May 1, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary
Department of Energy
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

The Board of Directors of the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers will convene in Washington on May 24th for its annual meeting. On behalf of the Alliance member companies, I would like to invite you to address our member company executives at a time that fits into your schedule. We know you fully understand the substantial contribution the automobile industry makes to the economic growth of the U.S. Our Board members would welcome the opportunity to discuss the critical role the auto industry can play in the development of a national energy policy.

As detailed in the enclosed primer, Alliance members are leaders in the development of advanced energy efficient vehicle technologies. These technologies include hybrid electric, fuel cell and battery electric powered vehicles, advanced lean burn technology, dual fuel, and dedicated alternative fuel vehicles.

Recently, the Alliance adopted a national energy policy position that endorses an energy policy based on broad, market-oriented principles. The policy position addresses the role of the light duty fleet as part of a national energy plan. A copy of this energy policy position, which previously was provided to you and other members of the Administration Energy Task Force, also is enclosed.

Key Alliance recommendations for energy policy include: tax credits to help consumers purchase advanced technology vehicles; tax incentives for alternative fuel infrastructure development; extension of the dual-fuel vehicle corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) credit; development of a market for advanced vehicles/fuels; government-industry partnerships for research; development of fuel efficient technologies; and increased efforts to mitigate traffic congestion nationwide.

BMW Group • DaimlerChrysler • Fiat • Ford Motor Company • General Motors
Isuzu • Mazda • Mitsubishi Motors • Nissan • Porsche • Toyota • Volkswagen • Volvo

1401 H Street, NW—Suite 900, Washington, DC 20005 • Phone 202.326.5500 • Fax 202.326.5567 • www.ausalliance.org
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The 13 members of the Alliance represent over 90 percent of the car and light truck sales in the United States. Alliance members have more than 250 manufacturing facilities in 35 states and employ more than 620,000 persons. When jobs dependent on the industry are included, the auto industry is responsible for 6.6 million jobs nationwide or 5 percent of private sector jobs, according to a recent study completed by the University of Michigan for the Alliance. The study also shows that more than 3.7 percent of America’s gross domestic product is generated by the sale and production of new light vehicles.

Mr. Secretary, Alliance members believe they can make an important contribution to the key issues facing our country and would welcome a discussion regarding how our plans and positions fit with your Department’s objectives and goals. I hope you can join us on May 24th. I will call your office shortly to follow-up on this request.

Sincerely,

Josephine S. Cooper
President & CEO

JSC/sf

Enclosures

cc: Kyle McStarlow, Chief of Staff
ALLIANCE OF AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Richard Schaum - DaimlerChrysler Corporation
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Joseph Kennebeck – Volkswagen of America, Inc.
Director, Government Affairs
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General Counsel
ENGLY POLICY POSITION
of the
Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers

The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers (Alliance) members are BMW of North America, Inc., DaimlerChrysler Corporation, Fiat, Ford Motor Company, General Motors Corporation, Isuzu Motors of America, Mazda, Mitsubishi, Nissan North America, Porsche, Toyota, Volkswagen of America, and Volvo. Alliance member companies have more than 620,000 employees in the United States, with more than 250 manufacturing facilities in 35 states.

Overview

The Alliance supports efforts to create an effective energy policy based on broad, market oriented principles. Policies that provide manufacturers incentives to produce more energy efficient products, and consumers the incentives to purchase such products, should be the cornerstones. Within the transportation sector, policies that promote and support the intense competition among the automobile manufacturers worldwide are the keys to addressing product efficiency and energy use concerns. This approach will enable automakers to work effectively within the private sector, and with public sector support, develop the advanced technologies for use in vehicles both near and long-term. In addition, incentives for the increased market penetration of advanced energy saving technologies will help pull them into the marketplace as rapidly as possible. These complementary approaches to energy supply and conservation are necessary in today's competitive environment.

