ROLL YOUR OWN BLACKOUT
THE FIRST DAY OF SUMMER
JUNE 21, 2001, THURSDAY EVENING
7-10pm worldwide, all time zones

As an alternative to George W. Bush's energy policies and lack of emphasis on efficiency, conservation and alternative fuels, there will be a voluntary rolling blackout on the first day of summer, June 21 at 7-10 pm in any time zone (this will roll it across the planet).

It's a simple protest and a symbolic act. Turn out your lights from 7-10 pm on June 21. Unplug whatever you can unplug in your house. Light a candle to the Sungoddess, kiss and tell or not, take a stroll in the dark, invent ghost stories, anything that's not electronic - have fun in the dark.

Read the 1999 book "Natural Capitalism" by Hawken and Lovins to learn that conservation/high efficiency technologies already ARE on-the-shelf.

If implemented these revolutionary ideas would pay themselves off within five years, after which we'd be pumping far less greenhouse gas into the atmosphere and saving bucks to boot.

Send this as widely as possible, to your government representatives and environmental contacts.

Let them know we want global education, participation and funding in conservation, efficiency and alternative fuel efforts - and an end to over-exploitation and misuse of the earth's resources.

Anyone knows that the Cheney-Bush team is blowing smoke when they tell us that "... conservation can't help, it'll just be too expensive to implement those technologies..." While on the other hand, technology to develop and deploy weapons to blow incoming ICBMs out of the sky are easy to come by.

Since when do you have to agree with people to defend them from injustice?
— Lillian Hellman
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

Subject: Energy Program

Dear Mr. President:

As you well know, one of the most pressing and complex problems which you and your administration face is the energy problem crisis.

Enclosed is a proposed program which I feel, with your leadership, will trigger ideas and enthusiasm, get the attention and interest of the people, and provide positive action.

It is realized that this paper does not provide all the details or refinements which obviously will be needed to plan, implement, and administer a program of this complexity; however, it does provide an overview of the basic concept.

If you have questions, or if additional detail is required, I will be happy to offer my thoughts.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Carl J. Seal

CCs/em

Enclosure

CC: Honorable Thomas Eagleton
    Honorable John Danforth
    Honorable Harold Volmer
    Governor Joseph Teasdale

Business Telephone: 314-553-2600
Residence Telephone: ...
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Mr Spencer Abraham  
Secretary of Energy  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independent Avenue SW  
Washington D.C. 20585  
U.S.A.

Dear Mr Abraham,

Thank you very much for sending me a copy of the National Energy Policy report of the National Energy Policy Development Group chaired by Vice-President Cheney with recommendations to President Bush. I welcome the opportunity to share some general thoughts on energy policy and to give you a preliminary reaction to certain issues in the report.

First of all I believe that the report is timely since it coincides with similar EU initiatives. The European Commission is actively involved in an important policy debate on future security of energy supply as set out in our Green Paper as well as proposals for new measures to further liberalise the gas and electricity markets.

The Stockholm European Council in his last March meeting endorsed the objective of further opening up of the gas and electricity markets and has invited the Energy Council to examine the Commission proposals and to implement the objective of market opening as soon as possible.

The completion of the internal market for energy should complement other basic Community objectives such as security of energy supply and sustainable development. The Green Paper on security of supply has started a substantial debate. It examines the advantages and drawbacks of the various fuel options, making recommendations, but draws the conclusion that energy security can only be effectively addressed by putting energy demand at the heart of EU policy in this field.

Although oil will continue to play a key role in world transportation in the decades to come, there is a need to use increasingly less-polluting alternative transportation fuels. In the Green Paper energy efficiency and renewable energies are basic priorities for action in relation to security of energy supply with particular emphasis on demand management in transportation and buildings.
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Climate change and the Kyoto Protocol are a basic concern of the Green Paper which is seen as an instrument for achieving climate change targets as well as securing energy supply. The US plan confirms the commitment to the environment and makes a number of recommendations but says little on carbon dioxide emissions and climate change issues. We would be interested to know your assessment of the environmental impacts of the projected growth in US energy consumption and in particular the implications of the increased use of fossil fuels.

Much of the plan's case for increasing the domestic supply of fossil fuels rests on the projected increasing gap between energy supply and demand. We are interested to learn more of your analysis of the scale of the gap problem and your assessment of the rate of growth of US energy demand over the next two decades.

