FROM: silerb@jetfuel.com
NAME: Barry Siler
SUBJECT: Energy Policy
ZIP: 77379
CITY: 
PARM.1: TO:the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
SUBJECT:Consumer Information_Comment_Form
STATE: 
TOPIC: National Security
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: United States
MESSAGE: This is an e-mail sent to you and the President. I have sent the attached e-mail to everyone copied on this e-mail with no response except auto-responders from some. I am also sending this to all via mail in hopes that at least one of you respond and hopefully support me in my effort to become involved in developing and maintaining a pro-active energy policy for National Defense and in support of both industry and the public. In addition to the attached prior e-mails, I would like to recommend that we
MAILADDR: 
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Secretary, The

From: silerb@JETFUEL.COM%internet [silerb@JETFUEL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2001 9:19 AM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Consumer Information Comment Form

FROM: silerb@jetfuel.com
NAME: Barry Siler
SUBJECT: Energy Policy
ZIP:  
CITY:  
PARM.1: TO: the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
SUBJECT:Consumer_Information_Comment_Form
STATE:  
TOPIC: nationalSecurity
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: United States
MESSAGE: This is an e-mail sent to you and the President. I have sent the attached e-mail to everyone copied on this e-mail with no response except auto-responders from some. I am also sending this to all via mail in hopes that at least one of you respond and hopefully support me in my effort to become involved in developing and maintaining a pro-active energy policy for National Defense and in support of both industry and the public. In addition to the attached prior e-mails, I would like to recommend that we
MAILADD:  
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From: dsel@IEEE.ORG\@internet [dsel@IEEE.ORG]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2001 10:19 AM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Consumer Information Comment Form

FROM: dsel@ieee.org
NAME: Don E. Self
SUBJECT: New Energy Policy
ZIP: 86
CITY: __________________________
PARN: TO:thecracy@hq.doe.gov
SUBJECT:Consumer Information_Comment_Form
STATE: 86
TOPIC: Policy
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: USA
MESSAGE: As an energy professional, with 24 years of experience in virtually every facet of the electric power industry, I am excited about the possibility that our country may at last be developing a comprehensive energy policy. I believe I could play a key role in that process, but the job that I am seeking may not yet exist. I would like to present my vision and credentials to the appropriate parties at the DOE. Could you please advise me on the best way to proceed?
MAILADDR: __________________________
FROM: cstein@chem.wisc.edu
NAME: Carol Steinhart
SUBJECT: Energy policy
ZIP:
CITY:
PARMT: TO:the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
SUBJECT:Consumer Information Comment Form
STATB:
TOPIC: Policy
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: phone
COUNTRY: USA
MESSAGE: I am happy that the Bush administration intends to give high priority to developing an energy policy, which this country has never had. A true energy policy will plan for the long term, at least 100 years, while looking broadly even beyond that. A corollary of this is that a true energy policy will be based on designing and implementing our transition from fossil fuels to sustainable energy. It is obvious that if the Arctic oilfields are developed at all, it MUST be in the context of buying time until we.
February 6, 2001

Secretary of Energy
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Av.
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Sir:

I am writing to congratulate you and the Bush administration for giving high priority to the development of an energy policy, something this country has never had. We need an energy policy to plan for the long term (at least 100 years) and look to the even more remote future while laying the initial 100-year plan. This means urgently preparing for a society that does not run on depletable resources.

In the early 1970s I wrote three textbooks for energy and energy policy courses my husband taught at the University of Wisconsin. I objectively discussed the pros and cons of alternative sources and technologies—solar, wind, nuclear, tidal, geothermal, hydrothermal, fuel cells, coal gasification, oil shale, biomass, cogeneration, etc. All had major drawbacks, chiefly economic and environmental; some technologies were still on the drawing board. Much of that has since changed. Solar and wind energy are now economically competitive for some applications and developments in fuel cell technology leave it waiting impatiently in the wings for widespread practical applications. We have the know-how to make alternative technologies practical and economical, especially in combination with continuing improvements in efficiency and conservation.

