

Williams, Ronald L

From: Scalingi, Paula
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 10:47 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Policy Options for Infrastructure Goals

Margot,

Cheers,
Paula

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 11:58 AM
To: Scalingi, Paula
Subject: RE: NEP goals

Paula,

Sent out earlier. No big deal on the deadline - would like to have your policy ideas by Monday (we have a WH deadline by Wednesday). I'll edit the goals using the input I got from you this a.m. Don't feel you have to dot every i - a solid paragraph for each program or policy idea will be enough for this first round. I'll compile what I get and send around in advance of a Monday afternoon meeting. I have a feeling this could go on for a week or two until WH decides what they want to go forward with.

1

9947

DOE015-0596

Margot

All,

Sorry this took so long. Got jammed up. Here is where we are. I got comments on template and goals and tried to accommodate

Who can meet on Friday afternoon?

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Scalingi, Paula
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 11:54 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP goals

Margot,

Hi. I'm back.

Paula

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 11:43 AM
To: Rogers, Cecellia
Cc: Scalingi, Paula
Subject: RE: NEP goals

Cecellia,

What I really need from Paula are her Policy ideas. Due yesterday COB but reprieve granted until today. See e-mail a few days ago which explained this. Thanks! Call if questions. Se new e-mail today about meeting on Monday to discuss.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Rogers, Cecellia

Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2001 5:24 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Scalingi, Paula; Kellner, Joseph
Subject: RE: NEP goals
Importance: High

Margot,
Here are Paula's notes:

Ceil

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2001 4:24 PM
To: Scalingi, Paula
Subject: NEP goals

Paul,

I lost my notes from yesterday and want to recreate your Infrastructure goal. Can you provide some language on the primary goal and sub-goals that support it. Thanks.

Margot

(b)(5)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Brown.Ellen@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Brown.Ellen@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 12:38 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet; Laitner.Skip@epamail.epa.gov%internet; Hall.Johnm@epamail.epa.gov%internet; Schultheisz.Daniel@epamail.epa.gov%internet
Subject: chapter 8 comments



tmp.htm

Margot,

9950

DOE015-0599

(b)(5)

Ellen

(b)(5)

Margot,

(b)(5)

Ellen

b(5)

Martin, Adrienne

From: KMurphy@doc.gov%internet [KMurphy@doc.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 12:18 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Chapter 8 edits

Thanks for your help!

-Kevin

(b)(5)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kevin O'Donovan [kmodonovan@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 1:03 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: FW: NEP news

Got it. Thanks.

>From: "Anderson, Margot" <Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov>
>To: "kmodonovan@hotmail.com" <kmodonovan@hotmail.com>
>Subject: FW: NEP news
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:49:12 -0500
>

>from yesterday

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Anderson, Margot
>> Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2001 1:59 PM
>> To: Whalley, Michael; 'O'Donovan, Kevin@hq.doe.gov'
>> Subject: FW: NEP news

>>
>> Kevin O.


>> Nice to meet you and I look forward to working with you. Some NEP
>> information. The Kevin in the body of the note refers to Kolevar.

>> Margot
>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Anderson, Margot
>> Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2001 6:22 PM
>> To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin
>> Subject: NEP news

>>
>> Joe and Kevin.



done redact

> > Margot
>

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 11:56 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

My level of detail is a sentence describing the action

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 9:29 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

Joe,

It would be nice to have your 70 as well so we could put a complete list together. I have two-pagers (following our template) on all 60. What level of detail do you have on yours? We will likely get a few more in from DOE staff today.

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 9:20 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 9:12 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

We provide our options on Wednesday (3/14). We will need to whittle down the proposals to date. Did you get my earlier e-mail with the list of options?

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 8:56 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

When do we provide our options to the Task Force? I can't remember. This week?

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 8:43 AM
To: Haspel, Abe; Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Lockwood, Andrea; Breed, William; KYDES, ANDY; Whatley, Michael; Carter, Douglas; Braitsch, Jay; Melchert, Elena; Cook, Trevor; 'jksber@bpa.gov'; O'Donovan, Kevin; Kolevar, Kevin; Scalingi, Paula
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: NEP Policy Options

9957

DOE015-0606

All,

<< File: Short titles.doc >>

Williams, Ronald L

From: Scalingi, Paula
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 12:00 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: FW: Policy Options for Infrastructure Goals--TITLES

Margot,

Your titles. I have amended the options I sent you to provide a title plus I indicated, as did others, what goal these refer to. Hope this fits the bill.

Paula

—Original Message—

From: Scalingi, Paula
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 10:47 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Policy Options for Infrastructure Goals

9959

DOE015-0608

(b)(3)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Brown.Ellen@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Brown.Ellen@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 1:23 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: more on 8



tmp.htm

Margot,

Ellen

(b)(5)

Margot,

(b)(5)

Martin, Adrienne

From: Breed, William
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 1:15 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Conti, John; Watts, Edward
Subject: RE: energy tax proposals

Importance: High

Margot:

here are two files; one from Barry's work, and one from Peter & Ed (that I have modified slightly) -- I will look at other of my ideas and see if anything else can be useful, but wanted to get these to you ASAP --

Bill



NEP Tax ideas short
13 APR.doc



NEP tax incentives
PO21 13APRO...

William Breed
Acting Director, Office of Energy Efficiency,
Alternative Fuels, and Oil Analysis (PO-22)
202-586-4763

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 8:31 AM
To: Conti, John; Breed, William
Subject: FW: energy tax proposals
Importance: High

Bill and John.

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 8:37 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Kripowicz, Robert; Haspel, Abe; Magwood, William
Cc: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: energy tax proposals
Importance: High

Infrastructure.

Cheers,
Paula

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 11:58 AM
To: Scalingi, Paula
Subject: RE: NEP goals

Paula,

Sent out earlier.

Margot

All,

Sorry this took so long. Got jammed up. Here is where we are. I got comments on template and goals and tried to accommodate

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Scalingi, Paula
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 11:54 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP goals

Margot.

Hi. I'm back.

Paula

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 11:43 AM
To: Rogers, Cecellia
Cc: Scalingi, Paula
Subject: RE: NEP goals

Cecellia,

What I really need from Paula are her Policy ideas. Due yesterday COB but reprieve granted until today. See e-mail a few days ago which explained this. Thanks! Call if questions. Se new e-mail today about meeting on Monday to discuss.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Rogers, Cecellia
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2001 5:24 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Scalingi, Paula; Kellner, Joseph
Subject: RE: NEP goals
Importance: High

Margot,
Here are Paula's notes:

She will be back in the office tomorrow.
Ceil

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2001 4:24 PM
To: Scalingi, Paula
Subject: NEP goals

Paul,

Margot

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 12:01 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: California Supply/Demand

Martin, Adrienne

5(5)

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 1:33 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: SPR

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 12:07 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

Will you be around?

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 12:04 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

Okay, no problem. I won't bug you. We (DOE staff) will meet anyway at 3:00 to see if we can make sense of the 70+ proposals I have. DO you need anything for the testimony? I just finished a natural gas 1 and a for Whatley to use.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 11:56 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

My level of detail is a sentence describing the action.

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 9:29 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

Joe,

It would be nice to have your 70 as well so we could put a complete list together. I have two-pagers (following our template) on all 60. What level of detail do you have on yours? We will likely get a few more in from DOE staff today.

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 9:20 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

Yes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 9:12 AM

9970

DOE015-0619

To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

We provide our options on Wednesday (3/14). We will need to whittle down the proposals to date. Did you get my earlier e-mail with the list of options?

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 8:56 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP Policy Options

When do we provide our options to the Task Force? I can't remember. This week?

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 8:43 AM
To: Haspel, Abe; Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Lockwood, Andrea; Breed, William; KYDES, ANDY; Whatley, Michael; Carter, Douglas; Braltsch, Jay; Melchert, Elena; Cook, Trevor; 'jstber@bpa.gov'; O'Donovan, Kevin; Kolevar, Kevin; Scaling, Paula
CC: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: NEP Policy Options

All,

<< File: Short titles.doc >>

7L66

(b)(7)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 3:44 PM
To: Conti, John; Anderson, Margot
Cc: Terry, Tracy
Subject: RE: CEC CA Summer 2001 Forecasted Peak Demand - Resource Balance

-----Original Message-----

From: Conti, John
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 2:53 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Terry, Tracy
Subject: CEC CA Summer 2001 Forecasted Peak Demand - Resource Balance

Attached please find Tracy and my comments on the CEC document.

<< File: review CEC forecast.doc >>

John J. Conti
Acting Director,
Office of Economic, Electricity,
and Natural Gas Analysis
(202) 586-4767

Martin, Adrienne

(b)(5)

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 2:12 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul; O'Donovan, Kevin
Subject: hydro potential

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 1:29 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: prices

Importance: High

What were average spot market prices in Dec, Jan, Feb in CA? I want to contrast the Duke Energy offer – \$55/megawatt-hour for 5 years – with spot market prices.

9979

DOE015-0628

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 3:44 PM
To: Conti, John; Anderson, Margot
Cc: Terry, Tracy
Subject: RE: CEC CA Summer 2001 Forecasted Peak Demand - Resource Balance

.Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: Conti, John
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 2:53 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Terry, Tracy
Subject: CEC CA Summer 2001 Forecasted Peak Demand - Resource Balance

Attached please find Tracy and my comments on the CEC document.

<< File: review CEC forecast.doc >>

John J. Conti
Acting Director,
Office of Economic, Electricity,
and Natural Gas Analysis
(202) 586-4767

Williams, Ronald L

(b) (5)

From: Michael York
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 5:22 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Sullivan, John; Haspel, Abe; Jeffery, Nancy; Garland, Buddy
Subject: Revised EERE Policy Options



EERE Rev Summary

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 4:21 PM
To: Conti, John
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy
Subject: RE: CA prices

Importance: High

I need percentages -
1/00 to 1/01 or 12/99 to 12/00?

-----Original Message-----

From: Conti, John
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 3:17 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy
Subject: FW: CA prices

Joe,

Attached please find some information on wholesale electricity prices in California. We will try to find some information for February. Is this what you need?

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry, Tracy
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 3:06 PM
To: Conti, John
Subject: CA prices

I'll start looking around for more detailed info if anyone needs it, but here are some summary tables that might be helpful. Also, I'll try to get some info on Feb prices. Just wanted to send you this ASAP.

<< File: CA prices.doc >>

(b)(5)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 4:21 PM
To: Conti, John
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy
Subject: RE: CA prices

Importance: High

-----Original Message-----

From: Conti, John
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 3:17 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy
Subject: FV: CA prices

Joe,

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry, Tracy
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 3:06 PM
To: Conti, John
Subject: CA prices

<< File: CA prices.doc >>

Williams, Ronald L

(b)(5)

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 6:34 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Haspel, Abe; Dixon, Robert
Subject: Re: distributed generation demonstration project



Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL on 03/11/2001 01:15:56 PM

To: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL
cc: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL

Subject: distributed generation demonstration project

Williams, Ronald L

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 6:34 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Haspel, Abe; Dixon, Robert
Subject: Re: distributed generation demonstration project

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2001 9:10 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot
Cc: John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet



NEP Sec3 rc 0312.doc



NEP Sec6 rc 0312.doc



NEP Sec7 rc 0312.doc



NEP Sec8 rc 0312.doc



NEP Sec9 rc 0312.doc

Joe

Margot
Kevin

Attached, for your information, are Treasury's comments on DOE's chapters.

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kevin O'Donovan [kmodonovan@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 1:03 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: FW: NEP news

Got it. Thanks.

>From: "Anderson, Margot" <Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov>
>To: "kmodonovan@hotmail.com" <kmodonovan@hotmail.com>
>Subject: FW: NEP news
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:49:12 -0500

>
>from yesterday

>
>> ---Original Message---

>> From: Anderson, Margot
>> Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2001 1:59 PM
>> To: Whatley, Michael; 'O'Donovan, Kevin@hq.doe.gov'
>> Subject: FW: NEP news

>>
>> Kevin O.

>>
>> Nice to meet you and I look forward to working with you. Some NEP
>> information. The Kevin in the body of the note refers to Kolevar.

>>
>> Margot

>>
>> ---Original Message---

>> From: Anderson, Margot
>> Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2001 6:22 PM
>> To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin
>> Subject: NEP news

>>
>> Joe and Kevin.

> > Margot
>

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>

Williams, Ronald L

From: Brown.Ellen@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Brown.Ellen@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2001 1:23 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: more on 8



tmp.htm

Ellen

Margot, I just got these but they seem helpful so I am passing them on.

Margot, I just got these but they seem helpful so I am passing them on. Ellen

Williams, Ronald L

(b) (5)

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2001 9:16 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP activities

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2001 8:28 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: NEP activities

Joe,

Do you want to meet at 10:00 to go over various NEP activities and meetings? I'll come down if you will be around.

Margot

10245

DOE015-0894

Williams, Ronald L.

(b) (5-)

From: Cook, Trevor
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2001 10:02 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: here you go... 2 attached files

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2001 9:53 AM
To: Cook, Trevor; Person, George
Subject: Reminder

Please don't forget to send e-versions of your policy proposals.

Thanks

10247

DOE015-0896

10248

DOE015-0897

2-1

300-87

1-25
1-29
-9

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 12:06 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: RE: Reformatted Chapters



Ch9.03.28double.doc



Ch9.03.28double.doc



Ch9.03.28double.doc



PIC15144.PCX

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/05/2001 12:06 PM

(Embedded image moved "Poche, Michelle" <Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov> to file: 04/02/2001 07:43:15 PM PIC15144.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP

cc: Subject: RE: Reformatted Chapters

Original Message

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov [mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
 Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 6:57 PM
 To: Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov; Galloglysj@state.gov; McManusmt@state.gov; Poche, Michelle <OST>; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV; commcoll@aol.com; WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov
 Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov;

John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov; Kjersten_dräger@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: Reformatted Chapters

All right, let's try this again. I believe last Friday, March 30, 2001, I requested the following:

Message follows:

Could you, by Monday noon, send me your Chapter(s) in the format that I requested on 3/26/01. As an example of what I'd like to see, I am attaching Treasury's latest submission.

We've got to start plugging in where graphics and photographs go in the chapters and seeing it laid out like that will help.

One last thing, please date your draft. That too will help.

To say the least, I didn't get an overwhelming response. I know that everybody was pushing to get ready for the Principals Meeting on Tuesday. Now that effort is virtually past, let's get back to business. Send those chapters along please.

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

with House of 9 pages

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 12:06 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: RE: Reformatted Chapters



Ch9.03.28double.doc



Ch9.03.28double.doc



Ch9.03.28double.doc



PIC15144.PCX

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/05/2001
12:06 PM

(Embedded
image moved "Poche, Michelle" <Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov>
to file: 04/02/2001 07:43:15 PM
PIC15144.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP

cc:

Subject: RE: Reformatted Chapters

Original Message

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov [mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 6:57 PM
To: Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov; Galloglysj@state.gov;
McManusmt@state.gov; Poche, Michelle <OST>; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV;
commcoll@aol.com; WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov

John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: Reformatted Chapters

All right, let's try this again. I believe last Friday, March 30, 2001, I requested the following:
Message follows:

Could you, by Monday noon, send me your Chapter(s) in the format that I requested on 3/26/01. As an example of what I'd like to see, I am attaching Treasury's latest submission. We've got to start plugging in where graphics and photographs go in the chapters and seeing it laid out like that will help. One last thing, please date your draft. That too will help.

To say the least, I didn't get an overwhelming response. I know that everybody was pushing to get ready for the Principals Meeting on Tuesday. Now that effort is virtually past, let's get back to business. Send those chapters along please.
Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

up to 23

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 12:06 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Mlebianc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: chapter 8



ch 8 march 24
doublespaced.doc...



PIC02554.PCX

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/05/2001

12:05 PM

(Embedded
image moved Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov
to file: 04/03/2001 04:38:37 PM
PIC02554.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP

cc:
Subject: chapter 8

(See attached file: ch 8 march 24 doublespaced.doc)

Williams, Ronald L

wh: Hess 6(5) 34 p80

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
 Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 12:04 PM
 To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
 Subject: FW: LATEST DRAFT of Section 5 - Economic Impact of Energy



NEP sec5 0327.doc



NEPSec5Charts.doc



NEPSec5captions.doc



PIC13578.PCX

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/05/2001 12:04 PM

(Embedded image moved Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov to file: 03/29/2001 06:10:07 PM PIC13578.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP, John Fenzel/OVP/EOP

cc:

Subject: FW: LATEST DRAFT of Section 5 - Economic Impact of Energy

> —Original Message—
 > From: Cononi, Rachel
 > Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 4:12 PM
 > To: Squitieri, Ray; Ellis, Dina; Soares, Chris; Flynn, Timothy;
 > Hendershot, Karen; Paulus, Michael; Gross, Jared
 > Subject: LATEST DRAFT of Section 5 - Economic Impact of Energy
 >

> Here's the latest version of our chapter. A few things were added to the
> business and agriculture sections, including a couple of new charts.
(Note
> that it has been reformatted according to OVP specifications. This
> entailed removing all the charts but I have included them in a separate
> document along with the accompanying captions.)
>
>
> <<NEP sec5 0327.doc>> <<NEPSec5Charts.doc>> <<NEPSec5captions.doc>>

491
Williams, Ronald L

with to Home 6(5) 18 pgs

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 12:05 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; comimcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: chapter 6



ch 6 march 25
doublespaced.doc...



PIC19413.PCX

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/05/2001
12:04 PM

(Embedded
image moved Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov
to file: 04/03/2001 04:38:28 PM
PIC19413.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP

cc:
Subject: chapter 6

(See attached file: ch 6 march 25 doublespaced.doc)

Williams, Ronald L

sub to the case b(5) 10 pgs

From: → Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 12:04 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Draft Environment Chapter for NEPD



att1.htm



env't chapter 3-9.wpd



graphDC.PRZ



Graph 2.ppt



PIC32494.PCX

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/05/2001
12:03 PM

(Embedded
image moved Schmidt.Lorie@epamail.epa.gov
to file: 03/09/2001 01:46:07 PM
PIC32494.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP

cc: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov, Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Draft Environment Chapter for NEPD

Just in case Jeremy isn't around to forward this to you, here's EPA's
draft of the environment chapter.
Lorie Schmidt
564-1681

— Forwarded by Lorie Schmid/DC/USEPA/US on 03/09/2001 01:45 PM —

Lorie Schmid
03/09/2001 01:44 PM

To: Jeremy Symons/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: Tom Gibson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Draft Environment Chapter for NEPD

This is the draft chapter.

This is the draft of Graph 1.

This is the draft of Graph 2.

My apologies for not being able to get the graphs in the chapter or to get them all wordperfect.

Please note that the formatting for the boxes in the draft chapter will need to be adjusted.

Just in case Jeremy isn't around to forward this to you, here's EPA's draft of the environment chapter.

Lorie Schmidt
564.1681

..... Forwarded by Lorie Schmidt/DC/USEPA/US on 03/09/2001 01:45 PM

Lorie Schmidt

03/09/2001 01:44 PM

To: Jeremy Symons/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: Tom Gibson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Draft Environment Chapter for NEPD

This is the draft chapter.
This is the draft of Graph 1.
This is the draft of Graph 2.

My apologies for not being able to get the graphs in the chapter or to get them all wordperfect.

Please note that the formatting for the boxes in the draft chapter will need to be adjusted.

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 12:03 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R._Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Mieblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J._Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: chapter 3



Chapter 3 March 27
doublespace...



PIC08697.PCX

At the request of a number of you, I will be forwarding the latest draft chapters (Chapters 3 -10). This is the first of many.

Charlie

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/05/2001
12:00 PM

(Embedded
image moved Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov
to file: 04/03/2001 04:38:24 PM
PIC08697.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP

cc:

Subject: chapter 3

(See attached file: Chapter 3 March 27 doublespaced.doc)

10443

DOE016-0195

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 11:23 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joet_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Comments of Draft Chapters

We are getting to the final stages of production of the report. I want to make sure that, if you had an interest in it, have reviewed the draft chapters and have provided comments.

I would appreciate it if you would give me the status of your review of the chapters. Please fill out the short form below and send it back. Thanks.

Review Completed Review in Process
Comments Submitted Comments to be
Submitted by

- Chapter 3
- Chapter 4
- Chapter 5
- Chapter 6
- Chapter 7
- Chapter 8
- Chapter 9
- Chapter 10

100
Williams, Ronald L *W.L. H.*

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 9:36 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Status of Chapters

Margot:

Please send along hard copy of the transmission graphic. With respect to photographs, EE and FE are pulling together recommendations regarding photographs for inclusion in the chapters. It is DOE's responsibility, however, to recommend/suggest to us which photographs might be used in each chapter.

Charlie

290

W.L. to Terry

Williams, Ronald L

From: Vernet, Jean
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2001 7:39 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

Importance: High

Margot,

I'll be going. I'd appreciate any guidance before I head off. Are the complete final options papers available? P-drive versions appear to be DOE drafts only.

Jean

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 12:08 PM
To: Vernet, Jean; Terry, Tracy
Cc: Conti, John; Watts, Edward
Subject: FW: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

Tracy and/or Jean,

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Symons,Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet
[mailto:Symons,Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 10:22 AM
To: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot;
Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet;
Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet;
Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet;
Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet;
Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet;
Beale.John@epamail.epa.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet;
Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet;
Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet;
Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet;
Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet;
Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet;
Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet;

MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; ndrew_D._Lundquist@oa.eop.gov%internet;
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet;
Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet;
Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet;
Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet;
Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet;
Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet;
Beale.John@epamail.epa.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet;
Juleanna_R._Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet;
Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet;
Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet;
Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet;
Mark_J._Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet;
Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet;
MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; ndrew_D._Lundquist@oa.eop.gov%internet;
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar,
Kevin; Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

The entrance to the building is at the Federal Triangle metro stop south of Pennsylvania Avenue on 12th street. Take the doors on the north side of the archway that spans the Federal Triangle metro stop (coming out of the metro, you would go to the doorway on the right).

Have the security desk call 564-7400 to be admitted, and use my name to identify the meeting you are attending.

Thank you.

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

271
Williams, Ronald L *to the Hon.*

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 3:04 PM
To: Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov; Galloglysj@state.gov; McManusmt@state.gov; Poche, Michelle; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov; Beale.John@EPA.gov; WheelerE@state.gov
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov; commcoll@aol.com
Subject: Photographs
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Thursday, April 05, 2001 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Any problems, let me know.

Thanaks

Charlie

252
Williams, Ronald L *wl L H-rc*

From: → Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 3:41 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: double-checking e-mail systems

Margot:

got them. they went out. things seem to be working ok.

Re. your voice mail and deadlines for comments. I talked with Karen about this and she is now talking with Andrew.

Charlie

001
Williams, Ronald L

White House BLS/EA comments 17 pages

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 3:08 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: comments on chapter 10



cht 10 DOE(IA) april 4.doc



EIA comments march
30.doc



ch10 march 27 FE
Comments.doc



PIC28303.PCX

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/04/2001
03:06 PM

(Embedded
image moved "Anderson, Margot" <Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov>
to file: 04/04/2001 12:25:50 PM
PIC28303.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP

cc:
Subject: comments on chapter 10

Charlie,
Three sets of comments for State on Chapter 10. Can you please forward? Let
me know if you receive.
<<cht 10 DOE(IA) april 4.doc>> <<EIA comments march 30.doc>> <<ch10
march
27 FE Comments.doc>>
Margot

10458

DOE016-0210

Williams, Ronald L

U.S. House International 15 page

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 2:47 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: more comments on chapter 10



03_29_01_NEPG
Study_R41-IA EDI...



PIC32209.PCX

Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 04/04/2001
02:45 PM

(Embedded
image moved "Anderson, Margot" <Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov>
to file: 04/04/2001 02:25:10 PM
PIC32209.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP

cc:

Subject: more comments on chapter 10

Charlie,

More edits for State's chapter. This set is the set from DOE's Office of International Affairs and includes the addition I sent you earlier. Please forward to Sate (or do you want me to do this? - Just let me know)

Margot

<<03_29_01_NEPG Study_R41-IA EDITS.doc>>

Williams, Ronald L

From: Braitsch, Jay
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 12:31 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Photographs for NEPD Report

Is there a more recent version of Chapter 8 beyond March 24? I am looking for photos, and want to make sure I know what I am sticking them in.

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 12:16 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay; Zimmerman, MaryBeth
Cc: 'Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet'; Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; 'commcoll@aol.com%internet'
Subject: RE: Photographs for NEPD Report

Jay and MaryBeth,

Please make sure you coordinate with me on the NEP photographs as I have the most recent copies of the chapters (I edit them every day when I get comments from other agencies.

Charlie

Can you press the other agencies for comments? Otherwise, should we plan on closing the books for substantive comments by Friday? We have more comments for chapter 10, which I will be sending shortly.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
[mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 12:01 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot;
commcoll@aol.com%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
commcoll@aol.com%internet
Subject: Photographs for NEPD Report

Margot
Joe
Kevin

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 12:01 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; commcoll@aol.com%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet
Subject: Photographs for NEPD Report

Margot
Joe
Kevin

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2001 10:22 AM
To: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Beale.John@epamail.epa.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; ndrew_D_Lundquist@oa.eop.gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Beale.John@epamail.epa.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; ndrew_D_Lundquist@oa.eop.gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

The entrance to the building is at the Federal Triangle metro stop south of Pennsylvania Avenue on 12th street. Take the doors on the north side of the archway that spans the Federal Triangle metro stop (coming out of the metro, you would go to the doorway on the right).

Have the security desk call 564-7400 to be admitted, and use my name to identify the meeting you are attending.

Thank you.

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

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2001 3:51 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: FW: NA Transmission Line Maps

Margot:

I think so. We're getting more maps showing more stuff then you can imagine. Sorting it out and making sense of it is another question.

Charlie

10496

DOE016-0248

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2001 3:41 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: as requested

Margot:

Wow. this time I got attachments.

Charlie

10497

DOE016-0249

Williams, Ronald L

6(5)

From: Poche, Michelle [Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2001 11:24 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Kolevar, Kevin; Poche, Michelle; 'Charles(u)M.(u)Smith(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Juleanna(u)R.(u)Glover(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Kmurphy(a)osec.doc.gov'; 'Dina.Ellis(a)do.treas.gov'; 'Sue(u)Ellen(u)Wooldridge(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Joel(u)D.(u)Kaplan(a)who.eop.gov'; 'Keith.Collins(a)USDA.gov'; 'Joseph.Glauber(a)USDA.gov'; 'Galloglys(j)(a)state.gov'; 'McManusmt(a)state.gov'; 'Patricia.Stahlschmidt(a)Fema.gov'; 'Brenner.Rob(a)EPA.gov'; 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'; 'Beale.John(a)EPA.gov'; 'MPeacock(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Mark(u)A.(u)Weatherly(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Robert(u)C.(u)McNally(a)opd.eop.gov'; 'Jhowardj(a)ceq.eop.gov'; 'William(u)bettenberg(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Tom(u)fullon(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Kjersten(u)drager(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Mieblanc(a)ceq.eop.gov'; 'Bruce.Baughman(a)Fema.gov'; 'Charles.m.Hess(a)USACE.army.mil'; 'commcoll(a)aol.com'; 'Carol(u)J.(u)Thompson(a)who.eop.gov'; 'Sandra(u)L.(u)Via(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Megan(u)D.(u)Moran(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Ronald(u)L.(u)Silberman(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Lori(u)A.(u)Krauss(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'WheelerE(a)state.gov'; 'Mark(u)J.(u)Sullivan(a)ovp.eop.gov'
Cc: 'ndrew(u)D.(u)Lundquist(a)oa.eop.gov'; 'Karen(u)Y.(u)Knutson(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'John(u)fenzel(a)ovp.eop.gov'
Subject: CAFE once more



cafedotdoe.doc

Please replace your document on CAFE with the attached. As of 11:30 Tuesday morning, this reflects the views of DOT and DOE.

