Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

February 21, 2001

Dr. Steven C. Barrowes

Dear Dr. Barrowes:

Thank you for your letter of January 12, 2001, to Secretary Abraham regarding nuclear power and our Nation’s energy policy. Your letter was forwarded to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology for reply.

As you stated in your letter, you believe nuclear power should have a prominent role in our national energy policy. I concur. For this to happen, it is vital that existing nuclear power plants continue to operate economically and safely. In addition, the Department of Energy (DOE) is working to ensure that nuclear power remains a viable energy alternative for power generators in the future. A number of initiatives at stimulating new investments in power generating capacity across the Nation are being explored. I assure you that nuclear power is one of those options.

Through the license renewal process for current nuclear plants, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has demonstrated a predictable and reasonably bounded approach that can lead to the relicensing of almost all of the currently operating nuclear units. Further, DOE has worked closely with NRC and the nuclear industry, and as a result of our collaborations, there are today three different standardized plant designs certified for construction by NRC. NRC has adopted a risk-informed approach that should allow for greater regulatory efficiencies in the future, and DOE is beginning to work with NRC to address issues associated with licensing future nuclear power plants. As for reimbursements to the industry from the Carter era moratorium on reprocessing, this matter has been settled in the courts.

For more specifics on current DOE policies and activities, I encourage you to explore DOE’s Strategic Plan at the Web site www.energy.gov and the Strategic Plan for Nuclear Energy at www.nuclear.gov.

Thank you for sharing your ideas and concerns.

Sincerely,

Gail H. Marcus
Principal Deputy Director
Office of Nuclear Energy,
Science and Technology
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MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY

FROM: Margot Anderson
Acting Director
Office of Policy

SUBJECT: Response to letter from Wilma Delaney, V.P. for Government Relations, Dow Chemical Co.
MESSAGE: Please support a United States Energy Policy that encourages research and development of alternative energy sources, especially ethanol and wind turbines. As we look to become more self-sufficient and less dependent on the middle east when it comes to energy, we need to encourage and support the efforts to develop alternative energy sources here in the US. Drilling for oil on US land is NOT the best solution. We will be right back where we are today in just a few years. In page A2 of the Tues,
To: Secretary, The

Subject: Policy

NAME: Norman Haan
SUBJECT: Policy
ZIP: 
CITY: 
PARM: TO:the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
STATE: 
TOPIC: New Sources of Energy
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: U.S.

MESSAGE: It appears to me that the Clinton administration had no energy policy resulting in shortages which are costing us heavily. I would like to see efforts to develop new sources of energy. We can get beyond the dependence on oil. What about garbage, agricultural products, nuclear waste, sea water? There are many other things. I am not a scientist, but we have tremendous technology today discovering new avenues and products. Car efficiency can also be increased very much. Give us a good energy policy and...
Many scientists have given long, hard, thought to the issue of power infrastructure in the United States. Please find some ideas that draw their origin from this community that might help in your efforts to form a National Energy Policy. I would be most pleased if you would consider seriously this input.

Increase available power to the National grid:

1. Solar panels on the roofs of homes in the sun belt. For an average home, 6-10 thousand dollars will install sufficient solar collectors to power the entire home during the day and will result in power being returned to the grid by the user, reducing their power bill. In the evening, the user will rely upon the local grid and power producers, however, the consumption will be much reduced. A user could easily make money in this process. Provide incentives for people to install these.

2. Make the hard choice and increase reliance on non-fossil fuel and domestic sources of power. These include solar, hydro, wind, and nuclear. Not only will this increase the available power to the National grid but also meet our International obligation to reduce fossil-fuel-produced greenhouse gases. The reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as well as the increased reliance on other renewable sources should appease many of the environmental groups. (Reminder, nuclear energy is renewable in that it can produce its own fuel. In addition, some limited reprocessing would permit extraction of HIGHLY valuable and rare medical radioactive isotopes for cancer, thyroid and other treatments.) Make this hard choice.

Reduce reliance on foreign sources:

3. Decrease reliance on non-US sources. While increasing the available electrical power to the grid via points 1 and 2, natural gas sources (our own) become available for such things as hybrid automobiles. Provide significantly increased incentives to use alternate powered vehicles and mandate that current gas stations be provided resources by the parent oil companies to provide distribution as part of their service (rapid chargers, natural gas). The use of gas-electric hybrid vehicles is a likely solution.