Changes are happening, but far too slowly, because industry is seeing the light. Why aren’t they happening faster? In large part because Washington has never had an energy policy and has withdrawn most of the minimal support for nonfossil–nuclear energy it once provided. An energy policy must, for example, provide major incentives to make and drive fuel-efficient vehicles. Incentives for improved building standards to minimize heating and cooling requirements. Incentives for rail and other forms of mass transit. Incentives for all those things and more. Provide information, because part of the problem is that the public is uninformed. As long as our intermittent energy “crises” are superficially and reassuringly attributed to corporate greed, public and private mismanagement, international politics, and environmentalists, we won’t face the fact that the root of these so-called crises is the dwindling of conventional resources and our energy thirst, and the problems will become more frequent, prolonged, and severe until the root cause is addressed.

That’s where Washington and the policy part come in. That’s why it’s so critically important to lay the groundwork for a sustainable energy future before it’s too late. Drilling the Arctic oil reserves is a solution to nothing. Don’t perpetrate that cruel hoax; it would be a tragedy for far more than that precious wilderness. Perhaps we will need that oil some day, to use sparingly in the transition to whatever the new energy system looks like. But not now. Please, not now. Exploit the alternatives to the Arctic, not the Arctic. Use that only if there is no alternative. Right now there is a wealth of options, much better ones.

Thank you and good luck!

Sincerely,

Carol E. Steinhart

29582
No Secretary Abraham,

No, No, No!! You’ve got your priorities all wrong! California has led the world into the era of power generation through clean burning natural gas! Activist on the west coast closed Rancho Seco Nuclear Power Plant near Sacramento in 1989 by a petition vote of registered voters in Sacramento County Municipal Utility District. The Trojan Nuclear Power Plant, north of Portland, Oregon was closed by a similar process! We knew from day one how much reserves of natural gas lie under the province of Alberta, Canada and now the news is out on Alaska, the Yukon, and Northwest Territories!

What has been described as your first step toward a Bush energy policy, is in the wrong direction Mr. Secretary!

You’re first step should have been to (along with the FERC) stay in compliance with
the Federal Power Act, which standard's clearly states that utility rates must be kept "JUST AND REASONABLE." Failing to do that, and thus breaking the law, you now dump this Energy Department offering of $95 million in matching grants to increase efficiency and decrease pollution at coal-fired power plants.

Coal burning produces a "whole galaxy of pollutants, including nitrogen oxide, mercury, toxic metals, soot and carbon dioxide."

No, Mr. Secretary, it's time to reverse your current policy, but a cap on wholesale cost of natural gas, and thus come into compliance with federal law.

William Dempsey
February 8, 2001

TO:
Spencer Abraham, Secretary
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

FROM:  
William Quapp

RE: PLANETFEEDBACK INCIDENT NUMBER 489622

Dear Sir or Madam,

Mr. Secretary, I submit the following for your serious consideration. It has been sent to a number of newspapers as a guest opinion.

---

The Moral Imperative for Nuclear Power

William J. Quapp, PE

A few years ago, when confronted by persons who adopted the NIMBY (not in my backyard) philosophy regarding the construction of electric power plants, I took the somewhat smug view of "let them work and live in the dark." I now realize that both of our views are wrong. Power shortages that are now occurring in California, cost all of us in terms of lost productivity, increased consumer prices, and the cost to heat our homes even when we live hundreds of miles away.

In my state, Idaho, natural gas wholesale costs have increased more than 132% in the last two years. As a result, the retail cost of gas to residential users by 48% since July 2000 and additional increases are likely. Our electric companies have announced price increases of around 25% because of the increased cost of power generated by natural gas.

When natural gas is used for home and water heating, the efficiency is over 90% using modern heating systems. Water heating has similar efficiencies, 70% to 90% depending upon the design and age of the water heater. In contrast, when natural gas is used in electricity production, the efficiency is about 50% for the very best and most modern gas-turbine units. The inefficiency (100% - efficiency) at the electric plant is wasted heat which is rejected to the atmosphere.
or to a water cooling source such as a river. Thus, the electric power companies consume great quantities of natural gas and waste nearly half of its energy value to produce electricity.

Effectively, those of us who use natural gas to heat our homes are now paying the increased cost to subsidize electric power generation. Since these increased gas costs cause millions of poor Americans to divert their income to just keep warm, this de facto energy policy is immoral. Burning of natural gas also contributes to the global warming and potential long term environmental problems.

Consequently, the new administration should focus on developing a balanced energy policy that includes nuclear energy as a major component of the National Energy Policy. In the US, we have the nuclear fuel resources for hundreds of years of large scale electric power production. Generating electricity from nuclear power will reduce demand for and lower the cost of natural gas for home heating.

