Frank Boring Fitzgerald

June 4, 2001

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE ENERGY SECRETARY
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20585

RE: Oil, Gas, Artesian Water, Uranium, and coal Reserves in Wyoming

Dear Mr. Secretary:

In 1950, United Geophysical Engineering and the Texas Company, found the United States Naval Oil Reserve on the Red Desert of Wyoming. That Reserve plus its surroundings is the largest in the western hemisphere in terms of potential energy of oil, natural gas, uranium, and coal. The Red Desert is accessible, with minimum environmental concerns, IF, it is developed scientifically correct.

On a map of Wyoming, north and west of the communities of Rawlins, Wamsutter, and Red Desert, and west of Baroil and Lamont is the Wyoming Red Desert. It is completely surrounded by Continental Divide. Uranium claims were prospected, filed, and bonuses granted. The geophysics of the Red Desert are immensely fascinating.

I suggest, Mr. Secretary, all of the gravimetric and seismographic recordings the Parties took, could now be run thru a computer programmed for 3-D virtual reality, as has been done elsewhere. Then you will see what I saw as I took and compiled the mile after mile recordings for UGEC Party 26. It is huge, Mr. Secretary. Consider it part of a crash program, like the Manhattan Project.

The Red Desert is an ideal site for several multiplex combined nuclear power plants, oil refineries, coal-to-gas-and-gasoline converters, and military facilities, ideal even for a space launching port because of its high altitude. Excess reactor heat could be used to cook crude oil from the Reserve and to process coal hauled in. All of the facilities could use excess reactor heat in the winter. To cool in the summer, Serval refrigerator technology could be used for cooling. Artesian water is abundant for end cooling. Fuel the many reactors with uranium mined nearby and processed on site with tunable eximer UV lasers for separation of U235 and U238 from Uranium Hexafluoride, as is now done elsewhere. Superconducting magnet energy storage and so much more. In-house energy sources? What more could one ask for? When the proper time comes, switch to fusion reactors. Artesian water would supply the hydrogen. Eximer UV lasers would separate hydrogen, deuterium, and tritium.

On a separate note: Mr. Secretary, conservation can take place now and sustain some areas from total blackouts. Feds can order the immediate drop of every end consumer power line voltage an 8% while maintaining 60Hz. This will not cause difficulties but will lower each consumer's MWH per month without any consumer having to do anything for that savings. Push fluorescent lights.

There ought to be a national plan [not policy] to convert all high voltage long line inter-ties from AC to DC at much higher voltages so as to be able to utilize lightning for added power as does the Bonneville to LA DC inter-tie. Plan to connect all of the US, Canada, and Central America on a DC
grid to feed to where needed. At a large number of places store off-peak energy in super-conducting magnets suggested many years ago by the Edison Electric Institute. The problems then of design and construction are no longer of consequence. Plan to take another good long intense hard look at cold fusion. I am convinced it works due to precise Pons and Fleichman essential design technology definitely missing from the literature.

Mr. Secretary, I recommend you put the best scientific minds on this accelerating multi-faceted energy crunch. Among other things, give due consideration to the above. Surely, other scientists have their own remedies. Formulate a publishable national energy plan with some teeth and gutsy in it. It is important, Mr. Secretary, the Administration and the Congress create immediately a sense of hope instead of allowing a wide-spread developing sense of economic bankruptcy and doom; come together to create abundant cheap and clean energy supplies. Once the bugs are removed from the plan, encourage Congress to pass a joint Resolution supporting the President’s National Energy Plan.

I do not wish to present a foreboding but the present national energy policy is not a plan, not well thought out, not scientific, it is simplistic, glossy meager, not enough, and envisions no improvement whatsoever now for us, nor for our children’s future. The policy apparently maintains the status quo with inadequate slight improvements for the distant future, but worse it pays no attention to the developing multi-faceted crisis we are all witness to.

The best scientifically designed and engineered fission reactors should be part of a national energy plan. The Red Desert presents a likely site to generate enough electric energy and other energy resources to supply all of the Western US until the year fusion reactors come on line.

With energy demands greatly out-stripping economically horded supplies, ours and OPEC [thus higher prices are intentionally generated which most energy barons applaud], and our growing reliance on OPEC, to act to formulate ambiguous simplistic national policy places the global economy in grave risk of financial ruin and depression. It merely provides further incentive and greedy opportunities for RICO types to “legally” occupy, dominate, and dictate to an otherwise free market place. [A RICO type by any other name is still a RICO.]

You should give the US and OPEC energy barons 72 hours to right their wrongs. Do so as a national security measure. It is that serious, Mr. Secretary. Leaving matters as they are transfers wealth from the rest of us to the energy barons just as if we were working for them part-time without pay. Decidedly a form of slavery.