For the past 26 years, since enactment of the Energy Policy Conservation Act of 1975, vehicle fuel economy has been regulated through the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) program. For several reasons, CAFE is an ineffective energy policy. First, it focuses only on new vehicle production and does nothing to spur the demand for fuel-efficient vehicles. With falling gasoline prices and adequate supplies instead of projected shortages, demand for fuel-efficient vehicles never materialized. Second, CAFE does not address the continued use of the approximately 200 million vehicles on the road. The growth in registered vehicles, together with the relatively inexpensive cost of fuel and increased vehicle fuel efficiency, has led to a doubling of vehicle miles traveled. Third, consumers have based purchase decisions on other vehicle attributes, such as usefulness, safety, performance and comfort. Fourth, like any artificial structure, it has disproportionate effects on some vehicle manufacturers. With this background, we propose the following:

Provide Tax Credits to Consumers for Advanced Technology Vehicles

- Fuel Cell Vehicle
- Hybrid Vehicle
- Battery Electric Vehicles
- Advanced Lean Burn
- Dual Fuel and Dedicated Alternative Fuel Vehicles

March 23, 2001
Provide Tax Incentives for Alternative Fuel Infrastructure Development

- Distribution Equipment
- Installation Costs
- Distributor Credit for Fuel Distribution

The Administration should extend the Dual-Fuel Vehicle CAFE Credits

- Initiate rulemaking that would extend credit through 2008 at the maximum levels provided in the current legislation.
- Congress should enact legislation to extend the credits at 1.2 mpg through 2012.

Advanced Fuel/Vehicle Market Development

- Government purchase XXXX advanced technology vehicles per year.
- Promote early introduction of clean, low sulfur gasoline and diesel fuels.

Encourage Government/Industry Partnerships for Research and Development on Fuel Efficient Technologies

- Promote research and development for lean burn emissions control technologies.
- Accelerate development of advanced engine and emission control systems to enable earlier technology deployment (e.g. NOx traps)
- Accelerate advanced fuels development, which will be needed for compression-ignition, direct injection engines to meet Tier 2 emission standards.
- Accelerate development of advanced batteries and power electronics for energy efficient hybrid-electric vehicles.
- Enhance fuel cell development efforts:
  - Accelerate development of high temperature membranes for fuel cell vehicles and efficient electrodes.
  - Increase support for use of fuel cell auxiliary power for passenger cars and trucks.
  - Initiate technology demonstrations to support introduction of fuel cell vehicles and hydrogen infrastructure.
  - Development of off-board generation of hydrogen and storage from various feedstocks.
- Increase the R&D effort for advanced carbon composite materials.
Evaluate Additional Policies to Reduce Transportation Sector Energy Consumption

- Traffic light timing
- Congestion Mitigation
- HOV lanes
- Other measures to control or reduce VMT
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The Honorable Richard Cheney
Vice President of the United States
The Old Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Mr. Vice President:

I am disturbed by early reports that the Energy Task Force recommendations fail to recognize the need to include a path forward for assuring that this country is capable of providing a reliable and economic source of nuclear fuel for commercial nuclear reactors. As you know, nuclear power is the second largest supplier of electricity generation in the country. Unfortunately, it is not unreasonable to expect that the U.S. could have an OPEC-like dependency on foreign sources of nuclear fuel supplies in the near future. To prevent such a situation, the U.S. needs to deploy cost competitive uranium enrichment technology or we will rely on foreign supplies to meet nearly one quarter of our electricity needs.

There have been adverse consequences to the nation’s energy security as a result of the privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) in July 1998. USEC is the only domestic supplier of uranium enrichment services in the U.S. When it was privatized, USEC operated two gaseous diffusion plants located in Piketon, Ohio and Paducah, Kentucky. However, last June, USEC made the decision to cease operations at the Piketon Gaseous Diffusion Plant (GDP) ignoring the advice of the Departments of Energy and Treasury. The targeted date for turning the key to the “off position” is June 1, 2001.