There are 103 operating nuclear generation plants operating safely in the US. Production cost data from the Nuclear Energy Institute (Jan 9, 2001) for 1999, shows the benefit of having a mixed energy source option in the US. This table clearly shows the advantage of nuclear energy in terms of the production cost advantage for 1999. When the year 2000 data are in, we will see a further marked increase in the average price of electricity from natural gas. California rates for December 2000 were reported in the California Price Report on average hourly wholesale prices (a large portion of which is from natural gas) was between 22 to 31 cents/kWh for southern and northern California, respectively.

While ideally the marketplace should decide which energy source to use, I believe that is not good Federal energy policy. The free market does only what is good for the next quarter's profits. It does not invest in infrastructure for the benefit of mankind. That is the job of government. Over the last 25 years, our de facto National Energy Policy has been to ignore nuclear power and presume that natural gas would be the energy of the future. That policy clearly has its weakness; primarily one of spiraling energy costs, shortages, and greenhouse effects. As natural gas became the standard for new power generation, we have seen the surplus disappear and the prices escalate dramatically.

We need a National Energy Policy that advocates clean, safe, and economic nuclear power to be a substantial portion of our energy mix; at least 50%. We also need a regulatory policy that assures that power plant investors get a fair return on their investment and not be subject to the whims of changing state governments, harassment lawsuits, and unreasonable regulation. Widespread nuclear power generation would stabilize the demand and price for natural gas which should be used more efficiently for home and water heating as well as industrial uses.

William Quapp is a nuclear technology and waste management consultant living in and can be contacted at Bill@TetonTechnologies.com

Sincerely,
William Quapp
Bill@TetonTechnologies.com

CC:
Larry E. Craig
Mike Crapo
Michael K. Simpson

http://www.planetfeedback.com

PlanetFeedback.com is a Web site that helps consumers focus and send their feedback directly to companies. The information enables companies to improve customer service and earn consumers' long-term loyalty.


To learn more about our commitment to customer service, go to http://www.planetfeedback.com/manifesto.
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February 8, 2001

TO:
Spencer Abraham, Secretary
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

FROM:
William Quapp
Idaho Falls, ID 83401

RE: PLANETFEEDBACK INCIDENT NUMBER 489622

Dear Sir or Madam,

Mr. Secretary, I submit the following for your serious consideration. It has been sent to a number of newspapers as a guest opinion.

The Moral Imperative for Nuclear Power

A few years ago, when confronted by persons who adopted the NIMBY (not in my backyard) philosophy regarding the construction of electric power plants, I took the somewhat smug view of "let them work and live in the dark." Now I realize that both of our views are wrong. Power shortages that are now occurring in California, cost all of us in terms of lost productivity, increased consumer prices, and the cost to heat our homes even when we live hundreds of miles away.

In my state, Idaho, natural gas wholesale costs have increased more than 132% in the last two years. As a result, the retail cost of gas to residential users by 48% since July 2000 and additional increases are likely. Our electric companies have announced price increases of around 25% because of the increased cost of power generated by natural gas.

When natural gas is used for home and water heating, the efficiency is over 90% using modern heating systems. Water heating has similar efficiencies; 70% to 90% depending upon the design and age of the water heater. In contrast, when natural gas is used in electricity production, the efficiency is about 50% for the very best and most modern gas turbine units. The inefficiency (100% - efficiency) at the electric plant is wasted heat which is rejected to the atmosphere.

William J. Quapp, PE

Secretary, The
or to a water cooling source such as a river. Thus, the electric power companies consume great quantities of natural gas and waste nearly half of its energy value to produce electricity.

Effectively, those of us who use natural gas to heat our homes are now paying the increased cost to subsidize electric power generation. Since these increased gas costs cause millions of poor Americans to divert their income to just keep warm, this de facto energy policy is immoral. Burning of natural gas also contributes to the global warming and potential long term environmental problems.

Consequently, the new administration should focus on developing a balanced energy policy that includes nuclear energy as a major component of the National Energy Policy. In the US, we have the nuclear fuel resources for hundreds of years of large scale electric power production. Generating electricity from nuclear power will reduce demand for and lower the cost of natural gas for home heating.

