CREATE JOBS: Replacing obsolete highways and bridges will create tens of thousands of jobs. So will the alternate energy R&D. A tremendous stimulant to our economy and tax base.
9. MINIMUM BUREAUCRACY & GOVERNMENT CONTROL: The Swartout Energy Policy (SWEP) works on the principle of free market supply & demand economy. Since there are already State and Federal gas taxes, there is already a fee collection method in place without hiring additional government employees. In fact, with SWEP, the Federal Department of Energy could be eliminated.

Dennis & Bruce Swartout
February 1, 2001

Dear Mr. President,

I am writing to express my concerns about what I think is the most pressing economic issue facing this country, and that is the affordability and stability of our energy supply. The only practical long-term solution to our base load electrical energy needs is the revitalization and advancement of nuclear technology for the generation of electricity. The advantages of nuclear generated electricity and nuclear power in general include the following.

1. Inexpensive and abundant uranium, thorium and plutonium fuel supply domestically available
2. No pollution released into the atmosphere
3. Proven safe technology
4. The only non-fossil fuel alternative capable of supplying the large amount of base load electricity necessary for future energy needs
5. Waste is extremely minimal if we utilize a closed fuel cycle and fast neutron breeder technology (as in France and other countries)
6. Nuclear power is the only practical way to produce the amount of hydrogen that will be needed in addition to electricity to replace fossil fuel for transportation and industry
7. New technology reactors and separation techniques are more weapons proliferation resistant.

I propose that the government take the following steps as part of a new energy policy that recognizes the central role of nuclear generated electricity and nuclear generated hydrogen.

1. Restart the breeder reactor research program (which was cancelled by President Clinton in 1993) with the goal of creating a standardized reactor design that can be placed safely and cost effectively in commercial operation with a closed fuel cycle (i.e. the French Phenix).
2. Change to a "closed fuel cycle" policy in the United States whereby spent nuclear fuel presently in temporary storage is purified and recycled to be used as fuel again (MOX). This will minimize waste and maximize fuel efficiency (already done in many other countries).

3. Open the Yucca Mountain waste repository

4. Promote the design and construction of Generation 3 and Generation 4 advanced technology nuclear power plant facilities in the United States to meet our present and future electricity needs.

5. Work with other countries with advanced nuclear programs to develop a standardized proliferation resistant reactor to help provide electrical power to the third world. This would be a major step forward in solving the problems of hunger, poverty, disease, overpopulation and air pollution.

6. Massively fund research into the design and development of efficient battery driven and hydrogen fueled vehicles and fuel cells (an Apollo Space Program type of effort) so that we will eventually phase out our need for oil (and be rid of its pollution as well).

7. Provide incentives for producing and purchasing fuel efficient and gas/electric hybrid vehicles and conversely disincentives for manufacturing and purchasing fuel inefficient vehicles.

8. Incentivize renewable energy resources such as wind, solar and geothermal which may contribute "peaking" electricity generating potential.

Presently nuclear energy may not seem to be politically popular but that will change as people become aware of the many negative environmental and economic impacts that ultimately go along with energy produced from fossil fuel. Please consider the above suggestions as you formulate a national energy strategy affecting not only us but also many generations of Americans to come.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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Spencer Abraham  
Secretary of Energy  
White House  
Washington, DC

Dear Secretary:

Congratulations on your new job, which is going to be a difficult one. I read President’s energy policy and I found it to be weak and toothless. Let me make some points and suggestions.

Nuclear Power. It hasn’t been discussed or addressed for a decade and yet new plants are needed badly. Mr. Secretary, there is a world out there outside of Michigan and USA, including countries where over half of energy is provided with nuclear power, sans accidents, sans high construction costs sans pollution, sans high fuel costs, etc. Did you know that the most energy-efficient nuclear plants are in Switzerland and Finland? It probably is a surprise to you. These are small countries, which cannot afford the multi-billion dollar initial costs we are used to. Neither have they reinvented the wheel with each plant, as we are wont to do. Nuclear power in the right hands is the least polluting option of all, giving off only water vapor into the air and warm water into a canal or stream. Instead of falling into the familiar trap of starting from scratch, why don’t you suggest copying one of the plants and building some in this country? I admit it will take leadership to carry it through, but it is more constructive than Bush’s energy policy which merely advocates prolonging the working life of existing nuclear plants and no mention of new ones.