Although rising energy prices may create some economic disruption and social hardship, in our view they do not necessarily constitute an energy crisis as such. An assessment by the Commission services indicates that peak gasoline prices (reached a month ago in Europe) were in real terms below the levels of the 1970s. We do however share your concern about current high world market oil prices and increased dependence on Middle Eastern supplies. Like you, we seek price stability on the basis of price levels which are sustainable for both consuming and producing interests in the longer term. An enhanced consumer-producer dialogue and increased efforts to diversify energy supplies are shared objectives.

I share with you the need for a new look at the potential value of nuclear power. Our Green Paper is rather prudent on the future role of nuclear energy but stresses how nuclear power contributes to limiting carbon emissions. Your report makes a positive case for nuclear power to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases but I am sure you would agree that we have to devote substantial efforts to tackle the difficult issue of waste disposal. This may be another area in which we can work effectively together.

In general, it can be said that the EU and US have similar energy supply patterns being first and second importers of energy in the world. We are both leaders in energy technologies and in favour of liberalised markets. Your plan places emphasis on the optimal exploitation of domestic resources while the Community emphasis tends to be on diversified supplies from around the world together with improved energy efficiency and increased use of renewables.

Finally there is a need to reflect together on how our enhanced bilateral co-operation can be used to improve the management of global energy issues especially in international fora such as the G8, the WTO, the OECD/IEA and in our relations with OPEC. This co-operation will enable us to harmonise our positions, and as appropriate present a co-ordinated front. I very much welcome your planned orientation to go beyond domestic energy considerations and your proposal for greater co-operation with other countries and international organisations.
I am certain that your National Energy Policy report and Community initiatives such as the Green Paper provide the basis for future bilateral co-operation in the energy sector. I would like to reiterate my keen interest in co-operation with you and your services and I note with satisfaction the recommendation in your report for a reinvigoration of the EU-US energy consultations. In this context, I support the idea of a resumption of the consultative process later this year in Washington.

I believe it is important that we work together to ensure that economic, social and environmental concerns are taken properly into account in developing our policies to safeguard our energy future and to meet our international commitments in the environmental field.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
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SAVE

GOVERNMENT ENERGY SAVINGS PROGRAM
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Save
And
Value
Energy

C. J. Seal

C. J. Seal
8 June 1977
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1. ABSTRACT

We have met the enemy and they are us.

In order to establish and implement a meaningful Government Energy Program and assure success, the Carter Administration must provide the means to stimulate the imagination of and trigger enthusiastic response from Government and the private sector; both Industry and Individual Citizen.

This paper provides an overview outlining a Government sponsored and funded program, appropriately titled "SAVE", which will encourage all of us (Government, Industry, and Private Citizen) to establish a personal energy savings goal of at least 10% and then make it happen.
2. BACKGROUND

Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather
what you can do for your country.

- Kennedy

America has faced many challenges during our short history. We
have had great successes and our share of failures. One of these
failures has been our apathy toward conservation of our natural
resources, and a result is today's energy problem, or perhaps crisis.

Our Government and, more specifically, our politicians have been
pussy-footing around this problem for a number of years with no
apparent solution in sight, and with not even an agreed to policy
established yet. The American People are no longer dummies who
blindly follow the politician and accept all that they are told.
They are tired of being talked down to. They want facts, and then
I think they wish to have a voice in the decisions being made.

I think the people would like to believe in their President, Govern-
ment, and Elected Representatives; however, the energy fiasco has
left most of us completely baffled. Is there really an energy
shortage? Or are we being ripped off again by the Oil and Utility
Companies as we seem to have been in the past?
I think there are two sides to these questions. Yes, we have been taken by special interests; however, logical considerations also tell us that, indeed, a real energy crunch is inevitable.

History tells us that all our past great successes were possible only by united efforts of all our people. I submit that the Energy Crisis will not be solved by the Carter Administration, Government, or Industry, but by all the people working together and motivated toward a common goal. Jimmy Carter and his team can, and must, provide the leadership to unify the people in this common cause.