—Original Message—

From: Poche, Michelle
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 6:22 PM
To: Poche, Michelle; 'Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov'; 'Juleanna_R._Glover@ovp.eop.gov'; 'Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov'; 'Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov'; 'Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov'; 'Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@ios.doi.gov'; 'Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov'; 'Keith.Collins@USDA.gov'; 'Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov'; 'Galloglys@state.gov'; 'McManusmt@state.gov'; 'Patricia.Stahlschmidt@Fema.gov'; 'Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov'; 'Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov'; 'Beale.John@EPA.gov'; 'MPeacock@omb.eop.gov'; 'Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov'; 'Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov'; 'Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov'; 'William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov'; 'Tom_fullon@ios.doi.gov'; 'Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov'; 'Mieblanc@ceq.eop.gov'; 'Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV'; 'Bruce.Baughman@Fema.gov'; 'Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil'; 'commcoll@aol.com'; 'Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov'; 'Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov'; 'Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov'; 'Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov'; 'Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov'; 'WheelerE@state.gov'; 'Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov'; 'Mark_J._Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov'
Cc: 'ndrew_D._Lundquist@oa.eop.gov'; 'Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov'; 'John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov'
Subject: RE: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

Final Language from DOT on CAFE:

—Original Message—

From: Poche, Michelle

Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 4:17 PM

To: 'Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov'; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov;
Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov;
Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@ios.doi.gov;
Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov;
Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov; Galloglysj@state.gov; McManusmt@state.gov;
Poche, Michelle; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@Fema.gov; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov;
Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov; Beale.John@EPA.gov; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov;
Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov;
Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov; William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov;
Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov;
Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV;
Bruce.Baughman@Fema.gov; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil;
commcoll@aol.com; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov;
Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov;
Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov;
WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov;
Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov
Cc: ndrew_D_Lundquist@oa.eop.gov; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov;
John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: RE: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

DOT is making some edits to the CAFE document. Will send final copy out shortly.

—Original Message—

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov [mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]

Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 1:26 PM

To: Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov; Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov;
Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov;
Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@ios.doi.gov; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov;
Keith.Collins@USDA.gov; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov; Galloglysj@state.gov;
McManusmt@state.gov; Poche, Michelle <OST>;
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@Fema.gov; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov;
Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov; Beale.John@EPA.gov; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov;
Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov;
Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov; William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov;
Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov;
Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV;
Bruce.Baughman@Fema.gov; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil;
commcoll@aol.com; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov;
Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov;
Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov;
WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov;
Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov
Cc: ndrew_D_Lundquist@oa.eop.gov; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov;
John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

Attached are the subject one-pagers

(See attached file: 3-pollutant standard.doc)(See attached file: Corporate Average Fuel Economy.doc)(See attached file: Energy Efficiency.doc)(See attached file: Nuclear Energy.doc)(See attached file: Outer Continental Shelf Leasing Moratoria.doc)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kjersten_S_Drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Kjersten_S_Drager@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2001 9:53 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; Marcus_Peacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; John_L._Howard_Jr@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Michael_R._LeBlanc@cea.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: New topic for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting



04/03/2001 09:47 AM

(Embedded
image moved Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov
to file: 04/02/2001 04:52:20 PM
PIC21176.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Andrew D. Lundquist/OVP/EOP, Karen Y. Knutson/OVP/EOP, John
Fenzel/OVP/EOP, Kjersten S. Drager/OVP/EOP
Subject: New topic for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

A heads-up regarding the 4/3/01 Principals Meeting
A new agenda item has been added

Message Sent

To: _____

Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov
Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov
Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov
Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov
Keith.Collins@USDA.gov
Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov
Galloglysj@State.gov
McManusmt@State.gov
Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov
Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov
Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov
Beate.John@EPA.gov
Marcus.Peacock/OMB/EOP
Mark A. Weatherly/OMB/EOP
Robert C. McNally/OPD/EOP
John L. Howard Jr./CEQ/EOP
William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov
Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov
Michael R. LeBlanc/CEA/EOP
Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV
Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov
Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil
Carol J. Thompson/WHO/EOP
Sandra L. Via/OMB/EOP
Ronald L. Silberman/OMB/EOP
Lori A. Krauss/OMB/EOP
WheelerE@state.gov
Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov
Mark J. Sullivan/OVP/EOP

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2001 9:37 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: reformatted chapters

Margot:

We're still (and probably will forever) having difficulty with attachments. Can you send the chapters along to John Fenzel and/or Kjersten Drager and they can forward them to me.

On another topic, can you start working with chapters 1 & 2 and find appropriate photographs to illustrate salient points. We need to get that material identified soon so that people here can start whacking away at it.

Thanks

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2001 9:17 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Reformatted Chapters

Margot:

Regardless of not having received another round of comments/suggested changes, I'd appreciate it if you would forward the chapters/graphics in the format requested so that we can begin to lay out where graphics/pictures go.

Thanks

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 6:57 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Reformatted Chapters

All right, let's try this again. I believe last Friday, March 30, 2001, I requested the following:

Message follows:

Could you, by Monday noon, send me your Chapter(s) in the format that I requested on 3/26/01. As an example of what I'd like to see, I am attaching Treasury's latest submission.

We've got to start plugging in where graphics and photographs go in the chapters and seeing it laid out like that will help.

One last thing, please date your draft. That too will help.

To say the least, I didn't get an overwhelming response. I know that everybody was pushing to get ready for the Principals Meeting on Tuesday. Now that effort is virtually past, let's get back to business. Send those chapters along please.

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

6/5)

From: Poche, Michelle [Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 6:22 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Kolevar, Kevin; Poche, Michelle; 'Charles(u)M.(u)Smith(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Juleanna(u)R.(u)Glover(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Kmurphy(a)osec.doc.gov'; 'Dina.Ellis(a)do.treas.gov'; 'Sue(u)Ellen(u)Wooldridge(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Joel(u)D.(u)Kaplan(a)who.eop.gov'; 'Keith.Collins(a)USDA.gov'; 'Joseph.Glauber(a)USDA.gov'; 'Galloglysj(a)state.gov'; 'McManusmt(a)state.gov'; 'Patricia.Stahlschmidt(a)Fema.gov'; 'Brenner.Rob(a)EPA.gov'; 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'; 'Beale.John(a)EPA.gov'; 'MPeacock(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Mark(u)A.(u)Weatherly(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Robert(u)C.(u)McNally(a)opd.eop.gov'; 'Jhowardj(a)ceq.eop.gov'; 'William(u)bettenberg(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Tom(u)fulton(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Kjersten(u)drager(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Mleblanc(a)ceq.eop.gov'; 'Bruce.Baughman(a)Fema.gov'; 'Charles.m.Hess(a)USACE.army.mil'; 'commcoll(a)aol.com'; 'Carol(u)J.(u)Thompson(a)who.eop.gov'; 'Sandra(u)L.(u)Via(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Megan(u)D.(u)Moran(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Ronald(u)L.(u)Silberman(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Lori(u)A.(u)Krauss(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'WheelerE(a)state.gov'; 'Mark(u)J.(u)Sullivan(a)ovp.eop.gov'
Cc: 'ndrew(u)D.(u)Lundquist(a)oa.eop.gov'; 'Karen(u)Y.(u)Knutson(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'John(u)fenzel(a)ovp.eop.gov'
Subject: RE: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting



cafe final.doc

Final Language from DOT on CAFE:

—Original Message—

From: Poche, Michelle
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 4:17 PM
To: 'Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov'; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov; Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@ios.doi.gov; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov; Galloglysj@state.gov; McManusmt@state.gov; Poche, Michelle; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@Fema.gov; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov; Beale.John@EPA.gov; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov; William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov; Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV; Bruce.Baughman@Fema.gov; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil; commcoll@aol.com; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov; WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov
Cc: ndrew_D_Lundquist@oa.eop.gov; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: RE: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

DOT is making some edits to the CAFE document. Will send final copy out shortly:

—Original Message—

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov [mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 1:26 PM

10507

DOE016-0259

To: Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov; Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov;
Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov;
Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@ios.doi.gov; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov;
Keith.Collins@USDA.gov; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov; Galloglysj@state.gov;
McManusmt@state.gov; Poche, Michelle <OST>;
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@Fema.gov; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov;
Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov; Beale.John@EPA.gov; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov;
Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov;
Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov; William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov;
Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov;
Mieblanc@ceq.eop.gov; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV;
Bruce.Baughman@Fema.gov; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil;
commcoll@aol.com; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov;
Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov;
Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov;
WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov;
Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov
Cc: ndrew_D_Lundquist@oa.eop.gov; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov;
John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

Attached are the subject one-pagers

(See attached file: 3-pollutant standard.doc)(See attached file: Corporate Average Fuel Economy.doc)(See attached file: Energy Efficiency.doc)(See attached file: Nuclear Energy.doc)(See attached file: Outer Continental Shelf Leasing Moratoria.doc)

Williams, Ronald L

b(5)

what name

From: Poche, Michelle [Michelle.Poche@ost.doe.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 4:17 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Kolevar, Kevin; 'Charles(u)M.(u)Smith(a)ovp.eop.gov'; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@ios.doi.gov%internet; Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@state.gov%internet; McManusmt@state.gov%internet; Poche, Michelle; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@Fema.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@Fema.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@state.gov%internet; Mark_J._Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Cc: ndrew_D._Lundquist@oa.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: RE: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

DOT is making some edits to the CAFE document. Will send final copy out shortly.

—Original Message—

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov [mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 1:26 PM
To: Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov; Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@ios.doi.gov; Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov; Galloglysj@state.gov; McManusmt@state.gov; Poche, Michelle <OST>; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@Fema.gov; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov; Beale.John@EPA.gov; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov; William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov; Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV; Bruce.Baughman@Fema.gov; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil; commcoll@aol.com; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov; Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov; WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov; Mark_J._Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov
Cc: ndrew_D._Lundquist@oa.eop.gov; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

Attached are the subject one-pagers

(See attached file: 3-pollutant standard.doc)(See attached file: Corporate Average Fuel Economy.doc)(See attached file: Energy Efficiency.doc)(See attached file: Nuclear Energy.doc)(See attached file: Outer Continental

Williams, Ronald L

6(5)

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 4:52 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J._Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: New topic for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

A heads-up regarding the 4/3/01 Principals Meeting

A new agenda item has been added

Williams, Ronald L

White House

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 3:45 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: charles_m_smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: DOE recommendations



tmp.htm

Hi Margo... do you have anything more detailed than a 1-sentence each list of recommendations. If so, would you mind resending to me? Thanks.

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

10514

DOE016-0266

(Handwritten: Margo C. L. H...)
Hi Margo... do you have anything more detailed than a 1-sentence each list of recommendations. If so, would you mind resending to me? Thanks.

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

Williams, Ronald L

at the time

6(1) = -- limit 10 pgs

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 1:26 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet; Mark_J_Sullivan@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Cc: ndrew_D_Lundquist@oa.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Recommendation One-Pagers for 4/3/01 Principals Meeting



3-pollutant standard.doc



Corporate Average Fuel Economy...



Energy Efficiency.doc



Nuclear Energy.doc



Outer Continental Shelf Leasin...

Attached are the subject one-pagers

(See attached file: 3-pollutant standard.doc)(See attached file: Corporate Average Fuel Economy.doc)(See attached file: Energy Efficiency.doc)(See attached file: Nuclear Energy.doc)(See attached file: Outer Continental Shelf Leasing Moratoria.doc)

Williams, Ronald L

Out of Home

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2001 12:06 PM
To: charles_m._smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Cc: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Revised energy efficiency piece



tmp.htm



eetarget.wpd

Charlie,

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

10527

DOE016-0279

Charlie,

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

Williams, Ronald L

From: Carrier, Paul
Sent: Saturday, March 31, 2001 6:01 PM
To: 'KMurphy@doc.gov%internet'
Cc: Mansueti, Lawrence; Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Hydropower Licensing & CZMA meetings

Kevin,

For hydropower licensing, DOE will be represented by Larry Mansueti and myself, Paul Carrier.

Paul Carrier
202-586-5659

—Original Message—

From: KMurphy@doc.gov%internet [mailto:KMurphy@doc.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 6:45 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul; william_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov%internet;
tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov%internet; keith.collins@usda.gov%internet; joseph.glauber@usda.gov%
internet; symons.jeremy@epa.gov%internet; charles.m.hess@usace.army.mil%internet
Cc: → andrew_d._lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; karen_y._knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Hydropower Licensing & CZMA meetings

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 7:31 PM
To: → 'Karen_Y._Knutson@OVP.EOP.Gov'; 'Andrew_D._Lundquist@OVP.EOP.Gov'; 'Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet'; Anderson, Margot
Cc: 'Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov'
Subject: nuclear energy paper


Sorry for the delay, it must be Noon somewhere in the world.



nuclear1.doc

Williams, Ronald L

6 (5)

From: KMurphy@doc.gov%internet [KMurphy@doc.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 6:45 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul; william_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov%internet;
tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov%internet; keith.collins@usda.gov%internet;
joseph.glauber@usda.gov%internet; symons.jeremy@epa.gov%internet;
charles.m.hess@usace.army.mil%internet
Cc:  andrew_d._lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; karen_y._knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Hydropower Licensing & CZMA meetings

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 4:41 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: graphics

Thanks

I got the new and better graphics for Chapter 8, first time through for Chapter 7, and possible adders for Chapter 9.

One day we're going to look back at this and smile.

Charlie

10535

DOE016-0287

Williams, Ronald L

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 4:14 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy; charles_m._smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y.
Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Cc: Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@epamail.epa.gov%internet
Subject: Final 1-pager on 3-pollutant strategy



tmp.htm



legislative_3P_2.wpd

Incorporates DOE comments.

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

10536

DOE016-0288

Incorporates DOE comments.

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

Williams, Ronald L

651

From: Johnson, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:26 PM
To: 'Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet'
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Braitsch, Jay
Subject: FW: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

Am available to meet on Tuesday. Tell me where and when is convenient for you.

Nancy Johnson, DOE Fossil Energy, 202-586-6458

—Original Message—

From: Braitsch, Jay
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:15 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Johnson, Nancy; DeHoratiis, Guido
Subject: RE: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

Nancy Johnson, 6-6458, unless she tells otherwise.

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:13 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay
Subject: RE: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

Jay,

I reading Jeremy's note, it does look like he intends to hold a meeting next week. So yes, send him a name. Muchas.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Braitsch, Jay
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:13 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

We didn't. Do you still want a FE POC on this?

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:03 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay
Subject: FW: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

Jay. Not sure you or your FE guys got this.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet
[mailto:Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 2:41 PM

10539

DOE016-0291

To: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy;
Karen_Y._Knutson@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet;
Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet;
Brenner.Rob@epamail.epa.gov%internet;
Osinski.Michael@epamail.epa.gov%internet
Subject: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

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

Williams, Ronald L

From: Braitsch, Jay
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:15 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Johnson, Nancy; DeHoratiis, Guido
Subject: RE: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

Nancy Johnson, 6-6458, unless she tells otherwise.

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:13 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay
Subject: RE: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

Jay,

I reading Jeremy's note, it does look like he intends to hold a meeting next week. So yes, send him a name. Muchas.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Braitsch, Jay
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:13 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

We didn't. Do you still want a FE POC on this?

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:03 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay
Subject: FW: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

Jay, Not sure you or your FE guys got this.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet
[mailto:Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 2:41 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy;
Karen_Y_Knutson@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet; ←
Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet;
Brenner.Rob@epamail.epa.gov%internet;
Osinski.Michael@epamail.epa.gov%internet
Subject: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

10541

DOE016-0293

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

Williams, Ronald L

From: Braitsch, Jay
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:13 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

We didn't. Do you still want a FE POC on this?

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 3:03 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay
Subject: FW: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

Jay, Not sure you or your FE guys got this.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet
[mailto:Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 2:41 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy;
Karen_Y._Knutson@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet;
Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet;
Brenner.Rob@epamail.epa.gov%internet;
Osinski.Michael@epamail.epa.gov%internet
Subject: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information

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

Williams, Ronald L

615

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 2:46 PM
To: Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Braitsch, Jay
Cc: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Photographs for National Energy Policy Development Report

MaryBeth
Jay

Let me know.

Thanks

Charlie

286

Wh. H. House 6(5)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 2:43 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet



NEP sec5 0327.doc



NEPsec5Charts.doc



NEPsec5captions.doc

Could you, by Monday noon, send me your

Chapter(s) in the format that I requested on 3/26/01. As an example of what I'd like to see, I am attaching Treasury's latest submission.

We've got to start plugging in where graphics and photographs go in the chapters and seeing it laid out like that will help.

One last thing, please date your draft. That too will help.

Thanks

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

1-6-01 4:00 PM

6:5)

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 2:43 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet



NEP sec5 0327.doc



NEPsec5Charts.doc



NEPsec5captions.doc

Could you, by Monday noon, send me your

Chapter(s) in the format that I requested on 3/26/01. As an example of what I'd like to see, I am attaching Treasury's latest submission.

We've got to start plugging in where graphics and photographs go in the chapters and seeing it laid out like that will help.

One last thing, please date your draft. That too will help.

Thanks

Charlie

10581

DOE016-0333

Williams, Ronald L

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 2:41 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Terry, Tracy; Karen_Y_Knutson@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet;
Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@epamail.epa.gov%internet;
Osinski.Michael@epamail.epa.gov%internet
Subject: Hydraulic Fracturing: Status and Background Information



tmp.htm



hydraulic fracturing.wpd

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

Williams, Ronald L

From: Freitas, Christopher
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:12 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Como, Anthony; DeHoratiis, Guido; Johnson, Nancy
Subject: RE: NEP chapter 9 –Final edits

Importance: High



Permits Flow.jpg



Pipeline Construction.jpg



Permits Schedule.jpg



Ch9.03.28.doc

Margot, FYI see attached file and my (FE-30) corrections/edits in red font and strike through for the electricity section. In addition, I've suggest the inclusion of the above jpg graphics for the pipeline section. I hope this is helpful.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Freitas
Program Manager, Natural Gas Infrastructure
(202) 586-1657

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 8:53 AM
To: Conti, John; Haspel, Abe; Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Lockwood, Andrea; Breed, William; KYDES, ANDY; Whatley, Michael; Carter, Douglas; Braitsch, Jay; Melchert, Elena; Cook, Trevor; Breed, William; 'jktier@bpa.gov'; York, Michael; Freitas, Christopher; Friedrichs, Mark; Pumphrey, David; Kolevar, Kevin; Pumphrey, David; Scaringi, Paula
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: chapter 9

All,

Chapter 9 is back from DOT. I just got it and haven't seen how many of the edits you provided made it in (Recall that FE, SO, PO, BPA provided significant input along the way). Please review. Unfortunately, there is an interagency peer review of this paper scheduled for 5:00 this afternoon. I would much like your comments by then, if possible.

Crystal - still no luck getting through to Jeff but we much need a BPA review. Can you help?

Thanks,

Margot

<< File: Ch9.03.28.doc >> << File: Silicon Valley.doc >> << File: transmissionprobmap.doc >>

293

John Fenzel

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:01 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Summary of Recommendations



Agency

Recommendations.doc
recommendations have not been incorporated as yet.



Table of Contents.doc

Attached is the summary of the Agency Recommendations. DOT's

Williams, Ronald L *White House*

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 8:13 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet



NEP sec5 0327.doc



NEPSec5Charts.doc



NEPSec5captions.doc

from Treasury.

FYI - Below is the latest draft of Chapter 5

> Here's the latest version of our chapter. A few things were added to the
> business and agriculture sections, including a couple of new charts.
(Note
> that it has been reformatted according to OVP specifications. This
> entailed removing all the charts but I have included them in a separate
> document along with the accompanying captions.)
>
>
> <<NEP sec5 0327.doc>> <<NEPSec5Charts.doc>> <<NEPSec5captions.doc>>

Williams, Ronald L

White House

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 6:57 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R._Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: CAFE



CAFE statement.doc



PIC17308.PCX

Attached is the CAFE piece from DOE for your information

247

Williams, Ronald L

White House

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2001 8:08 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lon_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: one-pagers

I must have been having a bad day yesterday. EPA, not DOE, has the lead on the Hydraulic Fracturing/Safe Drinking Water Act one-pager. Sorry about that.

10694

DOE016-0446

242

Williams, Ronald L

White House

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 6:49 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: photo coordination

many thanks

Charlie

10695

DOE016-0447

white house

Message Sent

To:

Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP
"Kelliher, Joseph" <Joseph.Kelliher@hq.doe.gov>
"Kolevar, Kevin" <Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov>
Juleanna R. Glover/OVP/EOP
"Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet'" <Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov>
"Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet'" <Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov>
"Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet'"
<Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov>
Joel D. Kaplan/WHO/EOP
"Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet'" <Keith.Collins@USDA.gov>
"Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet'" <Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov>
"Galloglysj@State.gov%internet'" <Galloglysj@State.gov>
"McManusmt@State.gov%internet'" <McManusmt@State.gov>
"Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet'"
<Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov>
"Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet'"
<Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov>
"Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet'" <Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov>
"Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet'" <Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov>
>
"Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet'" <Beale.John@EPA.gov>
Marcus Peacock/OMB/EOP
Mark A. Weatherly/OMB/EOP
Robert C. McNally/OPD/EOP
John L. Howard Jr./CEQ/EOP
"William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet'"
<William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov>
"Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet'" <Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov>
ov>
Kjersten S. Drager/OVP/EOP
Michael R. LeBlanc/CEA/EOP
"Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet'" <Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov>

ATTACHMENT.TXT

"'Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet'"
<Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil>
"'comcoll@aol.com%internet'" <comcoll@aol.com>
Carol J. Thompson/WHO/EOP
Sandra L. Via/OMB/EOP
Megan D. Moran/OVP/EOP
Ronald L. Silberman/OMB/EOP
Lori A. Krauss/OMB/EOP
"'WheelerE@State.gov%internet'" <WheelerE@State.gov>

07 white house

Williams, Ronald L

From: Wheeler, Evelyn [WheelerE@state.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 5:03 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Summary of Recommendations

Of course!!

Evelyn Wheeler
EB/ESC/IEC/EPC - Room 3535
Phone: (202) 647-4557
Fax: (202) 647-4037
This message is unclassified under precepts of EO 12958.

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:30 PM
To: 'Wheeler, Evelyn'
Subject: RE: Summary of Recommendations

Evelyn,

Sorry but we all just received a new version of chapter 10 this morning! Folks are already reviewing that version. If you send a revised you are going to throw us all off. Can you wait to get comments first?

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Wheeler, Evelyn [mailto:WheelerE@state.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:09 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Kolevar, Kevin;
'Charles(u)M.(u)Smith(a)ovp.eop.gov';
'Juleanna(u)R.(u)Glover(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Kmurphy(a)osec.doc.gov';
'Dina.Ellis(a)do.treas.gov'; 'Sue(u)Ellen(u)Wooldridge(a)IOS.DOI.gov';
'Joel(u)D.(u)Kaplan(a)who.eop.gov'; 'Keith.Collins(a)USDA.gov';
'Joseph.Glauber(a)USDA.gov'; Gallogly, Stephen J; McManus, Matthew T;
'Michelle.Poche(a)OST.DOT.Gov'; 'Patricia.Stahlschmidt(a)FEMA.gov';
'Brenner.Rob(a)EPA.gov'; 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov';
'Beale.John(a)EPA.gov'; 'MPeacock(a)omb.eop.gov';
'Mark(u)A.(u)Weatherly(a)omb.eop.gov';
'Robert(u)C.(u)McNally(a)opd.eop.gov'; 'Jhowardj(a)ceq.eop.gov';
'William(u)bettenberg(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Tom(u)fulton(a)ios.doi.gov';
'Kjersten(u)drager(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Mieblanc(a)ceq.eop.gov';
'Bruce.Baughman(a)FEMA.gov'; 'Charles.m.Hess(a)USACE.army.mil';
'commcoll(a)aol.com'; 'Carol(u)J.(u)Thompson(a)who.eop.gov';
'Sandra(u)L.(u)Via(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Megan(u)D.(u)Moran(a)ovp.eop.gov';
'Ronald(u)L.(u)Silberman(a)omb.eop.gov';
'Lori(u)A.(u)Krauss(a)omb.eop.gov'
Cc: 'Andrew(u)D.(u)Lundquist(a)ovp.eop.gov';
'Karen(u)Y.(u)Knutson(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'John(u)fenzel(a)ovp.eop.gov'
Subject: RE: Summary of Recommendations

We're updating our (State's) pages to reflect our latest draft and comments/discussions from this noon's meeting Will get them to Charlie as

soon as we can!

Evelyn Wheeler
EB/ESC/IEC/EPC - Room 3535
Phone: (202) 647-4557
Fax: (202) 647-4037

This message is unclassified under precepts of EO 12958.

—Original Message—

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov [mailto:Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:02 PM
To: Juleanna_R._Glover@ovp.eop.gov; Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov;
Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov;
Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov; Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov;
Keith.Collins@USDA.gov; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov; Galloglysj@State.gov;
McManusmt@State.gov; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov;
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov;
Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov; Beale.John@EPA.gov; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov;
Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov;
Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov; William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov;
Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov;
Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV;
Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil;
commcoll@aol.com; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov;
Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov;
Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov;
WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov
Cc: Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov;
John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: Summary of Recommendations

Attached is the summary of the Agency Recommendations. DOT's recommendations have not been incorporated as yet.