Reform the regulatory process and reduce NIMBY:

4. Reduce and streamline the regulatory process of getting approval to build new plants. Provide incentives to the local communities to build plants to reduce the "not in my back yard" (NIMBY) syndrome. People seeing their schools and cities benefit from a yearly "bonus" for having a local power plant (in the form of additional resources for their school or the like) would be much less likely to suffer.
NIMBY.

Educate:

5. Make nuclear power less ominous. Provide information on the use of nuclear power in other countries, such as France, and the improvements made over the 1960s technology used in Chernobyl and Three-Mile Island. People are afraid and they should not be. The ONLY way to solve that is for an organized government-driven education program.

I thank you for taking the time to read this. I really believe that some of these ideas should be incorporated in the US National Energy policy and would be more than willing the help with such. I have provided these ideas to you as a US Citizen.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Kreek
A concerned Livermore Laboratory scientist and US Citizen
DEAR MR. SECRETARY, I WOULD URGE YOU, AS YOU DEVELOP YOUR ENERGY PLAN FOR THE NEW ADMINISTRATION, TO PUT IN PLACE INCENTIVES FOR R & D AND USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES. ENVIRONMENTALLY THIS IS THE ONLY COURSE THAT MAKES SENSE. ALSO, IF WE CONTINUE TO RELY ON FOSSIL FUELS WE ARE LEAVING FUTURE GENERATIONS WITH HUGE PROBLEM WHEN THE EARTH RUNS OUT OF FOSSIL FUEL. SINCERELY, ANDY DEMAIN
March 5, 2001

President Bush
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20500

Dear President Bush,

I am writing to express my concern, and disappointment, with the recently released energy plan.

First, allow me to say that I believe the "energy crisis" we can hear so much about is greatly exaggerated. I have repeatedly seen news reports indicating that a sufficient supply of energy presently exists. The shortfall at the consumer level appears a likely consequence of delivery not production. Even California's distress seems more the result of corporate greed, poor regulation (or lack thereof), and excessive demand, than a shortage of production.

Consequently, your energy plan relies far to heavily on increased production and far to little on conservation. You would have us hand our public lands over to the same company's that are reporting record profits as of late (according to ExxonMobil's last quarterly earnings report, and the record profit stated therein, they also seem to have no trouble with our nation's current supply and demand status). This, in order to put more fuel into excessively inefficient SUV's, trucks, and vehicles of all kinds. Additionally, the short-term issue of exorbitant prices is not addressed. Even our homes have not been brought forward to the efficiency standards that are technologically obtainable. Sacrificing the Artic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to provide fossil fuels to this unnecessarily gluttonous appetite is unreasonable.

If we could (though, I strongly doubt it's possible) to drill, mine, and nuke our way out of the current energy shortfall it would come at a horrible price to our public health, and the environment. Your plan would ask us to destroy environmentally sensitive public lands while at the same time generating more pollution in the form of CO2 and other greenhouse gases, nuclear waste, and toxic spillage.

I believe the better way to solve our country's energy problems lie in putting forth an energy plan that places stronger emphasis on energy conservation and renewable power. Much more aggressive measures than the 42 listed within your plan. The U.S. Department of Energy has indicated that this alone can meet 60% of our nation's needs. Producing vehicles with a fuel economy only 3 miles to the gallon better would, in itself, over ten years save more oil than ANWR is likely to generate. Developing and implementing a more balanced strategy would even answer today's energy concerns sooner.

Please consider supporting a plan that is a more realistic, balanced, and environmentally sound solution to our nation's energy needs than has been put forth by your administration.

Yours,

Todd Abbotts
FROM: John Coolidge
SUBJECT: Nuclear Energy
ZIP:
CITY:
PAR:1: the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
STATE:
TOPIC: Energy Policy
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: Email
COUNTRY: usa
MESSAGE: I understand that an energy policy is under review. I urge that Nuclear Power be given a strong place at the table. We have allowed a small, liberal and I must say, left-wing minority to dictate our policies towards nuclear power. Ever since Three-Mile Island the government has been in a defensive posture. It reminds me of the Tet Offensive in the Vietnam war. We won the battle but the news media distorted and swayed the American people against the war on the basis of our "defeat." Similarly
In the emerging comprehensive energy policy that I have heard President Bush and Vice President Cheney speak of, what comparative effort will be made to seek out clean and renewable energy sources? Can and will this government encourage the development of a fuel cell industry while keeping its oil and utility business lobbyists happy? Was Mr. Cheney indeed an executive for an oil company in between his public service years? Seeing that we have never performed an experiment on our Earth to truly understand
Department of Energy  
Washington, DC 20585  
March 6, 2001

Mr. I. Arthur Hoekstra, PE

Dear Mr. Hoekstra:

Thank you for your recent letter, which offered recommendations on how to increase the use of garbage as a source of energy for the generation of heat and electricity.