I work for a large Midwestern Manufacturing Company, and one of my assignments is Cost Reduction/Value Engineering Manager for my Division. This assignment led to membership in the Society of American Value Engineers (SAVE). The application of Value Engineering/Analysis and its benefits are recognized by both Government and Private Industry. My experience in this field and association with Value Experts has contributed to this paper and to this Save And Value Energy concept.
4. **IMPLEMENTATION**

Lend thy serious hearing to what I shall unfold.

- Shakespeare

4.1 **Planning**

The first step should be the appointment of a study group to establish policy, define objectives/goals/requirements, recommend staffing requirements, define responsibilities, document program plan, select recognition awards, and then present recommendations to President Carter.

4.2 **Staffing**

Obviously, the administration of a program of this size and impact will require a permanent staff. This organization should report to the President's Cabinet Member responsible for energy.

The responsibilities of this organization will include all administrative aspects of the program including communication, systems design, reviewing enrollments, acknowledgement of enrollment acceptance, and recognition of successful participants.
4.3 **Program Documentation**

Documentation requirements include necessary policies, communication briefs (newspaper, radio, and television), program systems and procedures (including data processing requirements), enrollment/acknowledgement, reporting forms, and recognition certificate, and plaque artwork.

4.4 **Communication**

Communication will be a most important aspect of the SAVE Program. It should be kicked off first by Presidential Presentation to Congressional Leaders and then presented to the American People via the fireside chat. The message to the people will be key to success of program. If the message results in enthusiastic response from the people, we are well on the way to licking our energy problems.

This message will then be followed by a well planned advertising campaign in newspapers and on radio and television to hammer home the message and motivate the people to want to participate.

These messages will announce the kick-off date(s), how to obtain the enrollment forms, the benefits to Government and individuals (including dollars), and the recognition awards which will be presented to companies, organizations, clubs, families, and individuals who qualify.
5. **PARTICIPATION**

This above all, to thine own self be true.

- Shakespeare

5.1 **Enrollment**

The SAVE Enrollment Form may be picked up at any Post Office or Government Office. They will be pre-addressed to Jimmy Carter and may be mailed postage free. A duplicate copy is retained by the enrollee.

The form will contain all information necessary to indicate how the participant has defined his commitment to save 10% of current usage of transportation gas, natural gas, electricity, coal, or heating oil.

This form will also contain blocks to record any material recycling activities planned.

5.2 **Acknowledgement**

There will be an acknowledgement stub on the form which will be returned to the enrollee, along with a SAVE Year-End Report Form, after receipt and logging into the system by the White House Staff.
Each acknowledgement of enrollment will contain Jimmy Carter's signature.

5.3 Reporting

One year after enrollment in the SAVE Program, each participant will report progress/results by completing the SAVE Year-End Report Form, which was received with the enrollment acknowledgement.

This form will show comparison of original goals with actual energy used. After completion of form, the participant will calculate the percent (%) of energy savings actually realized. The accuracy of the report cannot be verified and must depend upon each participant's use of a self imposed honor system.

Upon completion, the reporting form is mailed (pre-addressed) postage free to Jimmy Carter. A duplicate copy is retained by the participant.
6. **RECOGNITION**

All's well that ends well, still the finis is the crown.

- Shakespeare

Upon receipt of the SAVE Year-End Reporting Form by the White House Staff and a verification of data submitted vs. original goals, an acknowledgement will be returned to the participant.

Those who have successfully achieved their 10% goal will receive appropriate recognition and award as follows:

- Plaque and flag (SAVE pennant) - Company, business, organization, club, etc.
- Certificate - Family or individual
- Lapel/tie pin/necklace - Individual and/or all family members

Somebody said that it couldn't be done

But he with a chuckle replied

That "maybe it couldn't" but he would be one

Who wouldn't say so till he'd tried.

- Guest
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President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

Subject: Energy Program

Dear Mr. President:

Two years ago I submitted to you a proposed Energy Conservation Plan which I thought might trigger some interest and action. This plan is again attached for consideration.

I also sent a copy of the plan to my Senators, Representative, and the Governor of the State of Missouri.

I was dismayed by the responses received. It was obvious the plan was not even read, understood, or considered; however, the Energy Administrator, John F. O'Leary, at least acknowledged receipt of my energy suggestion.

It certainly must be obvious to you and all politicians by now that a solution to our energy problem depends upon the American people - with all of us working together and motivated toward a national common goal.

