Dear Mr. Vice President:

As a follow-up to my previous request to serve on the newly created energy task force, I am forwarding the comments of the Nuclear Waste Strategy Coalition's Federal Intervention Legislative Liaison regarding my request to serve on the task force. I am truly honored and blessed to receive such recognition and words of encouragement from a noble and worthy organization that is truly committed to serving the interests of our nation's nuclear utility ratepayers.

If I may be of any assistance to you and the task force, please don't hesitate to contact me. Thank you again for any consideration you may give to my request.

Clinton E. Crackel

---Original Message---
From: Martez Norris [mailto:Marte Norris@state.mn.us]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2001 2:09 PM
To: Clint.Crackel@fema.gov
Subject: Re: FW: Energy Task Force

<<Marte Norris.vcf>> Good luck with the Task Force position. We sure need a friend. The Coalition is planning to meet with members of the Task Force soon. Good luck. Martez

Marte Norris
Federal Intervention Legislative Liaison
Minnesota Department of Commerce
Nuclear Waste Strategy Coalition
85 - 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198
Tel: 651.296.0417 Fax: 651.296.5819
Email address: martez.norris@state.mn.us

>>> "Crackel, Clint" <Clint.Crackel@fema.gov> 01/29 2:00 PM >>>
Senator Fitzgerald:
For your information...
---Original Message---
From: Crackel, Clint
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2001 12:54 PM
To: "vice.presIDENT@whitehouse.gov"
Subject: Energy Task Force

1

21147
DOE022-0028

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
Dear Mr. Vice President:

I have just learned of President Bush's decision to create a Federal energy task force. I would be honored to have the opportunity to assist you on the task force if you wish to utilize my services. I have attached a brief, one-page resume for your information. Please let me know if I can be of service.

<<Clint C Res 1.doc>>

Thank you for any consideration you may give to my request.

Clinton E. Crackel
Hello. My name is Steven Tzeferakos and I am an economist with Industry Canada HQ, (a federal government department here in Ottawa, Canada).

My director has requested that I begin to look into current and future U.S. energy policy developments, (at the moment, primarily in regards to the 'Cheney Energy Task Force'-National Energy Policy Development Group which Mr. Abraham is a member of). There seems to be some material out there but I'm not quite sure how reliable some of it is. Would you be able to provide me with detailed information (reports/briefings) in regards to these initiatives, their aims, current progress/findings and related upcoming developments in this process?

Information on near term anticipated releases & for upcoming meetings would be of use in ensuring that the Assistant Deputy Minister is up-to-date and doesn't miss anything over the next little while. (For example, I believe that in the near future there will be a House Energy Subcommittee hearing on National Energy Policy this Wednesday, and a 'Problems Report' issued by the Policy Development Group on March the 10th?) Do you have such information or know of the appropriate contacts who could help me in this matter? Your suggestions and assistance would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Tzeferakos
10305 East Tower
235 Queen Street, O.D. Howe Building
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A-0H5
CANADA
TEL (613) 957-4262
FAX (613) 941-2463
From: Mary Thacker <thack002@umn.edu> on 01/30/2001 05:07 PM GMT

To: president@Whitehouse.GOV
cc: 
Subject: Energy task force needs others

Dear President Bush,

from The New York Times, January 30, 2001
"Along with Mr. Cheney, Mr. Bush's energy task force includes Treasury Secretary Paul H. O'Neill; Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham; Commerce Secretary Donald L. Evans; Agriculture Secretary Ann M. Veneman and Transportation Secretary Norman Y. Mineta. It is also to include the Environmental Protection Agency administrator-designate, Christie Whitman, and the Interior secretary-designate, Gale A. Norton."

It is is group of "insiders" who will certainly follow your pronouncements and ill-chosen policy. Diversity of thought and diversity of solutions must be part of the discussion.

This committee is not representative of the wide concerns, diversity of thought, and depth of research on the oil drilling and energy issue. THERE MUST BE REPRESENTATIVES OF CONSERVATION, RESEARCH, AND ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS AT THE TABLE.

It is my hope, as you move to create the world according to George W. Bush, that you will be thoughtful every day of this fact: THE MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE VOTED FOR ANOTHER CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mary Thacker
March 22, 2001

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

RE: Coordinating the National Energy Policy and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

Dear Secretary Abraham:

I congratulate you on your recent speech before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce at the National Energy Summit. Having arrived at the brink of a new energy crisis, due in large part to nearly a decade of political shortsightedness, I applaud your efforts to propose and implement a National Energy Policy. I would also like to propose a solution to a legal issue that you and the Administration will no doubt confront very soon.