There are 103 operating nuclear generation plants operating safely in the US. Production cost data from the Nuclear Energy Institute (Jan 9, 2001) for 1999, shows the benefit of having a mixed energy source option in the US. This table clearly shows the advantage of nuclear energy in terms of the production cost advantage for 1999. When the year 2000 data are in, we will see a further marked increase in the average price of electricity from natural gas. California rates for December 2000 were reported in the California Price Report on average hourly wholesale prices (a large portion of which is from natural gas) was between 22 to 31 cents/kWh for southern and northern California, respectively.

While ideally the marketplace should decide which energy source to use, I believe that is not good Federal energy policy. The free market does only what is good for the next quarter’s profits. It does not invest in infrastructure for the benefit of mankind. That is the job of government. Over the last 25 years, our de facto National Energy Policy has been to ignore nuclear power and presume that natural gas would be the energy of the future. That policy clearly has its weakness; primarily one of spiraling energy costs, shortages, and greenhouse effects. As natural gas became the standard for new power generation, we have seen the surplus disappear and the prices escalate dramatically.

We need a National Energy Policy that advocates clean, safe, and economic nuclear power to be a substantial portion of our energy mix; at least 50%. We also need a regulatory policy that assures that power plant investors get a fair return on their investment and not be subject to the whims of changing state governments, harassment lawsuits, and unreasonable regulation. Widespread nuclear power generation would stabilize the demand and price for natural gas which should be used more efficiently for home and water heating as well as industrial uses.

William Quapp is a nuclear technology and waste management consultant living in Idaho Falls, ID and can be contacted at Bill@TetonTechnologies.com

Sincerely,
William Quapp
Bill@TetonTechnologies.com

CC:
Larry E. Craig
Mike Crapo
Michael K. Simpson

Planefeedback.com is a Web site that helps consumers focus and send their feedback directly to companies. The information enables companies to improve customer service and earn consumers' long-term loyalty.


To learn more about our commitment to customer service, go to http://www.planefeedback.com/manifesto.
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Fax Memo

Date       Feb 9, 2001
To         The Honorable Spencer Abraham
           Secretary of Energy
           Fax 202 586 4403
From       Dale Steffes
           Tel
           Subject U. S. Energy Policy

Page 1 of 5

Attached are copies of a fax (4 pages) I sent to Vice President Cheney a week ago.

You may recall that I sent you our proposed 1993 National Energy Stability Policy on Jan 17, 2001, which was timed to arrive the day the Administration changed over.

I was pleased to see coverage of your address to the Senate Armed Forces Committee where you stated "and could set a maximum allowable amount for imported energy".

It would be my honor to communicate with you and your committee on this policy. Let me know how I can be of service.
Dear Spencer Abraham:  

February 9, 2001

Hi! I saw you getting grilled last night on cspan. I thought you did pretty well. And congratulations on your appointment to the Secretary of Energy position! Many of the questions dealt with the lack of an energy policy, and the lack of good morale at the DOE and many other questions dealt with nuclear energy and the nuclear waste cleanup mess. As I'm sure you know, and as none of your questioners wanted to come out and say, they are essentially the same question.

I am pretty sure what the true situation is, but I wanted to get a reality check and see if you have the same thinking, or have a different view of the situation with nuclear power, nuclear waste, and a rational energy policy.

1. Any rational national energy policy is going to have to include new nuclear power plants, nationwide transport and safe underground storage of nuclear waste, and the immediate cleanup of lots of toxic nuclear hazards.

2. But any mention of transporting nuclear waste, let alone NEW nuclear power plants is political suicide because of the fear people have about it.

So: we don't have a national energy policy, because we can't make one without committing political suicide. Because we can't have a unified policy, the morale at DOE sucks, and the energy situation across the country is in chaos, the nuclear waste continues to rot in barrels in railroad cars on sidings near Denver (OK, that's hyperbole, it was there a couple of years ago...) and really dangerous nuclear waste cleanup situations continue to fester across the country. A couple of months ago, 4 grams of plutonium were trucked through Flint on their way to Canada to a treatment plant and people across the state practically went ballistic in their opposition. Do you know how big 4 grams of plutonium is? About the size of a grain of mustard seed.

I don't know about you, but I grew up on a farm, and if you didn't take care of a
problem, sometimes that brought about a real disaster. You can pile the manure up in back of the barn for a while, but sometime or other you had to take care of it, or it started to cause real problems.