Williams, Ronald L

From: Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov%internet [Symons.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 6:06 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Andrew_D._Lundquist@OVP.EOP.Gov%internet
Cc: jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Gibson.Tom@epamail.epa.gov%internet;
Brenner.Rob@epamail.epa.gov%internet
Subject: DRAFT Energy efficiency recommendation



tmp.htm



cctarget.wpd

Andrew,

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

Andrew,

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

Williams, Ronald L

From: Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Andrew_D._Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 7:18 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Juleanna_R._Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; 'kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet'; 'dina.ellis@do.treas.gov%internet'; 'sue_ellen_wooldridge@ios.doi.gov%internet'; Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; 'keith.collins@usda.gov%internet'; 'joseph.glauber@usda.gov%internet'; 'galloglysj@state.gov%internet'; 'mcmanusmt@state.gov%internet'; 'michelle.poche@ost.dot.gov%internet'; 'patricia.stahlschmidt@fema.gov%internet'; 'brenner.rob@epa.gov%internet'; 'symons.jeremy@epa.gov%internet'; 'beale.john@epa.gov%internet'; Marcus_Peacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; John_L._Howard_Jr@ceq.eop.gov%internet; 'william_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov%internet'; 'tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov%internet'; Kjersten_S._Drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Michael_R._LeBlanc@cea.eop.gov%internet; 'bruce.baughman@fema.gov%internet'; 'charles.m.hess@usace.army.mil%internet'; 'commcoll@aol.com%internet'; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L._Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A._Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; 'wheelere@state.gov%internet'; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: RE:



ATTACHMENT.TXT



PIC04707.PCX

You're right. Andrew

(Embedded
image moved "Anderson, Margot" <Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov>
to file: 03/29/2001 06:44:14 PM
PIC04707.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Andrew D. Lundquist/OVP/EOP, Karen Y. Knutson/OVP/EOP, John Fenzel/OVP/EOP

Subject: RE:
All,

I thought EPA had lead on Drinking Water Act. We will work with them, of course.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
[mailto:Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]

Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:13 PM

To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot;
Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet;
Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet;
Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet;
Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet;
Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet;
McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet;
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet;
Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet;
MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet;
Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet;
William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet;
Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet;
Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet;
Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet;
Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet;
Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject:

We would like to see good drafts by noon, 3/30/01. I'll circulate them as soon as I get them in.

Any questions, give me a call. 456-7874

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:53 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: one-pagers for Principals Meeting

Charlie

10705

DOE016-0457

Williams, Ronald L

White House

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:26 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: photo coordination

Margot:

Can you give me a POC for each chapter that I can deal with directly on selection of photographs? I'd like to get them in gear on Monday/Tuesday with DOE's Photo Librarian and Joan O'Callaghan to do an initial pass.

Thanks

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:13 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fullon@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov%internet; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov%internet; WheelerE@State.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet

As was discussed in the NEPD Working Group Meeting today, we are going to prepare 5 one-pagers for the next Principals Meeting on 4/03/01.

5 ()

We would like to see good drafts by noon, 3/30/01. I'll circulate them as soon as I get them in.

Any questions, give me a call. 456-7874

Charlie

Williams, Ronald L

From: Wheeler, Evelyn [WheelerE@state.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:09 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Kolevar, Kevin; 'Charles(u)M.(u)Smith(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Juleanna(u)R.(u)Glover(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Kmurphy(a)osec.doc.gov'; 'Dina.Ellis(a)do.treas.gov'; 'Sue(u)Ellen(u)Wooldridge(a)IOS.DOI.gov'; 'Joel(u)D.(u)Kaplan(a)who.eop.gov'; 'Keith.Collins(a)USDA.gov'; 'Joseph.Glauber(a)USDA.gov'; Gallogly, Stephen J; McManus, Matthew T; 'Michelle.Poche(a)OST.DOT.Gov'; 'Patricia.Stahlschmidt(a)FEMA.gov'; 'Brenner.Rob(a)EPA.gov'; 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'; 'Beale.John(a)EPA.gov'; 'MPeacock(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Mark(u)A.(u)Weatherly(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Robert(u)C.(u)McNally(a)opd.eop.gov'; 'Jhowardj(a)ceq.eop.gov'; 'William(u)bettenberg(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Tom(u)fulton(a)ios.doi.gov'; 'Kjersten(u)drager(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Mleblanc(a)ceq.eop.gov'; 'Bruce.Baughman(a)FEMA.gov'; 'Charles.m.Hess(a)USACE.army.mil'; 'commcoll(a)aol.com'; 'Carol(u)J.(u)Thompson(a)who.eop.gov'; 'Sandra(u)L.(u)Via(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Megan(u)D.(u)Moran(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Ronald(u)L.(u)Silberman(a)omb.eop.gov'; 'Lori(u)A.(u)Krauss(a)omb.eop.gov'
Cc: 'Andrew(u)D.(u)Lundquist(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'Karen(u)Y.(u)Knutson(a)ovp.eop.gov'; 'John(u)fenzel(a)ovp.eop.gov'
Subject: RE: Summary of Recommendations

We're updating our (State's) pages to reflect our latest draft and comments/discussions from this noon's meeting. Will get them to Charlie as soon as we can!

Evelyn Wheeler
EB/ESC/IEC/EPC - Room 3535
Phone: (202) 647-4557
Fax: (202) 647-4037

This message is unclassified under precepts of EO 12958.

—Original Message—

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov [mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2001 4:02 PM
To: Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov; Joseph.Kelliher@HQ.DOE.gov; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov; Galloglysj@State.gov; McManusmt@State.gov; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov; Beale.John@EPA.gov; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov; Mark_A_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov; William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov; Tom_fulton@ios.doi.gov; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov; Margot.Anderson@HQ.DOE.GOV; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil; commcoll@aol.com; Carol_J_Thompson@who.eop.gov; Sandra_L_Via@omb.eop.gov; Megan_D_Moran@ovp.eop.gov; Ronald_L_Silberman@omb.eop.gov; Lori_A_Krauss@omb.eop.gov; WheelerE@state.gov; Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov; John_fenzel@ovp.eop.gov
Subject: Summary of Recommendations

Attached is the summary of the Agency Recommendations. DOT's recommendations have not been incorporated as yet.

Kelliher, Joseph

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 10:48 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: Questions for Infrastructure chapter

Joe,

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 10:21 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: FW: Questions for Infrastructure chapter

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov&internet
{mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov}
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 8:24 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot;
Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov&internet;
William_bettenberg@ios.doi.gov&internet;
Tom_fulford@ios.doi.gov&internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov&internet
Cc: Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov&internet;
Andrew_G_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov&internet;
Karen_V_Rutson@ovp.eop.gov&internet
Subject: Questions for Infrastructure chapter

Kelliher, Joseph

WH

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2001 8:47 AM
To: 'Kjersten_S_Drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet'; McSllarrow, Kyle; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: 'Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet'; 'Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet'; 'Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet'
Subject: RE: Additional Requests...

Kjersten,

I am working on this chapter now - we did the fact check over the last few days. I'll take a look at the questions as well.

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Kjersten_S_Drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet
[mailto:Kjersten_S_Drager@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2001 6:39 PM
To: McSllarrow, Kyle; Anderson, Margot; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Additional Requests...

(See attached file: Ch. 6 for DOE Fact Checks, Add'l Info..doc)

(See attached file: Insufficient Info. Paragraph for DOE to Expand.doc)

if you have any questions. -Kjersten

Kelliher, Joseph

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 4:50 PM
To: Charles Smith (E-mail)
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: update on chapters

Charlie,

We are messenoging **chapter 5** fact check to you now.

We still owe you fact check for **chapter 3, 6 and 7.**

Margot

(b)(3)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 12:38 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Feedback on captions



PIC05332.PCX

Margot:

I'm not sure whose nickel this is but I thought that I'd send along suggested captions for the figures that may be used in the interim report.

Let me know how you think the graphics are going to get inserted.

----- Forwarded by Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP on 03/01/2001 12:32 PM -----

(Embedded
image moved CommColl@aol.com
to file: 03/01/2001 11:43:01 AM
PIC05332.PCX)

Record Type: Record

To: Charles M. Smith/OVP/EOP
cc:
Subject: Feedback on captions

(b) (5)

(b)(5)

99-1
Williams, Ronald L

(b)(5)

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 12:50 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Charlie's order for a copy of the NEP

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 11:58 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: Charlie's order for a copy of the NEP

Joe.

Williams, Ronald L

From: John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet [John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 12:48 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R_Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet; Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D_Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Charles_D_McGrath_Jr@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C_McNally@oa.eop.gov%internet; Cesar_Conda@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Jennifer_H_Mayfield@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mary_J_Matalin@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Nancy_P_Dom@who.eop.gov%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet
Subject: interim report



sec1.7.doc

Attached is the draft of the interim draft report to be discussed at today's NEPD Working Group Meeting at 4pm in the Vice President's Ceremonial Office.

John Fenzel

Williams, Ronald L

(b)(5)

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 1:06 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Feedback on captions

Margot:

Does that help?

Charlie

10734

DOE016-0486

30
Williams, Ronald L

(b)(5)

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 1:23 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: regional

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 1:08 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: regional

<< File: regional map.ppt >>

Joe,

Regional graphic to send forward. We will want comments at 4:00.

10735

DOE016-0487

5/16

release

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 2:00 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Feedback on captions

Margot:

Fax it if you would (456-1606) and bring copies along for the attendees.
That covers a host of sins.

Thanks

Charlie

207
release
Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 2:03 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: regional map

Kyle said we can commandeer whatever resources we need to get this report done in the proper manner by tomorrow COB. You know infinitely more about this than I do. Happy to sit down before 4, if that suits you. Let me know.

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 1:58 PM
To: Charles Smith (E-mail)
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: regional map

Fixed it!

New regional map. << File: regional map1.ppt >>

10737

DOE016-0489

release

Williams, Ronald L

From: John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet [John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 2:07 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Juleanna_R._Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet; Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet;
Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet;
Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet;
Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusmt@State.gov%internet;
Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet; Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet;
Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet; Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet;
Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet; MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A.
_Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet; Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet;
Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet; William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet;
Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Mieblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet;
Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Charles_D._McGrath_Jr@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Robert_C._McNally@oa.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Today's Working Group Meeting

Today's Working Group meeting has been postponed from 4:00pm to 4:30pm in the Vice President's Ceremonial Office.

John Fenzel

3/1
Williams, Ronald L

idea

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 2:43 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Today's Working Group Meeting

I have a 5:15 meeting with a utility CEO on behalf of the Secretary today, and will have to leave at 5. I told them that, and said you could handle things in my absence. I gave them another option – start at 6, which gives people more time to review. Fair warning. Please go through the new draft before 4, so you are ready to defend and protect.

—Original Message—

From: John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet [mailto:John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 2:07 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot;
Juleanna_R._Glover@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet;
Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet;
Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet;
Joel_D._Kaplan@who.eop.gov%internet; Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet;
Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet; Galloglysj@State.gov%internet;
McManusmt@State.gov%internet; Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet;
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet;
Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet;
MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mark_A._Weatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet;
Robert_C._McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet; Jhowardj@ceq.eop.gov%internet;
William_bettenberg@IOS.DOI.gov%internet;
Tom_fulton@IOS.DOI.gov%internet; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Mleblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet;
Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet;
Karen_Y._Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Charles_D._McGrath_Jr@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Robert_C._McNally@oa.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Today's Working Group Meeting

Today's Working Group meeting has been postponed from 4:00pm to 4:30pm in the Vice President's Ceremonial Office.

John Fenzel

312

Release

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2001 1:46 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: WH meeting

You should go with me to this meeting tomorrow, from 11 to 1. Any problem? Please send SSN and DOB. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov%internet [mailto:John_Fenzel@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2001 9:31 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kmurphy@osec.doc.gov%internet;
Dina.Ellis@do.treas.gov%internet;
Sue_Ellen_Wooldridge@IOS.DOI.gov%internet;
Tom_Fullon@iosiscns1.ios.doi.gov%internet;
Keith.Collins@USDA.gov%internet; Joseph.Glauber@USDA.gov%internet;
Galloglysj@State.gov%internet; McManusml@State.gov%internet;
Michelle.Poche@OST.DOT.Gov%internet;
Patricia.Stahlschmidt@FEMA.gov%internet; Brenner.Rob@EPA.gov%internet;
Symons.Jeremy@EPA.gov%internet; Beale.John@EPA.gov%internet;
— MPeacock@omb.eop.gov%internet; Mweatherly@omb.eop.gov%internet;
Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet;
John_W_Howard@who.eop.gov%internet
-- **Cc:** Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
— Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
— Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
— Charles_D_McGrath_Jr@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Review of Narrative Input for Final Report: Meeting Schedule

Review of Narrative Input for Final Report

The following times have been reserved for lead agencies to review their draft input with Andrew Lundquist and Karen Knutson for the NEPD Final Report:

Thursday, February 22, 2001:

11:00 am - 1pm: Department Of Energy

4:00 pm: Department of Transportation

Friday, February 23, 2001:

10.00 am: Department Of State

11:00 am: Department of Treasury

Lead agency representatives should feel free to bring any representatives from your agencies or members of your working group. We will need names, SSNs and DOBs to ensure they have access for these meetings.

John Fenzel

Kelliher, Joseph

B-5

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 12:01 PM
To: 'Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet'
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: Clean up of Chapter 1: Consistency check

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 11:56 AM
To: 'Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet'; Anderson, Margot;
'Robert_C_McNally@oa.eop.gov%internet'
Cc: 'Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet';
'Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet';
'Kjersten_S_Drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet';
Subject: RE: Clean up of Chapter 1

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
[mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 4:42 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot;
Robert_C_McNally@oa.eop.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Kjersten_S_Drager@cvp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Clean up of Chapter 1

Kelliher, Joseph

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 11:13 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: Going to Press: Clean up of Chapter 1

<http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/alternate/page/datatables/table10.html> or
call Barry McNutt in PO or JoAnn Shore in EIA

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 10:39 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Going to Press: Clean up of Chapter 1
Importance: High

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 8:40 AM
To: KYDES, ANDY; Carter, Douglas; Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: Going to Press: Clean up of Chapter 1

Need before 10:00 if possible.

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles M. Smith@ovp.eop.gov<internet
(mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov)>
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 4:42 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot;
Robert C. McNally@oa.eop.gov<internet>
Cc: Andrew D. Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov<internet>;
Karen Y. Knutson@ovp.eop.gov<internet>;
Kerster, S. Drager@ovp.eop.gov<internet>
Subject: Clean up of Chapter 1

Please get us responses to the open items by noon, Tuesday, May 1, 2001.

319

217

Kelliher, Joseph

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 8:40 AM
To: KYDES, ANDY; Carter, Douglas; Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: Going to Press: Clean up of Chapter 1

Joe K, Your name is listed as source for several of the questions below.

Need before 10:00 if possible.

Margot

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet
[mailto:Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2001 4:42 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot;
Robert_C_McNally@oa.eop.gov%internet
Cc: Andrew_D_Lundquist@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Karen_Y_Knutson@ovp.eop.gov%internet;
Kjersten_S_Drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet
Subject: Clean up of Chapter 1

11/11
Tripodi, Cathy

Lozier

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 8:13 PM
To: Tripodi, Cathy
Subject: FW: Input for Cheney TF Report

Importance: High

Predecisional: draft NEP recommendations

-----Original Message-----

From: Garrish, Ted
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2001 5:13 PM
To: 'Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov'; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: 'andrew_d_lundquist@ovp.eop.gov'
Subject: Input for Cheney TF Report
Importance: High



Yuccaportionofevirc
ptr.doc

Tripodi, Cathy

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 8:13 PM
To: Tripodi, Cathy
Subject: FW: Suggestions for the Task Force Report

Predecisiona: draft NEP recommendations

-----Original Message-----

From: Garrish, Ted
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 12:11 PM
To: 'andrew_d._lundquist@ovp.eop.gov'; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: 'Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov'; 'kjersten_s._drager@ovp.eop.gov'
Subject: Suggestions for the Task Force Report

Andrew and Joe--

Suggestions
Rpt..doc



Suggestions
Rpt..doc

516

release

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2001 4:43 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: status on Friday deadline

Margot:

made the deadline

John is sending it out to the working group even as we speak

Thanks for the offer

Have a good weekend - we'll do this all over again soon

Charlie

20
Williams, Ronald L

From: Carter, Douglas
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 3:24 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE:

Margot -

Doug

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 2:08 PM
To: Carter, Douglas; Melchert, Elena
Cc: DeHoratius, Guido
Subject: RE:

Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: Carter, Douglas
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 1:56 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Melchert, Elena
Cc: DeHoratius, Guido
Subject: RE:

Margot -

Doug

<< File: Ch8 Elec Figs.ppt >>

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 1:12 PM
To: Melchert, Elena
Cc: DeHoratius, Guido; Carter, Douglas

10750

DOE016-0502

Subject: RE:

Thanks. I hate to ask, but do you have some nifty graphics?

—Original Message—

From: Melchert, Elena
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 1:08 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: DeHoratis, Guido; Carter, Douglas
Subject:

Fossil Energy final Chapter 8
Thanks for your patience.
e << File: ch 8 march 23.doc >>

Elena Subia Melchert
Petroleum Engineer/Program Manager
Office of Fossil Energy
U.S. Department of Energy

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2001 8:27 AM
To: Anderson, Margot; Hudome, Randa; Angulo, Veronica
Subject: FW: International issues

—Original Message—

From: Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov%internet
[mailto:Robert_C_McNally@opd.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2001 8:11 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: International issues

321
Williams, Ronald L

Release

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2001 12:17 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: e-mail address

here it is

10754
22-3-21
Williams, Ronald L

From: Melchert, Elena
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 3:58 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Johnson, Nancy; DeHoratiis, Guido; Juckett, Donald; Allison, Edith; Hochheiser, William; Freitas, Christopher; Silva, Robert; Lagiovane, Peter; Pyrdol, John; Braitsch, Jay
Subject: oil and gas graphics for Chapter 8

Margot: here you go! We have a WONDERFUL staff. Let me know if you need anything else.
Elena

—Original Message—

From: Albayrak, Feridun
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 3:42 PM
To: Melchert, Elena
Subject: Slides

Attached..



OilandGas-Chapter8.ppt OilandgasChapter8-PartII.ppt

10754

DOE016-0506

137



JANE DEE HULL
GOVERNOR
STATE OF ARIZONA

2001-006411 Mar 9 A7:16

March 7, 2001

The Honorable Dick Cheney
Vice President of the United States
Old Executive Office Building
17th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Vice President Cheney:

Thank you for your leadership of the President's Task Force on National Energy Policy and the positive steps the Administration has made on this issue in just a few weeks. I hope this letter finds you in good health and back at your desk.

As we discussed in your office a couple weeks ago, I have confidence that the State of Arizona will have an adequate supply of electricity this summer, provided we do not experience any unforeseen impact on the electric grid and the existing commitments of power to our state's utilities. At the same time, we value your work in identifying those areas in which the federal government could be helpful in the short and long term to ensure adequate energy for the entire West, including our neighbors in California.


In this regard, I want to bring to your attention the issue described in the attached article from this morning's edition of the Arizona Republic, our state's largest newspaper. This story is illustrative of situations we are encountering regularly as my fellow Western Governors and I seek to ensure that the West does not suffer from a region-wide lack of electricity this summer.

As with my colleagues in the Pacific Northwest, I am committed to the greatest possible protection of the environment in our region. At the same time, cumbersome federal regulations related to species protection are often contrary to the best interests of the environment and common sense. I would invite you to consider whether these regulations may be simply too costly (in both direct and indirect economic costs) at a time when rural parts of my state are facing 300 percent increases in their electricity bills for power they receive from the federal system.

The Honorable Dick Cheney
March 7, 2001
Page Two

Again, thank you for the effort and attention you've dedicated to the Western energy situation and, particularly, the future energy needs of our region. If I can be of further assistance in your work on this vital matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,



JANE DEE HULL
Governor

cc: Secretary of the Interior Gail Norton
Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham
Arizona Congressional Delegation

enclosure

10772

DOE016-0524

Federal energy fund faces summer shortfall

By Judd Slivka
The Arizona Republic

Talk about a fish story.

A government-mandated study on the endangered humpback chub and a bushel of bad luck have drained about half of a \$100 million fund used to cushion the rising cost of power processing in the West.

That has at least one official predicting that government money to buy power next summer is going to run out, making it harder for utilities to find affordable electricity. If they have to pay more for power, customers likely will, too.

"If it's a dry, hot summer, it could be really bad," said Dave Sabo, manager of the federal government's Colo-

rado River Storage Project, which is part of the Western Area Power Administration.

The administration brokers federally produced energy in the West.

The money was lost when Glen Canyon Dam couldn't increase flows during the summer because of a mandated low-water flow test for the endangered humpback chub.

To make up for the unrealized power, the administration had to buy energy from an overheated open market, depleting its savings by \$55 million last summer.

The situation highlights a defining struggle going on in the boom West: Trade-offs are everything. More power

See FEDERAL | Page A2

FEDERAL | Energy fund faces shortfall

From Page A1

can be generated, but at the cost of resources. More species can be restored, too, but at the cost of production.

Federal agencies — in this case the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, which administers Glen Canyon Dam and the resulting Lake Powell reservoir — have all sorts of mandates to obey, from power supply to protecting endangered species.

They must strike a balance without offending too many constituents. Where those balances are found will define the West.

In the meantime, the Western Area Power Administration is expecting a long, hot summer, one in which its bank account will run dry.

"Going into next summer, I know I'm going to run out of money," Sabo said.

The problem trail

Next summer's problems started back in 2000.

Hydrologically, the past few years have been terrible for water flowing into Lake Powell. Add in California's deregulation, a scorecard of a

summer and nearly a decade of high growth, and the stage was set for a Western-size tragicomedy.

Then came the fish test, part of a federally mandated biological opinion.

There are only about 4,300 humpback chubs in the Colorado River, and biologists have been trying to coax them into creating more of themselves.

Cold water

But since the dams were built on the river and flows are released from the bottom of the dam, the Colorado's water has become very cold.

That water tends to kill the chub as they swim from the warmer Little Colorado River into the Colorado River.

The biological opinion held that in a year when water flow was down, scientists and the Bureau of Reclamation could work together to find out if lower flows were better for the chub.

"With the low flows, we hoped to have slow water that is warmer and allow greater survival of the young, so we could get a greater recruitment of fish that could sur-

vive the first year so they can become spawners," said Jeff Humphrey, a spokesman for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Three drought years in the Colorado River Basin made it easy to decide last year was the year for the study. There wasn't all that much water coming in, so it would be fine to limit it going out.

And so Glen Canyon Dam signed on to do the low-flow studies. After peaking at more than 30,000 cubic feet per second in May, flows were reduced to no more than 8,000 cfs until September.

Then the power crisis happened. California needed energy and looked, in part, to the federal government for help.

But because Glen Canyon didn't produce its expected amount because of the low-flow study, the administration was forced to buy on the open market.

The money drain

At the beginning of last summer, electricity was selling for about \$30 a megawatt-hour. By the end of the

summer, it was near \$300 a megawatt-hour, and the administration was paying \$12 million a month to buy needed energy when only \$6 million had been budgeted for the entire year.

The revolving fund, into which profits are deposited, began draining.

By the end of last summer, \$55 million had been taken from the \$100 million account.

Government hydropower sales, bringing in \$12 million to \$14 million a month, have been rebuilding the fund, but not quickly enough to provide a cushion for next summer.

Adding insult to injury, California's winter power crisis has drained \$71 million out of the fund just to keep up with demand.

The account now stands at about \$38 million.

The Fish and Wildlife Service will release the preliminary results of the Glen Canyon study of the humpback chub in late April.

Reach the reporter at:
judd.sivko@arizona
republic.com or (602) 444-8097.



JANE DEE HULL
GOVERNOR
STATE OF ARIZONA

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO: THE HONORABLE SPENCER ABRAHAM
SECRETARY OF ENERGY
FAX NUMBER: (202) 586-7644
PHONE NUMBER: (202) 586-6210
RE:

FROM: GOVERNOR JANE DEE HULL
DATE: MARCH 8, 2001
OF PAGES (w/COVER SHEET): 5

COMMENTS:

1700 WEST WASHINGTON • PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

10775
DOE016-0527

138

THE CONSERVATION FUND

1800 NORTH KENT STREET, SUITE 1120
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209-2156
(703)525-6300
FAX (703)525-4610

2001-007379 Mar 19 p 12:02

March 16, 2001

Hon. Richard B. Cheney
Vice President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Mr.  President:

As we briefly discussed recently on the phone, I am inviting you, the President, or another prominent member of the Administration, to join in the announcement of a significant public/private partnership involving your Administration's efforts to pioneer a major carbon sequestration and conservation project. This presents an excellent opportunity for this Administration to demonstrate its leadership and commitment to environmental stewardship and a positive approach to carbon dioxide emissions, as well as embracing voluntary and incentive based partnerships involving government, nonprofit, landowners and corporate players.

In an extraordinary partnership, American Electric Power, The Conservation Fund and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have developed an innovative approach to address two of the nation's top environmental concerns – climate change and habitat protection. The first of its kind in both vision and scope, this initiative is at once an important land conservation and habitat restoration project and a bold new carbon sequestration program.

The Project:

Located in Louisiana and punctuated by shaded bayous and marshy wetlands, more than 18,000 acres of critical wildlife habitat and watershed corridor lands had been unproductive, high-risk floodprone restorable agricultural lands. Thanks to a complex partnership between landowners, American Electric Power, the Fund and the Department of Interior, these lands will not only be protected but AEP has pledged all the necessary funding to acquire and restore 10,000 acres of bottomland hardwood habitat – critical for healthy wildlife populations, sustaining water quality along the Mississippi River and providing a sink for atmospheric carbon.

Once these restoration efforts are complete, it is anticipated that AEP will receive credits for reducing carbon dioxide gases through sequestration, an economically beneficial and highly visible program. The total 18,000 acres will then be transferred to the USFWS for permanent protection as a critical addition to the Catahoula National Wildlife Refuge system.

Partners in land and water conservation
www.conservationfund.org

10776

DOE016-0528


The Opportunity:

To increase public awareness, American Electric Power and The Conservation Fund will sponsor an event in Louisiana to celebrate this groundbreaking project. Scheduled for late April or early May, this event provides the Administration with a powerful, high profile opportunity to showcase a successful conservation partnership utilizing the entrepreneurial spirit and funding of the private sector to improve the environment. This event offers the opportunity for the Administration to advance some of the following themes:

- Free-market Environmentalism – Through private-sector leadership and public-sector support, this “free-market” model addresses environmental concerns and strengthens the Administration’s position on balanced energy development.
- International Implications – With the next round of global warming talks scheduled for this year, possibly in May, the timing of this event will allow the Administration to showcase a positive example of carbon sequestration shaping the direction of future discussions.
- EPA Significance – This project is an exciting example of private/public efforts that address concerns regarding emissions of the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide. This event provides the perfect platform for the Administration and the EPA to praise one of the nation’s leading electric platform for their commitment to the environment. The event also coincides with the EPA sponsored conference entitled “International Emission Inventory Conference: One Atmosphere, One Inventory, Many Challenges” held April 30 – May 3.
- Rewarding Innovation – Throughout the campaign, this administration promoted new ideas. This is an opportunity to play a lead role in an exciting new conservation strategy, recognize the pioneering spirit of the private sector and reward a commitment that will benefit future generations of Americans.

I look forward to working with you to schedule an event that will highlight the Administration’s leadership as well as new and collaborative approaches to energy utilization and environmental stewardship.

Sincerely,



John F. Turner
President & CEO

Cc:

Gale A. Norton, Secretary, Department of Interior
Spencer Abraham, Secretary, Department of Energy
Paul H. O'Neill, Secretary, Department of Treasury
Christine Todd Whitman, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency
I. Lewis Libby, Chief of Staff, Vice President of the United States

10777

DOE016-0529

2001-009196 Apr 4 A 11:06

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

April 2, 2001

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
Vice President of the United States of America
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. Vice President:

We are writing to you in your capacity as the Chairman of the National Energy Policy Development Group, to express our strenuous objection to a recent request to derail pending Clean Air Act enforcement actions. In a March 23 letter to you, two of our colleagues suggested that the National Energy Policy Development Group should halt all ongoing enforcement actions under the Clean Air Act's New Source Review (NSR) program by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) against certain electric utilities and oil refineries, in order to not interfere with the Administration's energy and fuel supply policies.