In conclusion, I say we just may be seeing the writing of a chapter of history wherein we, the people, view national political and economic leadership as though we were watching many Nerds fiddle while Rome burns. Nero ivory towers are not the place from which to observe and protect Humanity. Economic leaders are increasingly consuming more of Humanity. I for one do not want to see another Russian socio-political-economic system, passed or present. If it comes here, I think it would be appropriate then for a revolution to assure Humanity comes First.

However, with much respect for our new Energy Secretary, I am, member of the loyal opposition,

[Signature: Frank Boring Fitzgerald]

Frank Boring Fitzgerald, June 4, 2001
Mr. Spencer Abraham  
Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave. SW  
Room 7A257  
Washington DC, 20585

Dear Sir,

Your energy plan needs to focus much more on conservation as opposed to drilling for oil wells everywhere. Fortunately there are some obvious targets that the plan has overlooked.

A good place to start would be with SUVs. They are the fuel hogs of the road and they have been getting a free ride for too long. It is ridiculous to classify them as trucks. They are personal transportation vehicles and as such should be subject to the same fuel efficiency and exhaust emission requirements as other cars.

A bipartisan bill (S.804) was introduced recently that addresses that very issue. I would encourage you to support passage of that bill and make its provisions part of your energy plan.

Sincerely,

Mr. And Mrs. John N. Buterbaugh

5 June, 2001
The following is my response and the incoming for our records

-----Original Message-----
From: Friedrichs, Mark  
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 10:34 AM  
To: ( )  
Subject: FW: questions from a student

Dear Francis dela Cruz:

Thank you for inquiring about this Administration's energy policy.

To address the many energy issues facing the Nation, one of President Bush's first acts was to create a National Energy Policy Development Group, headed by Vice President Cheney. This Group was charged with developing recommendations to help the private sector and government at all levels promote reliable, affordable, and environmentally sound energy for America's future. On May 16, Vice President Cheney sent to the President a National Energy Policy report produced by the National Energy Policy Development Group. The report describes a comprehensive long-term strategy that uses leading edge technology to produce an integrated energy, environmental and economic policy. The National Energy Policy it proposes follows three basic principles:

* The Policy is a long-term, comprehensive strategy. Our energy crisis has been years in the making, and will take years to put fully behind us.

* The Policy will advance new, environmentally friendly technologies to increase energy supplies and encourage cleaner, more efficient energy use.

* The Policy seeks to raise the living standards of the American people, recognizing that to do so our country must fully integrate its energy, environmental, and economic policies.

To achieve a 21st century quality of life - enhanced by reliable energy and a clean environment - it recommends 105 actions to modernize conservation, modernize our infrastructure, increase our energy supplies, including renewables, accelerate the protection and improvement of our environment, and increase our energy security.

The President has already taken actions to implement many of the report's recommendations. Over the coming months, further actions will be taken by the President, individual Federal agencies and the Congress. These actions, once fully implemented, will help minimize future energy prices, while assuring that energy supplies are reliable and the environment is protected.

A copy of the National Energy Policy report, with the specific recommendations to the President, is available on the White House webpage, www.whitehouse.gov, or on the webpage of the U.S. Department of Energy, www.energy.gov.

If you read this report I think you will find the answers to each of your questions.
Thank you for writing.

Mark Friedrichs
Office of Policy
U.S. Department of Energy

--- Original Message ---
From:  
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 1:15 AM  
To: Secretary, The  
Subject: questions from a student

Dear Mr. Abraham,

My name is Francis dela Cruz and I'm a student at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. I recently did a short biography of your political career for my political science class. Being a California native, I'm wondering about the future of the current power crisis and I have a few questions about it. What is your current stance on the issue and how do you plan on addressing it? What do you plan to do about the possibility that the power crisis might spread across the nation? And also, what do think would happen to the power crisis a few years down the road? I hope to receive a response from you soon and I thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Francis dela Cruz
The following is my response and the incoming for our records

-----Original Message-----
From: Friedrichs, Mark
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 10:34 AM
To: Sweeney, Terrenthia
Subject: FW: questions from a student

Dear Francis dela Cruz:

Thank you for inquiring about this Administration's energy policy.

To address the many energy issues facing the Nation, one of President Bush's first acts was to create a National Energy Policy Development Group, headed by Vice President Cheney. This Group was charged with developing recommendations to help the private sector and government at all levels promote reliable, affordable, and environmentally sound energy for America's future. On May 16, Vice President Cheney sent to the President a National Energy Policy report produced by the National Energy Policy Development Group. The report describes a comprehensive long-term strategy that uses leading edge technology to produce an integrated energy, environmental and economic policy. The National Energy Policy it proposes follows three basic principles:

- The Policy is a long-term, comprehensive strategy. Our energy crisis has been years in the making, and will take years to put fully behind us.
- The Policy will advance new, environmentally friendly technologies to increase energy supplies and encourage cleaner, more efficient energy use.
- The Policy seeks to raise the living standards of the American people, recognizing that to do so our country must fully integrate its energy, environmental, and economic policies.

