What's your fax number? I have info on the report issued by the State of Washington today.
FYI: Mark’s request came out of today’s NEP meeting. I was hoping someone from EE would be there but I understand conflicts (I looped MB and Darrel - I’ll add Michael to my list). As I told the group today, we are likely to get assignments every day as the editing team progresses. I’ll let folks know by the end of the day if we need to meet the next day. Thanks.

Margot

---Original Message---
From: Friedrichs, Mark
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2001 2:27 PM
To: Zimmerman, MaryBeth; York, Michael
Cc: Anderson, Margot
Subject: List of energy efficiency examples/indicators
Importance: High

Sorry, I sent it by accident. Now it has the attachment.

Thanks. << File: Efficiency Indicators.doc >>

Mark D. Friedrichs (PO-2)
Policy Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20585
202-586-0124
Fax: 202-586-3047
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From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2001 2:12 PM
To: Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Beschen, Darrell; York, Michael
Subject: help

All,

Margot

(b)(5)
All,

EIA has been doing a heroic fact check on chapter 5 (increasing supply). I will compile all their edits into one doc and will want FE to review in the morning. Doug and Guido, will that be okay?

Margot
Tripodi, Cathy

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 6:47 PM
To: Tripodi, Cathy
Subject: FW: NEP guidelines with your edits

--- Original Message ---
From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2001 5:13 PM
To: PETTIS, LARRY; Kripowicz, Robert; Porter, Robert; Haspel, Abe; Sullivan, John; Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Magwood, William; Pumphrey, David; Hart, James; Scalini, Paula; Whatley, Michael
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: NEP guidelines with your edits

All,

Hope I got everything - I am sure you will tell me if I didn't. Still missing a few names. There is some new stuff, based on your input. I am only sending this to primary points of contact - you'll need to disseminate accordingly. Call or write with concerns.

Margot

NEP
organization.doc

24197
DOE024-1603
Joe - the short answer to your question on CZMA is that we do believe that legislation is necessary to solve the problems that application of the law have created for sound OCS development. The note below and the attachments speak in more detail. After you look at this, perhaps we should have a couple of our experts come meet with you. Please let me know what we can do next. Thanks. Jim. Industry position -

Support the original tenets of the CZMA including environmentally compatible energy development.

Consistency process is broken and a fix is necessary to consider as impacts on America's energy supplies are evaluated.

The previous problems are -

- Delays or impediments to obtaining permits especially in frontier areas. For example,
  - States have blocked or delayed federal offshore energy activities far outside of their coastal waters through unreasonable application of the CZMA consistency provisions. (i.e., FPSO's)
  - Commerce's improper objection and failure to act in an appeals decision which is highlighted in a Supreme Court decision issued involving leases off North Carolina known as the Manteo prospect.

New problems foreseen with recently finalized regulation -
Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
Kyle and Kevin,

I guess I hardly need to tell you that those of us in the fusion research community are extremely pleased with the recognition afforded fusion energy in the National Energy Policy Development report.

I look forward to working together with you to make DOE and fusion energy both successful.

- Rob Goldston

---

Rob Goldston, Director, MS-37  rgoldston@pppl.gov
DOE Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory  Phone: (609) 243-3553
P.O. Box 451, Princeton, NJ 08543-0451  Fax: (609) 243-2749

You can visit DOE PPPL's Home Page at http://www.pppl.gov
Tripodi, Cathy

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 8:58 PM
To: Tripodi, Cathy
Subject: FW: Proposed Energy Policy Language

Original Message

From: mmenezes@aep.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2001 12:54 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
CC: apkavanagh@aep.com
Subject: Proposed Energy Policy Language

As per our discussion. Thanks for you review and consideration.

Mark W. Menezes
Vice President and Associate General Counsel
American Electric Power
301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 320
Washington DC 20004
PH: 202.383.3430
FX: 202.383.3459
email: mmenezes@aep.com

This e-mail message from the Legal Department of American Electric Power is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.
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Mr. Kelliher,

At the conclusion of our meeting last week, you were kind enough to invite written comments on electric competition as a part of national energy strategy. Attached is a letter responding to that invitation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Karen O'Neill
Vice President, New Markets
Green Mountain Energy Company

<<Kelliher letter - final.doc>>
Joe,

In order for coal and coal-fired power generation to increase its role in meeting the nation's electricity requirements and energy needs, a number of actions would be helpful.

