Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

March 6, 2001

Mr. Walter A. Hans
President
Technology Resources and
Development Corporation
P.O. Box 2820
Cherry Hill, NJ 08052-0246

Dear Mr. Hans:

Thank you for your recent letter, which offered recommendations on how best to address some of the Nation’s current electricity demand and supply problems, through the use of the expertise and software available from Technology Resources and Development Corporation (TRD).

As you know, one of President Bush’s first acts was creating a National Energy Policy Development Group, headed by Vice President Cheney, to help the private sector and government at all levels, promote dependable, affordable, and environmentally sound production and distribution of energy for the future. This group includes the Secretary of Energy, as well as the Secretaries of the Treasury, Interior, Agriculture and Commerce Departments, the heads of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, the President’s Deputy Chief of Staff for Policy, and the Assistants to the President for Economic Policy and Intergovernmental Affairs.

The group will consider the ideas and recommendations of consumers, businesses, and independent experts on how best to address the broad range of energy issues now facing the Nation, including rapidly rising costs for natural gas, electricity supply and price problems in the West and the increasing dependence of the United States on imported oil. Your specific suggestions, and the expertise of TRD, will be made known to participants in this process.

Thank you for writing.

Sincerely,

Margot Anderson
Acting Director
Office of Policy

Printed with soy ink on recycled paper
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The Secretary of Energy
Washington, DC 20585
May 8, 2001

The Honorable Don Siegelman
Governor of Alabama
Montgomery, AL 36130-2751

Dear Governor Siegelman:

Natural gas supply and prices have been a leading issue in the Nation’s recent energy problems. The impact of high natural gas prices has been felt by residential consumers and businesses throughout the Nation. The role of natural gas in the California electricity crisis and its potential role in national electricity supply this summer have also been of concern. Many Governors, State legislators, and local officials have expressed interest in a review of these issues by the U.S. Department of Energy.

I have directed the Energy Information Administration to conduct a study of current natural gas supply, demand, and prices to be available this spring. This analysis will provide a useful background for understanding recent events in the natural gas markets and the near-term challenges before the Nation for this fuel. In addition, the report being prepared by President Bush’s National Energy Task Force should provide a comprehensive national approach to our energy crisis and legislative and regulatory guidelines for energy policy initiatives that affect natural gas as well as other components of the energy market. The Department of Energy will work with Congress at that time to develop a comprehensive national solution to our energy needs.

One issue that has emerged in our early review of the natural gas markets is the difficulty of obtaining accurate, timely information about natural gas production. At present the Energy Information Administration receives data reports on natural gas production from the 33 producing States on a voluntary basis. We understand that the States primarily collect these data for purposes of revenue collection or resource management. Staff level contacts in the States indicate that they receive data late or have limited resources to process the large amounts of data in a timely manner.

The Department of Energy is exploring ways to work with state agencies through the auspices of the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission and the
Association of American State Geologists for the purposes of improving the timeliness and accuracy of these data series. We hope that you will support this activity on the part of your State agencies.

I share your concern about the impact of natural gas supply and price changes on U.S. homes and businesses, and look forward to working with you and all Governors to address these issues.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Spencer Abraham
To: Secretary Abraham
Date: 3/23/01
Fax #: 576-7644
Pages: 2

From: 2001-007915 Mar 23 A 11:36

Comments:

NOTICE: This telecopy transmission and any accompanying documents may contain confidential or privileged information. They are intended only for use by the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, copy or distribute or use in any manner the contents of this information. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so we can arrange retrieval of the faxed document.

★ 2262 Rayburn Building ★ Washington, DC 20515 ★
★ Phone: (202) 225-3661 ★ Fax: (202) 225-4890 ★
Congress of the United States  
Washington, DC 20515

March 21, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham  
Secretary of Energy  
Forrestal Building  
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

As you are aware, our nation is confronting high energy prices and unreliable energy supplies that threaten to slow economic growth and have the potential to produce further energy disruptions this Spring and Summer. In an effort to adequately address this problem, we would like to invite you to meet with the Democratic Caucus Energy Task Force next week to discuss the current energy situation and the Administration's apparent effort to overhaul the national energy policy.

As committed leaders on energy issues in the Congress, we are concerned about the position the Administration has taken in recent days. Americans across the country are facing soaring gasoline prices at the pump, natural gas prices that have more than tripled, and electricity costs that have been volatile all over the country, particularly the West coast. As a result, home heating bills have increased by as much as three fold from last year's extremely high prices.

The Democratic Caucus Energy Task Force is moving closer to developing a comprehensive energy policy, and we strongly believe that we must be mindful of both short-term and long-term needs. Adopting a policy that strengthens our economy, protects our environment, and keeps our nation secure is our first priority. We would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and hear from you about your view of the current situation, as well as discuss with you in depth about the proposed budget for the Department of Energy.