As you and the Administration prepare to announce a proposed energy policy to the nation, I would suggest that there is a statutory tool that could serve you, the Energy Task Force, and the Administration quite well, if applied strategically. This statutory tool consists of the environmental process requirements within the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Too often, Federal agencies forsake the opportunity to use the procedural requirements of NEPA to their full advantage, especially when confronting a new policy or plan. Instead, environmental compliance becomes an afterthought and the obligatory process fails to provide the political gains and legal protection of a well-designed NEPA strategy.

An objective reading of 40 CFR §1508.18(b) by your attorneys will confirm that NEPA applies to the adoption of a proposed national energy strategy. The critical question for the Administration, therefore, is not whether, but when and how to satisfy the procedural requirements of the statute. May I suggest that it would be to the Administration’s strategic advantage to implement the procedural requirements of NEPA as soon as practicable and to utilize a policy-level approach to statutory compliance. The benefits of such a strategy would be many, including: 1) the immediate recognition that the Administration takes environmental requirements seriously; 2) reassurance to a suspicious public that the development of a national energy policy will be an above-board process with ample opportunity for public involvement; 3) an acceleration of the actual implementation of the new energy policy and ensuing site-specific actions; and 4) the
establishment of a strong legal position from which to defend against the inevitable challenge.

DOE is fortunate to employ some of the best NEPA talent in the country. Carol Borgstrom, Bill Dennison, Marc Johnston, Steve Fergusen, to name just a few, are outstanding practitioners and counselors. Additionally, the staff at the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), which oversees NEPA compliance nationally, relies upon the exceptional guidance of Dinah Bear and others. Some of the other Federal agencies that would necessarily cooperate in the development of a national energy policy also have NEPA advisors with varying degrees of expertise. Nevertheless, with all this talent, designing an effective NEPA strategy to advance a national energy policy will be an enormous undertaking and require creative thinking “outside the box.”

May I suggest that a policy-level document recently prepared by DOE’s Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), which evaluates the alternative means to balance regional energy production and fish and wildlife mitigation, would serve as a useful analytical model for a NEPA process to support the national energy policy. This BPA NEPA process is an outgrowth of another policy-level NEPA document prepared for the Agency’s business plan, which was lauded by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit as “superior.” In my opinion, the methodology employed by BPA to examine energy and environmental issues in the Pacific Northwest could be modified and expanded to evaluate similar issues on a national scale.

To be completely candid, I assisted BPA, as a consultant, in the preparation of the aforementioned policy level NEPA document and am very proud to have contributed to the development of this unique document. I have approached bigger, more recognized NEPA consulting firms about jointly proposing a procedural solution for a national energy policy, but I sense that they either fear the vastness of this project or are unwilling to step “outside the box” to change their standard approach to NEPA compliance. In my opinion, however, it is the very enormity of the project that mandates a different procedural approach, as BPA was willing to do with respect to their analysis of energy production and endangered salmon.

It now occurs to me that DOE and the Administration may be further along than anticipated and, probably feared, in the development of a strategy that will satisfy an important environmental compliance requirement, involve and inform the public, advance an energy policy long overdue, and provide legal protection. I would further suggest that the cost of fulfilling these goals could be considerably less than some may propose. Much of the talent necessary to do the job is scattered around the country, but already on the government payroll. I predict that the challenge of being associated with such a substantial and unique NEPA project would be of great interest to these individuals. No doubt, such an endeavor would require a recommitment of resources, but the job need not cost the many millions that some will no doubt suggest.

In closing, as one who has seen good, bad and ugly NEPA processes, I strongly suggest that DOE, the Interior Department, CEQ, EPA and others begin to design a
NEPA strategy today that will position the Administration where it wants to be a year or two down the road. The sooner you start, the sooner you can actually begin to solve the problem to your greatest advantage.

I appreciate your valuable time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

P. Benjamin Underwood, Esq.

cc: The Honorable President of the United States George W. Bush
    The Honorable Vice-President of the United States and Chairman
    of the Energy Task Force Richard Cheney
    The Honorable Secretary of Interior Gale Norton
April 4, 2001

The Honorable Richard Cheney
Vice President of The United States
Office of the Vice President
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

RE: Energy Task Force

Honorable Vice President Cheney:

Events concerning the deteriorating energy situation in the United States, and the apparent lack of a long term solution, has led me to write this letter in order to make you aware of an invention that will provide the ultimate solution to the worlds energy problems.