I think you have an opportunity to serve the people of the United States and the world by taking the bull by the horns and solving these problems quickly. If you emphasize that your purpose is to SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS, that left unsolved, THESE PROBLEMS CAN KILL US, and that you welcome help, not opposition, in solving these problems.

The opposition to nuclear waste transport, and new nuclear plants is caused by fear, mistrust and a sense of betrayal. (OK, there is also a lot of political grandstanding that politicians can do while making statements opposing any nuclear project.) You must admit, these are completely justified feelings, and should not be minimized, they must be dealt with in order to solve the problems.

I think you need to invite the organized opposition, and the fearful leaders and followers INTO the system to try and SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS. Political grandstanding needs to be neutralized by making it clear that any opposition to solving the problems is the UNSAFE alternative. Maintaining the status quo is the UNSAFE alternative. All it takes is one tornado to hit one above ground storage building to make it real clear that above ground storage is unsafe.

We need to solve the problem of energy, nuclear power, nuclear waste and low morale. Or it will kill us.

We need to deal with the fears of the people and the opposition of several radical and not-so-radical groups before we can solve the energy problems.

I think you need to make it clear to people that you are committed to SOLVING THESE PROBLEMS, that NOT dealing with the nuclear waste, and opposing any transport or underground solutions is the UNSAFE action, and that you need to have THEIR input and care in finding a solution. You may need to real
ize a loud
political uproar is a good thing in this case, as it means lots of peo-
ple care and want
to be included in the solution of the problems. A good quarterback doe-
sn't shrink
from a challenge, but leadership leads, through overcoming a challenge.

We probably need to include people along the routes of any transport,
and a wide
scattering of neighbors of any nuclear plants, processing plants, and
underground
storage facilities in a network of radiation monitoring (simple, inexp-
ensive geiger
counters are available for distribution) possibly along with a monthly
stipend, in
order to convince people we are not lying to them about whatever solu-	ion is in
progress, and we want them to be part of the solution. A lot of effort
will need to be
directed to education and to including suspicious and hostile neighbor-
s into the
effort to solve the problem.

As a people, we are afraid of nuclear power, and we have been lied to
about the
safety of nuclear power plants. We feel betrayed, and any solution to
the nuclear
power problem, the energy problem and the nuclear waste transportation
and
containment problem is going to have to acknowledge that betrayal, tha-
that fear,
overcome the resentment, and build an architecture of trust and mutual
care in order
to succeed.

That is what needs to happen before we can start cleaning up the nucle-
ar waste
mess. We need to start cleaning up the nuclear waste mess before we c
an start
talking about new nuclear power plants. We need to start talking abou-
t including
nuclear power before we can have a rational discussion of the energy p
olicy of the
United States.

And all this needs to happen before we can have a national energy poli-
cy.

Is this how you see it?
Sincerely,

Harmon Everett

harmoneverett@H

Many people think that the government caused all nuclear radiation and if they can prevent any nuclear activity from being in their backyard or transported through their area or state, they are keeping themselves safe. They need to be disabused of this notion and educated about normal background radiation. I suggest giving out inexpensive radiation detectors to schools and news organizations and having them available on request to interested citizens of the US, and also publishing daily "radiation" weather reports to the national news media about the background radiation in select different parts of the country to familiarize everybody about the truth about radiation. Lies, ignorance and fears about radiation allow demagogues to rally a suspicious population in opposition to our just cause. We want informed intelligent debate, not demagoguery. If people get used to the idea that there is a wash of radiation around them continually anyway, transporting some radioactivity safely through the neighborhood may not be so objectionable.
Mr. Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy
Department of Energy Headquarters
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20585

9 February 2001

Dear Sir,

I feel that after eight years of doing little, the Department of Energy (DoE) must develop a coherent energy policy that sets forth the goals and priorities of the Department. This Policy must then be implemented in accordance with an integrated plan that defines the schedules and budgets associated with each of the various tasks. This program will include such tasks as:

a) A PR program to convince the general public that gas guzzling SUV's are not cool for shopping and going to work. Hybrid electric vehicles are the “in” way to go. This will reduce the amount of oil used for transportation, and the amount of vehicle generated pollution.