1. Enactment of legislation similar to S.60, the National Energy and Environmental Technology Act which was introduced earlier in this Congress by Senators Byrd and McConnell and has bipartisan support of approximately eight Senators -- including the ranking member of the Senate Energy Committee, Senator Bingaman and the Democratic Whip in the Senate, Senator Reid. The concept of S.60 had the support in the previous Congress from Senator Abraham. Its provisions are expected to be included in the comprehensive energy legislation to be introduced by Senator Murkowski on February 26. The following material explains the rationale for S.60 and its justification.

2. A number of constraints to the continued economic availability of coal-fired power are presented by approximately 15 separate regulatory actions dealing with SO2, NOX and mercury which are either pending at the EPA or in litigation. It would be very important for DOE to take on a leadership role within the federal government to bring rationality to the plethora of regulatory actions directed at coal-fired power by the previous administration. Doug Carter (586-1650), policy analyst in Fossil Energy, is very articulate on this issue.

3. To make improvements either for environmental performance or increased efficiency of existing coal-fired power plants and to facilitate the construction of new coal-fired power plants and necessary
transmission
facilities, it is very important to give a priority focus to issues associated with siting and permitting. We would recommend an Executive Order, fashioned along the lines of the recent Executive Order addressing California's energy needs, that gives the DOE lead responsibility in ensuring priority focus on siting and permitting actions by the various federal agencies involved and facilitating those actions with the appropriate state authorities.

4. DOE should become involved in issues associated with access to coal reserves and the permitting of coal operations from an energy standpoint which will grow out of a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) anticipated to be published in draft form by EPA imminently. This EIS grew out of the "mountaintop mining" controversy in 1999. Similarly, DOE should take an active role in insuring the federal coal leasing program is administered in a way which insures timely access to the development of coal reserves on federal lands.

5. In addition to combustion technology and coal preparation, DOE should continue to focus its research activities in the area of alternative fuels from coal, such as liquids, with specific targets and timetables for development of cost-effective technologies to make greater utilization of our nation's coal reserves.

Under separate cover I will forward a recent study completed for the Edison Electric Institute entitled Fueling Electricity Growth for A Growing Economy. This study was conducted by the National Economic Research Associates and was published on January 15, 2001. It identifies the significant impediments to the expanded economic use of coal-fired power generation.

You should be aware that the National Coal Council, an advisory group to the Secretary of Energy, established by Secretary Hodel in 1985, was requested by former Secretary Richardson to report back by mid-April on obstacles to greater utilization of existing coal-fired power generation facilities. The initial draft of that report should be completed in early March. The Coal Council's recommendations should be helpful to your work.

Finally, under separate cover, you will also receive a chart we developed which identifies new additions in coal-fired generation capacities in the United States between 1980 and the year 2000 and a copy of our DOE transition paper. The chart shows that a significant amount of new coal-fired capacity is brought on-line in the 1980s and is currently helping to meet our nation's energy needs. Since 1990, relatively little low-cost, coal-fired power has been brought on line. Legislation such as S.60 would help provide incentives for construction of new coal-fired capacity that is more efficient in terms of producing electricity with improved
environmental results. EIA projects that by 2020 we will need 45 percent more electricity (over 1200 power plants) in the United States. To assure the availability of reliable, low-cost power, it is important that utilities have the flexibility to build coal-fired power.

Please call (202-463-2653) with any questions.

attachments

<NATIONAL ELECTRICITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY ACT prelim est of env. benes.doc> <NEET Outline - Title V 22101.doc> <NEET Overview - Policy Rationale 22101.doc> <NEET slides 22101.PPT>
Joe, thanks for the call back.

Below is a one-pager on the waste-to-energy tax credit. It's a little more than you asked for, but still only one page! Let me know if you need more, or less.

As to the cost of the tax credit: IWSA has estimated that a tax credit would result in additional electricity generation of approximately 200 megawatts. If the full credit of 1.7 cents per kilowatt were available, assuming 90 percent availability, I am told that the cost of the credit would be approximately $27 million per year. This figure would vary year-to-year, of course, based on how quickly new generating capacity is put into place. For purposes of estimating the cost, what is most important is the estimate of additional electricity generation of 200 megawatts from new units at existing facilities, or from altogether new facilities (less likely), over the next 5-10 years.

Again, thanks for your willingness to consider recommending this tax credit to the Vice President's Task Force. We appreciate that there is some disinclination to consider tax credits, and we are willing to do anything necessary to make the case. We would be most concerned if the Vice President's proposal included a tax credit package before we had a chance to make our case. Your call back was especially timely. Thanks again.