I have written letters to various government leaders over the past two years, including several letters to the Department of Energy, concerning the invention of a machine that provides a new source of energy. It would seem logical, that with the energy and pollution problems the world is currently facing, I would have received some positive responses. However, such has not been the case and, therefore, I am making another attempt at enlisting the involvement of the Federal Government to help bring this extremely important invention into the market place.

I have invented a machine that can transform potential energy into useful continuous energy. This invention will help resolve the energy problems currently faced throughout the world. It will accomplish this by providing clean, low cost energy without polluting the environment. This invention will provide the energy of the future. The type of energy that will provide opportunities for consumers to heat and light their homes without having to pay fuel cost, or automobiles that run without the use fuel. This new invention will revolutionize the production and distribution of energy in the future.

-1-
I would like to have you and the Department of Energy in the forefront of this revolutionary development. In fact, this invention is so revolutionary that I am positive government involvement will be necessary in order to prevent the technology from falling into the wrong hands and to speed the introduction of the product into the market place. I am talking about a machine that can continuously provide clean energy without the use of fuel. Clearly, this new invention is the answer to most of the energy problems California, the country, and the world are currently facing. I hope you will not miss the opportunity to lead this important energy related revolution.

I have attached a general description of the invention for your review. Your positive response, within two(2) weeks, will be appreciated. This invention is needed throughout the world. If no positive response is received from you or the Energy Department, within the two week period, I intend to take alternative steps to get this invention to the market. Those alternatives include, but is not limited to, approaching the public directly, soliciting the assistance of the United Nations, or seeking the involvement of interested foreign countries.

I wait in anticipation for your immediate and positive response. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bosquet G. DePina

CC: Secretary of Energy
The Honorable Spence Abraham
U. S. Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585
Subject: Invention of a machine that provides a new source of Energy

Introduction

Events of the past year, as they relate to energy volume and price manipulation, should give a clear indication that a new source of energy is desperately needed, if world economy and current standard of living are to continue to prosper. Projections for the future indicate energy demand will increase by approximately 30% by the year 2020. This reinforces the need for an alternative source of energy.

This new source of energy has been discovered. A machine that can transform potential energy, available in various forms around us, into useful energy has been invented. This new invention will provide the ultimate energy for the future. It will lead to the solution of many of the present and projected energy problems, while also contributing significantly to the reduction of air pollution. This machine will provide energy that is useful, clean, continuous, controllable, non-pollutant and, above all, efficient anywhere energy is required. It will accomplish all these without the need for fuel of any type. A working prototype has already been built.

The country that is first to register this invention will enjoy significant economic advantages.

Background

The inventor spent a good portion of the last four decades, building and testing various machine prototypes, in search of the ultimate machine design that would produce useful energy without consuming fuel. After many years of experimentation, failed attempts, and disappointments, success has finally been achieved and a machine that will revolutionize the production of useful and clean energy has been built.
Description

The subject invention is a machine considered to be impossible to build by the best of scientists. The machine has the following principle characteristics:

- Produces energy that is useful and controllable.
- Does not consume fuel of any type.
- Operates efficiently and produces no pollutants.
- Runs continuously, except for maintenance requirement after many years of service.
- Maintenance requirement consists primarily of lubrication and/or possible replacement of worn moving parts.
- The machine is operationally simple due to its concept of extraordinary technology.
- It is almost 100% free of breakdowns.

Application

The machine provides the basic energy that provide power utilized to run other machines or equipment. For this reason it has a vast potential application. Although its immediate application will likely be in the production of electricity, it can be used wherever energy is required. It can be applied for use on land, water, air or space. Specific application will depend on market demand and the capability of the manufacturer(s) to meet customer requirements.

The inventor envisions the manufacturer will be building variations of this machine to fit the customer’s intended application.

Competition

There is no product in the market today that can compete with this invention. Solar, wind and other related renewable sources of energy may be considered competitors, since they do not use conventional fuel. However, these other sources of energy come with significant limitations due to their dependence on weather and other factors. Additionally, with projections of energy demand to increase at approximately 3% a year through the year 2020, and with
all the increases in demand expected to be met by increases in the production of fossil fuel, there will be ample room in the market for this new product to succeed.