As you know, one of President Bush's first acts was creating a National Energy Policy Development Group, headed by Vice President Cheney, to help the private sector and government at all levels, promote dependable, affordable, and environmentally sound production and distribution of energy for the future. This group includes the Secretary of Energy, as well as the Secretaries of the Treasury, Interior, Agriculture and Commerce Departments, the heads of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, the President's Deputy Chief of Staff for Policy, and the Assistants to the President for Economic Policy and Intergovernmental Affairs.

The group will consider the ideas and recommendations of consumers, businesses, and independent experts on how best to address the broad range of energy issues now facing the Nation, including rapidly rising costs for natural gas, electricity supply and price problems in the West and the increasing dependence of the United States on imported oil. Your specific suggestions will be made known to participants in this process.

Thank you for writing.

Sincerely,

Margot Anderson  
Acting Director  
Office of Policy
Attached are the 6 requested options papers for C&PS.

I have not included the

I have not incorporated three items which we may wish to include:

[Files attached]

Doug Carter (FE-26)
US DOE
Washington, DC 20585
202-586-9684

[This email uses 100% recycled electrons.]
March 8, 2001

The Honorable Richard G. Lugar
United States Senator
306 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-1401

Dear Senator Lugar:

Ref: Ltr to you Senator, April 8, 2000, "The New Petroleum"

My Foreign Affairs, January/February 1999, issue, so dog-eared and soiled, I now circulate only my photo copies of your essay, "The New Petroleum"

It is written that the Bush budget includes, "...a sharp cut for energy-efficiency and renewable-energy research."

At one point during the campaign, I read that candidate Bush would cut out funding for ethanol research. Whether direct government funding for R&D costs or playing games with tax dollars generates the greater benefit is beyond my math ability.

Given that Texas is home for a large number of oil drilling equipment firms and that the Bush family is satisfied with the petroleum industry's future revenue generating possibilities from oil leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska, it is safe to assume that for political reasons, and self interest, it would be counterproductive that the administration support an alternative-energy program at this time.

With California's energy distribution fiasco, and the cry for more distribution lines and oil-fired generating plants, it becomes ever more certain that, "The United States cannot wait for the next energy crisis to marshal its intellectual and industrial resources." Drilling in Alaska for a quick solution to either of these problems is excessively optimistic. I feel that the president's energy plans for the future will lead to disaster unless people of knowledge, foresight, power and influence succeed in bringing about a change in the types of fuel we burn to generate electricity.

Your knowledge, your foresight, your place in our society is all we can hope for. We cannot do it alone. Your excellent essay, "The New Petroleum", is the most convincing piece I have ever read on the subject. I'm a Washington state resident and, of course, my vote must be cast, if cast at all, for candidates of our state, but the nature of this energy thing affects us all, if not the entire world.
I hope you and your staff will continue to work toward educating the American people... if nicotine is injurious to your health... "Our growing dependence on increasingly scarce Middle Eastern oil..." is far more deadly. We need another George Orwell Novelist to do a frightening, "Two Thousand Eighty Four" thriller—a bit more engrossing than non fiction, boring reality—a thriller to seize and take hold of our impaired, attention deficit readers' popular imagination, to drive home the possible catastrophic implications of world wide dependence on Middle Eastern oil.

Our country needs your help, Senator Lugar.

Sincerely,

Robin D. Cook

cc. Spencer Abraham,
Secretary of Energy
March 8, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary Of Energy
Department Of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue SW

Dear Secretary Abraham:

Will you please briefly comment on your views, your philosophy concerning the country's energy policies? In particular, will you address our concerns, both clearly addressed, and to those implied in the letter sent to Senator Lugar?

Thank you, Mr. Secretary,

Irina Cooley
R.D. Cooley
Rubin D. and Irina G. Cooley


We will appreciate your comments.
March 12, 2001

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

Dear Secretary of Energy Abraham:

I have high hopes for the new administration, and I feel it can be a great administration if it realizes the opportunity it has to proceed with vision on the country’s energy policy. While America should have made efforts to become energy independent right after the “energy crisis” of 1973, I don’t feel that this lack of initiative means that we should now drill for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or in other pristine natural areas.

