September 20, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham,
Secretary of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Enclosed are numerous unsolicited proposals and idea papers that we received from citizens from all across the country during the development of the National Energy Policy, and in the months to follow. Many of these individuals and companies have already received correspondence and acknowledgement from the NEPDG and/or the Vice President's office.

What most of these citizens are looking for, however, is for review and consideration of their proposals and ideas by program professionals. In turn, we would appreciate your vetting these proposals out to the appropriate departments within your agency for review. If you would, please have the appropriate staff respond with a direct reply to each of these individuals or companies.

Thank you for your assistance. I know these citizens will greatly appreciate receiving a response from the Department of Energy.

Sincerely

Andrew D. Lumquist
Director, National Energy Policy
Development Group
Dear Mr. Vice President,

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 ENERGETIC. 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" SUV's, 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. Californians 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 "bills" 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 "DE" 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
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 lasting 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 ("fix"), 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 cooking 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 1/3 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 its 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 its 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 "all" 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 Beaharon
Sr. Vice President
Atmel Corp.

Cc: Ben Nighthorse Campbell
Wayne Allard
Joel Heffley
George Perlegos
Bill O'Reilly

United States Senator
United States Senator
United States Representative
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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>380 @ 4000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2WD - 285 @ 5200 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325 @ 4000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>AWD - 4L60-E HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2WD - Four-speed electronic-shift overdrive automatic with torque converter clutch, 4L60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towing Capacity*</td>
<td>AWD - 8,500 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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./56 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Diameter</td>
<td>39.54 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Specifications

Fuel Economy

Chassis Dimensions

Interior Dimensions

Exterior Dimensions

http://www.cadillac.com/escalade/test_r_dim.htm

05/04/2001
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Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
### Envoy/4WD/SLT

**Engine:**
- **Engine:** Vortec™ 4.2L Inline 6-Cylinder
- **Fuel Type:** Gasoline
- **Compression Ratio:** 9.2:1
- **Valve Train:** DOHC, 16 valves
- **Fuel Delivery:** Sequential multi-port fuel injection
- **SAE Max Horsepower @ RPM (idle):** 270 @ 5600
- **SAE Max Torque @ RPM (idle):** 275 @ 4000

**Transmission:**
- 4L60-E Hydraulic 4-speed automatic with overdrive.
- Powertrain: available with 4-speed automatic transmission control.

### Specifications:
- **Overall Length:** 191.9"
- **Overall Height:** 71.6"
- **Overall Width:** 74.7"
- **Wheelbase:** 113.3"
- **Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR):** 5,750 lbs
- **Front Suspension:** Double-A arm
- **Front Axle Capacity (total lbs):** 3,580 lbs
- **Rear Suspension:** 5 link
- **Rear Axle Capacity (total lbs):** 3,320 lbs
- **Brakes:** 4-wheel disc with anti-lock brake system
- **Tires:** P215/70R15 P215/70R15

### Standalone:
- **Fuel Tank Capacity (gallons):**
- **Battery:** Cold Cranking Amps (CCA):
- **Alternator:** Maximum Towing Weight (lb):
- **Axle Ratio:** 3.42
- **Tongue Weight:** 10% + 10% of trailer weight up to 750 lbs

---

**Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002**
Colorado Springs Operations
1150 E. Cheyenne Mt. Blvd.
Colorado Springs, CO 80906
Fax 3 Fax (719) 540-1313

Fax

To: Dick Cheney
From: Ralph Brauman
Fax: (303) 456-2261
Pages: 8

Phone: Date: May 14th, 2001
Fax: CC:

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply

Comments: Energy letters to follow.
September 20, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Enclosed are numerous unsolicited proposals and idea papers that we received from citizens from all across the country during the development of the National Energy Policy, and in the months to follow. Many of these individuals and companies have already received correspondence and acknowledgement from the NEPDG and/or the Vice President’s office.

What most of these citizens are looking for, however, is for review and consideration of their proposals and ideas by program professionals. In turn, we would appreciate your vetting these proposals out to the appropriate departments within your agency for review. If you would, please have the appropriate staff respond with a direct reply to each of these individuals or companies.

Thank you for your assistance. I know these citizens will greatly appreciate receiving a response from the Department of Energy.