A Department of Energy report issued on January 19, 2001 describes the need for the U.S. “to be able to reliably meet the continuing demand for approximately 11 million separative work units (SWU) per year.” However, the Paducah plant can only produce approximately 4.5 million SWU per year in an economic manner. The balance of requirements comes from 5.5 million SWU derived from blended down weapons grade uranium imported from Russia under the U.S.-Russia REU Agreement and some European supplies. It is evident that the operation of a single enrichment plant in the country, coupled with a history of five interruptions in the delivery of enriched uranium under the Highly Enriched Uranium Purchase Agreement with Russia, raises questions about the vulnerability of the U.S. to a disruption in the supply of enriched uranium.
The Honorable Richard Cheney  
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This supply mix may change even further to the detriment of energy security. First, an August 2000 Nuclear Regulatory Commission report on USEC's viability suggests that USEC is unlikely to enrich uranium profitably at the Paducah plant beyond 2003. Second, USEC is trying to expand U.S. dependency on Russian nuclear fuel supplies beyond the 5.5 million separative work units (SWU) that it imports each year as Executive Agent under the U.S.-Russia HEU Agreement. USEC has been proposing additional imports of commercial enriched uranium through Tenex, the Russian export agent. One interim solution to maintain insurance against nuclear fuel supply disruptions from Russia is through a cold standby operation for the Piketon, Ohio enrichment plant. I am pleased that Secretary Abraham has taken the steps to provide for cold standby through fiscal year 2002. However, this standby plan must be linked to deployment of cost-competitive technology, such as gas centrifuge technology, and must be extended until the new technology is fully deployed. I fear there has not been adequate attention given to what happens beyond fall 2002 and this is particularly troubling because the Department of Energy's testimony before the Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee on March 27, 2001 indicates that after five or six years of cold standby there would be significant degradation to the Piketon plant.

I am aware that the Europeans have competitive centrifuge technology, and I understand that the Oak Ridge National Laboratories have a plan to develop cost-competitive U.S.-origin centrifuge technology within a three-year time period. However, at present, there is virtually no effort toward domestic self-sufficiency in enrichment services, no clear path forward for deployment from the private sector, and no government policy in effect to address the matter. Privatization has failed to deploy the advanced laser enrichment technology (AVLIS) that received nearly $2 billion in federal R&D. Indeed, two years have passed since USEC announced it was terminating the AVLIS Program and nothing has emerged to replace the WW-II era gaseous diffusion plants in the next decade. Indeed, USEC's impaired credit ratings make it unlikely that they could obtain financing to deploy any technology.

Given the short-term nature of the Administration's cold standby plan and the absence of any long-term strategy to utilize the Piketon facility and deploy next generation enrichment technology, the plan for Piketon presently falls well-short of the commitment made by President Bush during the campaign. In an enclosed October 4, 2001 letter to Ohio Governor Bob Taft, then-Governor Bush expressed his concern about USEC's decision to cease operations at the Piketon plant. He stated, "I am concerned that the closure of the Piketon site, which would leave only one uranium enrichment plant operational in the United States, would compromise our long-term national security interest in a continued safe supply of enriched uranium for our defense and energy needs." He further committed in that letter, "If I am elected President, my Administration will aggressively explore how the workforce and facilities at the Piketon site can continue to serve our national interest. I believe that our nation must continue to pursue research and development of new technologies for use in uranium enrichment." Release of the Energy Task Force report is the best opportunity for the Administration to follow through on its commitment to the Piketon community and our nation's nuclear energy security.
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The need for a secure, domestic uranium enrichment supply is underscored by the fact that nuclear power is enjoying improved operating economics and increased average efficiency of reactors. Demand is likely to remain stable or grow, as approximately 40% of the domestic nuclear reactors are currently seeking license renewals. During a hearing on nuclear power before the Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee on March 27, 2001, there was discussion about building the next generation nuclear reactors in the not-so-distant future. These next generation reactors will require 8-10% U-235 enrichment, compared with the 4-5% levels required for the current generation of boiling water reactors. It is troubling that USEC is closing the Piketon facility which is the only U.S. enrichment plant that is licensed to enrich uranium to 10% assay, when there is a trend toward higher assay fuel.

During the March 27, 2001 Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee hearing, testimony was offered which stated:

"USEC utilized only about 29% of its nameplate GDP capacity in 2000, and over the next year will supply a majority of its customers needs from Russian and U.S. HEU blending." (Testimony of John R. Longenecker, former USEC official).

Mr. Longenecker further states:

"USEC is finding it more profitable to operate as a trader of blended HEU rather than as a primary producer. This approach appears to lead inevitably to USEC exiting the market as a primary producer. As a result, constructing replacement enrichment capacity in the U.S. should be the key focus for the decade ahead."