Americans want to save land of unspoiled natural character. These areas should be off limits to the disturbances of man and are of increasingly greater value as the country grows in population and development. Wild places should be large to preserve viable wildlife populations and because large unfragmented tracts are the true character of wilderness. The administration I hope will uphold these values, for public lands are our best chance to maintain the integrity of nature itself on this continent. I ask you to consider how incredible America’s landscape is.

Though the subject of energy independence is one of national security, I feel that with real vision our nation can meet its energy needs and still protect this wonderful country. We don’t believe the oil industry experts who say oil extraction can be accomplished without destruction of sensitive areas—any human activity changes these special areas.

Therefore, I ask you to embark on a courageous path of showing real leadership to conserve energy—our citizens need your inspiration to turn off unused lights, shut windows so the heat doesn’t escape from a building, purchase energy-efficient cars and appliances. I’m referring to great leadership, like during World War II, when we faced the challenge with unity and purpose. This administration could rally the people on a grassroots campaign to accomplish the goal of not wasting energy. The work of Amory Lovins and others demonstrates that energy efficiency alone can get our nation out of the jam we’re in. Add to that the development of alternative sources of energy, and America could leave its wild open spaces alone for future generations to appreciate.

Sincerely,

James Stone
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 Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002
MESSAGE: Dear Mr. Abraham, Greetings. Congratulations on your appointment, and I hope all is well so far in this rather tumultuous term. I am writing to pass along the text from an original letter I sent President Bush today regarding his about-face on his campaign pledge to seek a uniform, federal role in regulating carbon dioxide emissions from power plants in national energy policy. To say the least, we were dismayed and outraged, and hope you will do what you can to redirect federal energy policy towards a...
United States Department of Energy
Secretary Spencer Abraham
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham,

The energy crisis affecting this country, and more particularly the west coast, is no more a crisis than a hangover is. Our problems with energy prices and energy availability is due completely to our gluttony, our over indulgence, our irresponsible disregard for our actions.

I find it disgraceful that the leaders of our country are so willing to abandon long term preservation of our environment, the health of our environment, our ecosystems, and ultimately our personal health, to alleviate our energy hangover, to pander to our adolescent-like irresponsibility.

It is time for the leaders of our country, for you, to act like leaders and plan for the long term. We need an energy policy that has a long term objective, a 20 year objective.

The policy must have objectives that encompass the things that are important to the prosperity of our country, our livelihoods, our personal health, and the health of our environment.

This long term plan must address:
Diversity of energy sources,
   Developing new energy sources,
   Clean, non-polluting energy sources, (the inability to address the detoxification of the waste from nuclear power plants makes such nuclear energy a very, very poor, short sighted choice for energy generation)
   Organic/renewable sources such as ethanol, organic petroleum,
   Fuel Cell technology,
   Solar,
   Wind.
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This long term plan must address:

Wise use of energy, energy conservation.
Investing in mass transportation, (trains, and particularly electric trains can be powered from sources of energy that will never usable on aircraft).
Investing in the development of new "engines".
Investing in the development of new lighting technologies, new heating technologies.

It is time for the leaders to start thinking 15, 20, 40 years out. Set up the foundation, get moving on the investment, the research that will help future generations address these issues.

Start thinking about future generations, not about future elections.

Sincerely,

Erik Miller
Mr. John Castle

Dear Mr. Castle:

I am responding to your fax of March 27 to Secretary Abraham that requested information on national energy policy plans, energy subsidies and nuclear power plants.

I am enclosing a copy of the most recent national energy policy plan, the Comprehensive National Energy Strategy (1998). I am also enclosing a copy of "Powering the New Economy," issued by the Department in September, 2000. Copies of the other energy policy plans that you requested are no longer available.

A 1999 report by the Department's Energy Information Administration provides an assessment of government interventions and subsidies related to energy. A copy is accessible at the following webpage: http://www.eia.doe.gov/booksshelf/finance.html

For the information on U.S. nuclear power plants, please contact the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Their webpage is: http://www.nrc.gov/

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

Sincerely,

Marge Anderson
Acting Director
Office of Policy

Enclosures
Hon. Richard Cheney  
Vice-President of the United States  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Washington, D.C.  
20500

Subject: California Electricity Problems-- And Potential  
Use Of U.S. Patent No. 4,686,325 To Help Mitigate  
Certain Transmission Line Power Transfer  
Bottlenecks.