Sincerely

Andrew D. Lundquist
Director, National Energy Policy Development Group
To: Vice President Cheney, Fax 12024562461
From: Suzanne Slezak
Date: May 16, 2001 19:10 GMT
Subject: Act to support clean energy

Vice President Dick Cheney
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Vice President Cheney:

As a university student, and future leader, I am writing to urge you to make renewable energy and energy efficiency a top priority as you craft a national energy policy. As the head of the President’s energy task force you should recommend:

- Diversifying the power supply with additional renewable energy sources by enacting a national market-based Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS). Diversifying our electricity mix by gradually increasing the percentage of electricity supplied from renewable resources such as wind, solar, geothermal and biomass will help avert natural gas price spikes that hit consumer’s pocketbooks. Renewable power is not subject to the price volatility that plagues fossil fuel-fired power plants.

- Increasing funding for energy conservation through a national Public Benefits Fund (PBE). Investing in energy efficiency is by far the fastest, least expensive way to balance energy demand and supply needs. This fund will preserve programs to increase energy efficiency; provide low-income customer assistance and universal access; and increase investment in renewable technology research and development.

- Increasing funding for the U.S. Department of Energy’s (DOE) renewable energy and energy efficiency programs in the Fiscal Year 2002 (FY’02). The President previously stated that he supports renewables and efficiency. Now there are reports that the administration may cut DOE’s energy efficiency and renewable energy research and development budget. These cost-effective programs are vital to the growth and commercialization of renewable energy technologies-solar, wind, geothermal, and biomass.

Short-sighted ideas, like drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, will have virtually no impact on the nation’s electricity power prices or supplies as only 2 to 3 percent of US electricity is generated from oil. Renewable energy and energy efficiency are the cheapest, safest and cleanest ways to cope with high electricity prices and reliability problems. Please put America on track to a clean and sustainable energy future by including the above policies in the Task Force’s recommendations to the President and Congress.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Slezak
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November 29, 2001

Mr. James Connaughton
Chairman
Council on Environmental Quality
Executive Office of the President
17th and G Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20503

Attn: Ms. V.A. Stephens
White House Energy Task Force

Dear Mr. Connaughton:

The Petroleum Association of Wyoming (PAW) would like to thank the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) for the opportunity to comment on issues affecting mineral access to federal lands. PAW is Wyoming's largest and oldest oil and gas organization, the members of which account for over ninety percent of the natural gas and over seventy percent of the crude oil produced in the state. This CEQ Task Force will focus on issues that directly affect members of PAW.

In your request for information, PAW would like to submit the following example, which should be placed in the "Exploration and Production" category:

- **Surface disturbing mitigation decisions determined by BLM that could have an affect on the gas transportation market:**

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has the responsibility of managing certain public lands in the West. Their management decisions include mitigation restrictions that revolve around the placement of oil and gas wells, roads, gathering lines, transportation pipelines, corridors, etc. The BLM Pinedale Field Office in Wyoming has recently made a decision that is concerning to PAW.

A producer, Double Eagle Petroleum Company, participated as a non-operator in the drilling of five wells in the Pinedale Anticline area during the summer and fall of 2001. The company then filed a right-of-way (ROW) application with BLM on October 9, 2001 (see Attachment A) for a four (4) inch temporary surface natural gas pipeline to transport its share of the produced gas to market. There are two existing sales pipelines in the area of the five wells. Both pipelines are owned by Pipeline A, an affiliate of the operator that drilled the wells. Due to economic concerns, the non-operating partner chose to apply for a two-and-one-half (2½) mile temporary surface pipeline to connect with another pipeline owned by a third party pipeline company (Pipeline B) and this temporary line was...
proposed to be placed twenty-five (25) feet from the existing pipeline which is within an existing pipeline corridor (see Attachment C).

To provide CEQ with additional information, most gas in the Pinedale Anticline area or southwest Wyoming goes into three (3) main plants for processing (removing of liquids to meet sales pipeline standards). These plants include: The Opal Plant, the Granger Plant, and Black Fork’s Plant all owned by different companies. All three plants are located near the town of Opal (40-60 miles south of the Pinedale Anticline Field). After the gas is processed at the plants, it generally flows west out of Wyoming. Frequently the company gathering the gas at the wellhead does not own the entire line from the well to the plant; however, the pipeline company has agreed with other pipeline companies to transport gas to the specified plant.

According to Double Eagle, currently the preferred market to deliver this gas to is the Opal Plant since there are five (5) pipelines at its tailgate (owned by five separate companies) and that Plant offers the most competition and accordingly offers the best prices to the producer. The offer initially proposed to Double Eagle by Pipeline A was to take all of the gas to its Black’s Fork Plant. The problem with this proposal is that Pipeline A owns the Plant and the only pipeline out of the Plant. Based on October’s index prices, Pipeline A’s price was $.29/mcf below two other pipeline companies in the area.