In addition, during a June 8, 2000 hearing before the Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, testimony was submitted stating that the front end of the nuclear fuel cycle is endangered:

"Since 1998, expenditures for uranium exploration and mine development have declined by 59%, three uranium processing facilities have closed during 1999 (two in Texas and one in Louisiana), employment in U.S. uranium exploration, mining, milling and process has decreased by almost 30%. Last year, production at ConverDyn, the sole remaining uranium converter in the U.S., was cut back by 25% and employment was reduced by over 12%." (Testimony of Mr. James Graham, President and CEO of ConverDyn).

If this nation's energy policy is going to place a greater emphasis on nuclear power, it must do so in a comprehensive fashion. An energy policy that ignores the reliability of the front end of the domestic nuclear fuel industry falls short of assuring needed energy security in this country. I urge you to carefully consider the needs of the entire nuclear fuel cycle as you prepare
The Honorable Richard Cheney  
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to issue your recommendations for a national energy strategy. I know you will agree that  
Americans would find it unwise and unacceptable to depend on foreign sources for the second  
largest supplier of U.S. electricity generation, nuclear power.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Ted Strickland  
Member of Congress

cc:     The Honorable Spencer Abraham  
The Honorable Bob Taft  
The Honorable Mike DeWine  
The Honorable George Voinovich  
The Honorable W. J. “Billy” Tauzin  
The Honorable John Dingell  
The Honorable Joe Barton  
The Honorable Rick Boucher
October 4, 2000

The Honorable Bob Taft
Governor, State of Ohio
77 South High Street, 4th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-6117

Dear Governor Taft:

I am writing regarding my growing concern over the events surrounding the decision by the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) to shut down the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Facility at Piketon. As you know, on September 28, 2001, USEC gave notice to the United States Department of Energy (DOE) to cease its contract for electric power. As the current appropriated/appropriation process for fiscal year 2002 comes to a close, I am further concerned that the DOE has yet to articulate a plan for future cleanup and use of the site in Portsmouth, as well as for the more than 2,000 employees at the Portsmouth facility.

I am concerned that the closure of the Piketon site, which would leave only one uranium enrichment plant operational in the United States, would compromise our long-term national security interest in a continued safe supply of enriched uranium for our defense and energy needs. The Clinton-Gore Administration has not articulated a cohesive and aggressive plan for the highly skilled workforce and the highly specialized equipment at the Piketon plant. This demonstrates a lack of leadership relative to a key national security issue that I will not tolerate as President.

If I am elected President, my Administration will aggressively explore how the workforce and facilities at the Piketon site can continue to serve our national interests. I believe that our nation must continue to pursue research and development of new technologies for use in uranium enrichment. Furthermore, I will ensure that the resources that have been committed by Congress for Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) of the site will be available in a timely manner. Finally, I will direct the DOE to explore other research opportunities that will continue to utilize the resources at Piketon. Simply stated, if I am elected President, I will work with Congress to help the Piketon workforce remain productive, ensure federal D&D obligations are met and ensure new opportunities for R&D are explored.

I know you are actively working at the state level to ensure opportunities for the workers at Piketon and their families. I look forward to working with you on this critical Ohio issue in the future.

Sincerely,

George W. Bush
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Florida House of Representatives

Jerry Paul
Deputy Majority Whip
Representative, District 71

May 25, 2001

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

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Enclosed is an article appearing in the Charlotte Sun Herald in Port Charlotte, Florida relating to our energy policy.

As a member of our Southern State’s Energy Board, I was pleased to provide input to Vice President Cheney’s Energy Task Force. As a former power plant engineer, nuclear engineer, and State Legislator I cannot overstate the extent to which I am pleased with the responsible, accurate and comprehensive recommendations of the Task Force Report.

I would welcome an opportunity to assist you in any way on issues relating to our nation’s energy policy.

Please call on me any time.

Respectfully,

Jerry Paul
District 71

Enclosure

JP jh
Paul: Nuclear needed

Says he'll use education to provide oversight

By GREG MARTIN
Staff Writer

President George Bush's administration contends that nuclear power should be included among the solutions to address the nation's "energy crisis" - and Florida should be no exception, according to state Rep. Jerry Paul, R-Port Charlotte.

However, Florida Power and Light officials said in a recent audit report that Florida doesn't face an energy crisis. FPL plans to increase its generating capacity by 33 percent over the next 10 years, "using environmentally friendly natural-gas technology," according to the report.