To achieve a 21st century quality of life - enhanced by reliable energy and a clean environment - it recommends 105 actions to modernize conservation, modernize our infrastructure, increase our energy supplies, including renewables, accelerate the protection and improvement of our environment, and increase our energy security.

The President has already taken actions to implement many of the report's recommendations. Over the coming months, further actions will be taken by the President, individual Federal agencies and the Congress. These actions, once fully implemented, will help minimize future energy prices, while assuring that energy supplies are reliable and the environment is protected.

A copy of the National Energy Policy report, with the specific recommendations to the President, is available on the White House webpage, www.whitehouse.gov, or on the webpage of the U.S. Department of Energy, www.energy.gov.

If you read this report I think you will find the answers to each of your questions.
Please re-assign to International Affairs.

Thanks

Bob Benny

--- Original Message ---
From: Secretary, The
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2001 7:54 AM
To: Energy, Policy
Subject: FW: Environmental Quality

--- Original Message ---
From: jim.steitz@usu.edu
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2001 12:42 AM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Environmental Quality

FROM: jim.steitz@usu.edu
NAME: Jim Steitz
SUBJECT: Environmental Quality
ZIP: 84321
CITY: Logan
PARM,1: TO:the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
STATE: Utah
TOPIC: Human Rights and the Bush Plan
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: USA
MESSAGE: To Whom it May Concern: The Bush energy plan has been criticized on the environmental front vigorously, but I wish to address a related issue that often suffers simultaneously – human rights overseas. In the entire 170 page Energy Plan offered by the Bush administration several weeks ago, there is not one mention of the need to protect human rights around the world, particularly in energy producing countries with repressive and undemocratic governments. At the same time, the plan promotes gaining more access to energy markets in such countries as Angola, Chad, Nigeria, and Azerbaijan, each with their own histories of troubled human rights and environmental records. As you read this, the U'we tribe of Columbia is losing its way of life to the involuntary imposed oil drilling of Occidental Petroleum. There is frequently a link between the rights of people to speak out on behalf of the environment and the environmental standards governments support. This is particularly true in oil producing countries where the rights of the wealthy few are too frequently elevated far beyond the rights of the people in the oil producing regions – people who are often poor and without access to basic human rights or political or economic power. This is true in places like Chad, Cameroon,
Nigeria, Ecuador, Burma and many other countries that human rights activists have highlighted. I fear that, in the rush for energy production envisioned by President Bush, the rights of native people and other politically non-connected inhabitants will be trampled on by national corporations and brutal governments eager to appease those corporations. I urge the Bush administration to put specific human rights safeguards and standards for energy corporations with assets in the U.S. operating overseas. If you do not, far too many more people will die at the heavy hand of progress. Sincerely, Jim Steitz

MAILADDR:
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Administration View

Thursday, June 21, 2001
10:00 a.m. - Noon
2318 Rayburn House Office Building

Secretary Abraham
U.S. Department of Energy

Hearing Commitment Follow-up

Q1. At the hearing the Secretary, in response to a question from Congressman Matheson, committed to providing documentation for the record that explained the EIA’s estimation of a 1.6% annual improvement in energy efficiency. Please provide this documentation.

Q2. At the hearing the Secretary stated that a budget review would be completed by July 10. Was it completed on time? Will the final report be completed in September as announced?

Post-Hearing Questions Submitted by Majority Members

Q3. We are now engaged in the fourth major national energy policy debate since the 1970’s. What mistakes have we made in the past, and what mistakes should we avoid in our current consideration?

Q4. In your testimony you state that, "our energy plan harmonizes growth in domestic energy production with environmental protection." Can you give the Committee some examples of this new harmony and how it differs from past efforts?

Q5. In your testimony, you noted that the President has issued two executive orders, one of which directs Federal agencies to consider the effects of proposed regulations on energy supply, distribution, or use—what some have called an "energy impact statement."

Q5.1 Might there be a downside to this, such as creating yet another bureaucratic hurdle that might actually add to delays of rulemakings that could enhance energy supply, distribution, and use?
Q5.2 To what extent have other agencies, such as EPA, participated in this process?

Q5.3 How would this new directive affect pending environmental regulations?

Q6. In your testimony, you say that 20 of the National Energy Policy Development Group’s 105 recommendations require legislative action, which means that 85 do not. What is the Administration’s timeline for implementing these?

Q7. Does H.R. 4 passed by the House, and the legislation being considered ... the Senate satisfy the Administrations legislative recommendations?

Q8. The NEPD Group recommended that the EPA Administrator develop a new renewable energy partnership program. Why was this recommendation directed to the EPA Administrator instead of you?

Q9. The NEPD Group recommended that you expand the scope of the appliance standards program. What additional appliances are being considered for standards?