We strongly object to this request to force suspension of enforcement of one of the country's landmark environmental laws, as a false solution to the energy challenges that we are facing and addressing together. We also wish to bring to your attention the error of any implication that the Clean Air Act has interfered with, or will interfere with, our nation's ability to meet our energy and fuel supply needs.

There is broad agreement, reflected in Congressional testimony and elsewhere, that air pollution laws are not causing electricity or fuel supply shortages. For example, with respect to California electricity disruptions, this broad agreement encompasses views by California utility officials, California air regulators, industry, academics, public policy groups, and EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman.

In November of 1999, electric utilities mounted a campaign to attach a rider to an omnibus appropriations bill for the purpose of interfering with DOJ's lawsuits targeting violations of the Clean Air Act's NSR requirements. The utilities claimed that such action was necessary to ensure continuation of electricity services. Both DOJ and EPA rejected these claims, and the agencies reiterated their willingness to consult with any utility unclear about activities subject to NSR permitting. We joined together with many of our colleagues in a letter to the Senate Majority Leader strongly opposing this rider. We noted that this effort would have encouraged extended litigation, undermined existing public health protections, interfered with judicial review, and interfered with the rights of states to seek injunctive relief themselves. We are equally concerned that any interference with the ongoing enforcement actions by the

10778

DOE016-0530

Administration would have the same negative consequences. For the same reasons that the rider effort failed, we urge you to decline the invitation to disrupt enforcement of the Clean Air Act.


We understand that there are ongoing enforcement actions and investigations against electric utility plants and refineries based upon similar alleged abuses of their "grandfathered" status under the Clean Air Act. While the Act does exempt or grandfather certain existing pollution sources from up-to-date pollution control standards, "modifications" to these plants trigger NSR requirements under the Act, including the need to install pollution control equipment to protect public health and the environment.

We are pleased to see that the Administration is continuing to pursue violations of the Clean Air Act's NSR requirements, having recently reached an enforcement settlement with three oil refiners that will reduce air pollution by over 60,000 tons per year. The Administration worked with the states of Delaware and Louisiana, and the Northwest Air Pollution Authority to target air pollution violations at nine refineries located in California, Washington, Texas, Delaware and Louisiana. The NSR violations at these refineries involved major modifications to their plants, increasing capacity and air pollution, without the installation of pollution control equipment required by law. The DOJ noted that its settlement would not reduce the capacity of the affected refineries but would require that production cause less pollution.

The nation's environmental laws can and must be faithfully enforced, while still meeting our energy needs. It is a false and unnecessary choice to pit public health and environmental safeguards against the nation's energy demands. It is also a dangerous and avoidable path to abandon enforcement of the laws against companies that provide social goods like electricity and fuel.

We urge you to allow EPA and DOJ to continue to enforce the nation's environmental laws undisturbed by the restrictions and intrusions suggested in the March 23 letter. We look forward to working with the Administration and the National Energy Policy Development Group to develop an energy policy that balances supply, demand, renewable energy sources, and conservation measures without weakening our environmental and public health protections. Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,


John F. Kerry


Susan Collins

cc: The Honorable Christine Todd Whitman
The Honorable Spencer Abraham
The Honorable John Ashcroft

10779

DOE016-0531

139

2001-011569 May 4 p 4:05



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

May 3, 2001

Secretary Spencer Abraham
United States Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter from Representative John Shadegg regarding the Clean Air Act and its effect on the electricity generating plants in California.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nancy P. Dorn".

Nancy P. Dorn
Assistant to the Vice President for
Legislative Affairs

10780

DOE016-0532



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

May 1, 2001

The Honorable John Shadegg
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Shadegg:

Thank you for your letter to the Vice President regarding the Clean Air Act and its effect on the electricity generating plants in California. I have taken the liberty of forwarding your letter to Andrew Lundquist, Executive Director of the National Energy Policy Development Group, as well as Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham and Administrator Christine Todd-Whitman of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Again, thank you. If I can be of any assistance to you in the future, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Nancy Dorn".

Nancy Dorn
Assistant to the Vice President for Legislative Affairs

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

10781

DOE016-0533

JOHN SHADEGG
5TH DISTRICT, ARIZONA
WASHINGTON, D.C. OFFICE:
430 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
D(202) 225-3261
FAX: (202) 225-3482
ARIZONA OFFICE:
301 EAST BETHANY HOME ROAD
SUITE C178
PHOENIX, AZ 85012
PHONE: 602-343-5300
FAX: 602-340-7733
e-mail: jshadegg@mail.house.gov



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-0504

April 23, 2001

COMMITTEE:
COMMERCE
SUBCOMMITTEE:
ENERGY AND POWER
FINANCE AND HAZARDOUS
MATERIALS
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT
REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE
JUNIOR CLASS REPRESENTATIVE
ASSISTANT WRDP

The Honorable Richard Cheney
Vice President
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20501

Dear Vice President Cheney:

As a member of the Energy & Air Quality Subcommittee of the House Committee on Energy & Commerce, I request information regarding the Clean Air Act and its effect on the electricity generating plants in California. I understand that the severe shortage of electricity which California is currently experiencing is due to the lack of electrical supply available to meet demand and that increasing the amount of electricity available is the only way to avoid blackouts and brownouts in California this summer.

I am specifically interested in identifying any provision of the Clean Air Act or any regulation enacted pursuant to its authority which affects the ability of generating plants within California and other states capable of supplying electricity to California to produce at their highest possible capacity. Moreover, I would like information on the effect which the cost of credits for Nitrous Oxide (Nox) emissions has had on the ability of plants to produce at full capacity as well as on the wholesale price of electricity in the California market.

Finally, I would like information on specific generating plants which have been unable to produce at full capacity or may shut down this summer to avoid exceeding their allowable emissions of Nox or other pollutants. I and other Members of Congress have received conflicting information on this issue and I hope that you are able to settle the uncertainty over this question.

In addition, I am seeking information on all generating plants in the state of California which are capable of being in service before September 1, 2001 but which are not currently generating electricity or are not generating at full capacity. Specifically, I would appreciate a list of all such plants and the reasons why each plant is not operating or is operating at less than full capacity. Furthermore, any information which you can provide on actions which Congress could take to bring these plants back into full service to forestall an emergency situation this summer is greatly appreciated.


10782

DOE016-0534

It is clear from testimony delivered at recent hearings on this issue that power supply problems are the root of California's current crisis. Any information which you can provide will be extremely useful as I and other Members of Congress craft legislation which will increase the amount of electricity actually available to California and thus avoid blackouts and brownouts.

Thank you for your attention to this request and I look forward to working with you to address this issue.

Sincerely,



John Shadegg
Member of Congress

10783

DOE016-0535

Tripodi, Cathy

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 7:09 PM
To: Tripodi, Cathy
Subject: FW: energy tax proposals

Predecisional: draft NEP recommendations

-----Original Message-----

From: Buddy Garland
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 4:11 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Sullivan, John; Baldwin, Sam; Steer, Randy; York, Michael; Glatstein, Fred; Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Abe.Haspel@ee.doe.gov@DOE%HQ-NOTES; tomjill@mris.com@DOE%HQ-NOTES; Ronen, Amit; Rubin, Joel; Tseng, Phillip
Subject: Re: energy tax proposals

Joe,

Normally, we have a team of about 7 employees in our office + ~20 people in our national laboratory and university community that we would include in a discussion and analysis of this nature. We will try to assemble these people next week and look into the possibilities for offering some tax policies to the Vice President's team.

Thank you.

Buddy Garland

----- Forwarded by Buddy Garland/EE/DOE on 04/13/2001 03:59 PM -----

John Sullivan
04/13/2001 11:19 AM

To: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc: Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: energy tax proposals

We'll do our best Joe. Just got the message. Buddy Garland will give you our best "half-day" response.

Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL on 04/13/2001 08:38:29 AM

To: John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Michael McCabe/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL

cc.

Subject: energy tax proposals

I sent this to Abe yesterday, but I understand he is out so I ask you to respond in his place:



ATTACHMENT.TXT



Tax Policy Ideas
For VP EPDWG ...

141

2001-011996 May 11 A 8:32



STATE OF MICHIGAN
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

JOHN ENGLER
GOVERNOR

Date: 5/9/01

Time: _____

Total Pages (including cover sheet): 3

TO: The Honorable Spencer Abraham

FAX NUMBER: (202) 586-4403

FROM: Gov. Engler

MESSAGE:

If this transmission is not complete, please call: _____

Telephone number: (____) _____



May 11 2001 4:13 P.01

Fax: 517-335-6949

EXEC OFFICE

10786

DOE016-0538



STATE OF MICHIGAN
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

JOHN ENGLER
GOVERNOR

May 9, 2001

The Vice President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20050

Dear Mr. Vice President:

The peak summer driving season is nearly upon us, and once again Michigan and parts of the Midwest are experiencing dramatically higher prices for gasoline than many other regions of the country. These higher gasoline prices create a hardship for consumers and can only have a detrimental effect on the Michigan economy.

During the period of nationwide high gasoline prices last summer, the Midwest sustained significantly higher prices at the pumps. Compounded by rising crude oil prices, severe fuel supply constraints drove self-serve, regular unleaded gasoline prices to \$2.15 per gallon in the Detroit-area last summer. Several factors caused supply constraints in our region, including a loss of regional refining capacity, distribution problems, and a major pipeline disruption. Additionally, last year's change-over from winter to summer fuels, and expectations for lower future crude oil prices contributed to motor fuel inventories reaching extremely low levels.

Gasoline inventories for the Midwest have recently been lower than levels described as critically low at this same time last year. Midwestern refiners are operating at maximum capacity, yet the "balkanisation" of our motor fuel supplies, as the result of a proliferation of "boutique" fuels, coupled with a lack of refining and pipeline capacity, may actually drive gasoline prices even higher than they were last year. The average cost of unleaded gasoline in Michigan went from \$1.47 on April 1, 2001, to \$1.71 on May 1, 2001. The 24 cents per gallon increase reflects both seasonal price increases typically seen this time of year and concerns that low inventories could lead to distribution problems and increased price volatility. The April 28, 2001, fire at the Touco refinery in Wood River, Illinois, demonstrated the volatility of the current situation. Following this refinery fire, prices rose 14 cents from the May 1 average of \$1.71 to \$1.85 on May 7, 2001. Prices of nearly \$2.00 per gallon have already been reported in some areas of the state. Although regional inventories appear to be building, the average retail price in Michigan of \$1.85 per gallon is nearly 17 cents higher than the national average.

The acceleration of these price increases, in addition to their magnitude, strains our economic vitality. The degree of these price increases is also difficult to understand in light of crude oil prices that have remained relatively stable during this time. Any further significant supply disruptions could push retail gasoline prices to record levels.



May 11 2001 4:14 P.02

Fax: 517-335-6949

EXEC OFFICE

10787

DOE016-0539

The Vice President

Page 2

May 9, 2001

We did not arrive at the current situation overnight, and we recognize that there are no simple short-term solutions to address this problem. As the National Energy Policy Task Force proceeds with their work to develop a comprehensive national energy policy, I request that you look closely at the issue of higher than average gasoline prices in the Midwest. Identifying practical solutions to reduce the requirements for multiple types of special gasoline, and working with the states on a regional basis to increase refinery capacity and improve the distribution system should be imperative national objectives. In addition, federal environmental requirements that impede the construction of refineries, such as the Clean Air Act "New Source Review" program, should be reformed. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality officials have developed recommendations on how this could be achieved without compromising environmental quality and have provided these recommendations to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Motor fuel composition must continue to play an integral role in reducing automobile emissions, and I have expressed my support for reasonable policies to reduce sulfur levels in gasoline in order to achieve greater mobile source emission reductions and air quality improvements. However, as we move toward requiring cleaner fuels and cleaner cars, we must address the patchwork of requirements that have resulted in the required use of 15 different types of gasoline nationwide, seven types in the Midwestern states alone. We must significantly reduce the number of fuels currently required to two or three different types nationwide. This number could accommodate clean air objectives, depending on the air quality designation of the area in which they are used. This policy decision can only be made at the federal level.

The gasoline supply issue in the Midwest exemplifies the problems we face because our nation lacks a comprehensive national energy policy. I applaud President Bush's foresight and your leadership in undertaking this daunting but necessary challenge.

Sincerely,



John Engler
Governor

JE/brdc

cc: The Honorable Spencer Abraham
The Honorable Christine Todd Whitman

2

May 11 2001 4:14 P.03

Fax: 517-335-6949

EXEC OFFICE

10788

DOE016-0540



— State of —
North Dakota
Office of the Governor

John Hoeven
Governor

2001-012103 May 14 A 7:59

TO: Vice President Richard Cheney
202/456-1798

cc: Secretary Spencer Abraham
Department of Energy
202/586-4403

FROM: Governor John Hoeven

PHONE: 701/328-2200

FAX: 701/328-2205

DATE: May 11, 2001

PAGES (including cover): 4

SENDER: Drew Wrigley
701/328-2204

COMMENTS:

600 E Boulevard Ave
Bismarck, ND 58506-0001
Phone: 701.328.2200
Fax: 701.328.2205
www.discovernd.com

10789

DOE016-0541



— State of —
North Dakota
Office of the Governor

John Hoeven
GOVERNOR

May 11, 2001

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

Dear Vice President Cheney:

Allow me to express my appreciation for your recent efforts to develop the much-needed and long-awaited national energy policy. Judging by all that I have read, the Administration understands the critical importance of developing the nation's domestic energy resources, including oil, natural gas and coal. I strongly support this emphasis and commend you for keeping it foremost in your policy development.

I am writing to reiterate the role that coal can and should play in meeting the United States' energy demands. In addition, I wanted to offer my assistance to you and President Bush in promoting coal and our other natural resources as key components in a national energy policy. If there is any way I can help in making the case for your energy initiatives, please feel free to put me to work.

It is appropriate that the President is coming to Minnesota on Thursday to address energy issues. Much of Minnesota's electricity is generated in North Dakota by coal-fired power plants. The lignite industry represents a significant part of our state's economy, and of course, we would like to develop it further in the coming decades.

The advantages of coal as an energy source are numerous, and from your years in Wyoming and Texas, I know you are well acquainted with the industry. Let me highlight coal's advantages as seen from a North Dakota perspective.

600 E Boulevard Ave
Bismarck, ND 58503-0001
Phone: 701.328.2200
Fax: 701.328.2205
www.discovernd.com

10790

Vice President Richard Cheney

Page 2

May 11, 2001

- **Supply** – The lignite-bearing regions of western North Dakota and eastern Montana have more than a 1,000-year supply of lignite that is currently economically feasible to recover. (Based on 35 billion tons with the current production rate of 30 million tons per year.) Energy independence clearly should be a central goal of a national energy policy; given the abundant supplies, coal will help anchor that independence.
- **Cost** – Although the price of coal has recently faced upward pressure, it remains a comparatively inexpensive source of energy in the United States. America's competitiveness benefits greatly from low-cost energy supplies, and coal is well-equipped to fill the economy's needs.
- **Environmental friendliness** – Coal-generated electricity and clean air are certainly compatible. North Dakota's industry has been a leader in reducing emissions, and even with our healthy energy sector, our air ranks among the cleanest in the country. I applaud the President's commitment to developing clean-coal technologies, including his budget proposal to spend \$2 billion on the coal-related environmental initiatives over the next 10 years.
- **Versatility** – Our coal industry is not limited to electrical generation. More than 13.5 percent of North Dakota's lignite is used to generate synthetic natural gas, at the only such plant in the United States. This technology holds tremendous potential for the future. (The Great Plains Synfuels plant is operating profitably, I would note.) In addition, about 7.5 percent of lignite is used to produce fertilizer products, such as anhydrous ammonia and ammonium sulfate.

North Dakota's commitment to coal is serious and long-term. Working in a partnership, the state and lignite industry recently launched the Vision 21 project, intended to lead to the establishment of at least one new coal-fired power plant. The 500 megawatt plant is estimated to require three million tons of coal a year while adding 1,300 new jobs.

In light of this goal, I am pleased to see reports that the President's energy strategy calls for regulatory steps that would expedite approval of new power plants.

10791

Vice President Richard Cheney
Page 3
May 11, 2001

By all accounts, the President's comprehensive energy strategy will strike a balance, encouraging conservation while promoting the wise development of all of our energy resources. While I am certainly an advocate for coal, I also support this balanced approach. Oil exploration and development should remain a priority, and there is an important place for renewable sources such as wind and bio-fuels.

The absence of a comprehensive, national energy policy has hampered our economic growth and contributed to the supply shortfalls and sudden price swings. The result is understandable political pressure to take short-term action that may, in fact, be counterproductive.

It is to the Administration's credit that you have sought to develop a long-term strategy with the appropriate emphasis on supply. I congratulate you for the effort, and stand ready to assist the President and you in whatever way would be helpful.

Sincerely,



John Hoeven
Governor

cc Secretary Spencer Abraham, Department of Energy

38:27:41

10792

DOE016-0544



— State of —
North Dakota

Office of the Governor

John Hoeven
Governor

2001-012458 5/17 3:39

May 11, 2001

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

Dear Vice President Cheney:

Allow me to express my appreciation for your recent efforts to develop the much-needed and long-awaited national energy policy. Judging by all that I have read, the Administration understands the critical importance of developing the nation's domestic energy resources, including oil, natural gas and coal. I strongly support this emphasis and commend you for keeping it foremost in your policy development.

I am writing to reiterate the role that coal can and should play in meeting the United States' energy demands. In addition, I wanted to offer my assistance to you and President Bush in promoting coal and our other natural resources as key components in a national energy policy. If there is any way I can help in making the case for your energy initiatives, please feel free to put me to work.

It is appropriate that the President is coming to Minnesota on Thursday to address energy issues. Much of Minnesota's electricity is generated in North Dakota by coal-fired power plants. The lignite industry represents a significant part of our state's economy, and of course, we would like to develop it further in the coming decades.

The advantages of coal as an energy source are numerous, and from your years in Wyoming and Texas, I know you are well acquainted with the industry. Let me highlight coal's advantages as seen from a North Dakota perspective.

600 E Boulevard Ave
Bismarck, ND 58505-0001
Phone: 701.328.2200
Fax: 701.328.2205
www.discovernd.com

10793

DOE016-0545

Vice President Richard Cheney

Page 2

May 11, 2001

- **Supply** – The lignite-bearing regions of western North Dakota and eastern Montana have more than a 1,000-year supply of lignite that is currently economically feasible to recover. (Based on 35 billion tons with the current production rate of 30 million tons per year.) Energy independence clearly should be a central goal of a national energy policy; given the abundant supplies, coal will help anchor that independence.
- **Cost** – Although the price of coal has recently faced upward pressure, it remains a comparatively inexpensive source of energy in the United States. America's competitiveness benefits greatly from low-cost energy supplies, and coal is well-equipped to fill the economy's needs.
- **Environmental friendliness** – Coal-generated electricity and clean air are certainly compatible. North Dakota's industry has been a leader in reducing emissions, and even with our healthy energy sector, our air ranks among the cleanest in the country. I applaud the President's commitment to developing clean-coal technologies, including his budget proposal to spend \$2 billion on the coal-related environmental initiatives over the next 10 years.
- **Versatility** – Our coal industry is not limited to electrical generation. More than 13.5 percent of North Dakota's lignite is used to generate synthetic natural gas, at the only such plant in the United States. This technology holds tremendous potential for the future. (The Great Plains Synfuels plant is operating profitably, I would note.) In addition, about 7.5 percent of lignite is used to produce fertilizer products, such as anhydrous ammonia and ammonium sulfate.

North Dakota's commitment to coal is serious and long-term. Working in a partnership, the state and lignite industry recently launched the Vision 21 project, intended to lead to the establishment of at least one new coal-fired power plant. The 500 megawatt plant is estimated to require three million tons of coal a year while adding 1,300 new jobs.

In light of this goal, I am pleased to see reports that the President's energy strategy calls for regulatory steps that would expedite approval of new power plants.

10794

DOE016-0546

Vice President Richard Cheney

Page 3

May 11, 2001

By all accounts, the President's comprehensive energy strategy will strike a balance, encouraging conservation while promoting the wise development of all of our energy resources. While I am certainly an advocate for coal, I also support this balanced approach. Oil exploration and development should remain a priority, and there is an important place for renewable sources such as wind and bio-fuels.

The absence of a comprehensive, national energy policy has hampered our economic growth and contributed to the supply shortfalls and sudden price swings. The result is understandable political pressure to take short-term action that may, in fact, be counterproductive.

It is to the Administration's credit that you have sought to develop a long-term strategy with the appropriate emphasis on supply. I congratulate you for the effort, and stand ready to assist the President and you in whatever way would be helpful.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Hoeven". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "J" and "H".

John Hoeven
Governor

cc: Secretary Spencer Abraham, Department of Energy

38:27:41

10795

DOE016-0547

Legislative Affairs
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20501

Office of the Vice President

CC:
- Allister
- Exec. Sec.

Fax

To: MICHAEL WHARTON From: STEVE RUNGON

Fax: 202 586-4891 Pages: 3 pp.

Phone: _____ Date: 5/30/01

Re: SHARPE REQUEST CC: _____

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

• Comments:

Per my email. Can you get him answers?

Thanks.

SR

456-6774

HR-29-2001 23:50

P. 02/03

JOHN SPENCER
 Air District, Arizona

WASHINGTON, D.C. OFFICE:
 CONGRESS HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
 WASHINGTON, DC 20515
 (202) 225-3071
 Fax: (202) 225-3482

ARIZONA OFFICE:
 301 East Broadway Home Road
 Suite C178
 Phoenix, AZ 85012
 (602) 248-8828
 Fax: (602) 248-7329
 e-mail: jspencer@spencerair.com



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
 Washington, DC 20515-0504

COMMITTEE:
 COMMERCE
 SUBCOMMITTEE:
 ENERGY AND POWER
 FINANCE AND HAZARDOUS
 MATERIALS
 HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT
 REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE
 JUNIOR CLASS REPRESENTATIVE
 ASSISTANT WHIP

April 23, 2001

The Honorable Richard Cheney
 Vice President
 Eisenhower Executive Office Building
 Washington, D.C. 20501

Dear Vice President Cheney:

As a member of the Energy & Air Quality Subcommittee of the House Committee on Energy & Commerce, I request information regarding the Clean Air Act and its effect on the electricity generating plants in California. I understand that the severe shortage of electricity which California is currently experiencing is due to the lack of electrical supply available to meet demand and that increasing the amount of electricity available is the only way to avoid blackouts and brownouts in California this summer.

I am specifically interested in identifying any provision of the Clean Air Act or any regulation enacted pursuant to its authority which affects the ability of generating plants within California and other states capable of supplying electricity to California to produce at their highest possible capacity. Moreover, I would like information on the effect which the cost of credits for Nitrous Oxide (Nox) emissions has had on the ability of plants to produce at full capacity as well as on the wholesale price of electricity in the California market.

Finally, I would like information on specific generating plants which have been unable to produce at full capacity or may shut down this summer to avoid exceeding their allowable emissions of Nox or other pollutants. I and other Members of Congress have received conflicting information on this issue and I hope that you are able to settle the uncertainty over this question.

In addition, I am seeking information on all generating plants in the state of California which are capable of being in service before September 1, 2001 but which are not currently generating electricity or are not generating at full capacity. Specifically, I would appreciate a list of all such plants and the reasons why each plant is not operating or is operating at less than full capacity. Furthermore, any information which you can provide on actions which Congress could take to bring these plants back into full service to forestall an emergency situation this summer is greatly appreciated.

APR 24 11:41 AM '01

10797

DOE016-0549


MAY-29-2001 23:51

P.03/03

It is clear from testimony delivered at recent hearings on this issue that power supply problems are the root of California's current crisis. Any information which you can provide will be extremely useful as I and other Members of Congress craft legislation which will increase the amount of electricity actually available to California and thus avoid blackouts and brownouts.

Thank you for your attention to this request and I look forward to working with you to address this issue.

Sincerely,



John Shadegg
Member of Congress

10798

DOE016-0550

2001-021462 9/19 A 11:29



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

021462

2001 SEP 19 A 11:29

TO: Ms. Carol A. Kennedy
Executive Secretariat
Room 7E-054 Forrestal Building
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20585

DATE: September 18, 2001

We are forwarding the enclosed constituent mail containing views and concerns about energy issues. It is not necessary to respond to our office regarding each reply.

Should you have questions about these procedures or need to provide updated contact information, you may reach me by telephone at 202.456.9002 or by fax at 202.456.7044.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cecelia Boyer".

Cecelia Boyer
Special Assistant to the Vice President
for Correspondence

10799

DOE016-0551

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

RECEIVED DATE: 4/27/01

TRACKING NO. 206

DATE DUE 5/4/01

NAME OF CORRESPONDENT: Western Governors

SUBJECT: fiscal energy proposal

ROUTE TO FOR ACTION INDICATED:

LIBBY	<input type="checkbox"/>	KLEPPE	<input type="checkbox"/>
MCGRATH	<input type="checkbox"/>	O'DONNELI	<input type="checkbox"/>
MATALIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	DUNN	<input type="checkbox"/>
ADDINGTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	HEIDEN	<input type="checkbox"/>
DORN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Rundquist</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
EDELMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Send to DOE</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CONDA	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>

ACTION CODES:

- 1) APPROPRIATE ACTION
- 2) DRAFT RESPONSE FOR YOUR SIGNATURE
- 3) DRAFT RESPONSE FOR CHIEF OF STAFF
- 4) DRAFT RESPONSE FOR VICE PRESIDENT
- 5) INFO COPY/NO ACTION NECESSARY
- 6) COORDINATE WITH _____

COMMENTS _____

RETURN TO CORRESPONDENCE OFFICE

10800



WESTERN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

Dirk Kempthorne
Governor of Idaho
Chairman

Jane Dee Hull
Governor of Arizona
Vice Chairman

James M. Souby
Executive Director

Headquarters:
1515 Cleveland Place
Suite 200
Denver, Colorado 80202-5114

303-623-9378
Fax 303-534-7309

Washington, D.C. Office:
400 N. Capitol Street, N.W.
Suite 388
Washington, D.C. 20001

202-624-5402
Fax 202-624-7707

www.westgov.org

April 27, 2001

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
Vice President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Mr. Vice President

On March 9, the Western Governors' Association transmitted a draft Memorandum of Understanding and joint implementation plan to you. The agreement would help align and coordinate our efforts to address the energy crisis now confronting the Western United States. The document was based on our very productive meeting with you on February 27. We also initiated a review among our states and public utility commissions to make sure the proposal was as complete as possible. That process has been completed with only minor, constructive changes, and we are pleased to transmit our final proposal to you for your consideration.

This agreement, along with the underlying support of participating agencies, should provide the necessary resources to enable a powerful state-federal partnership. Such a partnership will be essential to address both the short- and longer-term issues facing the region. Our work together will also provide a model for addressing the unique needs of the nation's other regions.