"Really, the touchstone in all of this, the primary goal, has got to be to keep the cost of electrical power as low as possible," Paul, a member of the state's House Committee on Utilities and Telecommunications, was asked this year by House Speaker Tom Kprés to the Southern States Energy Board. Florida Sen. Tom Lee, please see PAUL, page 3.

The Crystal River nuclear power plant is one of three nuclear power generating stations in Florida.

AGE ONE

★ PAUL

From page 1

R. Brandon, is the state's other
representative on the board.
Pua was reached in Miami
Tues cuty where he was attend-
ing a two-day meeting of the
FPL's board to discuss the bar-
drels to nuclear power projects
in the Southeastern United
States.
Paul said he hopes to use his educational back-ground to
oversee the expansion of
nuclear power in Florida. The
Port Charlotte attorney earned
degrees in marine engineering
at the Manhattan Marine
Academy in Maine in 1970, and
in nuclear engineering at the
University of Florida in 1981.

"We're talking about the
state's role in overseeing our
nuclear industry," Paul said.

One of the biggest issues
for the state is the storage of
spent fuel rods, Paul said.

In Florida, there are no hazardous
materials that have been
indefinitely stored in pools on the sites
of FPL's three nuclear power
generating stations.

These states include: two reactors at Turkey Point near
Homestead, two reactors at St.
Lorge and one reactor at
Crystal River.

Board members from other
states also discussed their con-
cerns, including how to dis-
pose of radioactive wastes
from nuclear weapons facili-
ties. Paul said Florida cur-
ently has no such facilities.

"They argue that nuclear
materials are naturally found
in the ground and could be
stored there. One factor that
has held the industry back has
been the federal government's
reluctance to establish a
national nuclear waste storage
facility, Paul said.

Former President Jimmy
Carter closed two facilities
that reprocessed spent fuel
rods so they could be refueled
a second time, Paul said.

"He forced every state to
basically store its own waste," Paul said. "That cost us a
lot.

Some 20 years ago, Congress vowed to establish a
nuclear waste storage facility by
the year 2000 at Yucca Mountain,
Nevada. However, that facility is
currently 10 years behind schedule, according to Paul.

FPL's current production
is about 40,000 megawatts of power, 20 percent
derived from nuclear power.

The state has a "deficit of
about 13,000 megawatts" due
to growth projections and
increased use of computer
technology, he said.

To avoid a crisis like
California's, Florida needs to
diversify its power sources, Paul said. California not only
depends heavily on natural
gas, but it also was blocked by
"caveat emptors" from build-
ing new power plants for the
past 10 years, Paul said.

However, Paul emphasized
that Florida needs to first pre-
max energy conservation and
alternative sources such as
wind, solar and "biomas" fuels.

After nuclear power, the
next cheapest is coal. But coal
pollutes the air with sulfur dioxide, Paul noted. Natural
gas is cleaner, but Florida
would require pipelines to get
the gas, he added.

"There is no free lunch," he
said. "It is costing us a lot. And
there is an environmental toll.

However, FPL, in an annual
report filed with the Public
Service Commission in April,
projected a 20 percent generat-
ing reserve margins for this
summer, assuring its cus-
tomers that there would be a
sufficient supply of electricity.

Also, FPL's report outlines
its 10-year plan to increase
capacity by 33 percent using
natural gas.

A pipeline has also been
recently proposed to run from
Texas through the Gulf of
Mexico to Port Manatee. The
gas pipeline will then cross the
state to Port Pierce with a spur
to south.

"Unlike California, Florida
customers can enjoy an ade-
quate supply of electricity," said FPL
President Paul E. Brunken. "Our
efforts reflect the commitment to maintain
sufficient reserves." With
remaining one of the cleanest
utilities in the country.

You can e-mail Greg Martin
gmartin@sun-herald.com
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From: Mackall, Brenda  
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2001 3:23 PM  
To: Secretary, The  
Subject: FW: In Response to Your Inquiry: Solar Energy R&D

--Original Message--
From: Burrow, Richard  
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2001 2:04 PM  
To: Joseph Brown  
Subject: In Response to Your Inquiry: Solar Energy R&D

Mr. Brown,

Thank you for sharing your views on alternative energy technologies and on solar energy in particular. As you may already know, Vice-President Cheney is leading an influential energy task force in a review our national energy policy. Their report is due out later this week and will address energy production and environmental issues.