**Development & Marketing**

The need for this type of equipment is so great, and the technology is so revolutionary, that government involvement is highly recommended. Due to the state of energy requirement, and the pollution problems being caused by existing power producing equipment, a speedy introduction of this new technology to the market place is required. The machine is relatively simple to manufacture and within a short period of time hundreds can be built and placed in service. Government involvement, in this revolutionary energy producing invention, is desirable in order to keep the equipment from controlling interests that may want to use it for undesirable purposes.

**Contacts**

For additional Information contact:

Bossuet G. DePina

Or

Neo S. Silva
Honorable Secretary Spencer Abraham
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

We would like to invite you to be a key participant in our Blue Ribbon Panel on Energy in America for the 21st Century to be held in Washington, D.C. at the Willard Hotel on Monday, April 23, 2001. We are inviting about 15 national political and business leaders to meet and discuss energy policy -- America's energy needs and how best to meet them.

This Blue Ribbon Panel will meet in a private conference room at the Willard Hotel on Monday morning, April 23rd. The purpose of the meeting will be to give you and the other national leaders a chance to discuss and formulate a sound approach to energy that the Panel can share with the White House. Andrew D. Lundquist -- who serves as Executive Director of the White House Energy Task Force created by President George W. Bush and chaired by Vice President Cheney -- has agreed to attend. The White House task force (i.e. National Energy Policy Development Group) and is comprised up of the Secretaries of Energy, the Interior, Treasury, Commerce, Transportation and Agriculture, as well as the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. After the conclusion of the luncheon, the meeting will adjourn. However, in the coming days, our blue ribbon panel will develop a written report which will be presented to Vice President Cheney.

I would be honored to have you serve with me on this Blue Ribbon Panel to promote sound energy policy. Given the immediacy of this matter, I request that you let us know within the next few days, if you can participate. I look forward to working with you to play a positive role in developing sound energy solutions for America's future.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Wallop

P.S. I have asked the Executive Director of the Frontiers of Freedom Institute, George Landrith, to coordinate the details with your staff. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact George at 703-527-8282. We understand that on short notice it may be impossible for you to attend. Please pass this invitation along to a deputy or other high ranking member of your staff and have them contact us to coordinate their participation.
April 10, 2001

Honorable Secretary Spencer Abraham
ATTN: Robyne Johnston
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

We would like to invite you to be a key participant in our Blue Ribbon Panel on Energy in America for the 21st Century to be held in Washington, D.C. at the Willard Hotel on Monday, April 23, 2001. We are inviting about 15 national political and business leaders to meet and discuss energy policy — America's energy needs and how best to meet them.

This Blue Ribbon Panel will meet in a private conference room at the Willard Hotel on Monday morning, April 23rd. The purpose of the meeting will be to give you and the other national leaders a chance to discuss and formulate a sound approach to energy that the Panel can share with the White House. Andrew D. Lundquist — who serves as Executive Director of the White House Energy Task Force created by President George W. Bush and chaired by Vice President Cheney — has agreed to attend. The White House task force (i.e., National Energy Policy Development Group) and is comprised up of the Secretaries of Energy, the Interior, Treasury, Commerce, Transportation and Agriculture, as well as the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. After the conclusion of the luncheon, the meeting will adjourn. However, in the coming days, our blue ribbon panel will develop a written report which will be presented to Vice President Cheney.

I would be honored to have you serve with me on this Blue Ribbon Panel to promote sound energy policy. Given the immediacy of this matter, I request that you let us know within the next few days if you can participate. I look forward to working with you to play a positive role in developing sound energy solutions for America's future.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Wallop

P.S. I have asked the Executive Director of the Frontiers of Freedom Institute, George Landrith, to coordinate the details with your staff. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact George at 703-527-8282.
The Business Roundtable strongly endorses this Administration for forming a special White House energy task force that will address critical energy issues. We encourage the development of a coherent and comprehensive strategy that effectively responds to the daunting economic, technological and environmental challenges ahead.

Below, the BRT outlines the long-term goals that should shape this strategy, and we offer some short-term recommendations. We are guided by three principles. First, a diverse energy supply promotes energy security and supports economic stability. Second, the Federal Government and private sector should engage in science and technology R&D to address long-term energy and environmental concerns. Third, processes should be developed and followed to align energy and environmental policies.

National Energy Security and Economic Stability is a goal that is now at risk. The wrong policy actions, such as unnecessary federal land use restrictions, popular consumer price caps, and casual opening of national emergency energy reserves, only exacerbate the energy supply and demand problem and undermine market mechanisms. For the most part, this can, and should, be corrected through promoting diverse energy supplies; vigilantly maintaining competitive markets; avoiding price controls; and minimizing or eliminating regulatory, tax and trade disincentives to improving energy efficiency and spurring technology innovation.