Q10. The NEPD Group recommended that you and the EPA Administrator assess the potential of nuclear energy to improve air quality. When is the assessment expected to be completed?

Q11. There was a great deal of controversy earlier this year when the Administration announced new emissions controls on “three P’s,” mercury, SOx and NOx, while omitting the fourth “P,” CO2. Can CO2 be controlled cost-effectively using existing technology? If not, how long might it be before we see such technologies on the market?

Q12. Please comment on the trend of gasoline prices this so far this summer.

Q13. On June 13, EPA published its public health and safety standards for the proposed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository in the Federal Register. Can these standards be met?

Q14. How do you reconcile the President’s National Energy Policy’s call for advancing new, environmentally friendly technologies and the emphasis on science and technology in your statement with the cuts proposed in your Fiscal Year 2002 budget?

Q15. The Report does not seem to be clear on what problems are faced by the Nation. It appears that we face two general problems:
• Immediate and long term "Capacity Challenges", in the infrastructure to extract, deliver, and use energy, and
• A longer term "Resource Depletion" challenge, where less of each resource will be able to be produced each year, thus driving prices up. The effect on the world economy will be recession/depression unless we beat the depletion by making the investments and shifting to other energy sources.

What is your opinion?

Q16. The National Energy Policy Development Group’s report seems to only look as far ahead as 2020. Given the time it will take to change existing technologies and launch new ones, and get them to the point where they make a significant impact on our energy economy, is not looking beyond 2020 realistic?

Q17. Oil supplies the largest portion of our energy, and motor vehicle use is the largest component of oil use. The Report does not seem to be very concerned with transitioning from oil use. The plan does continue development of hydrogen as a fuel, and does seek tax credits for hybrid cars, but there is no sense of urgency. When do the writers of the report forecast that oil will become even more difficult to extract, hence more expensive? What is the anticipated effect on our economy?

Q18. Are the writers of the report familiar with the theory of the geologist M. King Hubbert, that explains why U.S. oil production topped out in the 1970's and has been decreasing since? Dr. Hubbert’s theory also predicts that world oil production will peak sometime in the next two decades. At that point half of all possible oil that ever was will be still in the ground, but it will be increasingly difficult and expensive to obtain. World prices will climb steadily causing a recession or depression in the world economy, including the U.S., unless we are well along the road to alternative vehicle fuels, such as hydrogen. Do you agree? Please comment?

Q19. If the Federal government institutes a program to buy some of its vehicles as hybrid and alternative fueled; will you be willing to have them as part of DOE’s vehicle fleet?

Q20. The National Energy Policy Report directs continued development of hydrogen and fusion. Is it proper to group these two things together? Fusion has not “been invented” yet, i.e. no continuous release of energy, let alone producing any mechanical or electrical output; while hydrogen powered cars are on the road. Additionally, fusion is a primary energy source, but hydrogen as a combustion fuel is not a primary energy source, but a transport mechanism. Do you agree?

Q21. Given that hydrogen as a combustion fuel produces only water, and can be manufactured without creating carbon dioxide or any other pollutants of any kind,
and that hydrogen powered vehicles are on the road now, shouldn't hydrogen as a vehicle fuel be pursued with a great sense of urgency?

Congressman Bartlett, Chairman, Energy Subcommittee

Q1. Have you considered the following reality?

OPEC nations now have the ability to both create an oversupply and a shortage of crude oil in the world market relative to world demand. As long as they have an excess capacity, they are capable of keeping prices "under control", maximizing profits while keeping up with growing worldwide demand. Because a too rapid price increase could result in an economic downturn (killing the "goose that laid the golden egg") and high prices tend to make otherwise costly alternatives look attractive, OPEC nations have an incentive to keep up with the demand to prevent prices from going too high.

Further, as recent history has shown, there is no other major supplier who has the capacity to supply more when OPEC decides to cut back – everyone except OPEC is already pumping as much as they can to profit from current prices!

This means that, in the not too distant future, when even OPEC is unable to keep up with growing world demand, they will no longer be able to keep prices "reasonable". Oil will then be supplied to the highest bidders, with prices rising to many times current levels – until the global economy collapses.

Q1.1 What will we do then?

Q1.2 What should we be doing now?

Q1.3 Is tapping an oil field containing less than a year's supply (to be delivered in 5 - 10 years) the answer?

Q1.4 Is there any reason that we should not set a challenge for ourselves to become twice as efficient in our use of energy in the next 5 - 10 years? (5 - 10 times more efficient in the next 20 years?)

Q1.5 Should we wait and let the "price signal" alert us to the existence of a problem which is nearly upon us – wait until we are bankrupt to change our ways? Wait until the horse is out to realize we should close the barn door?
Post-Hearing Questions Submitted by Minority Members

Representative Lynn Woolsey, Ranking Minority Member, Energy Subcommittee

Q1. Please provide the names of all Department of Energy employees or contractor employees who provided support or staff work for the Cheney Group's work.