Fossil fuel consumption. Bush’s only solution is to drill for more oil and from the Arctic, instead of conserving oil, gas and gasoline. His is a very simplistic and shortsighted approach. He has said absolutely nothing about the lack of need for huge pickup trucks and SUV’s with their large gasoline consumption, driven mostly by one person. For good measure, both have been exempted from pollution controls by Congress in their infinite wisdom and as a gratitude for soft money. Isn’t there something wrong with this picture? Isn’t there a connection between usually ridiculously low gasoline prices and low fleet mileages? Again, this is not how the rest of the world operates, or were you aware of that? No wonder we consume over 20% of world’s energy with only 5% of its population. As a Secretary of Energy I would ponder about that and do something about it. Drilling with wild abandon in the Arctic and burning it as fast and cheaply as we can is not the solution, merely prolonging the agony of making some serious, mature decisions. If you’re still doubtful about any solution, why not start increasing the federal gasoline tax by one penny a gallon per year, until consumers decide to vote with their pocketbooks and gasoline and oil consumption will level off? It would still remain way below world market price for decades. As I said before, why should anyone worry about conserving something which is kept dirt cheap by government edict?

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Auvo Kemppinen

1 February, 2001
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February 2, 2001

Vice President Richard B. Cheney
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave.
Washington D.C. 20500

Dear Vice President Cheney,

Your appointment by President Bush to head a Task Force to define and implement a high priority, coherent, National energy policy is very encouraging. The degree of success of your Task Force will have a major impact on our future economy and on the quality of life in this country. The chaotic situation in California clearly demonstrates this fact.

The information emanating from the Administration appears to place the highest priority on oil from Alaska and a continuation of our present predicament of depending on more petroleum and other finite supplies of fossil fuels as a primary solution to the energy crisis. I do not believe this is your intent. Perhaps a clarification in this regard would gain stronger public support for your program.

I certainly understand the immediate need for more oil as a short-term measure for defense and such uses as transportation, heating, petrochemicals and other limited uses. However, the longer-term crisis is due to a failure to install massive electrical generation capacity and to develop alternative energy sources to decrease our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign suppliers. Oil is not the solution to the generation of large amounts of electricity, in the short or long term.

Fortunately, there are 65 nuclear power plants now operating in the United States that have a capacity to produce about 95,000 megawatts of electricity. The decision to build these plants was made by the utilities in the 1950, 1960, and 1970 decades. The U.S. was at that time the world’s leader in the research, development and deployment of nuclear power. A large effective nuclear power industry was developed during this period with several major power plant designers, architect engineers, suppliers and contractors. Under the Atomic Energy Act the Utilities were required to obtain construction permits and operating license from the Regulatory arm of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Construction permits and operating license issued by the commission were subject to the most comprehensive safety analysis review, detailed design standards and safety inspection regimes imposed on any industry. Operating experience to-date has demonstrated the high degree of safety and environmental acceptability of these U.S. designed plants.

France generates more than 70% of that country’s electric demand with nuclear power plants. Japan has few domestic natural energy resources and has selected nuclear power as the major electrical generating source for the future. Japan has 53 nuclear units and can produce 42,369 megawatts distributed on the home islands. Many other countries of the world depend to some extent on nuclear power plants.
From: Ries, Ken [Ken.Ries@kaiser.com]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2001 7:18 PM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Energy Crisis

Spencer Abraham
Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy

Dear Sir,

My name is Ken Ries. I am a Technical Specialist working for Kaiser Aluminum Corporation at Mead, Washington. I am writing to you to express my deepest concern about the present energy crisis in the NW and BPA's past misguided management of the situation (at least to this point) and the inevitable serious impact this mismanagement will have on the Aluminum industry (and jobs, economy) in the NW unless reversed.