Dear Mr. Vice-President,

On Jan. 27, 2001, I wrote to Hon. Spencer Abraham and  
Governor Gray Davis and included a significant package  
of supporting materials concerning the subject Patent  
which is entitled "CATENARY SAG ADJUSTMENT USING ADDED  
WEIGHTS" (copies of above included for your information).  
I also sent a follow-up letter today asking what I can  
do to initiate a dialogue on this innovative technique.

Without repeating the details included earlier, this  
Patent has the potential to increase the power-carrying  
ability of certain existing clearance-limited and  
sag-limited electrical transmission lines in a  
cost-effective, timely, and environmentally sensitive  
manner to help alleviate various existing transmission  
line bottlenecks! These limitations exacerbate the basic  
generation shortage problems in various regions of the  
country.

Since President Bush has recently appointed you to lead  
a high-level Task Force to develop a national energy  
policy (which necessarily includes the component of  
electrical transmission problems), I request that you  
and/or your Staff review these Patent Materials and make  
this information available to your Task Force for their  
consideration.

I hope that a review of this Patent leads to some solutions
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to the transmission line inadequacies that worsen the overall energy problems. Certainly, potential usage of this Patent, which effectively "squeezes" additional power transfer capacity out of existing lines warrants serious study.

By copy of this letter, I am also taking this opportunity to inform Hon. Billy Tauzin, Hon. Christy Todd Whitman, Hon. Curt Hebert, executives of three of California’s major utilities and others about this Patent by also furnishing them with the package of detailed Patent information.

Thank you for your consideration of my initiative and I look forward to being contacted by interested parties to begin a dialogue on this matter. Also, I have a small model that demonstrates the basic workings of this Patent and I would be happy to meet with appropriate people to personally explain the benefits and usage of the Patent.

Respectfully,

Ronald Marsico

Enclosures:

Copies: Hon. Curt Hebert--FERC Chairman
Hon. Gary Locke--Governor of Washington
Hon. Billy Tauzin--Chairman of House Energy Comm.
Hon. Christy Todd Whitman--EPA Administrator
Keith Bailey--President & CEO, Williams Company
Steve Baum--President & CEO, Sempra Energy
John Bryson--President & CEO, Edison International
William Hecht--President & CEO, PP&L Resources
Joe Perkins--President & COO, Reliant Energy
Charles Robinson--Calif. Independent System Operator
Jeffrey Skilling--President & CEO, Enron
Bruce Werthinton--Chief Counsel, PG&E
Bruce Freimark--Co-Inventor and Patent Co-Owner
March 16, 2001

President George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Subject: A Legacy for the George W. Bush Administration

Dear Mr. President,

Here is a legacy for you and your administration to leave for generations to come. Initiate an energy plan that will make our country independent of foreign oil and gas within the next ten years. It is possible and here's how.

Make a mandatory plan to require 60 mile per gallon personal vehicles only to extend our own oil resources - Implement a firm 10 year plan to bring renewable energy sources to full operational status and show how much of each type of is required. Maximize the use of wind energy where practical, all hydroelectric and geo-thermal potential where economically feasible and biomass fuel products in balance with food producing capability.

Your plan should include specific underwriting of solar farms to produce electricity as well as storable and shippable energy forms such as hydrogen. The electrical output should be connected to an all-states national grid and be run following, not battery and grid backup connected. Require national refitting of all coal burning power plants to strict clean emission standards.

Make firm plans to solve the radioactive waste problems in 10 years or put nuclear fission power plants to bed - The same for fusion. Revitalize our national railroad systems. Develop and initiate use of new fuels for aircraft.

Your plan should consider energy rationing and energy saving credit systems for consumers, if necessary, to achieve the independence goal. I am convinced the ten-year concept is feasible and I will be attempting to show the effects of such a plan in a follow-up report.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. Horton  
Telephone: 
E-mail:

K. G. Hagen, C. H. Sawtell and Wm. A. Horton
March 18, 2001

To whom it may Concern,

I am writing to express my worries about the present executive administrations energy policy. I have grown up hearing about the limits of fossil fuel. My grandchildren or great grandchildren may not have the luxury of half a century to postpone considering the inevitable loss of this resource. I beg you, as a matter of national security, please subsidize the production of solar panels, fund fuel cell research, and promote the disciplined and super cautionary use of nuclear power.

Sincerely,

Donald W. Roulier III
Father, Son, Citizen, IT Operations Manager
March 18, 2001

Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy

Dear Mr. Abrams,

I just recently heard your stimulating, far-reaching speech to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce on the energy policy of the Bush Administration.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the speech.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, May 2002