Q2. During the hearing, you indicated that the lack of a Science Advisor to the President had a negligible impact on the work of the Task Force. It was asserted that scientific expertise drawn from all the involved agencies stepped into the breach. Please provide the names of the science specialists at DOE who played a role in the work of the Task Force. Please provide their resumes for the record.

Q3. Mr. Secretary, during the hearing you briefly touched on your participation and the participation of the Department in the work of the Cheney Group. Please provide for the record:

Q3.1. The names of all witnesses or organizations who provided advice or material to the Cheney Task Force.

Q3.2. An explanation of why the Task Force conducted its business in secret and why that veil of secrecy has not been lifted with the completion of the Task Force report.

Q3.3. The details regarding the schedule of meetings that you or your representatives attended with other Task Force Members. Please indicate the name of DOE attendee/s, list of other invitees, list of other attendees, date and time of meeting, subject matter and/or agenda, names and affiliations of non-governmental attendees or witnesses meeting with the Group, copies of all discussion materials and DOE memoranda prepared for or distributed prior to the meeting, and copies of all materials distributed at each meeting.

Q4. In recent years, the House of Representatives has conducted very aggressive oversight of policy and conduct by the Executive Branch. For the record, please provide the following information:

Q4.1. How many subpoenas has the Department received from Committees of the House regarding DOE participation in the Cheney Task Force? Please provide copies of all such House Committee subpoenas.

Q4.2. How many document requests has the Department received from Committees of the House regarding DOE participation in the Cheney Task Force? Please provide copies of all House document requests related to the Cheney Task Force.

Q5. In the National Energy Policy, Report of the National Energy Policy Development Group (Cheney Group), May 2001, it is claimed on page 1-5 that "Energy..."
intensity is projected to continue to decline through 2020 at an average rate of 1.6 percent a year."

Q5.1. What is the source for this projection? If it is EIA, please indicate which EIA product is the source of this projection.
Q5.2. Please provide copies of all the analytical documents upon which this projection is based. Included in this submission should be any analytical documents that indicate how 1.6% was settled upon as the energy intensity level to be anticipated as opposed to other levels.
Q5.3. Please specify the policy assumptions that underlie this projection (i.e., funding levels for conservation and efficiency programs at DOE, tax credit programs for efficiency products, efficiency programs in the states, market conditions for energy that may affect consumer choice, etc.).
Q5.4 Given that other policy mixes would likely produce different declines in energy intensity, what cost-benefit analyses were done to show the tradeoffs between, for example, a 1.9% decline, a 2.5% decline and a 1.6% decline?

Q6. On page 1-5 of the Cheney Report, it is asserted that the nation will need between 1,300 and 1,900 new power plants over the next twenty years.

Q6.1. What is the source for this projection? If it is an EIA product, please identify which of their reports was used.
Q6.2. Please provide all of the analytical documents that underlie this projection. Included in this submission should be any analytical documents (including e-mails and memoranda) indicating how the figure of 1,300 to 1,900 power plants was settled upon.
Q6.3. What policy and market assumptions were made in settling on this projection?
Q6.4. What cost-benefit models were run to adopt a set of policies that puts us on a path towards needing 1,300 to 1,900 power plants as opposed to some smaller number?

Q7. In hearings earlier this year, the Committee received testimony from witnesses who cited the “Scenarios for a Clean Energy Future” report. This report, released in November 2000, was produced by the Interlab Group on Energy-Efficient and Clean Energy Technologies with representatives from Oak Ridge, Lawrence Berkeley, NREL, Argonne and Pacific Northwest National Laboratories. The Interlab Group report suggests that an aggressive energy efficiency and renewable energy policy path could lead to a 60% reduction in the anticipated growth in electricity demand by 2020. This leads to a demand for just 580 new plants rather than the projected 1,300 to 1,900 mentioned by you and the Cheney Group report.

Q7.1. Were the findings of this Interlab Group report made available to the Cheney Group by your Department? If this report was not
made available to the Cheney Group by your Department, please explain why.

Q7.2. Were any of the Lab staff who worked on this report involved in staffing or briefing the Cheney Group?

Q7.3. What analysis of this report has been done in-house at DOE? Please provide copies of all such analysis for the record.

Q7.4. What information or evaluations of this report were provided by your Department or its contractors to the Cheney Task Force staff? Please provide copies for the record.

Q8. In Chapter 4 of the National Energy Policy, there is a recommendation that "President direct the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) to review and make recommendations on using the nation's energy resources more efficiently." Yet, in 1997 PCAST, led by Harvard plasma physicist John Holdren, produced a comprehensive report identical to the one called for by the Task Force.

Q8.1. Why are you proposing to repeat the Holdren report?