I would like to point out that the Department of Energy has extensive research and development programs in new or alternative energy technologies, including solar, wind and photovoltaic energy technologies. These programs are conducted at our national labs and in joint programs with industry. I've attached a copy of our most recent Energy R&D Portfolio Report, which summarizes what is being done in our energy R&D programs, why the investment is necessary, and what outcomes are expected. This and other DOE mission area R&D portfolio reports may be downloaded from http://www.osti.gov/portfolio/. The report profiles the R&D being undertaken by the Department of Energy to address energy production, distribution and utilization. I hope you find it interesting.

I have forwarded your e-mail message to the Office of the Executive Secretariat for reassignment to the appropriate office within the Department of Energy for a more comprehensive response to your solar energy questions. Someone will contact you separately to follow-up on your concerns.

Sincerely,

Richard Burrow  
Deputy Director  
Secretary of Energy Advisory Board

---

From: Joseph Brown  
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2001 3:32 PM  
To: Burrow, Richard  
Subject: The Current Energy Crisis  
Message Flag: Follow up  
Due By: Monday, May 14, 2001 5:00 PM  
Flag Status: Flagged
Joseph Brown
16409 Oakmoor Place
Parker, CO 80134

May 10, 2001

Executive Director Vacant
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Executive Director:

I want to write/correspond with all persons I can that may be able to affect & effect change in the current energy crisis that is hitting our country and in all eventuality, the world. Today, we rely on coal, natural gas, nuclear power, wind and fossil fuels to power this great nation of ours. Over the last several months, we, your constituency and residents of the US, and planet Earth, have been peppered with the realities of a supply that WILL become exhausted and the ramifications of supply & demand in an hostile environment. Coal, Natural Gas, Fossil Fuels WILL become exhausted, maybe NOT in our lifetime, or our children's, or maybe even our children's children, but it WILL become exhausted. Not to mention the pollutants and hazardous by-products these different energy sources spew into our air & water--other natural resources that we truly CANNOT live without. And it puzzled me that over these months, I have not seen in print or heard via the various media sources the words: SOLAR ENERGY. Why is that? I know that the sun, for all practical purposes, is an inexhaustible supply of energy (unless you or anyone else living today plans to still be here in another couple of billion years), always reliable and FREE. If Jimmy Carter had been allowed to pursue and enact his solar energy agenda over 24 years ago, I wonder where we would be today from an energy supply, cost and clean air/clean water standpoint??!! Not to mention the advances we would have enjoyed in the technology of harnessing the sun's energy and the beneficial by-products & peripherals of same. Where do you think we would be if we had this opportunity?

I'm not completely naive. I understand the power and hold BIG OIL & BIG AUTO has on our nations elected officials, and how much we as a country, worship the almighty dollar, but Sir: at what point is the cost too great and the benefits too little?? I look into my daughter's face, and I see a face of hope and endless, boundless optimism, happiness and creativity. But I wonder aloud today, what future does my country & planet hold for her? When will the realities of what we have &/or haven't planned for her, slap that face and change everything? Do YOU want that responsibility? Or wouldn't it be to EVERYONE'S ADVANTAGE to look at EVERY alternative, regardless of the lobbyist and money poured into campaigns, and do what's best for our nation; what's right for our planet?

If anything, may I get some answers from you on these questions that I can relay to my daughter and future generations. I would be much obliged.

Thanks very much for your time & consideration.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Brown III
From: mholly2525@AOL.COM\%internet [mholly2525@AOL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2001 2:03 PM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Select

FROM: mholly2525@aol.com
NAME: Mike Holly
CITY: Bloomington
COUNTRY: USA
STATE: MN
ZIP: 55438
PARM.1: TO:the_secretary@hq.doe.gov

MESSAGE: Our company has modified Brazilian and Barbados sugar cane technology, used to produce low-cost ethanol vehicle fuel and cogenerate electricity, for a crop that can be grown in the U.S. farm belt called sweet sorghum. Bush's energy task force should advocate: 1) a requirement that all farm belt states deregulate their electricity and gas markets, and 2) the phase-out of MTBE to ethanol. Farm belt utilities are blocking entrance into the market. In addition, an expansion in the use of ethanol w
From: maierjandm@EARTHLINK.NET\internet [maierjandm@EARTHLINK.NET]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2001 5:12 PM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Policy