You and your team should and can provide the leadership to make things happen. I would be most happy to offer my thoughts and provide additional detail.

Sincerely,

Carl J. Seal

CIS/fja

Enclosure

CC: Honorable Thomas Eagleton
    Honorable John Danforth
    Honorable Harold Volcker
    Governor Joseph Teasdale
    Deputy Energy Secretary John F. O'Leary

Business Telephone: 314-333-4260
Residence Telephone:
To: Representative Secretary  
Re: Renewables - Wind  

Dear Representative Secretary,

In addressing the declining availability of fossil fuels, and the undesirability of nuclear energy, the only choices we have are energy efficiency and renewables. Fortunately, they are complementary choices and have the added virtue of being carbon free. Renewables include hydro, wind, solar, bio-fuels, geo-thermal, wave, and tidal energy. Of these, wind, solar, geo-thermal, and wave/tidal are abundant, but only wind is currently economical and easy to harness.

How Much Energy  
Probably the best data on the total USA wind resource is the 1993 report found at [www.nrel.gov/wind/potential.html](http://www.nrel.gov/wind/potential.html). This report estimated total potential for 25% efficient turbines, with 25% losses, and average 50m hub heights, and made exclusions for environmental, urban, and agricultural purposes. The result was that about 15 quads of equivalent fossil fuel energy could be replaced by class 5 to 7 winds. Adding class 4 winds, which were marginal at that time, raises the potential to greater than 60 quads.

Most recent Texas wind farms are in class 4 areas.

This report was based on 1991/92 technology, when the largest envisioned turbines were 300 KW and blade rotation speeds were such that considerable areas were excluded for environmental reasons, i.e. bird kill. Best wind speeds were 15-25 mph and it was also assumed that only 20% of the actual wind energy/km2 could be converted to electricity.

Today turbines being installed are 2 MW and in development are 3 MW. Blade rotation is much slower. Efficiencies are now about 35% and losses below 15%. Productive wind speeds are about 7 to 50 mph, moving class 4 areas out of the marginal category. Probable total available wind energy with 2001 technology is above 60 quads, and if we could buy wind energy from Canada, we would have access to near 100 quads fossil fuel equivalent.

In a 1997 study the EIA points out that much of this resource is not readily available for lack of transmission lines. A 1991 study in California estimated that only 12% of the "gross technical potential" was developable under the then existing transmission restraints.

The other major problem with wind is intermittent availability with significant daily, monthly, and seasonal variations. Frequently, peak availability does not correspond with peak energy demand.

All of these problems can be mitigated with an aggressive renewables energy policy. Any energy policy must strongly address upgrading and development.
of the transmission infrastructure. Wind should be central to such planning and execution. Large-scale wind development will lessen the daily and monthly variability as wind is always blowing somewhere in a large developed region. Assuming suitable wind strength 35% of the time, and a regional area as large as North and South Dakota and western Minnesota, 35% of total installed capacity is likely to be available all of the time. Energy storage systems (e.g. Regenesys) are in development that may in the future be combined with wind turbines and completely eliminate daily variability.

In a hydrogen economy, peak wind, not needed for electricity, can be used to produce hydrogen. The wind resource can be sized to exceed electricity needs during the lowest wind season. At all other times the excess electricity can be stored as hydrogen.

Of the 25 quads of renewable energy needed in 2030 (to be illustrated in a future letter), about 8 will be biomass and hydro (already at 7) and at least 15 can be wind.

Cost

In a 1995 disinformation effort, the coal industry sponsored a report developed by Resource Data International and published by the Center for Energy and Economic Development, projecting wind energy costs of 6.8¢/kWh in 1995, remaining unchanged until 2010.1 In a rebuttal, NREL estimated 5.3¢/kWh in 1995, going to 3.5¢ in 2010.1 The Lake Benton Wind Farm in Minnesota, now going into production, will produce wind at 3.2¢/kWh and the Oregon/Washington Stateline project is expected to be in production in 2002 at 2.5¢/kWh. Lake Benton uses 1 MW turbines.

The latest Danish offshore wind farm uses 2 MW turbines, and 3 MW units are likely to be in production by 2003.

Wind energy costs, of course, will vary depending on the steadiness and intensity of the winds being harnessed. However, we can expect average costs in the future to be cheaper than coal fired plants, with none of coal's environmental issues.