An Association Of Chief Executive Officers Committed To Improving Public Policy
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Energy Technology Research and Development is a goal that should be actively pursued by the Federal Government. The U.S. has substantial human resources dedicated to technological innovation, public and private. Public resources should be applied to productive and diverse energy technology R&D, including broad climate change R&D of emission reductions, carbon sequestration and adaptation technologies. These resources should be deployed in collaboration with business to assure that new and existing energy supply and energy conservation technologies are accepted by global markets. However, the government should avoid "picking winners and losers;" therefore, transparent processes should be established which develop and prioritize an energy technology R&D agenda and which continually assess and improve returns on government R&D investments.

Energy and Environmental Policy Alignment is imperative in the current energy crisis. The Federal Government should better align energy and environmental policies and the associated regulatory processes with a view to optimizing the synergies between these areas in policy decision-making. Risk-based analytical methods should be used across Federal agencies to compare, assess and communicate energy technology benefits and human health and environmental risks. Furthermore, ongoing risk analysis can point to the challenges and opportunities for long-term technological innovation, and perhaps, help avoid accelerating and/or escalating, crisis-like swings and clashes.

Finally, the BRT makes the following short-term strategy recommendations.

- Review regulations and regulatory processes both to identify and remove unjustifiable barriers to bringing energy technologies and services to market and to develop incentives that will not only enhance the functioning of the marketplace for energy, but also, achieve greater environmental results. In particular, rationalize and streamline Clean Air Act new source review requirements to produce a simpler, more workable permitting program - one that will not impede the ability of businesses to apply technology to increase process and operational efficiency and improve environmental performance.

- Develop energy and environmental policies that are fully informed by our historical experience with, and understanding of the consequences of, using market interventions such as price caps, natural resource management bans and mandates.

- Establish a balanced and transparent science and technology advisory process of government, industry and academia to identify and prioritize energy and environmental risks and recommend an R&D agenda.

- Bring these actions into a realistic global perspective. National energy independence does not, and will not, exist for the foreseeable future. Such a goal would distort markets and misallocate global resources. Meeting our national energy security needs necessitates supply diversification within a global energy market. Efforts to impose unilateral trade sanctions should be avoided. Foreign direct investment by the U.S. in prospective oil producing countries will be essential to meet future U.S. energy requirements.
The Business Roundtable has long been studying these issues. We have several publications (www.brt.org) that address many of our goals. These include: "Unleashing Innovation: The Right Approach to Global Climate Change," "Environmental Blueprint 2001," "Towards Smarter Regulation," and several others on subjects such as climate change and information management. Please know that we are committed to thoughtfully and constructively engaging these issues and stand ready to participate with you in shaping and executing a strategy that addresses the serious energy problems that confront us.

Sincerely,

Jamie Deavenport
Chairman & CEO
Eastman Chemical Company
Chairman, Environment, Technology &
The Economy Task Force
The Business Roundtable

William Cavanaugh
Chairman, President & CEO
Progress Energy, Inc.
Chairman, Energy Committee
The Business Roundtable

cc: The Honorable Spencer Abraham
The Honorable Joe M. Allbaugh
The Honorable Josh Bolton
The Honorable Mitchell Daniels
The Honorable Donald L. Evans
The Honorable Lawrence Lindsey
The Honorable Norman Y. Mineta
The Honorable Gale Norton
The Honorable Paul Henry O'Neill
The Honorable Colin L. Powell
The Honorable Donald H. Rumsfeld
The Honorable Ann M. Veneman
The Honorable Christine Todd Whitman
Mr. Ruben S. Barrales
Mr. Andrew D. Lundquist

Enclosures (3)
Secretary of Energy, Spencer Abraham  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave, SW  
Washington DC 20585

Dear Mr. Abraham  

May 11th, 2001

Approximately 3 months ago, I sent a letter to the Governor of Colorado, Bill Owens, Senators Wayne Allard and Ben Nighthorse-Campbell and United States Representative Joel Heffley. Today I write again, adding our very respected Vice President, Dick Cheney; who is working diligently with a "National Energy Task Force". My previous message addressed the concern that I have with escalating prices for electrical power and with the general condition that regardless of who wants to blame, we must take emergency and/or crisis level action to see that the present issues with energy shortfall and rising prices are addressed with long term corrective action and not "band-aids".