We look forward to finding common ground with you and hope that you will be able to join us. Please confirm with Soña Garcia at the Democratic Caucus at 226-3210.

Sincerely,

Richard Schmude  
Daleline  
Michael  
Mark Pallas  
Geoff Miller  
Jeff Alexander  
Charlie Stenholm
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September 18, 2001

James Connaughton  
Chairman  
Council on Environmental Quality  
722 Jackson Place, NW  
Washington, DC 20503

Dear Chairman Connaughton:

I am writing on behalf of the National Hydropower Association (NHA) to ask the Council's Energy Streamlining Task Force, in cooperation with the Departments of Interior and Commerce, to immediately rescind the Proposed Interagency Policy on the Prescription of Fishways Under Section 18 of the Federal Power Act (FPA) published on December 22, 2000 in the Federal Register (F.R. Docket No. 001215356-0356-01). Further, we ask CEQ's Task Force to direct the Departments to immediately halt any unilateral actions related to this proposed policy.

Section 1701(b) of the National Energy Policy Act of 1992 vacated the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) definition of fishways. The Act clearly delegates to FERC the authority to redefine fishways by rulemaking with the concurrence of the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce. The Departments' proposal evades the express intent of Congress, oversteps the authority of the Departments and directly conflicts with President Bush's hydropower recommendations contained in the National Energy Policy released in May.

The proposed policy is deeply flawed and greatly unbalanced. The proposal creates a definition of fishways prior to any action by FERC. It also is designed to greatly extend to the Departments' authority over all aspects of fishways. The proposal broadly defines "fishways" to include virtually any project structure or operational measure related to fish. The term "fish" was also redefined to include virtually every form of water-related animal life other than mammals and birds. Further, it provides the agencies virtually unbounded authority to prescribe new or modified fishways throughout the term of a license.

The President's National Energy Policy recognized hydropower as a valuable renewable energy resource and recommended legislative and administrative improvements to the licensing process, stating that there "is a need to reduce the time and cost of the hydropower licensing process" and that the process be "more clear and efficient." The policy proposal, on the other hand, would result in overlapping and conflicting federal roles in the licensing process, would increase the uncertainties for licensees and other stakeholders, would cause excessive delays in issuing a new
license and could cost the hydropower industry billions of dollars. It would exacerbate many of the problems that currently plague the hydropower licensing process.

As we face rising energy prices, increased levels of pollution and greenhouse gases, energy shortages and reliability concerns, this is the least opportune time, when viewed from the public interest perspective, for the Departments to mount a campaign for unbounded expansion of their prescriptive powers. Now is clearly the time for policymakers at the federal level to better incorporate hydropower into the nation's energy strategies, rather than devise policies that further diminish a resource that is so vital to energy adequacy, diversity and security.

The National Hydropower Association again asks that the Departments' proposed policy statement on fishways be immediately rescinded. Further, we ask that the Departments follow the intent of Congress and fully cooperate with FERC if a formal rulemaking is initiated by the Commission to, per the direction of Congress, define fishways and processes — including an appeals process — related to the development of fishways under Section 18 of the Federal Power Act. We hope you will quickly adopt our recommendations and we look forward to working with you and the Administration on this important matter.

If you have any questions, please contact me, or Mark R. Stover, NHA's Director of Government Affairs, at 202-682-1700.

Sincerely,

Linda Church Ciocci  
Executive Director

cc: Secretary Gale Norton, U.S. Department of Interior  
Secretary Donald Evans, U.S. Department of Commerce  
Deputy Secretary J. Steven Griles, U.S. Department of Interior  
Chairman Pat Wood, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Dr. William Hogarth, Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service
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I'm confident that you, Secretary Abraham, as one of the seven members of the Cheney's Interagency energy-policy task force, agree that nuclear power should account for a higher percentage of U.S. electricity than the current level of 20%. However, Leader Cheney has acknowledged that the task force hasn't figured out what to do with the nuclear waste. The attached document presenting the production-proven PURE process provides that answer.

Eleven years ago Admiral James D. Watkins, President George H. Bush's Secretary of Energy, also acknowledged this nuclear waste problem; he did something about it. With his in-depth knowledge of and hands-on nuclear power experience, Admiral Watkins acted decisively in 1990 and ordered an immediate thorough evaluation of the PURE-process alternative to the troubled Yucca Mountain Repository Project.