We thank you for your keen interest in resolving the Western energy crisis and look forward to working with the Administration as we move forward together to solve these problems. Please contact any one of us or our executive director, Jim Souby, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Dirk Kempthorne *Jane Dee Hull*
Dirk Kempthorne Jane Dee Hull
Governor of Idaho Governor of Arizona
Chairman Vice Chair

John A. Kitzhaber *Jim Granger*
John A. Kitzhaber, M.D. Jim Granger
Governor of Oregon Governor of Wyoming
Co-Lead Governor for Energy Co-Lead Governor Energy

cc: Western Governors

Enclosures

F:\Energy\mou\m1.wpd

10801

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
AMONG THE
PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP
AND ITS MEMBER OFFICES AND AGENCIES
AND THE
WESTERN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION
AND ITS MEMBER STATES
REGARDING ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION
IN THE WESTERN UNITED STATES**

I. Purpose

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is to establish a framework for cooperation between Western States and the Federal government to rapidly resolve immediate energy shortages and longer-term energy problems facing the West. This effort will involve the States and the Federal government. Other stakeholders may be called upon from time to time to provide advice. The regional approach will serve as a demonstration of principles and practices, which may be adopted nationally or in other regions.

II. Objective

To encourage cooperation among the President's National Energy Policy Development Group (NEPDG), its member offices and agencies, the Western Governors' Association (WGA) and its members states for the following purposes:

- (1) Improving intergovernmental systems that authorize and enable planning, financing, permitting and siting of energy facilities;
- (2) Increasing energy supplies;
- (3) Building needed energy infrastructure; and
- (4) Increasing the efficiency of energy use.

III. Background

Energy prices and supplies in the Western United States have become uncertain and highly volatile over the past year. Electricity and natural gas transmission systems may no longer be adequate to provide reliable, secure energy to citizens, businesses and governmental and national defense facilities. Due to unique Western land ownership patterns, widely dispersed population centers and government facilities, and the isolated nature of the Western Interconnection for electricity transmission, this situation poses

unique policy, management, and investment problems that must be addressed to ensure protection of public health, welfare, the environment and national security.

The Nation's energy policy must be broad-based and flexible so that each state and region in the nation can maximize its contributions to the economy and well-being of its citizens. The signatories to this agreement and the offices, agencies and states they represent are committed to carrying out both short and long-term, cost-effective efforts to resolve the energy crisis in the Western States. This may involve: obtaining and sharing necessary public information relating to energy markets and emerging energy technologies; identifying and implementing cooperative strategies for research, development, demonstration and adoption of policies, procedures and programs that will ensure delivery of new energy supplies, greater efficiency, more sustainable conservation practices and new or improved energy technologies; and assessing the effectiveness of implementation policies and practices.

The signatories are committed to market-based approaches so that the selection and financing of energy facilities and strategies, including those for research and development, will be based on wide competition, broad participation and market discipline.

The signatories seek a regional, integrated, cooperative approach to identifying solutions to problems. The proposed approach for this MOU will bring together the signatories or their designated representatives to share information and collaborate to the extent permitted by law.

IV. Authorities

Nothing in this MOU alters the responsibilities or statutory authorities of NEPDG and its member offices and agencies, or the WGA, and its member States and insular areas. This MOU does not supersede existing agreements among any of the signatories.

V. Responsibilities

The signatories agree to prepare a workplan and provide an annual report to identify and list by priority energy needs and requirements. The workplan and report will identify and assess governmental approaches, including regulatory practices that affect the development of energy supply, conservation and efficiency in the West. The report will consider current funding levels and allocations for governmental energy activities, the most pressing energy production, transmission and efficiency problems, and identify for demonstration and/or implementation the most promising new solutions.

The report will be completed and submitted to the signatories no later than February of each year for use as a resource in the formulation and review of the states' and nation's energy policies.

The signatories agree that this MOU may serve as a prelude to other regional or National programs for identifying and implementing needed new, cost-effective energy strategies for development and deployment.

VI. Authentication

This MOU becomes effective upon its signature by all parties. The MOU will continue in effect for three (3) years or until modified by mutual consent. Participation by any signatory member may be terminated at the request of any signatory with ninety (90) days prior notice.

FOR THE NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP AND ITS MEMBER OFFICES AND AGENCIES

Vice President of the United States Date

FOR THE WESTERN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION AND ITS MEMBER STATES

Chairman of the Western Governors' Association Date

Vice Chair of the Western Governors' Association Date

Lead Governor of the Western Governors' Association Date

Lead Governor of the Western Governors' Association Date

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR MEETING ENERGY NEEDS IN WESTERN STATES

May 2001

Introduction:

This addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) of May __, 2001 regarding energy development and conservation in the western states established a plan for initial implementation of the MOU.

This plan is intended to create the mechanisms necessary to implement the MOU and provide a legal and accepted basis to pursue regional cooperative efforts.

Proposed Approach:

First working independently, and then jointly, the Federal agencies and WGA will accomplish tasks in four areas in FY 2001-2004:

Task 1: Improve intergovernmental systems

- Establish policies that upon request extend NEPA "cooperating agency" status to states for energy project reviews as a matter of routine practice and provide funding to states to participate.
- Develop information to enable the timely development of alternatives for evaluation in EISs.
- Establish integrated state-federal processes for the shared development of energy plans, programs, policies and projects.
- Develop processes for the effective participation by key stakeholders in the consideration of energy issues.
- Investigate the application of information technologies to siting and permitting functions for energy facilities.
- Develop a budget and plan for accomplishing Tasks 1, 2, 3 and 4.
- Establish mechanisms for key stakeholder participation in the execution of Tasks 2, 3 and 4.

Task 2: Increase energy supplies

- Enable the operation of existing generation through expedited local, state and federal permit decisions affecting the operation of existing and retired generation while protecting the public health and environment.
- Enable the deployment of distributed generation through the identification of practices in the western power system that create barriers to distributed generation and the adoption of practices to overcome such barriers, such as standardized interconnection practices and information necessary for local zoning decisions.

- Streamline local, state and federal permitting of new renewable and fossil energy generation and associated electric transmission and natural gas pipelines.
- Speed the local, state and federal permitting of new, cleaner and more efficient technologies including the development of information necessary for agency reviews of the performance of new technologies and the sharing of such information among state and federal permitting agencies.
- Expand the efficient production and use of natural gas, oil, and coal through the development of new technologies and the timely permitting and leasing of resources.

Task 3: Build needed energy infrastructure

- Identify and evaluate the bottlenecks in western energy system (e.g., electric transmission, natural gas and petroleum pipelines).
- Determine financial impediments to investment in necessary infrastructure to eliminate bottlenecks in the western energy system.
- Seek opportunities to deploy new technologies to relieve bottlenecks.

Task 4: Improve the efficiency of energy use

- Coordinate federal agency efficiency efforts with state energy efficiency initiatives.
- Collaborate in evaluations of the effectiveness of energy efficiency initiatives in the West.
- Seek opportunities to identify and conduct pilot projects to test the implementation of new programs and technologies to increase energy efficiency.
- Conduct public outreach to encourage conservation and efficiency.
- Expand State and Federal energy efficiency programs and initiatives.

F:\Energy\16implementation plan.doc

2001-022603 10/5/01 2:51

022603



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

October 3, 2001

The Honorable Tony Knowles
Governor
State of Alaska
P.O. Box 110001
Juneau, AK 99811-0001

Dear Governor Knowles:

Vice President Cheney has asked me to respond to your letter urging the Administration to support construction of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline that utilizes a route following the Alaska Highway.

Governor, as you know, we have talked several times about this issue and its importance both to Alaska and our Nation's energy security. The President's National Energy Policy Report included a recommendation that directed the Secretaries of Energy and State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, to work closely with Canada and the State of Alaska, and all other interested parties to expedite the construction of a natural gas pipeline to deliver natural gas to the lower 48 states.

Again, as you know, the National Energy Policy Report did not take a position with respect to route selection. But, at this time, the Department of Energy is examining the issue closely. I appreciate your position and the points you have made in support. I will ensure that the Secretary of Energy is fully aware of where you stand, and, to that end, I have forwarded your letter to him.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. D. Lundquist".

Andrew D. Lundquist
Director, National Energy Policy
Development Group

cc:
The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy

10807

DOE016-0559

Mar-04-01 10:24am From-

+000

T-235 P.01/04 F-391

FAX TRANSMITTAL

STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

TONY KNOWLES
GOVERNOR

FRAN ULMER
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
PO BOX 110001
JUNEAU, AK 99811-0001

Telephone: (907) 465-3500
Fax: (907) 465-3532

Date: May 4, 2001

To: The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
Vice President of the United States

Fax No.: ~~202) 456-6216~~

U212

Pages: 4

From: Tony Knowles
Governor of Alaska

If you received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone, and return this FAX to the number at the above address. Thank you.

10808

DOE016-0560



TONY KNOWLES
GOVERNOR
governor@gov.state.ak.us

STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

P.O. Box 110001
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0001
(907) 465-3500
Fax (907) 465-3537
www.gov.state.ak.us

May 4, 2001

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
Vice President of the United States
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Vice President Cheney:

I write to strongly urge the administration to support construction of the Alaska Highway Natural Gas Pipeline in your recommendations to Congress on a national energy strategy.

The Alaska Highway Natural Gas Pipeline project makes sense for America for three reasons. First, it is by many years the quickest way to move this enormous, already discovered, and ready-to-market energy resource to American markets. Second, by following developed transportation corridors in Alaska and Canada, it is environmentally sound and the only project that is universally accepted and encouraged by environmental groups. The other "frontier route" is adamantly opposed by environmental and indigenous groups. Finally, it will create thousands of jobs and business opportunities for Americans.

The project is poised to deliver Alaska's enormous North Slope gas—35 trillion cubic feet of proven reserves—with another estimated 65 trillion cubic feet waiting to be discovered. The route has already been approved by Congress, is the subject of an international treaty with Canada, and much of it already has been permitted and rights-of-way issued. Updating that work would take only 18-24 months, in contrast to a new route which could take at least five years or more to permit.

Second, a chief reason for the overwhelming support of the Alaska Highway project is that it is environmentally sound. It would follow and use existing infrastructure, such as the North Slope Haul Road and Alaska Highway, and has the strong support of environmental groups with no environmental opposition we're aware of. In contrast, an alternative route under the ice-choked Beaufort Sea is strongly opposed by environmentalists and Alaska Natives of the region, the same indigenous people who generally support oil and gas development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

10809

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
May 4, 2001
Page 2

Third, the Alaska Highway pipeline project is good for America's economy and families. At time of worry over an economic slowdown, it would create thousands of good jobs across our nation, both during the construction and operations. Supplying 4 billion cubic feet a day, it would meet a huge portion of the nearly 2 billion cubic feet a day annual increase projected for natural gas demand for electrical production, factories, and homes. And it would help make our nation more energy sufficient and less reliant on uncertain foreign energy sources.

Recognizing these realities, both the Western and National Governors' Associations have unanimously endorsed it. Alaska's two United States senators strongly support the Alaska Highway project. We perceive a growing bipartisan sentiment in Congress to incorporate support for the highway route in the pending national energy legislation.

A strong expression of support by the Bush administration urging North Slope gas producers to rapidly file application for this route could significantly accelerate pipeline construction. Such filings would not preclude the companies from considering other routes, but would significantly accelerate the effort to transport Alaska gas to markets in the U.S. Midwest.

Such support also would demonstrate to the Canadian government the continuing commitment of the United States to international agreements executed between our two governments in the late 1970s.

Finally, I suggest that your report to Congress discuss the establishment of a task force consisting of representatives from the U.S., Canada, Alaska, and other parties to accelerate the commercialization of natural gas from Northern Alaska and Canada. This task force would consist of policy and technical experts and would be directed to develop a comprehensive plan for producing and transporting this gas, including facilitating construction of the Highway Natural Gas Pipeline. This coordination is essential for the project and the sooner it is begun the better. This would also put the public on notice that work is immediately underway to address our critical need for natural gas.

Supporting construction and routing of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline would enable the administration to assure Americans that help is on the way now to address our nation's pending energy crisis. Jump-starting a \$10 billion construction project with broad American support, which would deliver to markets the preferred environmental fuel of the 21st century—the largest known natural gas reserve on the continent—at a rate of 4

10810

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
May 4, 2001
Page 3

billion cubic feet a day, is a dramatic and significant positive step toward resolving our energy supply crisis.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Sincerely,


Tony Knowles
Governor

cc: The Honorable Ted Stevens, U.S. Senator
The Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senator
The Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative
Mr. Andrew Lundquist, National Energy Policy Development

10811

DOE016-0563

2001-020806 9/10/01 3:24

020806

Vice-President Dick Cheney
Re: Energy Policy

August 28, 2001

Our current need to import approximately 60% oil requirements does not reflect a viable supply situation. The administration policy of developing more domestic oil and gas production is commendable. This includes drilling in the Alaskan wildlife preserve and offshore California among other known locations where oil and gas reserves are probable.

Consideration should also be given to starting a development program for our oil shale reserves, which are estimated to contain billions of barrels of oil. About 25 years ago considerable work was done in this area during previous oil supply problem. I believe that the technology exists whereby at least 1 million barrels of oil production per day is feasible from shale. While this shale oil production costs may be higher than current oil purchase costs, it would be highly desirable from a national safety viewpoint.

To help support oil from shale program, consideration should be given to a shale oil development tax on all motor fuel. I have estimated that a \$.05 shale oil development tax on all fuel would raise approximately \$180 million per year. This could be used to subsidize oil shale development.

cc: Secretary Christie Todd Whitman

10812

DOE016-0564

142

Tripodi, Cathy

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 7:09 PM
To: Tripodi, Cathy
Subject: FW: energy tax proposals

Predecisional: draft NEP recommendations

-----Original Message-----

From: Buddy Garland
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2001 11:08 AM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Baldwin, Sam; Abe.Haspel@ee.doe.gov@DOE%HQ-NOTES; Sullivan, John
Subject: RE: energy tax proposals

Joe,

I will contact you when I have some answers.

Thanks,

Buddy

Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL on 04/17/2001 08:41:02 AM

To: Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL

Subject: RE: energy tax proposals

-----Original Message-----

From: Buddy Garland

Sent: Friday, April 13, 2001 4:11 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Sullivan, John; Baldwin, Sam; Steer, Randy; York, Michael; Glatstein, Fred; Zimmerman, MaryBeth; Abe.Haspel@ee.doe.gov@DOE*HQ-NOTES; tomjill@mrisc.com@DOE*HQ-NOTES; Ronen, Amit; Rubin, Joel; Tseng, Phillip
Subject: Re: energy tax proposals

Joe,

Normally, we have a team of about 7 employees in our office + ~20 people in our national laboratory and university community that we would include in a discussion and analysis of this nature. We will try to assemble these people next week and look into the possibilities for offering some tax policies to the Vice President's team.

Thank you.

Buddy Garland

----- Forwarded by Buddy Garland/EE/DOE on 04/13/2001 03:59 PM -----

John Sullivan
04/13/2001 11:19 AM
To: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc: Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: energy tax proposals

We'll do our best Joe. Just got the message. Buddy Garland will give you our best "half-day" response.

Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL on 04/13/2001 08:38:29 AM
To: John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Michael McCabe/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL
cc:

Subject: energy tax proposals

I sent this to Abe yesterday, but I understand he is out so I ask you to respond in his place:

<< File: ATTACHMENT.TXT >> << File: Tax Policy Ideas For VP EPDWG 4-13-01
EERE.doc >>



bpqpf50



bpqpf51

143

2002-001547 Jan 28 P 2:59

(b)(5)

Secretary, The

nb
From: kit_bond@bond.senate.gov
Sent: the.secretary@hq.doe.gov; askdoj@usdoj.gov; president@whitehouse.gov;
To: vice.president@whitehouse.gov; thesec@doc.gov; secretary@state.gov;
Cc: ann.veneman@usda.gov; WalkerD@gao.gov
Subject: release list of energy task force participants

Dear Senator Bond:

Please urge Vice President Cheney to turn over records of participants who helped formulate the Bush Administration's energy policy. The GAO and the American public have a right to know this information.

I suspect that there may be serious corruption going on here and ask for an investigation by your committee. The American public has a right to know what advisers or energy moguls participated in forming the nation's energy policy recommendations. If they were outside parties the policy may well be illegal under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. If Mr. Cheney is not forthcoming with the roster of participants I ask that you pursue action to release this information. This information is even more important and disturbing in light of the recent Enron debacle and it's ties to Karl Rove in the administration, and President Bush's and Vice President Cheney's ties to big oil.

I was disappointed to learn of the selection of Camden Toohey as a special adviser to the Department of the Interior. Mr. Toohey is the director of the pro-oil development group Arctic Power and as such is extremely biased in his viewpoint. I am appalled at the thought of the oil industry conducting the Department of Interior as an enterprize zone.

The selection of John D. Graham as director of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in the office of Management and Budget and the selection of Donald R. Schregardus as Assistant EPA Administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance lead me to believe that many Bush appointees are selected solely on the basis of their political contributions and industry bias without concern for the well-being of the nation.

I ask your support for a full investigation into these participants and appointments. In accordance with the core values of accountability, integrity and reliability this information must be made available to the American public.

Sincerely,

10817

DOE016-0569

Join the world's largest e-mail service with MSN Hotmail. Click Here <http://go.msn.com/bgl/hmtaq4ell_EN.asp>

2001-003217 2/5 A 9:58

(b)(6)

Secretary, The

From: Crackel, Clint [Clint.Crackel@fema.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2001 10:09 AM
To: Vice.president(a)whitehouse.gov
Cc: Secretary, The; 'president(a)whitehouse.gov'; 'speaker(a)mail.house.gov'; 'senatorloti(a)lott.senate.gov'; 'dick(a)durbin.senate.gov'; 'Senator(u)Fitzgerald(a)fitzgerald.senate.gov'; 'governor(a)state.il.us'; 'governor(a)governor.ca.gov'; 'Governor.Tall(a)das.state.oh.us'; 'governor(a)state.mn.us'; 'jmoore(a)icc.state.il.us'; 'mnorris(a)dpsv.state.mn.us'; 'lpaige(a)cagw.org'; 'coclair(a)dps.state.oh.us'; 'ncrowley(a)powercom.net'; 'jfc(a)nei.org'
Subject: FW: Energy Task Force



Martez Norris.vcf

Dear Mr. Vice President:

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

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

Clinton E. Crackel

—Original Message—

From: Martez Norris [mailto:Martez.Norris@state.mn.us]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2001 2:06 PM
To: Clint.Crackel@fema.gov
Subject: Re: FW: Energy Task Force

<<Martez.Norris.vcf>> Good luck with the Task Force position. We sure need a friend. The

Coalition is planning to meet with members of the Task Force soon. Good luck. Martez

Martez Norris

Federal Intervention Legislative Liaison

Minnesota Department of Commerce/

Nuclear Waste Strategy Coalition

85 - 7th Place East, Suite 500

St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Tel: 651.296.0417 Fax: 651.296.5819

Email address: martez.norris@state.mn.us

>>> "Crackel, Clint" <Clint.Crackel@fema.gov> 01/29 2:00 PM >>>

Senator Fitzgerald:

For your information..

—Original Message—

From: Crackel, Clint
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2001 12:54 PM
To: 'vice.president@whitehouse.gov'
Subject: Energy Task Force

Dear Mr. Vice President:

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

Thank you for any consideration you may give to my request.
Clinton E. Crackel

(1/16/02)

144

2001-003634 Feb 7 p 1:16

CR



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20515

JOE SKEEN
2nd DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO

Dear Secretary Abraham,

I wanted to share with you some thoughts on a national energy strategy that we recently sent to the Vice President. I believe this information is critical as you put together your 2002 budget.



JOE SKEEN

10821

DOE016-0573

C. W. BILL YOUNG, FLORIDA, CHAIRMAN
 RALPH REGULA, OHIO
 JERRY LEWIS, CALIFORNIA
 JONAS EDWARDS PORTER, ILLINOIS
 HAROLD ROGERS, NEW YORK
 JOE SKEEN, NEW MEXICO
 FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
 TOM DELAY, TEXAS
 JIM ROUSE, ARIZONA
 DON FACIARD, CALIFORNIA
 SONNY CALLAHAN, ALABAMA
 JAMES T. WALSH, NEW YORK
 CHARLES W. TAYLOR, NORTH CAROLINA
 DAVID L. HOESON, OHIO
 FRANK J. STONE, JR., OKLAHOMA
 HENRY BONILLA, TEXAS
 JOE MANLISBERG, MICHIGAN
 DAN MILLER, FLORIDA
 JAY BYRNE, ARIZONA
 JACK ERNSTON, GEORGIA
 ROBERT P. BREAUGH, NEW JERSEY
 ROGER F. WICKER, MISSISSIPPI
 GEORGE R. METSKUTZ, JR., WASHINGTON
 RANDY "Duke" CLARK, CALIFORNIA
 TODD TANKY, CALIFORNIA
 ZACH WAMP, TENNESSEE
 TOM LATHAM, IOWA
 ARNE M. NORTHUP, KENTUCKY
 ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, ALABAMA
 JO ANN EMERSON, MISSOURI
 JOHN E. SUNUNU, NEW HAMPSHIRE
 LAY GRANGER, TEXAS
 JOHN E. PETERSON, PENNSYLVANIA
 WYCA H. GOODE, JR., VIRGINIA

Congress of the United States
 House of Representatives
 Committee on Appropriations
 Washington, DC 20515-6015

January 31, 2001


DAN R. BURTON, INDIANA
 JIM COOPER, NORTH CAROLINA
 NORMAN D. DICK, ARIZONA
 MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., MISSISSIPPI
 JIMMYE L. HAWKINS, MISSISSIPPI
 ALAN W. BENTLEY, MISSISSIPPI
 MARK E. SWAN, MISSISSIPPI
 NANCY M. PELLER, CALIFORNIA
 PETER W. RODINO, CALIFORNIA
 NICK ANTONIO, CALIFORNIA
 JOE L. BARTON, TEXAS
 RONALD L. DENNIS, TEXAS
 JAMES P. BROWN, VIRGINIA
 JAMES H. CLAYTON, MASSACHUSETTS
 ED PASTOR, ARIZONA
 CAROL P. MILLER, FLORIDA
 DAVID PRICE, NORTH CAROLINA
 MICHAEL P. FORBES, NEW YORK
 CHEY EDWARDS, TEXAS
 HOWARD "BUCK" CLARK, ALABAMA
 WALLACE D. SMITH, NEW YORK
 LUCILLE HORTON ALLARD, CALIFORNIA
 SAM FARR, CALIFORNIA
 JESSE J. JACKSON, JR., MISSISSIPPI
 ANDREW HOPKINS, MICHIGAN
 ALLEN BYRD, TEXAS
 CLERK AND STAFF DIRECTOR
 JAMES W. TAYLOR
 TELEPHONE
 202-225-2111


The Honorable Richard Cheney
 Vice President of the United States
 The White House
 Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Vice President Cheney:

As you assume your new responsibilities as head of the national energy taskforce, we wanted to take this opportunity to share with you some of our thoughts on the need for a national energy strategy. These ideas are based on our long history of funding energy research through the Interior appropriations bill. As current and past chairmen of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and longstanding members of that committee prior to our chairmanships, we have seen many attempts at formulating a national energy policy by previous administrations.

Our views on what needs to be done and why past strategies have failed are outlined in the enclosed documents. We stand ready to assist you in any way we can in addressing this important issue, which is critical to the economic health of this nation and the worldwide well being of the environment.


 Ralph Regula
 Subcommittee on Interior
 and Related Agencies

Sincerely,

 Joe Skeen
 Chairman
 Subcommittee on Interior
 and Related Agencies

Energy and the Lack of a Comprehensive National Strategy

The current problems with electricity deregulation in California illustrate several problems with the Federal approach to addressing the energy situation in this country and worldwide. The biggest problem is that the country is dependent on fossil fuels – coal oil and natural gas – to supply the vast majority of our energy needs now and for the foreseeable future. Instead of focusing efforts on how to use these fossil fuels more efficiently and more cleanly, the majority of energy research has been focused on finding “magic bullets” that will substitute for fossil fuels.

Renewable and alternative fuels do need to be developed, and research should be continued in those areas. However, these alternatives are not capable of replacing fossil fuels to any great extent over the next couple of decades. Many in the environmental community (and in government) have oversold the promise of renewables and alternative fuels. Meanwhile, the energy infrastructure in this country has not kept pace with demand and we have created disincentives to improving and siting new technologies that would improve the efficiency and cleanliness of fossil fuels.

A comprehensive national energy strategy needs to be developed that acknowledges the importance of improving fossil fuel technology at the same time as continuing research on renewable energy and alternative fuels. Also, there needs to be an immediate, independent objective review of “what happened” in electricity deregulation in California.

Federal research is only a part of the answer to the energy situation. We have invested nearly \$25 billion in energy conservation and fossil energy research through the Interior appropriations bill alone since the founding of the Department of Energy in 1977. Have we gotten \$25 billion worth of results? We need a framework for where we invest research funding in the future and that framework should be based on the energy needs of the country and the relative contribution of the various energy sources.

There are several initiatives that have been funded under the Interior bill that should be continued and expanded. They include natural gas infrastructure improvements, technology improvements to extend the life and productivity of existing oil fields, fuel cell research for electric power generation and for transportation applications in cars and trucks, methane

hydrates research, and a new power plant improvement initiative for coal-fired power plants.

The power plant improvement initiative recognizes that more than half of our electricity is generated by coal and will continue to be so for decades to come. As the U.S. electric power industry transitions to a new and competitive business structure, the demands on existing coal-fired power plants are changing. These plants must achieve greater efficiency and reduce carbon dioxide and other emissions. Advanced technologies need to be developed and applied to existing and new power plants.

Whatever energy strategy is developed needs to recognize that the Federal government can't "do it all". We need to work cooperatively with industry so that Federal research makes sense and is a joint government/industry effort. The energy strategy also needs to recognize that most of the major energy breakthroughs that have been achieved have come from industrial research efforts and from small entrepreneurs in the private sector and not from Federal research investments.

Conservation efforts need to be continued but conservation is no replacement for aging infrastructure; nor can it adequately address ever-increasing demand. The basis for a national energy policy that will work needs to be a realistic view of the current and future market share for the various fossil fuels and for renewable and alternative fuels. All the various energy strategies that have been put forth to date have failed because they have been based on the flawed premise that conservation and renewable and alternative fuels can substantially displace our reliance on fossil fuels. That is a myth that needs to be debunked. Conservation and renewable and alternative fuels research need to be appropriately integrated with fossil fuels research and improved technology.

Attached are some remarks that Congressman Ralph Regula recently made on the House floor on this issue. The data are compelling. Now is the time to move forward boldly with a balanced, rational, national energy policy.

The Need for a National Energy Policy
Remarks by Congressman Ralph Regula, OH
January 2001

The current situation with rising electric power prices and power outages on the West Coast comes on the heels of the price spikes and tight supply of crude oil that we've been experiencing over the past year and the resultant large increases in the prices for natural gas, heating oil and gasoline. I challenge each member of this chamber to join with me in working with the next Administration to develop and implement a reasoned and balanced **National Energy Policy** in the 107th Congress.