FROM: maierjandm@earthlink.net
NAME: Jean E Maier
SUBJECT: Policy
ZIP: 95492
CITY: Windsor
PARM.1: TO: the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
STATE: CA
TOPIC: Renewable Energy is Vital to America's Future
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: USA
MESSAGE: Dear Secretary Spencer Abraham: WE NEED a forward-looking 21st century energy policy not a policy stuck in the outdated technologies of the past. Without such vision, our country will lose its competitiveness as other nations adopt more efficient energy systems. I am writing to urge you to make renewable energy and energy efficiency a top priority as you craft a national energy policy. As a member of the President's energy task force you should recommend: - Diversifying the power supply with
MAILADDR: 138 Espana Way
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U.S. Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham,

I received your agencies acknowledgement that my email is being reviewed by the proper department. Could somebody please reply and give me a status for my inquiry?

Original Message
From: Rick Dunnett (rdunnett@advancedequities.com)
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 10:17 AM
To: The.Secretary@hq.doe.gov
Subject: Energy Conservation

U.S. Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham,

My name is Rick Dunnett and I work for Advanced Equities (www.advancedequities.com), a private investment boutique in Chicago. I am writing to you after reading The National Report on America's Energy Crisis, Energy Summit March 19, 2001. In the report, you mentioned President Bush's Energy Task Force headed by Vice President Cheney.

I am attempting to find investors for an innovative technology that significantly reduces consumption of standby power. In most cases an this company delivers a 10 fold efficiency. The product is patented and in production today. Your energy report cites the energy task force mentioned above, and their strategy calling for "our commitment to conservation and energy efficiency...and encourage investment in new technology to further the development of renewable energy resources." Could you please steer me in the proper direction to locate investors in energy related companies.

I appreciate your time for this matter.

Best Regards,

Rick Dunnett
VP Investments
Advanced Equities
(312)377-5339
(800)474-0900
rdunnett@advancedequities.com

Although the statements of facts in this report have been obtained from and are based on sources that we believe to be reliable, we do not guarantee their accuracy, and any such information may be incomplete or condensed. This report is for informational purposes only and is not intended as an offer or solicitation with respect to the purchase or sale of any security.
Secretary, The

From: mholly2525@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2001 2:03 PM
To: Secretary, The
Subject: Select

FROM: mholly2525@aol.com
NAME: Mike Holly
ZIP: 55430
CITY: Bloomington
STATE: MN
TOPIC: Energy Task Force
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: USA

MESSAGE: Our company has modified Brazilian and Barbados sugar cane technology, used to produce low-cost ethanol vehicle fuel and cogenerate electricity, for a crop that can be grown in the U.S. farm belt called sweet sorghum. Bush's energy task force should advocate: 1) a requirement that all farm belt states deregulate their electricity and gas markets, and 2) the phase-out of MTBE to ethanol. Farm belt utilities are blocking entry into the market. In addition, an expansion in the use of ethanol w
ALBERTA
ENERGY
Office of the Minister
Responsible for
Alberta Energy and Utilities Board

July 16, 2001

Frank Blake
US Deputy Secretary of Energy
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Frank Blake:

It was a pleasure to meet with you to discuss Alberta's role as a key supplier of energy to the United States, and our commitment to working with the U.S. Administration to develop the continental energy market and implement the Cheney Energy Task Force recommendations.

As we discussed, our mutually beneficial interest in energy could be enhanced in a number of ways. Increased investment in Alberta oil sands, transmission of arctic gas through Alberta's distribution hub, cooperation on clean coal research and technology and better electricity transmission linkages would all help to improve the continental energy market. I trust that this mission will prove instrumental in promoting closer collaboration on energy issues between Alberta, Canada, and the United States and we look forward to working with you, Secretaries Abraham and Martens and Canadian Energy Minister Goodale, on these matters.

Again, thank you for meeting with us and I wish you all the best in the future.

Yours truly,

Murray Smith, MLA
Minister

copy: Honourable Ralph Klein
Premier
Honourable Halvar C. Jonson
International and Intergovernmental Relations

404 Legislature Building, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 2B5 Telephone 780/427-3740, Fax 780/422-0195
www.energy.gov.ab.ca
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September 12, 2001

Mr. James M. Owendoff
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Environmental Management
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Owendoff:

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for your testimony during the April 26, 2001 Committee on Science hearing, “The Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 budget request for the Department of Energy (DOE).”