John W. Bartlett, Director of DOE's Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, was charged with carrying out Admiral Wahtkin's orders for a prompt evaluation of the PURE alternative. Within three months Director Bartlett's ten-man Ad Hoc team reported back that the PURE process was technically feasible and economically attractive and should be studied in-depth by DOE's Washington-based research department.

Shortly thereafter the Clinton Administration took office; further evaluation of the PURE alternative to the Yucca Mountain Repository Project got lost within the bureaucratic maze.

You, as a member of Cheney's seven-person energy Task Force are in an enviable position to capitalize on Admiral Watkin's 1990 vision; you can be instrumental in implementing this production-proven PURE process alternative which resolves the nuclear waste issue.

Respectfully yours,

Cleve Anderson
E-mail Cleveplume@GCI-net.com
THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY IS A NUCLEAR BOON-DOGGLE

CREATING, NOT RESOLVING, PROBLEMS FOR NUCLEAR ENERGY

CLEVE ANDERSON
April 11, 2001

"I'm a strategy builder, I love strategies and I believe a strategy is critical", declared retired Admiral James D. Watkins in responding to his appointment in January 1989 by President George H. Bush to be Secretary of Energy. It was a typical approach for this can-do, full-steam-ahead submariner from Hyman Rickover's rigorous nuclear navy. Watkins brought a strong support and knowledge of nuclear power to compliment President George H. Bush's knowledge in-depth of the oil and gas issues.

Upon completing his first year as Energy Secretary in shaping a "national energy strategy" that would give President George H. Bush some policy options in the future, Admiral Watkins had discovered that being a strategy builder has its limits especially when dealing with conflicting missions and the pressures of national politics.

In discussions with John Sununu, President Bush's Chief-of-Staff, Admiral Watkins became aware of a process alternative to the Yucca Mountain project, called PURE - Plutonium Recovery and Recycle, that removes one hundred percent of the plutonium from the spent fuels; this essentially zero-cost recovered plutonium could replace the expensive uranium-235 as the fuel for nuclear power reactors.

Admiral Watkins noted a major advantage to the PURE process over the Yucca Mountain Project in that with the plutonium removed, the remaining radiotopes in the spent fuels would decay to trace levels within five hundred years. These residual wastes could be safely stored in titanium cylinders for that five hundred-year period of time thereby greatly reducing the long-term demands for a waste repository. He ordered an immediate thorough evaluation of this PURE alternative.

John W. Bartlett, Director of DOE's Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, was charged with carrying out Admiral Watkins's orders for this prompt and thorough evaluation of the PURE alternative. Director Bartlett immediately formalized a ten-man evaluation task-force; a few months later they reported back that the PURE process was technically feasible and should be studied in-depth by DOE's Washington-based research department.

Shortly thereafter, the Clinton Administration took office. Hazel O'Leary, who had no experience or knowledge of nuclear
energy, was appointed Secretary of Energy. Further evaluation of the PURE alternative to the Yucca Mountain Repository Project got lost within DOE's bureaucratic maze.

These then are the plutonium and nuclear waste problems left by the previous administration that are facing Vice President Cheney's interagency task force as they evaluate nuclear energy options for meeting the Nation's energy needs.

PLUTONIUM PROLIFERATION - WORLDWIDE

Every nation or group that has access to a nuclear reactor, whatever its type, has a readily available inventory of plutonium. For terrorist or rogue nations, the readily available spent fuel being discharged annually from power reactors is an easy way to accumulate plutonium for bomb purposes.

Contrary to today's politically motivated consensus, recovery of this plutonium can be readily implemented by a conventional process requiring only commercially available equipment. It can be implemented by any group having a basic knowledge of chemistry. They do not need the hazardous, multi-cycle reprocessing facilities currently employed by the developed countries. Instead, by holding these spent fuels for five years following reactor discharge, natural radiation decay reduces the radiation level by one thousand-fold. Plutonium can then be recovered by a simple, well-known, one-step, anionic resin extraction process.

Today in the United States, the "politically correct" burial method for disposing of power reactor plutonium is a sham. In January 1999, the Government Accounting Office, GAO, issued a report, GAO/OCG-00-6 stating:

DOE has spent $6.5 billion over 15 years for a permanent disposal site for highly radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. This project is currently 12 years behind schedule, and DOE has not yet determined whether the site is suitable for a repository.

Regardless of the problems with the Yucca Mountain Project, any rogue group, using the Yucca Mountain example, can justify accumulating plutonium in its spent fuel form. Easy recovery of the plutonium can be anytime five years following spent fuel discharge from the reactor. That would not require constructing a complex repository; the fuel could even be held in the reactor storage basin for the five years cooling that facilitates plutonium recovery.