I just finished reading an information letter by Stephen J. Wright, acting Administrator for BPA, sent out to BPA customers and ratepayers explaining why power rates to be paid by DSIs in the 2002-2006 time period are going to increase an average of 60%! He goes on to explain that due to "increasing costs" BPA must now "adjust" rates again and after just concluding agreements (i.e. signed contracts) with DSIs in June for a 16% increase in prices and "power rationing" that will only allow Aluminum Smelters to operate at about 40% of capacity (very inefficient!). It is apparent that the "increasing costs" are the result of BPA contracting to provide 11,000 MW of power when it only is capable of generating 8,000 MW. The extra power contracted must be purchased on the open market and (thanks to California) is in short supply and high-priced.

BPA's cavalier don't-blame-me attitude toward this whole problem really irks me! I don't quite understand how they can sign contracts for 11,000 megawatts when they can only generate 8,000! Who do they think they are? The airlines? Maybe if they stopped running all of the social programs (fish recovery, etc.) we could be paying rates more like 4 mills, which is the actual cost to generate the power. Also, I don't think they will have to worry about protecting the environment either. When they put all the NW Aluminum smelters out of business, there won't be any population left outside of Seattle to run roughshod over Mother Nature!

Also, I really don't understand how Kaiser can have a signed 5-year contract with BPA and then when, due to BPA's own mismanagement, the "costs" go up they say, "Oops, our costs went up. Your contract means nothing, it's now going to cost you 60-100% more! Sorry." If any private business tried to pull a stunt like that they would find themselves in court so fast it would make their head swim.

When you consider all that, plus the fact that the snow pack in the mountains are inadequate, reservoirs are being pulled down to historically low levels, power demand continues to grow and no new generating sources can be brought on line for at least two years and I think it is safe to assume that most, if not all of the NW smelters shut down will not be able restart until 2002 or 2003 at the earliest. What do you think is going to happen to all of the workers, salaries, export revenue and associated economic activity that will not be there? Things are looking very bleak indeed for Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana non-urban areas.
Unless we want to see the Aluminum industry disappear from the Pacific NW, BPA must:

(1) Stop exporting our NW power resources out of the region (to California). They created their own problem and they must solve it.
(2) Start managing the NW power resources like a business instead of a social welfare program. Keep costs down for the benefit of all.
(3) Encourage new power generating capacity. Temper environmental radicalism with a little rationality.
(4) Try to keep the Aluminum industry here in the NW. Aluminum is strategically vital to this region and the nation. If you want to see what happens to the Aluminum Industry when you raise electricity rates to the extreme, just look at what happened to Japan in the late 70's.
(5) Don't let BPA use power as a political weapon (as they have been doing for the past year or two) to buy California votes, cozy up to labor unions or score political points with radical environmentalists who would like to see the NW turned into a vast wilderness wasteland.

I am aware that President George W. Bush has initiated a group to develop a comprehensive energy policy for the nation, and that you will be spearheading that effort. You have a daunting and urgent task ahead of you in that regard, especially in light of the total lack of energy policy for the past 8-years by the outgoing administration. The one policy that the prior administration appears to have implemented is converting BPA into an entity hell-bent on killing the NW economy by diverting power outside the region the dams were built for and by using BPA as an enforcement arm for the labor unions and environmental extremists. I believe that the Bush administration is committed to the principle that we must allow free markets and the laws of supply and demand to solve the long term power issues in the NW. I would also strongly encourage you to provide a reasonable transition to that concept that will preserve the Aluminum industry at the same time. Please involve the DSI's in the development of this national energy policy and insist that BPA honor its contracts and operate as an efficient business.