Objections

The usual objections presented by wind skeptics are:

* Bird kill
* Unsightliness
* Land area
* Noise
* Future like the past

In response to these objections one can state:

Bird kill - There is no evidence that new large turbines, with slowly rotating blades, kill even as many birds as power lines do.

Noise - Modern turbines have noise levels below 50 dbm (like a summer breeze in the trees) at distances of about 250 yards.

Unsightliness - Surveys in Palm Springs and Wales (UK) show that neighbors grow to like wind farms and find them attractive. Most wind farms in the USA will be sighted in areas that vary from rural to empty, where the issue is unlikely to arise.

Land area - Class 4 and higher wind areas available for wind development are 6% of total lower 48 land area. Of this area, less than 5% would be occupied by turbines, equipment, and access roads. Cultivation can be carried out almost to the base of the turbines, and livestock like the wind
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Future like past - Saying that wind will never happen, because it never has is like saying a one-year-old will never walk because he never has.

Benefits
Apart from clean, inexpensive power, the surprise benefits to the economy can be a sharp drop in farm subsidies. Minnesota farmers earn less than $30/acre with livestock, and $250 per acre with crops, but can earn $1,000/acre from land rental for wind farms, and still have the livestock or crop.

The Challenge
A 2 MW wind turbine with a 30% duty cycle and 95% availability will generate 5.8 million kWh/year. Eighteen quads of wind power by 2030 would require 900,000 turbines, or 30,000 per year starting now. That is five times present world production capacity, but is probably a worst-case estimate. At 3MW, 35% duty cycle and 15 quads we would need only half as many. Building 15,000 to 30,000 turbines per year is no big deal for an economy that can build 17 million cars, trucks, and busses per year, but still, we had better get cranking. It can't wait until after 2020.

Respectfully yours,

Murray Duffin

MD/rmb
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TO: The Honorable Spencer Abraham  
Secretary of Energy  
Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave, SW  
Washington, DC 20585

FROM: Patricia Bennett  
Program Director - Energy Programs

If you do not receive this fax correctly please contact:  
Bennett, Patricia (858) 453-5560 X 120  Email: patricia@iaamericas.org

CONTENT & MESSAGE:

Please see attached  
- invitation letter to participate as a Keynote Speaker  
- draft outline  
- information about the Energy Program of the Institute

2001-016228 Jul 9 A 9:46
Friday, July 06, 2001

The Honorable
Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

The Institute of the Americas, in collaboration with the Inter-American Dialogue is organizing a one day seminar to explore the Bush Administration National Energy Policy and its linkages with Latin American energy strategies. The event is scheduled to take place on September 4, 2001 at the St. Regis hotel in Washington, D.C.

We would be honored if you would accept to give the Keynote Speech on this important international forum.

Following a recommendation by our Steering group member companies, listed at the margin, the Institute is convening this high-level forum to analyze how US Energy Policy both in its national and international scope, influences the Latin American energy sectors and indirectly, their economies. Included among the key topics to be covered are: the benefits and challenges of hemispheric energy globalization; cross-boundary energy trade; lessons learned, similarities and correlation of electric power crises in Brazil and California; and multilateral and bilateral trade agreements advancing competition and investment.

We anticipate participation of the US Secretaries of State, Energy and Commerce, representatives from Latin American Energy Ministries, particularly Bolivia, Brazil, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela, and private sector representatives of the financing and energy industries interested on Latin American investment addressing issues enhancing global alliances and energy security.

Attached is a draft outline of the program, for your information. We welcome your comments or suggestions regarding this program.

Patricia Bennett, Director of Energy Programs for the Institute will be in touch with your office to verify availability. Meanwhile, if you need to contact us, please do so at (858) 453-5560 via fax at (858) 453-2165 and via e-mail at pbennett@lamerica.org.