DEFINING THE PROBLEM
Over fifty years ago our country's political, scientific and engineering leaders coalesced around the Manhattan Project in an all out team effort to produce the world's first atomic bomb. In their view our national security was at stake. Within three years following President Roosevelt establishing the Project team, kilogram quantities of plutonium were being produced.

Plutonium production started out fifty years ago as a closely guarded military program with a limited objective. The world's attention is now focused on controlling so-called "weapons-type" plutonium as exemplified by the Test Ban Treaty negotiations.

Today, plutonium produced in light water power reactors is being falsely defined as separate and distinct from weapons-type plutonium produced in graphite moderated reactors. The truth is that bombs have been constructed and successfully tested using plutonium produced in light water power reactors. Our national leaders are either unaware of, or choose to ignore, that by far the greatest risk to our national security is the plutonium being produced in the 436 licensed nuclear power reactors operating in the world today.

The most recent example of our blindness to this threat is our financing of two light water moderated reactors for North Korea in exchange for their promise to shut down their existing graphite moderated reactor.

The facts are that the bomb quality of the plutonium produced in any type reactor is directly related to the total exposure time of the fuel in the reactor. In today's power reactors that residence time is normally about four years and yields a product containing 80 percent of the fissionable form of plutonium. Shorten the fuel cycle time and the fissionable quality of the plutonium will be improved proportionately. The only known way to eliminate plutonium by peaceful means is to convert it into useful energy. As the leader of the world, it is imperative that the United States show the way in this critical mission.

It is disturbing today to find proposals being advanced to extend and even double the forty year service life of existing power reactors. Such actions fly in the face of common sense. You cannot inspect in safety; you can only build it in at time of construction. Ocean freighters, airplanes, trucks and railroad locomotive respect this fundamental truth. They are routinely retired at the end of their design life to be replaced by safer, more efficient equipment. Common sense would seem to dictate that the well-known catastrophic consequences of a reactor failure, such as Chernobyl, would dictate at least equal caution in dealing with nuclear reactors.
RESOLVING THE PROBLEM

As a basic part of a plutonium elimination program, existing reactor and fuel designs will have to be replaced. New plutonium-consuming, power producing reactors, specifically designed for efficiently destroying plutonium can and must be built.

Such design philosophy is in marked contrast to existing reactor and fuel designs where fission fuel efficiency is the dominant theme. Critics will abound. What type of reasoning can possibly justify such a total departure from today’s nuclear concepts? There are four primary facts that mandate a full and complete review of this proposal. They are:

1. The world-wide accumulation of plutonium by any group, including rogue Nations and terrorist groups, that has access to nuclear power reactors.
2. The ease with which plutonium can be recovered from the spent fuels discharged annually from these reactors.
3. The well recognized capability of producing bomb quality plutonium in each and every one of the 436 licensed nuclear power reactors operating in the world today.
4. With essentially complete recovery of the 24,300 year half-life plutonium, the remaining radioactivity in the spent fuels decays to trace levels within five hundred years. Containment in titanium capsules for that period of time would resolve the long-term nuclear waste disposal problem.

The dedicated team effort of the Manhattan Project’s political, scientific and engineering leaders fifty years ago created plutonium. In the ensuing years, political and nuclear energy corporate leaders have usurped control and allowed plutonium production to get out-of-control. Based on their legislated decisions, the politicians appear to lack even a basic understanding of the consequences of their actions. At the same time the nuclear energy corporate leaders studiously avoid any responsibility for disposing of the spent fuels with their contained plutonium. They lobby intensely and at length to keep that as a government responsibility.

Today, an equally dedicated project team similar to the Manhattan Project of fifty years ago is needed to first, clearly identify this out-of-control threat posed by power reactor produced plutonium and second, formulate an integrated effort to eliminate it. Outstanding scientists, engineers and environmentalists, free of both internal corporate influence and political pressures, are required to bring this about.
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What is needed to "put the show on the road" is a leader who can maintain complete separation of the corporate and governmental executives with their vested interests and the scientific-engineering-environmental personnel who are required to implement the program.

The author's credentials that qualify him to speak on this issue include three major plutonium patents and one fail-safe nuclear reactor patent. He has had eight years of on-site experience and served as the Head of the Redox Hanford Plant Ruthenium Emissions Task Force, HW-32465, and chairman of the Hanford Seven-Year Waste Management Program, HW-58329. Other nuclear related activities include serving as an expert witness in Congressional Hearings, serving as an expert witness for Nebraska Public Power in its successful lawsuit against General Electric, and being a consultant to the California Energy Commission in formulating its nuclear legislation.

Prepared by Cleve Anderson
501 S. La Posada Circle, #137
Green Valley, AZ 85614
E-mail - Clevepluto@GCI.net.com
April 11, 2001