b) We have the technology to convert nuclear waste into “bricks” which can be transported and stored safely. Let’s do it, then mount a PR campaign to convince the public that nuclear power is clean and safe. After all, France generates about 40% of its electricity from nuclear power stations, we could do that also.

c) As a result of R&D efforts by industrial and national laboratories, equipment has been developed and tested which dramatically reduces the energy losses associated with the control and transportation of electric power. This equipment uses superconductivity to achieve energy savings. Let’s use this technology.

d) Across the great southwest one sees hundreds of wind powered generators, many of which are standing still due to reliability problems. The DoE should support the reliability studies and corrective actions necessary to put those machines back on line.

e) The United States has large reserves of coal that are not as widely used for power generation as they could be because coal is considered a “dirty” fuel. We have the technology to process coal into a cleaner burning fuel, but the current processes are relatively expensive. The DoE should support further research and development of a less expensive process.

The list goes on and on, there is much to do. The foregoing are examples of tasks intended to provide the United States with more energy at lower cost, and to reduce our dependence on foreign oil which places us at the mercy of international politics.

You need someone (not a politician) with the education, the training, and the experience necessary to manage such a program. I am that person and I WANT THAT SLOT.
My background is that of a Professional Engineer with 40+ years of experience, mostly in the aerospace world where planning, budgets, and schedules are a way of life. I did spend my last years on the DoE sponsored Superconducting Super Collider Laboratory (SSCL) program in Texas. I took early retirement when that program was cancelled.

I am bored with retirement and desire to get back to what I do best – manage large, complex programs.

I am available for further discussions at your convenience and hope to hear from you.

Sincerely,

John E. Matz

29595

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

I am writing in regard to the National Energy Policy Development Group you are heading. The development of a national energy policy is vitally important and is long overdue.

The fact that the Bush administration's best idea is drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, however, should be embarrassing. While President Bush tries to convince Congress and the public that drilling ANWR is a super idea, PacifiCorp announced the construction of the world's largest wind farm, on the Oregon-Washington border. The Tennessee Valley Authority will soon be offering electricity generated through solar power. Citizens in Washington are finding ways to cut energy consumption by 10%. When gas prices rose quickly last year, people complained but they also increased carpooling and use of mass transit. Organizations across the country are encouraging conservation, development of renewable resources, reduction of pollution and protection of wildlife habitat. America is trying to make real progress on energy. It would be great if the federal government would at least catch up with us, if not provide leadership.

I'm sure you have seen all of the facts showing that drilling ANWR would be shortsighted, uneconomical, and a blatant pander to the oil companies, so I will not repeat them here. I am writing to urge you to drop drilling ANWR from your list of considerations. Drilling any part of ANWR is unconscionable. ANWR should instead be designated as a national monument. I urge you to focus on the long list of progressive steps toward a responsible national energy policy, including:

- Raise vehicle fuel efficiency
- Raise fuel taxes
- Provide incentives for purchase of alternative fuel vehicles
- Encourage and support enhanced oil recovery from existing wells
- Encourage and support gas-to-liquid technology use near Prudhoe Bay (BP/Exxon/Mobil still make money)
- Remove market barriers to renewable (non-nuclear) energy
- Switch governmental promotion and support from nuclear power to renewable power
- Support Senator Jeffords' Clean Energy Act

Most Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rebecca L. Smith
February 10, 2001

Mr. Spencer Abraham, Secretary
US Dept of Energy
100 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Abraham,

I am writing in regard to the National Energy Policy Development Group you are heading. The development of a national energy policy is vitally important and is long overdue.

The fact that the Bush administration's best idea is drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, however, should be embarrassing. While President Bush tries to convince Congress and the public that drilling ANWR is a super idea, PacifiCorp announced the construction of the world's largest wind farm, on the Oregon-Washington border. The Tennessee Valley Authority will soon be offering electricity generated through solar power. Citizens in Washington are finding ways to cut energy consumption by 10%. When gas prices rose quickly last year, people complained but they also increased car-pooling and use of mass transit. Organizations across the country are encouraging conservation, development of renewable resources, reduction of pollution and protection of wildlife habitat. America is trying to make real progress on energy. It would be great if the federal government would at least catch up with us, if not provide leadership.