Q8.2. The Holdren report called for major new Federal investments in efficiency R&D. Do you believe that recommendation was wrong?

Q8.3. Was Professor Holdren invited to participate in the task force's deliberations? If not, why not?

Q9. There have been reports in the press regarding potential conflicts of interest involving several senior Bush officials. For example, Karl Rove, a senior policy advisor to the President, held as much as a quarter-million dollars in stock in Enron as well as holdings in GE (which has a nuclear power division), Royal Dutch Shell and BP Amoco. Reportedly, Mr. Rove was involved in crafting the Administration's Energy plan.

Q9.1 Can you confirm whether or not Enron, GE, Royal Dutch Shell or BP Amoco provided testimony or other materials to the Cheney Working Group, its staff or other high Bush Administration officials?

Q9.2. Can you provide the names of all the Bush Administration officials, save the DOE officials noted in response to Questions 1 and 2 above, who played a role in crafting the Energy plan?

Q9.3. Why didn't the administration bar conflicts-of-interest such as that involving Mr. Rove, and compel officials with the Cheney Group to divest themselves of all energy-related holdings before they could work on energy policy?

Q10. On several occasions, the President has claimed that his Administration is the first to propose a comprehensive, National Energy Strategy. Would you please explain what we should consider the first Bush Administration's National Energy Strategy to be? We also note that Congress passed a bipartisan National Energy Strategy Act, which was signed into law by then-President Bush in 1992. Did that
effort in 1991 and 1992 provide, as then Secretary of Energy James Watkins described it, “a comprehensive blueprint for America’s energy future?” If you believe the work of that Bush Administration was not a truly comprehensive strategy, please explain why it was not and how this Bush Administration’s approach constitutes a truly comprehensive National Energy Strategy?

Q11. The Administration’s FY2002 budget request for the Department of Energy included severe cuts to renewable energy and conservation programs. However, there were some assurances included in the Department’s RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES, ENERGY SUPPLY section of the DOE FY 2002 budget request submitted to congress. The following paragraph from that document seems to suggest that despite the steep cuts, some future additional request would occur.

“HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRAM REQUEST ($ in millions)
Renewable Resources Technologies (FY 2001 $277.3; FY 2002 $174.2) $103.1

Even though FY 2002 funding is 37 percent below FY 2001, the request maintains core R&D efforts for renewable technologies and hydrogen research until ongoing operations can be evaluated against the outcome and priorities that will flow from the Vice President’s National Energy Policy Development Group.”

Based on this statement, I’d like to ask the following:

Q11.1 With respect to the FY 2002 budget:

Q11.1.1 How did you determine “core R&D efforts”? Will “core R&D efforts” be reduced or cut back in any way compared to the previous year’s activities?

Q11.1.2 Which specific efforts were deemed non-core? Please provide a specific list of projects, grants, or programs that you would terminate or reduce in level of effort to accommodate this 37% cut.

Q11.2 With respect to the NEPD Group:

Q11.2.1 Where are the “priorities” that are supposed to flow from the National Energy Policy? Do these priorities exist at this time? If so, what are they?

Q11.2.2 What would you say was the “outcome” that has flowed from the Vice President’s National Energy Policy Development Group? How can this outcome be used to evaluate ongoing operations in renewable resource technologies?
Q11.2.3. When will the Department be evaluating ongoing operations against the outcome and priorities?

Q11.2.4. What specific budget guidance came out of the NEPD process for these accounts?

Q12. The President has said we must fund innovative technologies for conservation and renewable energy. Yet the FY 02 budget included cuts of 26% for renewable energy research and 27% for conservation research.

Q12.1. These large reductions in the budget appear to be at odds with the President's call for greater attention to energy. How do you reconcile the Administration's words and actions?

Q12.2 Were the proposed cuts in the energy research budget supported by any studies? Can you provide us with those studies?

Q13. Which R&D programs were highlighted in the National Energy Policy as deserving of more funding than was provided in the April budget request? Where would the additional funds come from? Will the Department be sending Congress reprogramming requests or supplemental requests to support these numbers? Please provide a general description of the requests that the Department plans to submit to Congress?

Q14. In his statement on global climate change, the President called for research in a variety of areas ranging from fundamental research on climate change to applied alternative fuels technologies. Given that the DOE budget has been cut in both R&D and alternative fuel sources, how will these initiatives be funded and who will do the research?

Q15. We know you don't support the Kyoto Protocol, but do you believe that the U.S. should commit itself to ANY reduction of greenhouse gas emissions? If so, what rate of reduction would be appropriate? If not, what rate of increase would be inappropriate?

Q16. During the campaign for the Presidency, Mr. Bush was very critical of the Clinton Administration for not being effective enough or tough enough with OPEC to raise its production levels. I have seen reports that, since January when the Bush Administration took office, OPEC has reduced its production by 2.5 million barrels a day. What steps are you taking, distinct from the prior administration, to get OPEC to expand its production?