Enclosed are additional questions from Members of the Committee, as well as a copy of the hearing transcript. Your responses will be published as part of the official record of the hearing. In addition to a hard copy of your answers, the Committee requires an additional copy, including any supporting graphs or charts, saved on a DOS formatted 3.5 inch diskette, in either Word Perfect, Word or ASCII text. Please send your responses to Mr. Tom Hammond of the Committee staff. If you prefer, you may E-mail your responses to: tom.hammond@mail.house.gov.

I would appreciate receiving your responses to the enclosed questions by October 15, 2001.

Also enclosed is a copy of the verbatim transcript for your review. The Committee’s rules pertaining to the printing of transcripts is as follows:

The transcripts...shall be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record, as appropriate. Any requests to correct any errors, other than transcription, shall be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted.

The complete revisions to the transcripts submitted for the record must be received by September 24, 2001 and should be sent to Mr. Tom Hammond, Subcommittee on Energy, H2-389 Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Hammond at (202) 225-9662.
Mr. Owendoff  
Page 2  
September 12, 2001

Thank you again for making this hearing successful.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ROSCOE BARTLETT  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Energy

RB/ijh

Enclosures
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hearing
on
Department of Energy Fiscal Year 2002 Budget

April 26, 2001

Post-Hearing Questions Submitted to Mr. James M. Owendoff, Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Office of Environmental Management, U.S. Department of Energy

Republican Member Questions

PI Q1. What has been DOE's role in the work of Vice President Cheney's Energy Task Force? In
particularly, have you worked with the Vice President and his staff to ensure that a robust
energy R&D program—both near-term and long-term—is included in the Task Force
recommendations?

PI Q2. What is DOE's role in climate change policy review that is reportedly underway by the
Administration?

FC Q3. It appears that several DOE Offices are funding similar programs—fuel cells and turbines,
for example. Please explain how you coordinate your research efforts to avoid duplication
of effort.

Q4. It has been learned that the decline in students studying the physical sciences threatens our
near-term labor pool for the DOE labs and other Federal science and technical programs.
What is the expected impact on Energy R&D and what suggestions do you have to address
this growing problem?

Q5. Your testimony stated that West Valley "negotiations between New York and DOE
concluded in January 2001 without an agreement."

Em Q5.1 What is meant by "concluded"? Are there any plans at this time to resume
negotiations?

Em Q5.2 Your testimony further stated, "Should DOE and the State ultimately be unable to
reach consensus on a preferred alternative, DOE will proceed with the
Decommissioning EIS on its own." How long with DOE wait before proceeding on
its own?

Em Q6. Your testimony stated that characterization of West Valley Demonstration Project tank
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radiation levels revealed higher than expected levels of radionuclides that will require continued vitrification in FY 2002. What is the cost of this unanticipated work and the impact on the project's completion timeline?

Q7. Regarding the recycling of metal from the Oak Ridge K-25 site, your testimony stated that "impacts to the contract [BNFL, Inc.] have been minimized in that metals destined for recycling are being purchased by the Department and stored for possible future release."

EM Q7.1 What was the technical basis for the Clinton Administration's moratorium on the sale of this recycled metal?

EM Q7.2 To your knowledge, how have European countries dealt with recycling similarly used metals?

EM Q7.3 What is the cost to the Department to purchase this recycled metal as a result of the moratorium?

Q8. Regarding the surveillance and maintenance of the inventory of 4,700 cylinders of depleted UF6 and the 2,500 cylinders of surplus uranium at Oak Ridge, what is the general condition of those cylinders, how long have these cylinders been under "surveillance and maintenance" and what has been the cumulative cost?

Q9. Your testimony stated that $10 million is requested in the Oak Ridge Account to chemically convert depleted UF6 into a "more stable form that would make it acceptable for reuse, if applications for the material are found." What are the possible applications for reuse of depleted UF6 and if they are not known, why is the UF6 being chemically converted?

Q10. Your testimony regarding waste remediation at Paducah described consideration for an on-site disposal facility for low-level, hazardous and TSCA [Toxic Substance Control Act] waste, and mixed waste. Is the State aware of this consideration and is consideration for hazardous and TSCA waste on-site disposal underway at any other DOE site?