I write this letter as both a concerned American and as an Executive in the Semiconductor business with responsibility for a major manufacturing site of Atmel Corp. in Colorado Springs, CO. I believe this problem is as significant as was our need to put men in space ~40 years ago, and to say that we had better treat it in the same manner; with a vision given to the American people as to the real nature and size of the problem. Along with the vision of the problem must come a vision for solutions in the near, intermediate, and long term that allows our economic well-being to remain positive and full of hope in each of those forward looking time periods. This is not a smaller task than putting men in space and on the moon, and in reality it is even more important as it has "everything" to do with the American way of life, and the expectations of opportunity that we would wish all to have.

The issue is ENERGY! And as I stated above, at stake is the standard of living of every American, and those citizens of any other country who aspire for economic freedom and opportunity.

All economic issues, events, or situations are the result of the balance of a myriad of forces, to name some:

- Conservation and/or conservationists
- Productivity (Producing the most for the least, or preventing the loss of purchasing power by continuously producing at a higher rate than the underlying cost components)
- Exploration and Development (oil, natural gas, nuclear energy)
- Producing and Refining
- Automobiles being manufactured including a range from "lean machine" to "gas guzzler"

If not for a sustained period of low inflation and high productivity in place at this time, the present economic downturn could very easily have been a major recession. We are lucky and "everyone" had best admit it to themselves. In fact, I contend that this current downturn has the potential for greater retrenching if we don't build confidence that we have a plan in both areas of energy and taxes. Yes, tax relief is important, but the optimum solution to our energy situation and its'
potential influence on our economy is much, much more. We had better have the right answer this
time, because this issue has only received "lip service" for the past 30 years, and we had better
"sell" our "right answer" to the American public as though it is the emergency that it really is.

We have time to be in control of the play-out of all these opposing forces, but there will be "no
more time", if we play "games" with the energy situation again.

Let's recognize with the wisdom of many of the prophets of biblical times, that from blessings can
come self-confidence that can erode to arrogance, indulgence, greed, and apathy. We are not
"above" the nature of humankind.
We in America have come to a point of economic prosperity and superiority that we believe we can
"have our cake, and eat it too", that the "good times" will never run out, that at least is what we
have come to expect. As a result, we want to believe that we can leverage all the "easy" forces in
the equation, and ignore the harder or more distasteful ones.

Some for instances:
- If one SUV is big, then the next supplier makes a bigger one, and what does the consumer
do...he follows in like step,
- If one conservationist wants their State to keep out all new power installations because of
"their" more precious environment, then let's do it, ..."but" we don't want to pay higher
prices, or do without the many things electrical power provides.
- Maybe the most classic is..."I want to eat any and all the food I want, but I don't want to
gain a single pound".

What's the point? The point is that we don't have the time, nor can we get this done if we only do
the "easy stuff". We must be willing to conserve in our homes, we must be willing to give up on
these "tanker size" SUVs, we must be willing to give some ground, not in the fashion of compromise,
but in order to "optimize" and achieve the end which allows the most economic viability; otherwise
we will give it up in our standard of living. How do I know? We are already there. Californian's are
suffering brownouts, with both gasoline and utility bills they can ill afford. Many lower income
citizens, are giving up medicine, or even foods they might otherwise buy, because of "ills" that are
now 30-100% higher than a year or two years ago. The bad news is "at the doorstep".

I'm sure that the talent, skill, and demonstrated qualifications of those on Vice President Cheney's
Energy Task Force are very adequate to the task. But I do have some concerns, the primary one
being that "it's hands off" to have the American citizen forego their existing lifestyle, or in any way
require of them more discipline, or live with less options than they do today.
Folks, this is serious: we had best not leave one element aside that can be a contributing factor in
this race. Also, is there anyone reading this that agrees with my position that this "THS" bigger
than a "man in space", and is just as daunting in the magnitude of issues that we face whether
technically, socially, or otherwise? We need to make this a "National Endeavor" and sell the vision
of both the problem and the solution, and get our nation behind the program.

Some "must do's":
- Allow and encourage coal-fired power generating installations, by moderating/optimizing the
amount of cost of capital equipment with less strict EPA regulations for the next 3-5 years.
- Have each State project both their planned use and capacity of electrical power from both
public and private sources, Where critical gaps exist in some States, insure that there are
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solutions that can be implemented to close those gaps: as a minimum, understand "where" the problems are and what is being done to remove them.