Representative Jim Barcia

Last summer, gas prices in the Midwest surged above $2.00 a gallon and this year, prior to the Memorial Day holiday weekend, gasoline prices increased by as much as 25 cents
across the state, making the cost of gasoline in Michigan the third highest of any state in the country. The Federal Trade Commission did a review of the last summer’s price spike and issued a report in March of this year that stated there was no evidence of collusion. However, the report did note that individual companies withheld extra supply because “selling extra supply would have pushed down prices and thereby reduced profits.”

I know that oil companies have a right to make a profit. At the same time, those companies carry a public trust to deliver a product to our consumers in a timely fashion. Deliberately acting to depress production or withhold supply from the market to inflate the price could be viewed as a violation of that trust.

What steps will this Administration take to ensure that oil companies live up to their responsibility to consumers?

Congressman John Larson

During your question and answer period, you cited the President’s interest in a CO2 technology program. President Clinton for years proposed a Climate Change Technology Initiative, which was repeatedly cut by the Republican Congress. Please submit for the record how, specifically, President Bush’s CCTI will differ from President Clinton’s.

Congressman Jerry Costello

I support the President’s Clean Power Initiative - however even after you add the $150 million down payment of the President’s proposed $2 billion initiative to this year’s fossil fuel budget - the budget is cut by 17%. This trend continues over the next few years. How can the Administration support increased funding for clean coal technologies then turn around and slash the fossil fuel budget?
Congressman David Wu

There are 19 recommendations contained in the "Final Report of the Taskforce against Racial Profiling".

Q1. Issue a letter from the Secretary to all Federal and contractor employees. The letter reiterates DOE's policy against racial profiling.

Q2. Appoint a National Ombudsman to be located at DOE headquarters to continue DOE's work in eliminating racial profiling, monitor and review diversity management matters, and advise the DOE on improving systems for primarily addressing contractor employees' concerns and resolving workplace disputes.

Q3. Assign responsibility to the DOE Executive Steering Committee on Diversity, in collaboration with the National Ombudsman, for monitoring and reviewing diversity and racial profiling issues for Federal and contractor employees, following the sunset of this Task Force.

Q4. Improve leadership accountability for Federal executives and managers by developing a model to assess effectiveness in diversity management. The model should seek employee feedback and assessment of results. Additionally, performance in this areas should be linked to promotion, bonuses, and hiring.

Q5. Develop contract language, which ensures fair and meaningful assessment of EEO activity by contractors. DOE should take steps to hold Management and Operating (M&R), Management and Integration (M&I) contractors, and laboratory facilities accountable for human resource management (recruitment, outreach, hiring, retention, promotions, training, etc.), by requiring that they include relevant performance goals and measures in their strategic plans, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Government Performance and Results Act. To support this objective, contractors should conduct regular "quality of work life" surveys in measuring employee opinions and attitudes. Furthermore, contractors should routinely publicize to their employees' relevant employment statistics and related information. Contractor performance in this areas should be linked to performance fees and should be utilized as part of an overall assessment of past performance for a variety of contract management purposes (e.g. exercising options, conducting evaluations for future rewards, etc.)

Q6. Establish a team to promptly address any outstanding individual cases regarding security practices. This team would report to the Deputy Secretary on regular basis.

Q7. Conduct an EEO/diversity stand-down, similar to the approach utilized for the Security Awareness stand-down.
Q8. Ensure that an inclusive review process is utilized for making future security changes, with input and advice from line management, employees, and human resources professionals. The current Field Management Council process, which was established in April 1999, should be utilized to ensure proper coordination and collaboration between appropriate staff offices.

Q9. Review security procedures to ensure that they do not take a “one-size-fits-all” approach for all sites.

Q10. Publish baseline human resources management data on hiring, promotions, and diversity representation by grades, with respect to all Federal and contractor employees.

Q11. Include Asian Pacific American leaders and representatives of other minority groups in future workplace assessments.

Q12. Require Federal, M/Os, M/ls, and laboratory executives to issue annually and in writing diversity policy statements and publish them in a universal manner to coincide with performance appraisal cycles. Require discussion of these policies at performance appraisal review sessions. Develop a set of definitions and a glossary for diversity, pluralism, racial profiling, etc. based on private sector models.

Q13. Consider creating a DOE web-site on workplace improvements, and publishing progress reports on improvement in diversity management, to include human resource management data.

Q14. Form appropriate consortiums to plan for - and to combat - the recruitment and retention problems being experienced throughout DOE laboratory facilities.

Q15. Improve training for the DOE Federal and contractor workforce in effective diversity management, with special seminars for executives. The Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, in collaboration with Heads of Headquarters and Field Elements should ensure that all Federal and contractor employees undergo mandatory training on equal employment opportunity and interpersonal sensitivity. Also, site managers should conduct periodic focus group meetings to discuss employee diversity issues, including racial profiling.