The offer proposed by Pipeline B was to deliver gas to the Opal Plant for less gathering cost than Pipeline A. This would allow the operator less gathering cost and allow the delivery of gas to a preferable market. The only problem was that Pipeline B’s interconnect was 2½ miles south of the five wells, hence the 2½ mile R-O-W request. Because of BLM’s decision to reject the R-O-W application, the producer must use Pipeline A and pay more in gathering costs. This decision will in turn cause the producer to receive less money for the produced gas, pay more in transportation costs, and reduce the money paid to the royalty owners which in this case is the federal government.

BLM rejected the R-O-W application by stating that “[s]ince there is already sufficient capacity in existing pipelines to transport your natural gas, it has been determined that allowing this additional pipeline at this time would not be in the public interest and would cause undue and unnecessary degradation to the public lands” (see Attachment B)

It is not PAW’s position to defend a particular company or project over another; however, PAW brings this example to CEQ’s attention because there is a concern that BLM’s land management decision to refuse granting the second pipeline connection based on surface disturbance will affect the market and potentially set a precedent for future projects on public lands. PAW believes that
it is not within BLM's authority to make land management decisions that significantly affect the gas transportation market (i.e. pricing, available pipeline capacity, transportation, etc.).

Clear and concise written instructions should be issued to BLM state and field offices immediately to guide land management, surface disturbing decisions, which may potentially affect the gas transportation market. Once instructions are issued, careful oversight must be provided by the Administration to ensure that such instructions are interpreted and implemented as were intended.

PAW appreciates this opportunity to provide meaningful comment to the CEQ Energy Task Force regarding issues that affect our ability to access public lands for purposes of natural resource development and industry will continue to strive for a balance between economic growth and environmental protection. Should you have questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Dru Bower
Vice President
Petroleum Association of Wyoming

Cc: The Honorable Gale Norton
    The Honorable Ann Veneman
    The Honorable Spencer Abraham
    The Honorable Jim Geringer
    The Honorable Craig Thomas
    The Honorable Mike Enzi
    The Honorable Barbara Cubin
    Mr. Steve Degenfelder
    Mr. Curt Parsons
    Mr. Kirk Steinle
    Mr. Rick Robitaille
    Mr. Gene George
    Mr. Joe Icenogle
    Ms. Claire Moseley
    Mr. Bob Ugland
Attachment A

21351
DOE022-0232

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
Martin, Adrienne

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 11:21 AM
To: 'Charles M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet'
Cc: 'commcoll@aol.com%internet'
Subject: RE: State's comments on Transportation

Charlie,

You sent to DOT, right? They have the lead.

Margot

fyi

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/13/2001 10:57 AM

In the version of Chapter 8 that we have, our comments were not incorporated

Evelyn Wheeler
EB/ESC/EC/EPC - Room 3535
Phone: (202) 647-4557
Fax: (202) 647-4037
This message is unclassified under precepts of EO 12958.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>From:</strong></th>
<th>Anderson, Margot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sent:</strong></td>
<td>Friday, April 13, 2001 12:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To:</strong></td>
<td>'Charles Smith (E-mail)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cc:</strong></td>
<td>Kelliher, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
<td>revised chapter 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charlie - with Joan's edits (see front page).
Martin, Adrienne

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 12:46 PM
To: 'Wili_lmn_Bettenberg@ios.doi.gov%internet'
Cc: 'Charles_M._Smith@opy.eop.gov%internet'
Subject: RE: chapter 8 [Virus checked]

Received. Thanks.

---Original Message-----
From: William_Bettenberg@ios.doi.gov%internet
[mailto:William_Bettenberg@ios.doi.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 11:22 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Charles_M._Smith@opy.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Re: chapter 8 [Virus checked]

Margot — Attached are our edits for chapter 8 without the recommendations.
Bill

--- Forwarded by William Bettenberg/PPA/OS/DOI on 04/13/2001 11:10 AM

Deborah Weinstein
To: William Bettenberg/PPA/OS/DOI@DOI
04/13/2001 09:41 AM
Subject: Re: chapter 8 [Virus checked]
(Document link: William Bettenberg)

Bill—
I've attached a version with all recommendations and steps stripped out.
If you need more work done to this, I'll be happy to do it. I have a 10am
meeting at Jackson Place and then I'll be back.
Deborah
(See attached file: DOI chpt8 without recs.rtf)

From: William Bettenberg on 04/12/2001 06:47 PM
To: Deborah Weinstein/PPA/OS/DOI@DOI
cc:
Subject: chapter 8

Deborah — I need a version of chapter 8 with the recommendations stripped
out. Check with me and I'll explain.
Bill
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From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 4:36 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay; Carter, Douglas
Cc: Kellner, Joseph
Subject: FW: chapter 8 [Virus checked]

Jay and Doug,

Margot

Original Message:
From: William_Bettenberg@ios.doi.gov%internet
[mailto:William_Bettenberg@ios.doi.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 11:22 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.epc.gov%internet
Subject: Re: chapter 8 [Virus checked]

Margot -- Attached are our edits for chapter 8 without the recommendations.