We import 52% of our petroleum today and by 2020 that number is projected to increase to 64%. Demand keeps going up and supply is, at best, remaining level. Refinery capacity in this country is pretty much "maxed out" and no new refineries appear likely in the current regulatory climate. We need to address this problem now.

New oil and gas pipelines and new electric power generating capacity also need to be put on a "fast track" to keep pace with demand. We need to **remove disincentives** to siting new and improved "clean energy" technology that will reduce energy use and lower harmful emissions. At the same time, we need to continue to develop alternative sources of energy such as wind, solar and geothermal energy.

About 85% of U.S. energy use today comes from traditional fuel sources – coal, oil, natural gas – and that market share is expected to reach nearly 90% by 2020 as nuclear power generation declines. Alternative fuel sources provide less than 7 percent of the total energy used in this country and that percentage is not expected to increase over the next 20 years. As energy consumption in this country increases, the use of alternative fuels will increase but so will the use of traditional fuel sources.

Some in this chamber have advocated eliminating all research on traditional fuel sources. These same individuals also advocate huge increases in alternative energy research. We need to have reasonable **funding increases in traditional energy research** and we need to bring greater focus to our research on alternative energy so that we pursue the most promising alternatives aggressively and terminate or scale back other alternative fuels research.

Our recent history in this area has not been good. We have under funded traditional energy fuels research and this under funding has contributed to our **current short supply and escalating price situation**. At the same time, we have continued to increase and widely disperse alternative fuels research into literally thousands of different projects. **Many of these alternatives have proved to be unrealistic, yet we continue to fund them.**

We need to work on "hybrid" technology that combines the use of traditional fuel sources with alternative sources of energy. This "combination" technology shows great promise for many applications in the short term. A couple of examples are: fuel cells that can use natural gas or propane as a fuel source to supply the power needs of residential and small commercial buildings; and a **combination gasoline and electric power or diesel and electric power hybrid system for cars and trucks that can achieve substantially greater miles per gallon than existing vehicles.**

Unfortunately, at times like these, the answers many folks turn to are "band aid fixes" to address regional problems like electric power shortages in the West and heating oil shortages in the Northeast. Once the crisis passes, memories fade and we are left, yet again, with no far-reaching, longer-term solution to the U.S. energy situation.

There are many opportunities for the **Department of Energy to work with the Environmental Protection Agency** in regulatory areas that directly affect energy production and use. DOE does work cooperatively with EPA now but much more needs to be done to address inconsistencies in programs in the two agencies.

In particular, the two agencies should collaborate on a "Four Pollutant Strategy" to address emissions from existing electric power plants of SO₂, NO_x, mercury and CO₂. In addition, EPA's proposed "Air-Water Interface Work Plan" should be coordinated closely with DOE in assessing the potential impact of emissions from the electric utility sector on water quality and in determining the need for further regulation.

EPA is also developing policies that would **marginally reduce NO_x and air toxics from clean burning natural gas power plants**. Unfortunately, these rules may raise the operational costs of these plants so much that there could be an incentive to switch to other fuels. We need to make sure that

well-intentioned efforts to reduce emissions don't raise power costs for clean burning fuels while encouraging shifts to fuels with greater emissions. DOE needs to work very closely with EPA on this policy.

EPA also needs to work closely with DOE in formulating **cooling water intake regulations for existing electric power generation facilities and for existing petroleum refineries**. Existing plants have fewer compliance options and much greater mitigation costs than new plants. The economic impact of an overly stringent rule for existing sources could trigger another energy crisis in this country.

In 1999, U.S. consumers used 4 times as much gasoline as we did 50 years ago. We consume over 19 million barrels of petroleum a day in this country, about 59 billion cubic feet of natural gas and nearly 3 million short tons of coal. The U.S. has only 4.5% of the world's population but we account for 26% of worldwide petroleum consumption, 26% of total natural gas use and 21% of total coal use. We need to use technology to help us get our jobs done and retain our lifestyle while using less energy. Many of these technologies are available now and many more are on the horizon. The consumer needs to know how to get access to them and, with today's Internet society, there is no excuse for not getting the word out.

We leave 2 barrels of oil in the ground for every barrel we produce. We can do better and we need to support research that will help improve domestic production of oil. We have more coal in this country than the rest of the world has recoverable oil. Coal is an excellent energy source and we should be supporting research that will ultimately provide us with zero emissions coal-fired power plants.

We can't ignore the international market either. Our energy strategy needs to acknowledge the importance of the international situation because issues like global warming and carbon sequestration cannot be addressed in isolation by U.S. policy.

One-third of the world population – 2 billion people – lack access to electric power. Current electric power capacity will have to be tripled over the next 50 years to meet global demand. The worldwide market for new power generation equipment is expected to be \$2 trillion a decade for at least the next 5 decades.

China and India are going to be primarily dependent on coal. China alone plans to build 8 to 10 power plants a year over the next 20 years – 75% of which will burn coal. If you are really concerned about the environment, this is where the rubber meets the road. We need clean technology for electric power generation. We also need U.S. technology that will compete successfully in the international marketplace if we are to be a major player in cleaning up the environment.

We need a National Energy Policy that does not pit traditional fuels against alternatives fuel sources. We need to look at the whole range of technologies. That is the message we should deliver in the 107th Congress.

005333

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ



ENERGY AND RESOURCES GROUP
310 BARROWS HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CA 94720-3050
ER.G. <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/erg>

DANIEL M. KAMMEN
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENERGY AND SOCIETY
DIRECTOR
RENEWABLE AND APPROPRIATE ENERGY LAB (RAEL)
EMAIL: dkammen@socrates.berkeley.edu
PERSONAL <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~dkammen>
RAEL <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~rael>
TEL (510) 642-1139 (Office)
TEL (510) 643-2243 (RAEL)
FAX (510) 642-1085

2001-005333 2/26/01 4:28

February 16, 2001

The Honorable Richard Cheney, Vice President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Vice President Cheney:

We applaud your efforts as you begin a comprehensive review of U.S. energy policy. This critical initiative is long overdue, and is particularly relevant today as the California energy crisis illustrates the deficiencies in regional and national energy policy and planning. Additionally, as the threat of global climate change is becoming widely acknowledged in the U.S. there is a growing understanding that a responsible national energy policy includes a global climate change mitigation strategy that can be environmentally effective and economically advantageous.

We are concerned that the current crisis mentality pervading the discussions of energy issues in the country has fostered an ill-founded rush for "quick fix" solutions that, while politically expedient, will ultimately do the country more harm than good. It is critical to examine all energy options. The potential for renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency to have a significant positive impact on our energy future is such an example of an opportunity that demands far greater examination and commitment to implementation than we have seen to date.

In the last decade the case for renewable energy has become compelling economically, socially, and environmentally. For many years renewables were seen as environmentally and socially attractive options that at best occupied niche markets due to barriers of cost and available infrastructure. That situation has dramatically changed. Renewable energy resources and technologies – notably solar, wind, small-scale hydro, and biomass based energy, as well as advanced energy conversion devices such as fuel cells – have undergone a revolution in technological innovation, cost improvements, and in our understanding and analysis of appropriate applications. There are now a number of energy sources, conversion technologies, and applications, where renewable energy options are either equal,

10829

or better, in price, and equal, or better, in services provided than are the prevailing coal, oil, and gas technologies. For example, in a growing number of settings in industrialized nations, wind energy is now the *least cost* option across *all* energy technologies with the added benefits of being quick to install and bring on-line, and modular. In fact, some farmers in the Midwest can generate more income per hectare from the electricity generated by a wind turbine on their land than from their crop or ranching proceeds. Furthermore, photovoltaic panels and solar hot water heaters placed on buildings and houses across America could help reduce consumers' energy costs, produce a healthier living environment, and increase our energy supply while stabilizing our energy demand.

California's energy crisis has recently caught the national attention and raised fundamental questions about regional and national energy strategies. Rising demand suggests the need for new energy supplies, and certainly some new energy capacity is needed. However, there is a wide range of options for achieving supply and demand balance, and some of these options are not being given adequate attention. Governor Davis in California is now emphasizing policies that put the state into the position of brokering power purchases. Not only is this unlikely to be economically efficient, it fails to address the underlying problems of market manipulation and under-investment in capacity expansion of new, clean, technology development and installation. We believe that statewide, public sector investment in renewable energy generation, combined with increased municipal control of electricity production and retail sales, would offer a better and more meaningful long-term solution to the problems that electricity deregulation has raised.

In general, the absence of past state and federal leadership has meant that we have seen too few incentives for energy conservation and efficiency measures, little attention to appropriate power plant siting issues, and lack of long-term concern for transmission and distribution bottlenecks. At the national level drilling for oil in Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one step that could be taken to increase oil supplies. Yet, it would have a *negligible* effect on electricity production, and would not significantly reduce oil prices, improve energy security, or alleviate the trade deficit. Any oil and gas found will be trivial in comparison with global production and long-term U.S. consumption. This combined with the economic and environmental costs of such a proposal make disrupting the Arctic Refuge an unnecessary step, and illustrate a lack of integrated energy planning.

We firmly believe that the ultimate solutions to meeting our nation's energy needs must be based on private sector investment, bolstered by well-targeted government support such as tax incentives for emerging energy technologies and R&D. This must be coupled with policies that *open* markets to new generating capacity, rather than through federal subsidies for programs to increase energy supply using already mature technologies. This latter strategy would only generate near-term and incremental paybacks, while doing little to promote energy security or advance social and environmental goals. Instead, we now have the opportunity to build a sustainable future by engaging and stimulating the tremendous innovative and entrepreneurial capacity of the U.S. private sector. To accomplish this, we must develop policies that guarantee a stable and predictable economic environment for advancing clean energy technologies. This can be further bolstered by market incentives to reward actions that advance the public good. The Federal Energy Task Force has the opportunity to clarify federal policies, build a sustainable energy research base, encourage state and regional initiatives, and build dynamic markets and industries focused on clean energy options. With these thoughts in mind, we present several options that address both the short-term need to increase

energy supply and the long-term goal to have a sustainable, economic and environmentally sound U.S. energy policy.


- **Increase federal R&D funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.** To date, federal investment in renewable energy and energy efficient technologies has been sparse and erratic, with each year producing an appropriations battle that is often lost. The resulting financial and policy uncertainty discourages effective energy technology development and deployment in the marketplace. With energy now a clear national priority, funding for the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Program must be substantially and systematically increased. The realization that R&D funding provides a critical driver to economic growth resulted in important commitments, particularly in the life sciences, to doubling R&D funding in five years. The same return on investment exists in the energy sector, but it has not been translated into similarly increased R&D funding for new renewable and energy efficiency technologies. If the U.S. expects to be a world leader in this industry, as it is in the biomedical and high-tech sectors, such investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency are essential. (See Appendix, Note 1)
- **Provide tax credits in addition to tax cuts for companies developing and using renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.** The R&D tax credit has proven remarkably effective and popular with private industry, so much so that there is a strong consensus in both Congress and the Administration to make this credit permanent. Clean energy must be a national priority, and given the importance of private sector R&D in commercializing new technologies, an additional tax incentive for R&D investment in renewable and energy efficiency technologies is exactly the type of well-targeted federal policy that is needed. Furthermore, tax incentives directed toward those who use the technologies would provide the 'demand pull' to accelerate the technology transfer process and rate of market development. The U.S. has largely lost its position as the global leader in energy innovation resulting in the loss of jobs and earning potential for U.S. companies precisely at the time when the international market for clean energy technologies is booming. Our domestic industries as well as the global energy economy would both benefit directly from a renewed commitment to U.S. clean energy leadership.
- **Institute improved efficiency standards for residential and commercial water heating and space heating and cooling, and motors and appliances.** Significant advances in heating and cooling system efficiency, and for motors and many appliances, have been made, but more improvements are technologically possible and economically feasible. A clear federal statement of desired improvements in system efficiency is needed to remove uncertainty and reduce the economic costs of implementing these changes. If such a federal mandate existed then efficiency standards for heating and cooling, and for motors and appliances would begin to gradually increase, helping to expand the market share of existing high efficiency systems, as well as spurring a wealth of further improvements. (See Appendix, Note 2)
- **A federal renewable portfolio standard (RPS) to help build renewable energy markets.** The RPS is a renewable energy content standard, akin to efficiency standards for vehicles and appliances that have proven successful in the past. A gradually increasing RPS is an economic way of ensuring that a growing proportion of electricity sales are provided by renewable energy, and is designed to integrate renewables into the marketplace in the most cost-effective fashion.

In this manner, the market picks the winning and losing technologies and projects, not administrators. We recommend a 20 - 25 percent renewable energy component within ten to fifteen years, using market dynamics to stimulate innovation through an active trading program of renewable energy credits. (See Appendix, Note 3)


- **Federal standards for net metering of distributed small-scale energy generation.** Net metering allows customers to interconnect and feed surplus power back into the grid during periods when generation exceeds the customer's own use. Such a system makes it easier and more affordable for customers to generate their own power from renewable energy sources or other distributed generation technologies. The use of net metering benefits customers, utilities, and independent power providers, and is particularly important for intermittent renewable sources, such as solar and small wind machines, which generate electricity only when the resource is available. A uniform federal standard is needed to replace the confusing and disparate array of state net metering programs currently in existence. (See Appendix, Note 4)
- **Form a National Public Benefits Fund based on revenue collected from a national, competitively neutral wires charge.** Such a fund could match state funds to assist in continuing or expanding energy efficiency, low-income services, the deployment of renewables, research and development, and similar public purpose programs the costs of which have traditionally been incorporated into electricity rates by regulated utilities. As the utilities have moved toward deregulation such public benefit funds have been disappearing.
- **Improve federal standards for vehicle fuel economy.** New hybrid vehicle technologies are beginning to enter the marketplace, offering significant improvements in vehicle fuel economy at modest incremental vehicle costs. Looking beyond the initial wave of gasoline hybrid vehicles, fuel cell vehicles are currently under active development by all of the large automakers and promise even higher efficiencies and still lower emission levels. The improvements in fuel economy that these new vehicle types offer would help to slow growth in petroleum demand, reducing our oil import dependency and trade deficit. While the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles helped to generate some vehicle technology advances, an increase in the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standard is required to provide an incentive for companies to bring these new vehicles rapidly to market. The potential for future hybrid and fuel cell vehicles to achieve over 100 miles per gallon is believed to be both technically and economically viable in the near-term, and needs only clear federal guidelines and support to move from planning to reality. (See Appendix, Note 5)
- **Integrate domestic energy and environmental planning with U.S. global leadership.** The need for leadership on the global climate issue has become particularly apparent with the lack of international cooperation at the recent climate meeting in The Hague. Past domestic political opposition to U.S. leadership in this area was based on outdated views of the science and economics of climate change. It is now widely understood that the costs of inaction on global warming can be catastrophic, while the benefits of actions to reduce the environmental impacts of energy use through new innovation, developing clean energy industries, and improving domestic air quality and health can be substantial. This represents the classic 'win-win' scenario. Significant action on climate change mitigation now appears unlikely unless the U.S. takes on a significant leadership role. (See Appendix, Note 6)

If we hope to enjoy the type of prosperity in the coming century as we have in the past the work of the Task Force on Energy in formulating a new national energy policy must be carried out with careful consideration. We commend you for this auspicious undertaking and would be happy to elaborate further on any of the points raised above. Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in at this critical juncture in our country's history.


Sincerely,



Professor Daniel M. Kammen, Director
Renewable and Appropriate Energy Laboratory
Email: dkammen@socrates.berkeley.edu



Dr. Antonia V. Herzog
University of California President's Postdoctoral Fellow
Email: aherzog@socrates.berkeley.edu



Dr. Timothy E. Lipman
Postdoctoral Fellow, RAEL
Email: telipman@socrates.berkeley.edu

Cc:

Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy
Governor Gray Davis, Governor of California
Rosina Bierbaum, Acting Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy
Senator Frank H. Murkowski, Chairman, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Senator Jeff Bingaman, Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Hon. W.J. "Billy" Tauzin, Chairman House, Committee on Energy and Commerce
Hon. John D. Dingell, Ranking Member House, Committee on Energy and Commerce

10833

Appendix: Supporting Materials and References

Many of the publications listed below are available on line at the Renewable and Appropriate Energy Laboratory's (RAEL) Internet site. The Publications Page is:
<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~tacl/papers.html>

Note 1: Federal R&D funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies

Federal funding and leadership for renewable energy and energy efficiency projects has resulted in a small number of notable successes, such as the *Energy Star* and *Green Lights Programs* that has now been emulated in a number of countries. Despite these achievements, funding in this area has been both scant, and so uneven that private sector involvement has been actually discouraged. A combination of a federal program for steadily increasing funding and active political leadership would transform the clean energy sector from a good idea to a pillar of the new economy. In particular, promising technologies such as fuel cells deserve special attention. Fuel cell development is attracting significant public and private funding and offers the promise of being a keystone technology for the ultimate transition from natural gas, petroleum, and coal energy to a renewable and hydrogen based energy economy.

Duke, R. D., and Kammen, D. M. (1999), "The economics of energy market transformation initiatives", *The Energy Journal*, 20, pages 15 - 64.

Kammen, D. M. and Margolis, R. M. (1999) "Evidence of Under-Investment in Energy R&D Policy in the United States and the Impact of Federal Policy," *Energy Policy*, 27 pages 575 - 584.

Margolis, R. M. and Kammen, D. M. (1999) "Underinvestment: The Energy Technology and R&D Policy Challenge," *Science*, 285, pages 690 - 693.

President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) (1997) *Federal Energy Research and Development for the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century* (Washington, D.C.: Energy Research and Development Panel, President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology), November.

A second, and related issue is the structure of the Department of Energy itself. We have hindered, even crippled, the ability of the Department of Energy to investigate, promote and champion innovation in the energy sector by focusing much of its activities on the clean-up of the legacy of nuclear energy research and waste. While this is an important mission, it dominates the resources of the Department of Energy and prevents the focus from moving to current and future energy needs and opportunities. A separation of these functions is in order.

Note 2: Efficiency standards for residential and commercial water heating and space heating and cooling, and motors and appliances.

A confluence of technical advances and economic and policy mechanisms now exists that could be utilized to dramatically reduce domestic, commercial and industrial energy needs. Federal leadership and partnership programs with state and regional organizations could produce dramatic improvements and cost reductions.

Interlaboratory Working Group (2000) *Scenarios for a Clean Energy Future* (Oak Ridge, TN; Oak Ridge National Laboratory and Berkeley, CA; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory), ORNL/CON-476 and LBNL-44029, November.

Note 3: A federal Renewable Portfolio Standard

All federal RPS proposals should use tradable renewable energy credits for compliance. Renewable credit trading is analogous to the sulfur allowance trading system established in the Clean Air Act. Like emissions trading, it is designed to be administratively simple and to increase flexibility and decrease the cost of compliance with the standard. Electricity suppliers can generate renewable electricity themselves, purchase renewable electricity and credits from generators, or buy credits in a secondary trading market.

The RPS is the surest mechanism for securing the public benefits of renewables and for reducing their cost to enable them to become more competitive. It is a market mechanism, setting a uniform standard and allowing companies to determine the best way to meet it. The RPS will reduce renewable energy costs by:

- Providing a revenue stream that will enable manufacturers and developers to obtain reasonable cost financing and make investments in expanding capacity to meet an expanding renewable energy market.
- Allowing economies of scale in manufacturing, installation, operation and maintenance of renewable energy facilities.
- Promoting vigorous competition among renewable energy developers and technologies to meet the standard at the lowest cost.
- Inducing development of renewables in the regions of the country where they are the most cost-effective, while avoiding expensive long-distance transmission, by allowing national renewable energy credit trading.
- Reducing transaction costs, by enabling suppliers to buy credits and avoid having to negotiate many small contracts with individual renewable energy projects.

Clemmer, S.L., Noguee, A., and Brower, M. (1999) "A Powerful Opportunity: Making Renewable Electricity the Standard," Union of Concerned Scientists, January.

Note 4: Federal standards for net metering

Net metering eliminates the administrative expense of installing, reading, and billing for an additional meter to measure generation separately from consumption. During surplus generation

periods, the single meter spins backwards, so that the customer is billed only for the net amount of electricity consumed during a billing period. By facilitating small-scale generation by customers, net metering will help reduce loads on central generation, transmission and distribution, enhancing reliability as well as fuel diversity.

Wan, Y. (1996) *Net Metering Programs*, NREL/SP-460-21651, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, December.

Note 5: Improved federal standards for vehicle fuel economy

After five years of Congressional bans, studies on the potential for increases in CAFE standards to cost-effectively reduce petroleum demand are now underway by the Department of Transportation and the National Academy of Sciences. These studies, with results due in July 2001, will help to suggest optimal levels of increased standards, given the costs and benefits of higher fuel economy, as well as phase-in schedules that will protect the competitive interests of domestic automakers. The issue of raising CAFE standards is becoming increasingly relevant with progress in the PNGV program, and as several automakers are preparing to introduce high-efficiency fuel cell vehicles beginning as soon as 2003-2004.

Dulcep, K. G. (1997) "Evolutionary and Revolutionary Technologies for Improving Fuel Economy," *Transportation, Energy, and Environment: How Far Can Technology Take Us?*, Edited by J. DeCicco and M. Delucchi, ACEEE, Washington, D.C.

Mark, J. (1999) "Greener SUVs: A Blueprint for Cleaner, More Efficient Light Trucks," Union of Concerned Scientists, July.

Office of Technology Assessment (1995) *Advanced Vehicle Technology: Visions of a Super-Efficient Family Car*, OTA-ETI-638, Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C., September.

Note 6: Climate change and the need for federal leadership

The U.S. can reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while improving our economic efficiency, creating jobs and saving consumers money, maintaining our technological leadership, and achieving other environmental benefits. The options presented in this letter not only represent a responsible energy strategy, but can also simultaneously address the need to reduce U.S. GHG emissions. In particular, they would support a range of strategies to reduce power plant emissions, which account for a substantial percentage of total U.S. emissions of greenhouse gases, 29 percent in 1998. These include switching from our current reliance on high-carbon fossil fuels, particularly coal and oil, to renewable fuel sources, which have zero carbon emissions, and lower-carbon natural gas; and increasing the efficiency of electricity generation and use.

We strongly support the recent initiatives in Congress, for which the current Administration has indicated it's backing, to reduce pollutant emissions from electricity generation. In the 106th Congress Senator Jeffords and Senator Lieberman introduced, S.1369, the Clean Energy Act of

1999. This legislation contained provisions that addressed the environmental damage and competitive distortions created by the patchwork of unequal and inadequate standards that currently apply to electric power plants nationwide. The bill put a national cap on emissions from all power plants of nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, mercury, and carbon dioxide. The reductions in carbon dioxide would have brought emissions levels back to 1990 levels by 2005, the same level implied by the non-binding targets of the Rio Treaty of 1992, as ratified by the U.S. Senate. Legislation that controls the four major power plant pollutants in an integrated package will help reduce uncertainties for electric generators and will be less costly than separate programs for each pollutant. Integrated control encourages system-wide efficiency improvements and increased utilization of cleaner fuels. And while voluntary action by American companies is an attractive option to consider, in the last ten years voluntary actions have failed to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in the U.S. Instead, emissions have increased by 15 percent since 1990 and continue to increase.

Baer, P., Harte, J., Haya, B., Herzog, A.V., Holdren, J., Hultman, N.E., Kammen, D.M., Norgaard, R.B., and Raymond, L. (2000) "Equity and Greenhouse Gas Responsibility," *Science*, 289, page 2287.

Interlaboratory Working Group (2000) *Scenarios for a Clean Energy Future*, (Oak Ridge, TN; Oak Ridge National Laboratory and Berkeley, CA; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory), ORNL/CON-476 and LBNL-44029, November.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) (2001) *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis*, January.

Kinzig, A. P. and Kammen, D. M. (1998) "National trajectories of carbon emissions: Analysis of proposals to foster the transition to low-carbon economies", *Global Environmental Change*, 8 (3), pages 183 - 208.

Natural Resources Defense Council (2001) *A Responsible Energy Policy for the 21st Century*, February.

008020



RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

P. O. BOX 12967
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711-2967
512/463-7140
FAX 512/463-7161

CHARLES R. MATTHEWS
COMMISSIONER

March 21, 2001

2001-008020 3/26 P 12:05

The Honorable Richard Cheney
Vice President of the United States
Chairman, National Energy Policy Development Group
Room 283
Old Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20501

Re: Cross-Border Pipeline Project

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Please accept my congratulations on your election as the Vice President of the United States and on your assignment to the President's National Energy Policy Development Group. I enjoyed our association while you were in Texas, and I truly empathize with you regarding the daunting task before your Group. As a Texas Railroad Commissioner, I am acutely aware of the energy problems confronting the State of Texas and the nation and have been working to devise policies to help the industry meet the growing demand for natural gas and provide customers reliable and reasonably priced energy. As you are developing your recommendations for the nation's new energy strategy, I want to offer for your consideration a project that we have just initiated in Texas to streamline cross-border pipeline projects.

The state agencies responsible for permitting international cross-border pipelines entered into a memorandum of understanding, which was finalized on March 20, 2001, designating the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC) as the central conduit for state permits. This means that any entity that intends to build a pipeline across the border between Texas and Mexico will have to deal with only one state agency in acquiring all of the permits required by the various Texas state agencies. I recommend that the federal government encourage the other states bordering Mexico to follow suit and designate one contact agency for permitting. Further, I recommend that the federal government use that state-designated agency as the contact for all federally required permits for cross-border pipeline projects between that specific state and Mexico. In this way, a private entity would deal with only one governmental agency, and that agency would then deal with all of the other state and federal permitting agencies.

10838

The Honorable Richard Cheney

March 21, 2001

Page Two

The benefits received by this single window approach are numerous. Many of the steps required by the various regulatory agencies involved in cross-border energy projects could be eliminated and/or consolidated, thus reducing the overall time and cost associated with the permitting process.

The idea for a single window approach developed during collaborative efforts, which began in 1997, between the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC) and the Comision Reguladora de Energia (CRE), the agency in charge of the regulation of natural gas, LPG, and electric power industries in Mexico. In 2000, RRC staff members and I traveled to Mexico City to meet with the CRE and the Instituto Nacional de Ecologia (INA) to discuss the natural gas issues confronting the two nations. As a result of those meetings and subsequent discussions with CRE, we identified the need to build pipelines to transport natural gas between the two countries as a high priority. Currently, there are seven natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico, having a total capacity of 1610 MMcf per day. Of this, 1270 MMcf per day has bi-directional capability. To have viable commerce between the two countries, much more capacity must be built.

In the course of our discussions, we discovered that a major obstacle to building pipelines was the large number of state and federal regulatory entities involved in the permitting process. On just the United States side of the Texas-Mexico border, there are six federal agencies (International Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Region IV of the USEPA, Department of Energy, FERC, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife); and four state agencies (Railroad Commission of Texas, Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, Texas General Land Office, and Texas Historic Commission) from which permits must be obtained. The permitting process is both expensive and time-consuming. Consequently, reducing the number of agencies an applicant must contact would expedite the permitting process. The quality of regulatory oversight would not be compromised, but the applicant would be required to have a face-to-face relationship with only one agency, and that agency in turn, would work with all of the other agencies involved in the process.