Q16. Conduct follow-up fact finding visits in Spring 2002 to assess whether management has successfully carried out its policy against racial profiling; look for innovations, and provide feedback and suggestions for improvement to Federal and contractor workforce management.

Q17. Monitor, track and follow-up on pertinent data with respect to representation of minorities, women, and underrepresented groups in the Federal and contractor workforce.
Q18. Conduct a multi-year workplace satisfaction evaluation survey; include topics such as management practices and diversity management. The survey should be repeated at given intervals (e.g. biannually). If costs are prohibitive for a comprehensive survey of all employees/contractors, utilize a statistically significant sample.

Q19. Require an organizational self-assessment based on "best practices."

Q20. Please address the following items for each of these recommendations: (a) whether there has been any follow-up on the recommendation, (b) what action has been taken to date, and (c) what are the next steps proposed by DOE with regard to this recommendation.
June 21, 2001

The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20500

Attr: Vice-President Dick Cheney

Dear Mr. Vice-President:

SUBJECT: ERROR IN NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY REPORT

In reviewing the NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY REPORT, we have found a tremendous error in Chapter 6, Nature’s Power. The last two paragraphs on page 6-12 contain utterly false statements that will, if not retracted immediately, severely damage our business, which is, the sales and installation of biomass gasification systems.

The first sentence of the paragraphs, “In partnership with DOE, NREL, Battelle Lab, Burlington Electric and others, Future Energy Resources Corporation of Norcross, Georgia, was able to build, test and operate the world’s first biomass gasification system,” is a total misrepresentation of the truth. While this may very well have been FERCO’s first gasification system ever, our company, PRM Energy Systems, Inc., has been building gasification systems since 1982 and has probably gasified more biomass than all of our competitors combined.

We are a small family business located in Hot Springs, Arkansas and we are sick and tired of DOE, NREL and other government agencies not only funding, but touting our competitors, particularly with untrue statements about unproven technology. Everything we have heard about The McNeil Plant over the past five years has been negative, yet DOE and NREL continue to tout the technology on behalf of FERCO. This time they have gone too far. By claiming to have built the “world’s first biomass gasification system”, DOE, NREL, FERCO, et al, are slandering our company and damaging our business. We know that these agencies have poured tens of millions of dollars into the McNeil Plant in attempts to make it work, but that does not mean that they should be allowed to advertise on FERCO’s behalf, to the detriment of FERCO’s competitors.

Please try to imagine how difficult it is for a small company, like ours, to explain to a potential customer that the US Government’s NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY
REPORT is wrong. The report asserts that FERCO has the one and only solution to the biomass gasification market, which could not be further from the truth.

Please correct this egregious error and advise your agencies that their attempts to give the world's biomass gasification market to FERCO are wrong. A simple correction within the report will not suffice since the report was distributed worldwide over the Internet. You must correct the problem with a widely publicized retraction.

Respectfully yours,

Ron Bailey, Jr.

Cc: Congressman Mike Ross, Senator Tim Hutchinson, and Senator Blanche Lincoln
Dear Mr. Arterburn:

Thank you for expressing your concern about implementation of the National Energy Policy.

To address the many energy issues facing the Nation, one of President Bush's first acts was to create a National Energy Policy Development Group, headed by Vice President Cheney. On May 16, Vice President Cheney sent to the President the recommendations of this group, together with a National Energy Policy report. To achieve a 21st century quality of life - enhanced by reliable energy and a clean environment - the report recommends 105 actions to modernize conservation, modernize our infrastructure, increase our energy supplies, including renewables, accelerate the protection and improvement of our environment, and increase our energy security. Once these actions have been fully implemented by the Congress and Federal agencies, they will help minimize future energy prices, while assuring that energy supplies are reliable and the environment is protected.

The Department of Energy (DOE) is working to ensure that nuclear power remains a viable energy alternative for power generators in the future. For this to happen, it is vital that existing nuclear power plants continue to operate economically and safely. In addition, future plants will depend on investments we make today in nuclear power plant safety, reliability, and economic competitiveness. We are actively pursing a number of means for stimulating new investments in nuclear power generating capacity. The Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology is responsible for nuclear energy research and development in the Department. You can learn more about their activities by visiting the website www.nuclear.gov.

The Department is making steady progress on the geological repository for high level wastes. The President has committed to ensuring that sound science governs the site characterization activities being conducted by the Department in support of a possible recommendation to continue development of a potential repository at Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

A copy of the National Energy Policy report, with the specific recommendations to the President, is available on the White House webpage, www.whitehouse.gov, or on the webpage of the U.S. Department of Energy, www.energy.gov.
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Thank you for writing. I hope this information is helpful.

Sincerely,

Margot Anderson
Acting Director
Office of Policy