- Almost every area of the country has seen natural gas prices "double" over the past year. With a combined task force of government and energy company officials, require a composite look at the demand and capacity projected forward: what is required to bring forces into place, from all aspects—exploration, development, transport, delivery—that will mitigate this current rise, or as a minimum insure the present accelerated price trend is moderated. Insure, everything is "on the table", there should be no predatory pricing, or gouging, because of the present demand/supply scenario. If so, it's no different than the abhorrent looting that goes on in the aftermath of a tornado, or hurricane.

- Do the same thing for electrical power installations and generation, what's the plan, where are the gaps, how do we "head them off"?

- Do the same for oil, we face a much higher probability that oil supply shortfall compromises our economy and/or standard of living, than any potential military action.

So far, I've limited this discussion to the existing fossil fuel constraint; when it (fossil fuel) is gone ("fini"), the above arguments get really serious. The thoughts presented above only deal with the short and intermediate term, so why does anyone think that 30-50 years from now (when my grandkids are in their prime) isn't as demanding upon science and technology as was/is the effort by NASA and any associated enterprises in the era of space exploration? Sometimes I get the feeling that we have seen so many technological miracles that we find the one of delivering energy to our homes for heating and cooling in very different ways, or the one of providing fuel to an automobile, that is no longer oil based as a very boring and unimportant endeavor. Quite the opposite, this is as important as any key event in the history of our country, because left undone, it takes away our ability to continue the "productivity" curve such that "every American" has the opportunity before them.

Now, let me address another side of the coin. The last area our politicians want to take action in is the market place, i.e. influence or control prices. Let me touch on three areas where something can be done (if the courage is there to do it):

1) As individuals, families, or business enterprises, we are facing ludicrous increases in electrical rates in the year 2000/2001. Please refer to the attached chart, which depicts the price for the Colorado Springs Utilities to purchase power from other sources when used to supplement the existing power capacity available from this very efficient and well run public utilities provider. I think it goes without saying that from 1985 through 1999 those providers of supplemental power were operating on what they considered an acceptable profitability. So what happened? First of all natural gas prices increased, therefore that cost must be passed on. Secondly, nothing else happened except the power providers in the American west saw an opportunity with the California situation to "gauge" the consumer and industrial users of electricity. In fact, the Atmel site here in Colorado Springs will pay an additional $1m for power in 2001 than even that in 2000. How many jobs does $1m account for? At least 25-30 jobs. Why is it so unreasonable to give a Presidential order that no company in an unstable market environment can have greater than a 100% margin against their cost? The result of such an order would reduce the 2001 rate on the attached chart to less than ½ of that depicted, and for our new President, such an order would likely increase votes on his behalf in 2004 in California by a significant amount. That should not be President Bush's motivation, but regardless, it's a very likely result.
2) Now for gasoline, the present prices are ludicrous and predatory. A year ago oil prices went to $37 per barrel, and gasoline prices went up dramatically; supposedly because of this huge price increase in basic supply, the many blends and regulations placed on refined gasoline, and the shortage of capacity to actually produce at the rates demanded. One year later, when the oil supply cost is at $27-28 per barrel, and all other things are basically equal, the price for gasoline is far beyond it’s peaks of last year, even though we are only early in the expanded driving season. In a period where consolidation of major "oil" corporations is rampant, due diligence requires the excessive profit rates of these corporations to be reviewed. Why is it that most of our high tech corporations are suffering serious revenue, profit, and stock value setbacks in a time that the major oil firms are more profitable than ever? Please don’t try to convince me that we are seeing a huge increase in the "productivity" of our oil firms...they don’t even understand the word.

3) On the other side, the American people still "wants it's cake and eat it too". I've attached two website renditions of the ever increasing SUV size. We are facing a terribly bleak picture in the near term for gasoline prices and for any real solutions to mitigate this issue to be found. Give an EPA mandate that "Carl" personal or family vehicles delivered in the year 2003 or 4, achieve 25 mpg on highway, and you will see things change. Will this really "cost" the American public anything? Not really. I myself actually own a 1997 Jeep Grand Cherokee, purchased well before I could read enough material to understand the current scenario being played out. Really, my concern is not with $1.79-2.00 gas prices, my concern is that unless we do something our economy and our standard of living will be more like many countries around the world than the one that exceeds all expectations ever conceived. By the way, my Grand Cherokee is up for sale!