I'm sure you have seen all of the facts showing that drilling ANWR would be shortsighted, uneconomical, and a blatant pander to the oil companies, so I will not repeat them here. I am writing to urge you to drop drilling ANWR from your list of considerations. Drilling any part of ANWR is unconscionable. ANWR should instead be designated as a national monument. I urge you to focus on the long list of progressive steps toward a responsible national energy policy, including:

- Raise vehicle fuel efficiency
- Raise fuel taxes
- Provide incentives for purchase of alternative fuel vehicles
- Encourage and support enhanced oil recovery from existing wells
- Encourage and support gas-to-liquid technology use near Prudhoe Bay (BP/Exxon/Mobil still make money)
- Remove market barriers to renewable (non-nuclear) energy
- Switch governmental promotion and support from nuclear power to renewable power
- Support Senator Jeffords Clean Energy Act

Most Sincerely,

Rebecca L. Smith

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
The enclosed reports offer information and solutions for:

1. Nuclear waste reduction by converting the presently stored waste to electrical energy!
2. Conserving world non-renewable resources.
3. Protection from diversion of Plutonium into the wrong hands.
5. Global warming due to the burning of fossil fuels.
6. A viable replacement for our light water nuclear reactors, as they are retired from service.

Please read the enclosed reports!!!! They offer the possibility of energy for generations to come, including the benefits listed above.

I am a degreed physicist with no ties to the Nuclear Industry. I write this as a concerned citizen, with hopes it will reach enough people that have the future of the U.S., and indeed the World, in their hands, and they will have the foresight to act upon this information without political ramifications.

If you have any questions, or if I can be of any service, please contact me:

Robert A. Clarke
Tel:
Fax:

Copy: President George W. Bush
U.S. Senator John Ensign
U.S Senator Harry Reid
NV Governor Kenny Guinn
Las Vegas Mayor Oscar Goodman
U.S Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham
February 11, 2001

Dear Secretary Abraham,

I strongly protest the suspension of environmental laws and public input in the chaotic and unnecessary rush to build more power plants and mine more oil, natural gas, and coal. Generating capacity is NOT the root cause of this perceived energy crisis. The problem is lack of money, lack of incentives to conserve, and lack of a balanced regulatory and marketing system. I note that the majority of the world is able to function very well with much less energy per person/household than the amount used in the US.

To bypass environmental laws and public input, even temporarily, is a very bad precedent. It is also an unacceptable disservice to the current and future generations which will have to cope with the ensuing exhaustion of nonrenewable resources, polluted and toxic environment, and reduced quality of life. If you abandon common sense and sustainable development, you significantly endanger human health, the carrying capacity of earth, and our capability to survive on this planet.

I urge you NOT to waive environmental laws and public input in the development of a local, state or national energy plan.

Instead, I urge you to comply with the publicly supported environmental laws and to seriously consider citizen input. I also ask you to strongly press for conservation incentives. These incentives could include: increased prorated energy rates, rolling or timed blackouts of residential areas during the day, energy police [there is no obvious conservation occurring in my neighborhood - lots of christmas and regular lights are on all night], and special exemptions to rate increases for essential services such as hospitals, farmers (where the energy is key in saving a crop), and fire/police stations.

Your ability to look beyond the immediate "crisis" and to consider the long-term sustainability of this country, its people, and the entire Earth, would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Laura Fujii
From: Patricia Hoffman
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2001 12:35 PM
To: Carter, Douglas
Subject: Re: Electricity outline for the WhiteHouse

Joseph Galdo
02/14/2001 12:29 PM
To: Patricia Hoffman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: White House Electric Outline

Attached is my input for item #1. There is a little overlap with Phil's
this is what I have to date. [ ] b(5)

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
From: Friday, February 16, 2001 1:03 PM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Consumer Information Comment Form

FROM:
NAME: Nita Spracklen
SUBJECT: resume
ZIP:
CITY:
PARM.1: TO:the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
SUBJECT:Consumer_Information_Comment_Form
STATE: OH
TOPIC: Policy
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: USA
MESSAGE: February 16, 2001 U.S. Department of Energy 1000 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, DC 20585
Dear Sir: You will discover from the enclosed resume that I have a results-oriented background with extensive experience working in the trenches of deregulation of the electricity and natural gas markets. I am very interested in offering my expertise where ever it is needed in the development of a National Energy Policy. My skills and talents have been applied successfully in the deregulated
MAILADDR: 958 Hidden Ridge Drive