Bill

Forwarded by William Bettenberg/PPA/OS/DOI on 04/13/2001 11:10 AM

Deborah Weinstein
To: William Bettenberg/PPA/OS/DOI@DOI
04/13/2001 09:41 AM
Subject: Re: chapter 8 [Virus checked]
(Document link: William Bettenberg)

Bill
I've attached a version with all recommendations and steps stripped out.
If you need more work done to this, I'll be happy to do it. I have a 10am
meeting at Jackson Place and then I'll be back.
Deborah
(See attached file: DOI chpt8 without recs.rtf)

From: William Bettenberg on 04/12/2001 05:47 PM
To: Deborah Weinstein/PPA/OS/DOI@DOI
Cc:
Subject: chapter 8

Deborah -- I need a version of chapter 8 with the recommendations stripped
out. Check with me and I'll explain.

Bill
From: Anderson, Margot  
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 6:11 PM  
To: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet'  
Cc: Karen_Y._Knutson@OV.P.EOP.Gov%internet; Charles_m._smith@OV.P.EOP.Gov%internet; Moss_Jacob@epamail.epa.gov%internet; Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet'  
Subject: RE: EPA comments on chapters 7 and 8  

Thanks Jeremy,

Margot

---Original Message---  
From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet  
To: Anderson, Margot  
Cc: Karen_Y._Knutson@OV.P.EOP.Gov%internet; Charles_m._smith@OV.P.EOP.Gov%internet; Moss_Jacob@epamail.epa.gov%internet; Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet  
Subject: EPA comments on chapters 7 and 8  

Margot,

Attached are EPA comments on chapters 7 and 8.

You should have received comments on chapter 6 previously from Jacob.

Thanks!

Jeremy

Jeremy Symons  
EPA, Office of Air and Radiation  
(202) 564-9301  
Fax: (202) 501-0394

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
From: McManus, Matthew T [McManusMT@state.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2001 6:10 PM
To: 'Kjersten Drager at OVP'; 'John Fenzel, NEPD'
Cc: Anderson, Margot; 'Andrew Lundquist, OVP'; 'Karen Knutson at OVP'
Subject: Preview of Chapter 10

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 6:12 PM
To: "Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet"
Cc: "Karen.Y.Knutson@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet"; charles_m_smith@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet; "Moss.Jacob@epamail.epa.gov%internet"; "Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet"
Subject: RE: EPA comments on chapters 7 and 8

Jeremy,

No attachment!

Margot

---Original Message---
From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet [mailto:Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 5:57 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Karen.Y.Knutson@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet;
    charles_m_smith@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet;
    Moss.Jacob@epamail.epa.gov%internet; Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet
Subject: EPA comments on chapters 7 and 8

Margot,

Attached are EPA comments on chapters 7 and 8.

Thanks!
Jeremy

Jeremy Symons
EPA, Office of Air and Radiation
(202) 564-9301
Fax: (202) 501-0394
Martin, Adrienne

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 6:14 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay
Subject: FW: CEA comments on chapter 8

Margot

---Original Message---
From: Charles M. Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
[mailto:Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 3:11 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: CEA comments

Margot:

Change

(See attached file: CEA Comments on Chap 8.doc)(See attached file: CEA Comments on Chapter 7.doc)
From: Faulkner, Doug
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 9:02 AM
To: McSharrow, Kyle; Kelliher, Joseph; Garrish, Ted; Hutto, Chase; Kolevar, Kevin; Davis, Joseph; Whatley, Michael
Subject: FW: Speech by Karen Knutson, Office of the Vice President, before NASEO

From: Buddy Garland
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 8:35 AM
To: Faulkner, Doug
Cc: Abe.Haspel@ee.doe.gov@DOE%HQ-NOTES; Sullivan, John
Subject: Speech by Karen Knutson, Office of the Vice President, before NASEO

Thank you,
Buddy

Michael York
02/28/2001 02:45 PM
To: Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:
Subject: Speech by Karen Knutson, Office of the Vice President, before NASEO

I just returned from the National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO), 2001 Energy Outlook Conference which was held February 26 - 28, here in Washington DC. Of particular interest was a presentation by Karen Knutson, Deputy Director, National Energy Policy Development Group, Office of the Vice President. She discussed the development of the Administration's National Energy Policy.