Sincerely,

Paul H. Boeker
President

Paul H. Boeker
President

10111 North Torrey Pines Road - La Jolla, California 92037 U.S.A. - tel. (858) 453-5560 - fax (858) 453-2165 - web site: www.lamerica.org
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Institute of the Americas
US Energy Policy and its implication
on Latin American Economies
St. Regis Hotel, Washington D.C.
September 4, 2001
Preliminary Agenda

Tuesday, September 4

8:00 Registration
8:45 Welcome and Opening Remarks
   Paul H. Boeker, President, Institute of the Americas
9:00 The Implementation of the National Energy Policy
   US Dept. of Energy
9:30 Demand vs. Capacity: The Energy Challenge for the Americas
10:00 Achieving Common Prosperity: Sharing the Benefits of Globalization
   US Dept. of Commerce (OECD) (WTO) (FTAA)
10:30 The Role of Multilateral Organizations and Bilateral Relationships: Advancing Competition, trade and investment
11:00 Coffee Break

DEVELOPING ENERGY INTEGRATION: Policy, Trade, and Investment Analysis

11:30 Mexico:
   North American Energy Group
   Oil, natural gas, and electricity cross-border trade
   Border Region and "Presidential Permitting"
   Mexico’s Electric Power Opening

(US Secretary of Energy,
FERC,
Mexico Secretary of Energy,
CRE, US Private sector energy companies,
Multilateral Trade Policy in the Ministry of Economy of Mexico)

1:00 Lunch
2:00 Bilateral Investment Treaties:
   Venezuela
   Brazil
   (US Commerce Dept. and Venezuela and Brazil Energy Ministries)
3:00 North-Bound Trade: South American Gas for US Markets
   Bolivia
3:30 Coffee Break
4:00 Promoting Sustained Economic Growth: Collaborative market based solutions to environmental concerns
5:00 Hemispheric Implications of US Energy Policy
6:30 Reception
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Institute of the Americas
Energy Program 2001

The Institute of the Americas' energy sector program main goals are to promote economic integration in the region and to identify new project opportunities, new financing mechanisms, and means for the public and private sectors to work together for trade liberalization and cooperation that will facilitate business transactions and investment throughout the hemisphere.

We accomplish these goals by working closely with the public and private sectors as well as with the multilateral financial institutions that are major sources of funding for such projects.

To keep pace with the events in the rapidly evolving energy sector, the Institute brings together experts in business development, competitive intelligence, and strategic planning on business opportunities in the oil & gas, petrochemicals, and electric utilities sectors in Latin America.

The Institute's work focuses on the importance of the regulatory structure governing private involvement and sector integration to help identify, evaluate, and develop the critical planning strategies required for a successful enterprise, in collaboration with the various energy ministries.

Tenth Annual Latin America Energy Conference

Celebrating ten successful years, The La Jolla Conference, was held on May 21-22, 2001, convening the most influential players of the Latin American energy sector. The meeting addressed energy integration, private sector restructuring strategies, energy trade, and the latest policies and plans affecting the Latin American markets, incorporating in-depth analysis of the energy trade, emerging trends, and opportunities for private investment in Latin America.

Roundtables

The Energy Roundtables offer opportunities to examine energy policy issues and its implication, by encouraging greater strategic input from business and fostering understanding amongst key energy sector players.

These private events, held in cooperation with the pertinent government agencies, address energy sector’s pressing issues, relevant policies and practices, market opportunities, and prospects through open and candid dialogue.

Scheduled for 2001 are five energy executive meetings:

- Mexico Power Roundtable, Mexico City, March 13-14
- Brazil Energy Roundtable, Rio de Janeiro, June 25-26
- Central American Energy Roundtable, Antigua, Guatemala, October 2-3
- Venezuelan Oil and Gas Roundtable (date and venue to be defined)

Energy Sector Steering Committee

AEG Corporation
Arthur Andersen
Bechtel Corporation
BP
Caterpillar/Solar Turbines
Chevron Overseas Petroleum
CMS Energy
Duke Energy International
Enbasa
Enron
ExxonMobil Gas Marketing Company
GE Capital, Structured Finance Group
GE Power Systems
INTESA
JP Morgan
PSEG Americas
SAIC
Sempra Energy International
Shell International Exploration & Production
Shell International Gas Limited
Société Générale
Technit Group
Thelen Reid & Priest LLP

For additional information, please contact: Patricia Bennett, Director of Energy Programs, at +(858) 453-5560 ext. 120, email: pbennett@iamericas.org

To find out about sponsorship or Steering Group opportunities, please contact Mary Morrison at +(858) 453-5560 ext. 123, or via e-mail at: mmorrison@iamericas.org

For our latest calendar, registration, and more information, please visit our Web site at: http://www.iamericas.org
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