There are two primary reasons for having state rather than federal agencies serve as the conduits for all state and federal permits. First, each of the border states has a greater vested interest than the federal government in the successful completion of cross-border pipelines. Because of their proximity to Mexico, the border states have strong economic and cultural ties to Mexico. Second, based on my discussions with the CRE, the CRE would prefer to deal with the border states than with the federal government.

I believe that the construction of pipelines is just the first step in developing energy related projects between the United States and Mexico that will be beneficial to both countries. The new pipelines should stimulate more interest in Mexico to further develop their gas fields. The pipelines also will help alleviate some of the tanker truck traffic on Texas highways. For

10839

DOE016-0591

The Honorable Richard Cheney
March 21, 2001
Page Three

example, one company has already approached the RRC for help in obtaining a permit for a multi-line system to export butane, propane, and natural gas into Mexico. That company estimates its proposed pipeline will eliminate the need for approximately 200 trucks each day.

I strongly urge you to consider this recommendation. In the short-term, the pipelines would most likely not help alleviate the energy crisis because most of the gas would flow from the United States producing states into Mexico; however, in the long-run, and I agree with President Bush that we must plan for the long-run, the flow across these pipelines should be reversed, and these cross-border pipelines would transport much-needed gas produced in Mexico into the United States.

For your convenience, I have attached copies of the Texas Memorandum of Understanding, the list of permitting agencies, and other related information. If you have any questions regarding this recommendation or if I can assist you in any manner, please contact me at (512)463-7140 or Melissa Columbus at (512)463-7142.

Sincerely,



Charles R. Matthews
Commissioner

Cc: The Honorable Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy ✓
The Honorable Donald Evans, Secretary of Commerce

10840

DOE016-0592

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AMONG THE OFFICE OF
THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF
TEXAS, THE TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION, THE TEXAS
GENERAL LAND OFFICE, THE TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE
CONSERVATION COMMISSION, AND THE TEXAS PUBLIC UTILITY
COMMISSION**

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (Memorandum) is made and entered into among The Office of the Secretary of State, The Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC), The Texas Historical Commission (THC), the Texas General Land Office (GLO), the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC), and the Texas Public Utility Commission (PUC).

WHEREAS, The Office of the Secretary of State recognizes, with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico, that the energy needs of the citizens of Texas and Mexico can be met more efficiently if the permitting process in the State of Texas were organized in a manner that reduces the number of agency contacts a potential permittee must make and assures that the potential permittee secures all appropriate permits;

WHEREAS, The Office of the Secretary of State, on the advice and consent of the other parties to this Memorandum, further recognizes the RRC is particularly well-equipped to serve as the central state agency that reduces the number of agency contacts a potential permittee must make and assures that the potential permittee secures all appropriate permits for building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico;

WHEREAS, the RRC is responsible for issuing Hydrostatic Test water discharge permits, issuing opinions to the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) concerning Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification, and assuming responsibility for reviewing USACE Section 10 navigability clearance with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico;

WHEREAS, the THC in its role as the State Historic Preservation Office, is responsible for ensuring that adverse effects on historic properties are avoided or minimized with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico;

WHEREAS, with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico, the GLO is responsible for issuing easements for portions of the Rio Grande River that have not been deeded to the United States government;

WHEREAS, the TNRCC is responsible for issuing permits to withdraw United States-owned water from the Rio Grande River, its tributaries, and any other Texas stream for hydrostatic testing and permits for operations of certain pipeline facilities which emit air contaminants with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico;

WHEREAS, the PUC does not issue permits with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico, but may in some instances play a role in such projects;

WHEREAS, the RRC, THC, GLO, TNRCC and PUC recognize that, with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico, the permit requirements from the various State agencies are necessary to protect public health and safety and cultural resources; and,

WHEREAS, the RRC, THC, GLO, TNRCC and PUC fully concur with The Office of the Texas Secretary of State that, with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico, the energy needs of the citizens of Texas and Mexico can be met more efficiently if the permitting process in the State of Texas were organized in a manner that reduces the number of agency contacts a potential permittee must make and assures that the potential permittee secures all appropriate permits.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the benefits to the State of Texas, The Office Secretary of State, the RRC, the THC, the GLO, TNRCC, and PUC enter into this Memorandum and hereby agree as follows:

1. The RRC, THC, GLO, and TNRCC shall prepare an inventory of all known permits each agency may require with respect to building natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico. The inventory shall include a list of each agency's permits identified by name and/or number, and identify the appropriate staff contact person by name, phone number, and e-mail address for each permit.
2. The RRC, THC, GLO, TNRCC, and PUC mutually agree the RRC is designated as the distributor for applicable state permit applications, initial screener of completed applications for completeness, and facilitator among the other agencies to this memorandum for applicants who wish to build natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico. The RRC, THC, GLO, TNRCC, and PUC further agree to encourage other relevant State and Federal agencies to engage in this process as the necessity for and convenience provided by their participation becomes apparent.
3. Within thirty days of the effective date of this memorandum, the RRC shall implement a system and designate personnel to distribute all notices of permit requirements, permit applications, and instructions for permit submission to persons who wish to build natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico.

This Memorandum shall be effective as of the date of the last signature on this document. Any party may withdraw from this Memorandum at any time upon 30 days written notice to the other parties.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF TEXAS

By: Henry Cuellar
Henry Cuellar

Date: _____

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

By: Michael L. Williams
Michael L. Williams, Chairman

Date: _____

By: Charles R. Matthews
Charles R. Matthews, Commissioner

Date: _____

By: Tony Garza
Tony Garza, Commissioner

Date: _____

TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION

By: F. Lawrence Oaks
F. Lawrence Oaks, Executive Director

Date: MARCH 2, 2001

TEXAS GENERAL LAND OFFICE

By: David Dewhurst
David Dewhurst, Texas Land Commissioner

Date: March 1, 2001

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

By: _____
Robert J. Huston, Chairman

Date: _____


R.B. Marquez, Commissioner

Date: _____


John M. Baker, Jr., Commissioner

Date: _____

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

By: 
Patrick H. Wood, III, Chairman

Date: 23 Feb 2001


Judy W. Walsh, Commissioner

Date: _____


Brett A. Perlman, Commissioner

Date: _____

Robert J. Huston, *Chairman*
R. B. "Ralph" Marquez, *Commissioner*
John M. Baker, *Commissioner*
Jeffrey A. Saitas, *Executive Director*



TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution

February 21, 2001

Mr. Ronald Kitchens, Director of Energy Operations
Ms. Kathy Pyka, Director of Finance and Administration
Railroad Commission of Texas
P.O. Box 12967
Austin, TX 78711-2967

Re: Memorandum of Understanding Concerning Permitting of Trans-Border Natural Gas Pipelines

Dear Mr. Kitchens and Ms. Pyka:

This is in regard to the proposed memorandum of understanding (MOU) among several state agencies for facilitating the permitting of trans-border natural gas pipelines. I understand that the Railroad Commission of Texas would be the lead agency and the central point of contact for entities desiring information on state permit requirements for the construction of trans-border natural gas pipelines. I believe that our Commission would support such an endeavor. However, since our agency is required to adopt any MOU with another state agency as a rule before signing the MOU, the time required to complete the rulemaking would preclude our participation in the MOU at this time.

In order to avoid delaying the execution of the MOU by the other participating parties, I will provide to your agency by letter the desired permitting information that you can disseminate as necessary. Our staff will continue to coordinate with your staff to update this information, as appropriate. In the meantime, as soon as the MOU is executed by the other parties and the language is final we will initiate the rulemaking process related to our participation in the formal MOU. Although these interim actions are not binding (the final decision on any rulemaking rests with the Commissioners) we trust that they support your endeavor.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Randolph Wood, Deputy Director, Office of Environmental Policy, Analysis, and Assessment, at (512) 239-1120.

Sincerely,


Jeffrey A. Saitas, P.E.
Executive Director

cc: Mr. Duncan Norton, General Counsel

USA/TEXAS CROSS BORDER NATURAL GAS PIPELINE REGULATION

In addition to the Department of Energy Import Export License, the certificate(s) issued by FERC under Section 3 or Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and the Presidential Permit with required recommendations from the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, the following State and Federal Agencies will be involved in the following manner with construction and operation of a cross border natural gas pipeline from Texas to Mexico:

AGENCY	PERMIT/LICENSE	NATURE OF AGENCY AND PERMIT
International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) (USA)	* License To Construct	Agency is in charge of border property; license assures construction is sound, prudent and complies with all environmental requirements.
US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) (USA)	* Section 10 Clearance (navigability) * Section 401/404 Permit for wetlands and water quality	Agency in charge of maintaining navigable US waterways and with assuring their water quality and wetland protection; permits are vehicles for accomplishing these goals. The Section 401 Clean Water Act permit is in 9/10 cases a general permit which per USACE should not require State involvement.
USEPA Region VI (USA)	*Storm Water Discharge permit for construction activity * National Pollutant Elimination System permit for Hydrostatic Test water discharge	Agency function here to maintain water quality; likely a general permit for construction activity requiring work to employ best management practices and requiring little paperwork; EPA likely not to issue NPDES permit because it is minor and operator left to work under state permit. <i>If RRC seeks and gets NPDES authority from EPA, this federal element of paperwork could be eliminated.</i>
Department of Energy (USA)	*Import/Export License	DOE provides permit that allows party to take title to gas imported or exported across the border
FERC (USA)	*Natural Gas Act Section 3 or 7 Certification; coordinates with State Department for Presidential Permit	FERC coordinates Presidential Permit by getting letters from Secretaries of State and Defense approving buying or selling gas at the particular border location; also issues Section 3 permit to build facilities at border, and if gas going to interstate market, issues Section 7 permit.
US Fish and Wildlife	*Threatened and Endangered Species Clearance	Agency assures project will not threaten endangered species.
Railroad Commission (TX)	*T4 Permit to operate pipeline *Hydrostatic Test water discharge permit * Issuance of opinion to USACE re Clean Water Act Section 401 certification * Review of USACE Section 10 Clearance	Commission authority for intra state pipeline operation and sole authority for assuring no surface or subsurface water pollution from activities under its jurisdiction; also responsible for state element of 401 certification for such activities; Staff reviews navigability clearance voluntarily to assure Texas has no problem with USACE recommendation. RRC staff can in most cases assure itself USACE general permit standards protect state water quality standards and thus eliminate this state element of paperwork.
Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TX)	Permit to withdraw Rio Grande River water for Hydrostatic Testing	Agency function here to regulate water use; permit needed only if river water to be used, and general permit may apply.
Texas General Land Office (TX)	Easement to use State land	Agency issues easements through State rights of way such as river bed.
Texas Historic Commission	Cultural Resources Clearance	Archaeologist may need to do survey to assure construction does not disturb antiquities.

NEWS from



Charles R. Matthews

Commissioner, Railroad Commission of Texas

Contact: Melissa Columbus 512-463-7142

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 15, 2001

TEXAS STATE AGENCIES COLLABORATE ON CROSS BORDER NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS

AUSTIN—Today, Secretary of State Henry Cuellar, Railroad Commissioner Charles Matthews, Texas Land Commissioner David Dewhurst, Public Utility Commissioner Pat Wood, III and Texas Historical Commission Director F. Lawrence Oaks signed into a joint memorandum of understanding to streamline the permitting of crossborder natural gas pipelines.

"With this MOU, we are streamlining government to make the process more efficient and effective," said Secretary Cuellar. "The Secretary of State's office is always looking at partnerships that will continue enhancing our relations with Mexico. This initiative is an example of a cooperative effort between Texas and Mexico."

This memorandum establishes a joint agreement between the Secretary of State, Railroad Commission, General Land Office, Public Utility Commission and the State Historical Commission in developing dialogues regarding the building of natural gas pipelines that cross the border between Texas and Mexico. Recognizing that the energy needs of the citizens of Texas and Mexico can be met more efficiently if the permitting process in the State of Texas was organized in a manner that reduces the number of agency contacts a potential permittee must make and assures that the potential permittee secures all appropriate permits.

"Streamlining permit applications is a win-win the General Land Office has been pursuing since I took office; first with coastal and offshore permits, and now with cross-border natural gas pipelines. Streamlining the process should result over the next decade in additional gas supplies for Texas at competitive prices," stated Commissioner Dewhurst.

"This is the first step of an overall effort to bridge vital services between Texas and Mexico," said PUC Chairman Pat Wood, III. "The PUC also is working to strengthen electricity and telecommunications links."

F. Lawrence Oaks, Executive Director of the Texas Historical Commission stated, "The Texas Historical Commission is happy to be a part of this cooperative effort that will strengthen our relationship with Mexico and provide an efficient process for providing natural gas pipelines. Working closely with Mexico on matters of this type makes good sense for Texas."

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE • POST OFFICE BOX 12967 • AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711-2967 • PHONE: 512-463-6710 • FAX: 512-463-8463
TDD: 800-735-7989 OR TTY: 512-463-7234 • AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER • INTERNET: <http://www.rtc.state.tx.us>

10847

DOE016-0599

"Texas State Agencies Collaborate..."

Page 2

Communications that began in 1997 between the Mexican Energy Regulatory Commissioner Dr. Raul Monteforte and Railroad Commissioner Charles Matthews have focused on identifying barriers on both sides of the border. By streamlining the permitting process many of these barriers will disappear. Currently there are four state agencies a permittee has to go through to obtain permits for crossborder pipelines. The Railroad Commission will become the lead permitting agency.

The future of the North American energy industry would greatly benefit through the relationship between the Texas and Mexican regulatory agencies whose rules will help form the structure and practice of the trans-border industry. With the demand of natural gas in both the United States and Mexico increasing, these bi-directional pipelines will benefit both countries.

In this way, the foundations will be established for the natural gas and LPG transportation permitting process on both sides of the border to be carried out in a coordinated manner, thus avoiding paperwork delays and providing certainty to investors interested in developing this type of project.

"This is the first step. Our next step is to begin working with the various federal agencies to continue the process of streamlining the pipeline permitting process. Our goal is to help serve the increasing energy needs of both the United States and Mexico. We believe that these efforts will ultimately affect consumers by lowering the cost of natural gas for both countries," stated Matthews.

2001-015964 Jul 5 p 3:48



**Westinghouse
Electric Company**

Charles W. Pryor, Jr.
President and
Chief Executive Officer

Post Office Box 355
Pittsburgh Pennsylvania 15230-0355

July 2, 2001

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
Vice President of the United States
276 Dwight D. Eisenhower
Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Vice President Cheney:

As our nation moves forward to develop and implement a comprehensive, balanced energy strategy, we at Westinghouse Electric Company believe that nuclear energy research and development can play an important role in achieving results that best meet the needs of the American people. Earlier this year, the Department of Energy launched an initiative to prepare a technology roadmap for guiding nuclear R&D activities that will lead to a new generation of new reactor technologies – referred to as Generation IV. Working groups (comprised of representatives from industry, laboratories, and academia) are carrying out this initiative under the guidance of the Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee (NERAC).

One particular activity within this technology roadmap initiative that needs the immediate attention of Congress and the Administration is the interim report recently released by the Near Term Deployment (NTD) Group. Just issued at the end of May, this report identifies activities that should be initiated right away – to address the complex, time-consuming regulatory hurdles that must be overcome by new, advanced nuclear plants. Specifically, the NTD Group's report recommends that \$36 million be included in the Department's nuclear R&D budget for fiscal year 2002, to support efforts by NRC and industry to establish the new licensing processes needed for new plants. Although the NRC has already promulgated regulations to help streamline the licensing of new plants in 10CFR52 (for Early Site Permits, Combined Operating Licenses, and Design Certifications), most of these regulations have yet to be put to use and there are many details to be worked out before future applicants can be sure that the new licensing processes will work smoothly. There is also the need to work out new regulatory policies and procedures for handling the review of new advanced reactor technologies (e.g., the gas cooled reactor designs) and for approving design changes to already certified standard designs (e.g., uprating power level to improve economic efficiency).

10849

DOE016-0601

Page 2

As recommended by your National Energy Policy Development Group, developing these new licensing processes and resolving issues related to new advanced reactor technologies are essential to expanding the use of nuclear energy in the United States, while maintaining high levels of safety and environmental protection.

I strongly encourage your efforts to include the NTD Group's recommendations in the fiscal year 2002 budget. I apologize for the late timing of this letter; however, the NTD Group's recommendations were only recently released.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Charles W. Pryor, Jr." The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Charles W. Pryor, Jr.
President and CEO
Westinghouse Electric Company

CC: The Honorable Spencer Abraham

10850

DOE016-0602

145

Kelliher, Joseph

From: DeHoratiis, Guido
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2001 3:06 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph; Anderson, Margot; Stevenson, Beverley; Porter, Robert; Furiga, Richard; Johnson, Nancy
Subject: RE: NPC report

I spoke with Eric and he was looking for FE's report, "Environmental Benefits of Advanced Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Technology," 1999. He located it on our web site. I offered to send him a hard copy, but he was satisfied with the web site: http://www.fe.doe.gov/oil_gas/enviro_n_rpt/index.html

-----Original Message-----

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2001 1:31 PM
To: DeHoratiis, Guido
Subject: FW: NPC report

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2001 1:07 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert; Anderson, Margot
Subject: NPC report

Bob McNally with the White House called asking about a NPC report from 1997-98 that described how the footprint from oil and gas development has strunk dramatically. Please coordinate and respond to Bob through his assistant, Eric (456-5378). Get them a copy of any such report. I have a number of meetings so please deal with this directly. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2001 6:09 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph; Kolevar, Kevin; Davis, Joseph
Subject: SPR exchange
Importance: High

Attached is a Q&A on the 30 million barrel exchange and the "net" effect of the transaction. If you want additional information, please let me know. << File: Sec-SPR.wpd >>

746



2001-020782 Sep 7 p 1:33

Chairman

John T. Dillon
International Paper

Cochairmen

Philip M. Condit
Boeing

Edward B. Rust, Jr.
State Farm

1615 L Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036-5610
Tel (202) 872-1260
Fax (202) 466-3509
Web www.brt.org

John J. Castellani
President

Patricia Hanahan Engman
Executive Director

September 6, 2001

HAND DELIVERED

The Honorable Dick Cheney
Vice President
The White House
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Mr. Vice President:

The Business Roundtable strongly supports many of the initiatives the Bush Administration has proposed as part of the National Energy Policy issued in May of this year. In particular, our members have a keen interest in the efforts by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Justice to review the program design and enforcement posture of the New Source Review (NSR) program under the Clean Air Act. The BRT feels that a prompt resolution of the NSR issue could greatly benefit the nation's energy and fuel supply needs as well as improve the energy efficiency of domestic manufacturing.

We have attached a policy statement that reflects the Roundtable's viewpoint on the issues that have arisen with this program and our recommendations for improving it in the future. We ask you to consider these views as the Administration considers administrative reforms to the program that will advance air quality goals without stifling technological innovation or imposing unnecessary burdens.

EPA has recently taken actions that represent a reinterpretation of the scope of the NSR program's permitting and technical standards to include routine maintenance and replacement activities at industrial plants. These changes in EPA policy have been implemented through enforcement actions, rather than notice and comment rulemaking that would allow for a public dialogue on the program's substantive policies. We believe that these policies do need a more public discussion because EPA's current course with the NSR program can magnify burdens for industry, impose procedural delays and discourage technological innovation. Such policy changes should not be made through retroactive reinterpretation of the law or through enforcement actions.

It is important to emphasize that the Roundtable members support continuous improvement in reducing air emissions from industrial plants. We believe, however, that there are a range of strategies that EPA and the private sector can employ to achieve that goal without creating unnecessary burdens or chilling technology innovation. A number of constructive proposals for NSR reform have been offered to the Administration. We believe that many of these ideas hold great promise for improving environmental performance at plants while maintaining operational flexibility. As we have outlined in the attached paper, we urge the Administration to take a close look at those proposals and to address the improvements through the available administrative processes.

An Association Of Chief Executive Officers Committed To Improving Public Policy

10852

DOE016-0604

September 6, 2001

Page 2

As the Administration proceeds with its efforts to reform the NSR program, the Roundtable urges the Administration to keep two considerations in mind. First, the implications of the program extend to a wide range of the American economy. There has been a tendency to focus on the implications of the program for electricity generating plants and petroleum refineries, in part because these facilities have been recent targets of EPA's enforcement program. The Business Roundtable's membership is quite diverse, and we can certainly affirm that companies in a variety of industries are concerned about the implications, and uncertainties, of the NSR program for their operations.

Second, it is important that the efforts you initiated produce tangible results in a reasonable period of time. Over the last several years, EPA has received a variety of proposals for reform but has not made any substantive changes in the NSR program. Thus, we were encouraged by the Bush Administration's commitment, in the National Energy Policy, to conduct its review of the program in 90 days. On August 14, 2001, the EPA Administrator announced that EPA would be combining its NSR review with an effort to develop a "3 pollutant" proposal to reduce air pollution.

While we can understand why EPA would find it desirable to combine several efforts to change air pollution requirements, we are concerned about the implications of that decision for the timing of any meaningful changes in the NSR program. The NSR program is having tangible effects on industrial plants today. Therefore, we urge the Administration to proceed with its original plan to follow through on appropriate administrative changes to the NSR program.

We certainly believe that EPA should be afforded a reasonable opportunity to develop its more comprehensive proposal. However, given that the legislative process requires significant debate, we urge the Administration to proceed with its original plan to follow through on appropriate administrative and rulemaking changes to the NSR program as soon as practical.

The Business Roundtable stands ready to work with you on any of the elements of the attached policy statement. We appreciate your continuing involvement and leadership in these matters.

Sincerely,



Ernest W. Deavenport
Chairman and CEO
Eastman Chemical Company
Chairman, Environment, Technology & the Economy Task Force
The Business Roundtable

cc: The Honorable Spencer Abraham
The Honorable John Ashcroft
The Honorable Christine Todd Whitman
Mr. Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.
Ms. Linda Fisher
Mr. John D. Graham
Mr. Lawrence B. Lindsey

Enclosure

10853

DOE016-0605



THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

NEW SOURCE REVIEW REFORM POLICY STATEMENT

Introduction

Without question, achieving environmentally sound economic growth in the next century will require innovative solutions. Our society is facing growing environmental challenges and energy demands. Whether we can respond effectively to these challenges will depend to a large extent upon our ability to apply technology and increase process and operational efficiency. The Business Roundtable strongly believes that our government needs to encourage companies to routinely maintain existing equipment and to incorporate technological improvements systematically, particularly as component parts are replaced.

Within the recent past, the EPA has taken actions that represent a fundamental shift in the Agency's New Source Review ("NSR") policy under the Clean Air Act ("Act"). These actions are focused on imposing NSR permitting requirements on existing sources that heretofore have never been considered subject to NSR. In BRT's view, EPA is pursuing a course of action that is both environmentally and economically counterproductive. Most importantly, the Agency's actions reflect a reinterpretation of the law that threatens routine capital investments that increase neither capacity nor emissions rates, but only improve the reliability or efficiency of operations. This reinterpretation of existing rules implies that routine incorporation of new technology at existing facilities either is a violation of the Clean Air Act or requires a new lengthy permit approval process.

BRT believes that expanding the scope of the NSR program beyond its intended boundaries would significantly undermine constructive industry efforts to reform the basic NSR requirements. Congressional members have raised objections that including carbon dioxide emissions reductions as part of this program would violate Congress' express prohibition against implementation of the Kyoto Protocol prior to its ratification by the U.S.

A Badly Broken Regulatory Process

Under the NSR program, companies must install state-of-the-art controls if they plan to construct a major new facility. However, Congress did not require existing plants to meet the technology-based control requirements for new sources, unless the owner modified its facility in such a way as to increase significantly its capability to emit regulated air pollutants. But existing plants must always install whatever control requirements are necessary to comply with the applicable state implementation plan to meet ambient air quality standards. These standards are established to protect human health and the environment with generous margins of safety. Until recently, it was uniformly understood by industry that "routine repair and maintenance" did not constitute a "modification" that would trigger NSR. But through its reinterpretation of the NSR requirements, EPA has now created considerable misunderstanding and ambiguity where none existed before. EPA's recent reinterpretation of this NSR exclusion could not have been

anticipated by industry, and it fails to recognize how industry has consistently operated both before and since the Clean Air Act was enacted.

There is little disagreement that this reinterpretation of the NSR rule further increases the complexities of a program that already imposes unnecessary burdens on States and industrial sources. Applicants now face an extremely detailed and time-consuming permitting process. Moreover, this delay and related burdens create significant disincentives to new investment in more efficient and cleaner technologies and processes. In sum, the basic NSR program is in need of reform and an effort is presently underway to overhaul it through the rulemaking process.

EPA Rule Interpretations Threaten Reliability and Efficiency Investments

Through recent regulatory proposals and administrative and enforcement activities, EPA is reinterpreting existing law in two important ways. First, in its statements and enforcement actions, EPA is taking the position that any significant efficiency or reliability project constitutes a change that could trigger NSR, even though the project produces no corresponding increase in a source's achievable emissions rate. Second, in its 1998 NSR Notice of Availability, the Agency proposed that any change to an existing unit will create an irrefutable presumption that the change will result in an increase in future annual emissions requiring NSR.

Moreover, on November 3, 1999, EPA brought legal action against eight utilities throughout the Midwest and the South claiming that past efficiency and reliability improvement projects are now subject to NSR requirements. This is directly contrary to the common sense understanding of the term that EPA has historically applied. Recognizing that industry must undertake activities to maintain its facilities, the Agency has always allowed industry to undertake "routine maintenance, repair and replacement" projects that are customary to preserve safe, efficient and reliable generation. However, without providing any fair notice, EPA is now asserting that the electric utility industry has been violating the Clean Air Act for nearly three decades by performing such replacement and maintenance activities. EPA is claiming that projects done without any cloak of secrecy can be penalized now, regardless of how many years have passed since the work was done.

Adverse Effects of EPA's Actions

BRT believes that EPA's activities are environmentally and economically counterproductive. Essentially, its reinterpretation of NSR rules will dissuade companies from undertaking the types of projects that improve efficiency, reliability, and availability – projects that would result thereby in lower emission rates and more efficient use of capital. EPA's enforcement activities also amount to a bypassing of the regulatory process that is undermining constructive efforts to achieve real reform and consistent application of the NSR program. Similarly, Congressional members already have raised objections to EPA that expanding the scope of the NSR program to cover controlling carbon dioxide emissions would violate congressional directives.

Magnifying Burden: EPA's actions, which affect potentially thousands of projects, magnify the burdens already associated with this program. The Agency's current approach will

undoubtedly confuse companies about the legal status of planned replacements and jeopardize maintenance programs. For example, utility companies, many of which operate under state statutes mandating routine maintenance to keep generating plants in reliable condition, will have to decide whether to continue to make routine repairs on their plants or forego maintenance. This risks plant shutdowns or, if they keep their plants running, worker safety and forced outages.

Increasing Procedural Delays: EPA's reinterpretation of long-standing law will now require prior Agency NSR review for even capital projects that are designed simply to prevent a deterioration in efficiency. Far from streamlining an already burdensome program, this approach will significantly increase the number of time-consuming "applicability" determinations that will have to be made before virtually any capital projects are initiated. Furthermore, it could take 18 months or longer for new permitting to be completed and even longer for new control equipment to be installed.