We are a proud nation, the "land of opportunity", where at some point "all" people will be limited only by their own desire, and personal drive. We face a real crisis and yes, we can’t afford to “scare the public”, but tell us, the American people, the truth, a complete picture. Show us what really happens if we don’t act. Show us what can be done if we do. Show us the options and why you choose to do what you propose to do, we can come together when we "have to", when we must....as a Nation we always have.

Sincerely,

Ralph Bohannon
Sr. Vice President
Atmel Corp.

Cc: Dick Cheney
    Joel Heffley
    Ben Nighthorse Campbell
    Wayne Allard
    George Perlegas
    Bill O'Reilly

Vice President of the United States
House Representative
U.S. Senator
U.S. Senator
President & Chief Executive Officer,
Atmel Corporation
Fox News Channel
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### Dimensions & Specs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engine Type</td>
<td>AWD - High Output LQ9 6.0L OHV V8 2WD - 5.3L OHV V8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Delivery</td>
<td>AWD - Sequential fuel injection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>AWD - 364 / 5967 (cm³) 2WD - 327 / 5328 (cm³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression Ratio</td>
<td>AWD - 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsepower/Torque (lb-ft)</td>
<td>AWD - 345 @ 5200 rpm 380 @ 4000 rpm 2WD - 285 @ 5200 rpm 325 @ 4000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>AWD - 4L60-E HD 2WD - Four-speed electronic-shift overdrive automatic with torque converter clutch, 4L60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towing Capacity*</td>
<td>AWD - 8,500 lbs. 2WD - 7,700 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Drive Ratio</td>
<td>AWD - 3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fuel Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA Estimated MPG</td>
<td>AWD - 12 City/16 highway* 2WD - 14 City/18 highway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chassis Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheelbase</td>
<td>116.0 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tread (f/r)</td>
<td>65 in. /66 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Diameter</td>
<td>39.54 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GMC.COM: MODELS & SPECS**

**ALL-NEW ENVOY ENGINEERED FOR SURPRISING COMFORT**

Introducing the all-new GMC Envoy. The next generation Envoy not only provides you with the capabilities you demand in an SUV, it offers extraordinary comfort. Its remarkably smooth ride, expansive room, accommodating amenities, quiet interior and smooth engine performance work in concert to cradle you in comfort.

### Envoy/4WD/SLT

**Engine:**

- **Vortec 4200 Inline six-cylinder**
  - **Capacity:** 4.2 liters
  - **Bore and Stroke (mm):** 83 x 102
  - **Compression Ratio:** 10.1:1
  - **Valve Train:** Double-overhead-cam with four valves per cylinder
  - **Fuel Delivery:** Sequential fuel injection
  - **SAE Net Horsepower @ RPM (auto transmission):** 270 @ 6000
  - **SAE Net Torque @ RPM (lb-ft):** 275 @ 3000

**Transmission:**

- 4L80-E Hydramatic 4-speed automatic with overdrive.
  - Powertrain: available with and without traction control

### Specifications:

- **Overall Length:** 191.5"
- **Overall Height:** 71.9"
- **Overall Width:** 74.7"
- **Wheelbase:** 113.5"
- **Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (lbs):** 5,750
- **Front Suspension:** Double-A front arm
- **Front Axle capacity (total lbs):** 2,600
- **Front Spring capacity (total lbs):** 3,100
- **Rear Suspension:** 5 leaf
- **Rear Axle capacity (total lbs):** 3,300
- **Rear Spring capacity (total lbs):** 3,300
- **Brakes:** Vented 4-wheel disc with anti-lock braking system
- **Fuel Tank Capacity (gallons):** 18.7
- **Battery:** Delco Freedom
- **Cold Cranking AMPS rating:** Standard Heavy-duty 800CCA
- **Alternator:** 120 AMPS
- **Maximum Towing Weight (LBS):** 6,200
- **Tire:**
  - **Tire Size:** 3.42
  - **Tire Weight:** 10% - 15% of trailer weight up to 750 lbs

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
June 6, 2001

Dear Representative Thompson:

Thank you for your recent letter urging the Administration to implement your recommendations to ameliorate electricity shortages by Executive Order as soon as possible. The President certainly appreciates your concern and suggestions.

I have shared your letter with the President's energy policy advisors and the Energy Task Force who are formulating policy recommendations in this area. Your comments are receiving their close and careful attention.

Thanks again for your letter on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Nicholas E. Calio
Assistant to the President and
Director of Legislative Affairs

The Honorable Mike Thompson
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Bcc w/ copy for appropriate action: VPTF
For Information: DP, DOE
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