Thank you in advance for your timely assistance in this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Kenneth E. Ries

[Signature]

Kenneth E. Ries
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The demise of the nuclear power plant manufacturing and construction industry in this country, beginning in the late 70's, was due to lack of a National energy policy, opposition from special interest intervenor groups, protracted public hearings and legal delays of construction all of which escalated costs beyond reason. It was not due to documented safety or environmental issues.

I trust that your Task Force will include a thorough reevaluation of nuclear generating plants as a viable alternative for satisfying a major part of the fast growing electricity demand in our society.

Best wishes for your success and thank you for serving,

Lester R. Rogers*

*Retired
Former Director of Regulatory Standards
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
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Mr. Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy  
Energy Department  
Washington, DC  

Dear Secretary Abraham:

As a fellow Michigander, and as one who always voted for you, I wish to make a suggestion, which if adopted, would solve all the present and future energy problems of our nation.

I just read of the meeting in Portland, Oregon where the energy crisis was discussed. The newspaper article goes on to state, "The Bush administration has warned that the federal government will not provide a solution to the problems".

While this may be true, there is a step that the government could take that would go a long ways towards solving everything. And all it takes is a simple stroke of the pen. The step would be to sign the following suggested energy policy:

"Effective immediately I declare a state of emergency in following energy areas; electrical power, natural gas for heating, and gasoline for automobiles. All are in short supply. I urge that we immediately commence building of more power plants (including coal-fired, nuclear, and hydroelectric). exploration and drilling for natural gas, and exploration and drilling for petroleum. To achieve results quickly our primary consideration will be our nation's interest and as such, will be our first consideration. Environmental concerns will be secondary until we as a nation become self-sufficient in all energy areas".

This is the statement President Bush should sign.

To do any less is merely kow-towing to the tree huggers and the environmental wackos who are responsible for putting us in the situation in the first place.

I would like to know your feelings on this.

Sincerely,

Fred Breuninger
February 3, 2001

Secretary Spencer Abraham
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham,

Enclosed for your information and consideration is a copy of a letter that I have sent to Vice President Cheney concerning the Task Force on the formulation of a National Energy Policy, recently announced by President Bush.

We appreciate your willingness to accept the important and difficult responsibilities that you have inherited in the Department of Energy. Our best wishes for your success in this important undertaking.

Sincerely,

Lester R. Rogers
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February 3, 2001

Mr. Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy
Energy Department
Washington, DC

Dear Secretary Abraham:

As a fellow Michigander, and as one who always voted for you, I wish to make a suggestion, which if adopted, would solve all the present and future energy problems of our nation.

I just read of the meeting in Portland, Oregon where the energy crisis was discussed. The newspaper article goes on to state, "The Bush administration has warned that the federal government will not provide a solution to the problems".

While this may be true, there is a step that the government could take that would go a long ways towards solving everything. And all it takes is a simple stroke of the pen. The step would be to sign the following suggested energy policy:

"Effective immediately I declare a state of emergency in following energy areas; electrical power, natural gas for heating, and gasoline for automobiles. All are in short supply. I urge that we immediately commence building of more power plants (including coal-fired, nuclear, and hydroelectric), exploration and drilling for natural gas, and exploration and drilling for petroleum. To achieve results quickly our primary consideration will be our nation's interest and as such, will be our first consideration. Environmental concerns will be secondary until we as a nation become self-sufficient in all energy areas".

This is the statement President Bush should sign.

To do any less is merely kow-towing to the tree huggers and the environmental wackos who are responsible for putting us in the situation in the first place.

I would like to know your feelings on this.

Sincerely,

Fred Breuninger
February 3, 2001

Secretary Spencer Abraham
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham,

Enclosed for your information and consideration is a copy of a letter that I have sent to Vice President Cheney concerning the Task Force on the formulation of a National Energy Policy, recently announced by President Bush.

We appreciate your willingness to accept the important and difficult responsibilities that you have inherited in the Department of Energy. Our best wishes for your success in this important undertaking.

Sincerely,

Lester R. Rogers
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