Disincentive to Innovate: EPA's construction of the Clean Air Act's requirements will seriously discourage innovation in equipment design and industrial processes to achieve efficiency improvements. This is largely because economic savings and reliability improvements from the projects will be far outweighed by the cost of having to undergo NSR or of having to limit annual emissions to past levels to avoid NSR, even though the source may be well below permitted emission levels. As a result, the price of this system will continue to be lost opportunities for energy, conservation and environmental gains, and employment lost to foreign competitors. Many foreign countries have lower wage scales than the U.S. and therefore enjoy lower standards of living. U.S. industries have been able to compete with these lower-wage countries because U.S. industry has consistently been able to use technological innovation to improve efficiency and productivity to offset any wage differential.

EPA's Retroactive Reinterpretation of the Law through Enforcement Actions: The legal actions that EPA has brought against Midwest and Southern utilities represent only a part of the Agency's nationwide enforcement initiative. In addition to electric utilities, EPA also is targeting the pulp and paper, petroleum refinery, and iron and steel industries. EPA's allegation of massive noncompliance throughout all of these industrial sectors is ample evidence that its reinterpretation of NSR requirements has no validity. By retroactively reinterpreting the law and undertaking this massive enforcement effort, the Agency is seeking to effect changes through punitive actions, rather than providing leadership to the ongoing stakeholder process that is seeking to achieve real NSR reform. The NSR program needs balanced industry-wide solutions that are best developed through the rulemaking process rather than through enforcement mechanisms.

Industry Proposals Provide a Constructive Basis for Reform

BRT endorses the proposals that industry has crafted as the preferable approach to defining a basic NSR scheme. BRT believes that the Utility Air Regulatory Group, Plant-wide Applicability Limits, and complex manufacturing proposals provide a constructive basis for serious discussions between the Agency, the industry, and other stakeholders. Unlike earlier EPA proposals, which dwelled on specific aspects of the rule and took a line-by-line approach,

these proposals seek to achieve overall clarification, to strike an equitable balance between competing stakeholder concerns about the core issues, and to provide certainty about compliance obligations. These proposals (Utility Air Regulatory Group, complex manufacturing, and plant-wide applicability limits) would achieve the following:

- Greatly simplify and clarify NSR applicability determinations. In the case of the utility and complex manufacturing proposals, rationalize the accounting rules that determine whether modifications by existing sources trigger federal and state NSR controls.
- Through systemic approaches substantially decrease the rate and amount of emissions from existing facilities. Through programs designed to address the respective circumstances of the manufacturing and electric generating firms, the agency would achieve NSR levels of emission reductions at existing facilities efficiently and cost-effectively, rather than through piecemeal reductions on an ad hoc basis through selective enforcement of the NSR "modification" rule. (For example, existing electric generating units would be subject to new source levels of emission control over time, in a manner coordinated with the implementation of other existing source control programs and allowing trading among sources. The complex manufacturing proposal would improve the level of control at existing units over time by assuring the installation of controls on new units as capital stock turns over and on significantly changed existing units.)
- By simplifying and clarifying NSR applicability determinations, significantly reduce disincentives in the current system for making plant changes that improve efficiency with corresponding emission reduction benefits.
- Provide facilities the flexibility to negotiate plant-wide applicability limits.
- Preserve the historical common sense understanding of "routine maintenance, repair, and replacement," allowing companies to take steps to maintain their plants in a safe, reliable, and efficient operating condition.
- Formalize EPA's guidance issuance procedures to eliminate the potential for conflicting (and often unpublicized) advice from different Agency offices.

Conclusion

BRT maintains that EPA's attempts to reform the NSR program on an ad hoc basis through a retroactive reinterpretation and selective enforcement of the "modification" rule is counterproductive from the standpoint of the environment, economics and worker safety. This bypassing of the regulatory process will only serve to further delay any reasoned implementation of the NSR program. Moreover, it is unnecessary given industry's willingness to work with the Agency and other stakeholders in developing a new basic NSR scheme. The approach that prevails will make the difference between opening opportunities for energy-efficiency improvement projects and increasing the obstacles for technology development and deployment.

147



2001-021520 9/20 A 9:55

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

021520

2001 SEP 20 A 9 55

TO: Ms. Carol A. Kennedy
Executive Secretariat
Room 7E-054 Forrestal Building
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20585

DATE: September 18, 2001

We are forwarding the enclosed constituent mail containing views and concerns about energy issues. It is not necessary to respond to our office regarding each reply.

Should you have questions about these procedures or need to provide updated contact information, you may reach me by telephone at 202.456.9002 or by fax at 202.456.7044.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cecelia Boyer".

Cecelia Boyer
Special Assistant to the Vice President
for Correspondence

10858

DOE016-0610

have Andrew look over

Repeal PUHCA Now
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 352
Washington, D.C. 20004

March 1, 2001

Honorable Richard B. Cheney
Vice President of the United States
Office of the Vice President
Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20501

Dear Mr. Vice President:

We, the undersigned companies and organizations, congratulate you and look forward to working cooperatively and effectively with you, particularly on your efforts with the National Energy Policy Development Group.

Repeal of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (PUHCA) remains an issue of enormous importance to a healthy and sound electric industry. We appreciate the Administration's understanding of the need for repeal. We are encouraged by then-Governor Bush's recognition that PUHCA "...limits the activities of existing utilities, discourages new entrants, and places undue burden on utilities regulated by it", as well as his assessment that repeal of PUHCA will contribute to lower prices and better services for consumers.

Over the past several Congresses, efforts to repeal PUHCA have enjoyed bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. Every major piece of restructuring legislation has contained provisions for the repeal of PUHCA. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), which enforces PUHCA, has consistently recommended repeal to Congress since the early 1980s. After lengthy analysis, the SEC concluded that the statute is unnecessary in view of the several other Federal and state statutory and regulatory provisions protecting shareholders, ratepayers and consumers.

The Congressional Budget Office has scored this legislation, indicating that repeal would not have an impact on the U.S. Treasury. In fact, repeal would very likely result

10859

DOE016-0611

in savings to the government. Furthermore, societal costs of PUHCA have been consistently estimated in the billions of dollars.

Despite the need for repeal and the gains we have achieved, we need your support and leadership. For the sake of consumers and investors alike, we feel it is important that the Task Force not overlook the significance of PUHCA as a barrier to entry in electricity and gas markets. Every day that PUHCA remains on the books, innovation, competition and new market entry are thwarted and companies continue to labor under arcane and outdated restrictions resulting in unnecessary delays, additional expenses and uneconomic situations – the costs of which are ultimately borne by energy consumers.

We look forward to working with you and your team to accomplish PUHCA repeal within the first year of the new Administration.

Sincerely,




Thomas R. Kuhn
President
Edison Electric Institute




David N. Parker
President and CEO
American Gas Association





Alan J. Noia
Chairman, President, and CEO
Allegheny Energy, Inc.





E. Linn Draper
Chairman, President, and CEO
American Electric Power



James E. Rogers
Chairman, President, and CEO
Cnergy Corp.



William T. McCormick, Jr.
Chairman and CEO
CMS Energy



Corbin A. McNeill, Jr.
President and Co-CEO
Exelon Corporation



James L. Broadhead
Chairman and CEO
Florida Power & Light


Fred Hafer
Chairman, President, and CEO
GPU



David Sokol
Chairman and CEO
MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company


R. Steve Letbetter
Chairman and CEO
Reliant Energy



H. Allen Franklin
President and CEO
Southern Company



Wayne H. Brunetti
President and CEO
Xcel Energy



William Cavanaugh, III
Chairman, President, and CEO
Progress Energy



J. Wayne Leonard
Chief Executive Officer
Entergy




Erle Nye
Chairman and Chief Executive
TXU



Richard B. Priory
Chairman, President, and CEO
Duke Energy



John M. Derrick
Chairman and CEO
Pepco



Martin A. White
Chairman, President, and CEO
MDU Resources Group, Inc.

cc: Secretary Ann M. Veneman
Secretary Donald L. Evans
Secretary Spencer Abraham
Secretary Gale A. Norton
Secretary Norman Y. Minetta
Secretary Paul H. O'Neill
Administrator Christie Whitman
Andrew Lundquist, Director

10863

DOE016-0615

148

2001-025330 12/10 P 4:25

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THOMAS J. DONOHUE
PRESIDENT AND
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

1615 H STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20062-2000
202/463-5300 • 202/463-5327 FAX

November 7, 2001

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
Vice President of the United States
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Mr. Vice President:

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector, and region, respectfully requests that revisions to the New Source Review (NSR) program be proposed as expeditiously as possible. The current NSR program is unnecessarily complex and uncertain. Further, the program as implemented by EPA impedes increased domestic electricity production, fuel production, and energy efficiency.

As part of the May 16, 2001 Report, *Reliable, Affordable, and Environmentally Sound Energy for America's Future*, the National Energy Policy Development Group recommended that the President direct the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and other relevant agencies, to review NSR regulations and interpretations. This report was due to the President on August 17. The New Source Review program has been the source of much uncertainty and litigation. EPA has sued several electric utility companies and has challenged refineries for allegedly avoiding air quality requirements. These enforcement actions, however, typically rely on a recently changed EPA interpretation of a key Clean Air Act permitting requirement. Thus, EPA attempts to retroactively penalize companies for facility operations over the last two decades.

EPA could rapidly issue a proposal that lists the problems with the NSR program and proposes administrative solutions. EPA has been considering this issue for the last decade. For example, in a 1997 White Paper, EPA suggested that certain specified changes to facility operations could be approved in advance as part of the Clean Air Act operating permit. It is essential that EPA quickly clarify the scope of the NSR program for energy, fuel, and manufacturing companies.

10864

DOE016-0616

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
November 7, 2001
Page Two


The NSR program, as presently constituted, is also a severe impediment to increasing domestic energy supply. Electric generating plants cannot make even minor changes to their operations without running the risk of ruinous enforcement actions that impose huge fines and enormous compliance costs on their facility. National energy policy, indeed national security, requires the removal of every administrative and regulatory obstacle to increased domestic energy and fuel production.

Revisions to the NSR program have become entangled, unnecessarily, with the Administration's forthcoming multi-pollutant strategy for old power plants. The requisite amendments to the Clean Air Act will require substantial debate. Defining what is and what is not a new source is not related to which and how much power plant emissions are to be controlled. In contrast, improvements in the NSR program would immediately benefit energy production, fuel production, and energy efficiency improvements independent of any emission policy review. Reducing the problems with the NSR program is vital, and such efforts should remain at the top of the Administration's regulatory and administrative reform agenda.

Accordingly, the U.S. Chamber concludes that immediate NSR administrative reform is needed. We request your efforts to ensure a prompt response from EPA, DOE, and other relevant agencies.

Thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely,



Thomas J. Donohue

→ cc: The Honorable Spencer Abraham
The Honorable John Ashcroft
The Honorable Thomas Ridge
The Honorable Christine Todd Whitman
Mr. Lawrence Lindsey
Mr. Andrew D. Lundquist

10865

DOE016-0617

149

2001-025333 12/10 P 4:25



BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Larry W. Walter, Chairman
Don Shearer, Vice Chairman
Domingo Toro, Secretary
Nancy Gernsike, Assistant Secretary
Bill Hart, Director
George A. Gant, Mayor/Ex-Officio Director

James C. Welsh, President & General Manager CEO

1701 W. Carroll Street
Kissimmee, Florida 34742-3219
407-933-7777
FAX 407-933-2655

November 16, 2001

Vice President Richard B. Cheney
The Office of the Vice President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20501
Fax: (202) 456-1606

Dear Mr. Vice President:

I am writing to express concerns about the growing impact on energy reliability resulting from reinterpretations of the New Source Review Program (NSR) under the Clean Air Act, and the specific threats to energy reliability in my community due to fears about making routine maintenance and repairs at electric utilities.

Utility managers are unsure of how to proceed with routine maintenance and repairs at their fossil-fuel electricity generation plants. Under EPA's new reinterpretation of NSR, EPA has alleged that all but the very simplest of repairs and routine maintenance cannot be made without triggering costly and unfair retrofit controls to reduce pollutants. As a result, utility managers are discouraged from making important maintenance, safety and performance improvements to their plants. This uncertainty could impact how a utility responds to electricity outages or in making seasonal repairs. Failure to undertake these activities could be a danger to the reliability of electricity supply, to the facility employees and the community.

In light of these repair problems, I am concerned about energy reliability in my state— for residential, commercial, and industrial customers. Given our current economic and international situation, I urge you to break the ten-year logjam with the U. S. EPA on simplification and reform of this program.

There is a straightforward solution that would allow for immediate repair and maintenance activities to move forward in the short-term while the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency works on the larger issues contained in the NSR program. The utility industry needs a simple cost test to enable routine maintenance and repair decisions to be made without confusion or delays which could lead to reliability problems. This cost test should not discriminate between investor-owned electric utilities, publicly owned electric utilities or cooperatively owned electric utilities. All energy sources are needed as we face the winter of 2002 with growing international demands on domestic energy supplies.

Serving the Kissimmee Area Since 1901

10866


DOE016-0618

Vice President Richard B. Cheney
November 16, 2001
Page 2

I urge your office to communicate the immediate need for a cost test on NSR to the U. S.
EPA.

Thank you for your attention to this very important matter.

Sincerely,



George A. Gant
Mayor
City of Kissimmee

cc: Administrator Christine Todd Whitman
U. S. EPA
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D. C. 20460

→ Secretary Spencer Abraham
Secretary of Energy
Room 7A-257 Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue, NW
Washington, D. C. 20585

10867

150

From: Bertram Wolfe To: Spencer Abraham

Date: 02/01/2001 Time: 3:19:10 PM

Page 1 of 4

2001-002837 2/2 A 9:32

002837

(b)(6)

Vice President Richard Bruce Cheney
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear VP Cheney:

Let me start by indicating my delight at our new administration, and your new VP position. I have supported you and President Bush, and have been pleased at the material received from you and the President thanking me for my support.

My reason for this letter is to provide important information for you as head of the new energy task force. My topic involves the need to reestablish nuclear energy in this country. As you can see from the brief enclosed biography, I am knowledgeable about the subject. I should note that I have no personal reason to support nuclear energy except for the welfare of the nation, the world, and my children and grandchildren.

Before the Arab oil boycott of 1973, energy in this country was doubling every ten years and nuclear energy was being supported by the environmental movement because of need, and concern over the detriments of the other available energy sources. After the boycott, energy growth slowed to a doubling every 35 years; and because of the orders placed before 1973 there has until recently been a surplus of energy plants in this country. The environmental movement since 1973 has been against all new energy plants; and because of the surplus, it has not mattered until recently. But for the past couple of years there have been shortages, and, in particular, California is now under deep trouble from lack of needed electricity.

Mr. Cheney, the situation will get much worse with time. The Energy Information Agency predicts an increase of 30-40% of energy use in this country in the next two decades. More troublesome is the increase in the third world population, and because of the average increase in per person energy use worldwide, it is projected that world energy use will double to quadruple in the next fifty years. This will put a major problem on the cost and availability of gas and oil, which is predicted to be depleted in this century (coal next century). Furthermore, increased use of fossil fuels is projected to lead to global warming catastrophes. If the above concerns are real, there is only one available means to mitigate or eliminate these problems, and that is with a major increase in the use of nuclear energy, worldwide. Advanced nuclear power has the capacity to provide clean world energy for thousands of years.

In this country nuclear power has been dying; primarily from lack of need; and from resulting US government impediments, which caused new nuclear plants to be uneconomic because it took 10 to 20 years to build them here. Overseas, US companies build plants in an economic 4 or 5 years. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission recognized its licensing impediments and has recently adopted new procedures which are intended to allow new plants to be built here economically.

10868

DOE016-0620

The problem is that these new procedures have not been demonstrated to be workable, considering the anti-nuclear suits likely to be filed. Thus, to provide the ability to revive nuclear power here, and to lead the world on a sensible means to utilize non-greenhouse gas nuclear power, we should be demonstrating that we can now build nuclear plants efficiently here. With the increased price of gas, nuclear energy can be the lowest cost energy source available. In this country and the west, it has been the safest.

Mr. Cheney, the point of this letter is bring forth the major need for nuclear energy in the US and the world in the future; and the need to move now in the US to take away unnecessary impediments, and to demonstrate that we can be world leaders in the needed nuclear expansion. If we had built new nuclear plants in this country we might have avoided our present energy problem; should we wait for the new disasters before moving?

I hope the material above will be of use to you. I have previously written to Sec. Abraham, and will also communicate with Sec. Norton. Mr. Vice President, if I can be of further aid to you please contact me. I would be pleased to come to Washington if you think it would be of help.

cc: Sec Abraham; Sec Norton

I am appending a brief biography, and a copy of a recent Op-Ed piece that was published in the LA Times.

5/16/01
D/S

Dr. Bertram Wolfe is a pioneer in the development of peaceful nuclear energy. He is presently an independent Consultant in the fields of business, energy, and nuclear energy. He has been on the Boards of Directors of Houston Industries and Houston Lighting and Power Co.; and is on the Boards of Urenco Inc. and Urenco Investments Inc.. He is also on a number of industry and academic advisory committees. These activities follow a career of over thirty five years with General Electric, from which he retired in 1992 as a Vice President and General Manager of GE's Nuclear Energy Business.

Dr. Wolfe received a BA in physics from Princeton U and a Ph.D. in Nuclear Physics from Cornell U. He joined GE in 1955; has since worked in almost all technical phases of peaceful Nuclear Power and has had responsibility for a number of successful nuclear reactor projects. In 1987 he was appointed a Vice President of GE and Manager of its Nuclear Energy Division.

Dr. Wolfe was elected to the National Academy of Engineering in 1980 and has served on several NAE Boards. He was elected President of the American Nuclear Society in 1986-7; was the recipient of the Walter Zinn technical accomplishment award in 1990; was honored with the Henry DeWolf Smyth nuclear statesman award in 1992; and was presented with the Tommy Thompson Nuclear Safety Award in 1997. He is a fellow of the American Nuclear Society, and a Professional Engineer in the state of California. He has been a member of a number of electric power industry advisory boards; has written well over a hundred publications on energy and nuclear energy; and is well known as a spokesman on energy and nuclear energy.

LOS ANGELES TIMES

NA/WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3, 2001 A11

Commentary

State's Energy Problem Has Roots Nationwide

By BERTRAM WOLFE
and CHAUNCEY STARR

Why is California now suffering from a lack of affordable electricity? The answer is that California and the nation have not looked responsibly to the future.

In the late 1960s and early 70s, the United States was doubling its electricity use every 10 years. To meet coming needs, utilities were placing major orders for new generating plants. In 1973 the situation changed. The Arab oil boycott and the resulting higher energy costs slowed the growth of electricity use to a doubling in 35 years. As a result, the new plants ordered before 1973 that were subsequently built led to a surplus of electrical supply.

That nationwide surplus, which is now gone, is what California officials were counting on when deregulation was approved in 1996—a robust, competitive market of wholesale electrical supply from generating companies outside the state. That expectation failed. Why?

Before 1973 the Sierra Club supported nuclear power. Since then, the influential "environmental" organizations have opposed oil, gas, coal and nuclear plants, as well as dams, and even geothermal plants. They argue for solar and wind power, which on a large scale are impractical because of their immense land use and their intermittent availability; indeed, on such a scale they are environmentally detrimental. However, with a surplus of energy supply, it didn't matter.

But, the electrical surplus has vanished. In the U.S. we now need new energy capacity to meet our present and future needs. On a world basis, population in the next 50 years is projected to increase from 8 billion to 10 billion. If the average per person energy use reaches only one-third of that in the U.S. today, world energy use will triple. Thus, we now face both serious near-term national and coming world energy problems.

In this country we must decide how to meet our energy needs. The Energy Information Administration projects a continued U.S. increase of electricity needs of 40% in the next 20 years, and the needed replacement of 25% of our current capacity.

There are problems that must be addressed. The price of natural gas has quadrupled in the past year. New gas-fueled electricity plants, which were the least expensive source of electricity, are now the most expensive. Natural gas supply will remain tight for the foreseeable future, with accompanying price volatility depending on weather and import availability from Canada and Mexico. Oil is subject to serious overseas political problems, and costs that have gone up and down. Coal, which is among the most plentiful and least costly energy sources, has environmental problems: large emissions of CO₂ and other pollutants, including small particles.

Nuclear energy, which has no significant emissions, can also be among the lowest cost energy sources, but it has political barriers to overcome. The 103 existing nuclear plants (ordered before 1973) remain a vital, safe, electricity source in California and in the U.S. But since 1973 it has taken an uneconomic 10 to 20 years to build the previously ordered nuclear plants in this country, whereas U.S. firms build nuclear plants abroad (and used to build them here) economically in four or five years. Similarly, antinuclear forces have unnecessarily delayed the construction of repositories for nuclear wastes.

The electricity trap in which California now finds itself is a consequence of the national trends coming together this winter. Weather has increased demand in the Western U.S., so California cannot depend on low-cost electricity purchases from neighboring states. The political response has so far been Band-Aid fixes, which do not tackle the root issue of making California a friendly state for long-term investment by electricity generators.

The recent electricity problems in California make it clear that we must take action to prevent future energy disasters. In the next few years our only means to provide the needed electricity is with an expansion of gas and/or coal-powered plants, with their financial and environmental problems. We should demonstrate now that nuclear plants can be built here

'The one available solution is a major increase in the utilization of nuclear energy.'

as efficiently as they can be built abroad and move to get our waste repositories moving. We need government commitment and action to ensure that we can meet our near-term and long-term energy needs in California and nationally.

The one available solution is a major increase in the utilization of nuclear energy. Nuclear energy can provide an essentially unlimited supply of energy economically. Antinuclear activists frighten the public about nuclear wastes thousands of years out. But the real concerns are fossil fuel environmental impacts and the lack of energy in the coming decades when oil and gas supplies are exhausted and, in the following century, when economic coal supplies are depleted. The near-term expansion of nuclear energy would allow us to mitigate global warming and to lengthen the availability of specially needed fossil fuels. Although long-term nuclear wastes can be safely accommodated, advanced nuclear plant designs will allow us to modify the nuclear wastes so that they lose their radioactivity in just a few hundred years.

Today we are having very disturbing, but relatively mild, energy problems due to our lack of preparation. We must work to solve this near-term problem. But we should also not wait for the future national and world energy disasters to occur before we act to mitigate—and hopefully eliminate—them.

Bertram Wolfe, a former vice president of General Electric, is an independent consultant and a fellow and past president of the American Nuclear Society. Chauncey Starr, dean of the UCLA School of Engineering and Applied Science from 1967 to 1973, is president emeritus of the Electric Power Research Institute, of which he was a founder.

10871

DOE016-0623

751

TRD

TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES & DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

2001-003587 Feb 7 A 10:20

January 31, 2001

Ms. Majida Dandy
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Ms. Dandy:


Attached is a letter with support material addressed to Mr. Spencer Abraham. The subject are solutions to the energy crisis. TRD professionals are applying these solutions on a small scale. We wish to make our experiences and software available to the US Department of Energy for national exposure.

A copy of this letter has been sent to Vice President Richard Cheney, who is heading an energy task force.

Your name was given to me as the person who can assure that this letter will come to the attention of Mr. Abraham before he possibly may be contacted by Vice President Cheney in this matter.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Sincerely,



Walter A. Hans
President
WAH/ljs
Enclosures

Phone: (856) 667-3342 Fax: (856) 667-8168
E-Mail: TRDCORP@AOL.COM
P.O. Box 2820 - Cherry Hill, NJ 08052-0246

10872

DOE016-0624

TRD

TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES & DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

January 31, 2001

Mr. Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy
US Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Electricity supply and price problems can be solved swiftly and competition among energy providers can be enhanced by eliminating barriers to free market forces and informing consumers how to use energy cost-effectively.

Industrial plants alone can reduce electrical peak loads sufficiently throughout the nation to prevent power shortages. The combined load reduction capacity of industrial plants is more than 45,000 megawatts. A large portion of this reduction is accessible immediately through market driven incentives and does not require any capital investment.

The above mentioned load reduction is equivalent to approximately 7 percent of the total 1999 net summer generation capacity in the US and more than the planned capacity additions for the years 2000 through 2004. This reduction is being accomplished through *energy usage and source flexibility*, mainly through operational adjustments and/or the use of on-site generation (see "Solving the Energy Crisis with Market Driven Incentives").


For over 20 years, TRD professionals have developed and tested methodologies and tools for improving the overall technical operating efficiency and enhancing *energy usage and source flexibility* in industrial plants.

TRD wishes to make its expertise and software available to the US Department of Energy.

In my opinion, the US Government is the only body that can initiate an immediate promotion of the *energy usage and source flexibility* concept on a national basis and issue guidelines for individual states to remove regulatory barriers that impair full benefits for the consumer.

I am prepared to provide further details and make a presentation about the subject to your agency. Please have me contacted personally.

Sincerely,



Walter A. Hans

President

WAH/ljs
Enclosures

cc: Vice President Richard Cheney

Phone: (856) 667-3342 Fax: (856) 667-8168
E-Mail: TRDCORP@AOL.COM
P.O. Box 2820 - Cherry Hill, NJ 08052-0246

10873

DOE016-0625

Solving the Energy Crisis with Market Driven Incentives

Industrial plants alone can reduce electrical peak loads sufficiently throughout the nation to prevent power shortages for years to come. The combined load reduction capacity of industrial plants is more than 45,000 megawatts. A large portion of this reduction is accessible immediately through market driven incentives and does not require any capital investment.

The above mentioned load reduction is equivalent to approximately 7 percent of the total 1999 net summer generation capacity in the US and more than the planned capacity additions for the years 2000 through 2004.

Similar results can be achieved in the commercial sector. Educational tools are being developed by TRD to make curtailment of electricity usage during peak load conditions financially attractive in the residential sector.

The Peak Load Reduction Potential

The reduction of the peak load by 45,000 megawatt in industrial facilities alone was based on the assumption that 25 percent of all industrial operations in the US will convert to *energy usage and source flexibility* (see attached table "Potential Electricity Peak Load Reduction").

Energy usage and source flexibility is a combination of load reductions, load shifting and on-site generation, used to reduce electricity usage during peak load conditions and control energy costs.

Some industrial plants with critical operations and many institutional facilities, such as hospitals and banking centers, have standby generation equipment already in place.

The California power crisis will accelerate the trend toward power self-sufficiency for those operations that suffer consequential losses from power outages, which includes almost all industrial plants.

Facilities with full standby generation capacity can reduce their electricity usage to zero during peak load conditions without incurring any significant expenses. To the contrary, market driven incentives offer large benefits.

Many of these facilities do not participate in load reduction programs, offered by utilities, because of unrealistic requirements, poor incentives, penalties for non-compliance and penalties for intensified electricity usage after a load reduction. The use of load reduction programs for price control purposes, which is becoming more frequent, is quickly reducing participation.

One of TRD's main accomplishments is simplifying the way complex interrelations, such as energy flows in large industrial plants, are viewed and managed. TRD's optimization tools make energy flows visible, understandable and therefore easily manageable.