

3-29

(b) 5 - AS MARKED
AND WITHHOLD
ATTACHED
DRAFTS



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/14/2001 11:08 AM

To: Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE

cc: John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, #EE-ADAS

Subject: FW: NEP Draft outline

Directions on NEP Assessment paper. Please read all of this very carefully before proceeding:

Product

Schedule:

- Inputs due from sectors to Planning: COB on Thursday (sorry)
 - Due from EERE to Policy Office: noon on Friday
 - Due to Vice President's Office: COB next Tuesday
 - Comments back to DOE: next Wednesday
 - Final edits on DOE chapters due to VP task force: next Thursday.
- Please have someone standing by on Tuesday next week to answer questions; on Thursday next week to help with final edits.

EERE Tasks:

EE.3/EE.1 Leads:

- Chapter 2. Lead author: Joel Rubin (if OK with Nancy) Lead fact coordinator: Darrell Beschen
- Chapter 4. Lead author: Mary Beth Beschen Lead coordinator: Darrell
- Chapter 5: Lead author: Sam Baldwin Lead coordinator: Mike York
- Chapter 1 inputs: Mary Beth
- Chapter 6 inputs: Mike York
- Chapter 7 inputs: Mike York

These leads will be contacting you individually as needed to address each section.

15526

DOE017-0154

Crystal,

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:35 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC; Seifert, Roger - KN-DC
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information
Importance: High

> <<DSI paul info.doc>> <<McCook pr final.doc>>



Draft outline.d

15528

DOE017-0156

331

b-5.

Williams, Ronald L

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 1:47 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

My earlier message wasn't crystal clear. Let me try again...

Crystal

—Original Message—

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 9:51 AM
To: 'Anderson, Margot'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 5:54 PM
To: 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'; 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Thank you.

—Original Message—

From: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC [mailto:jkstier@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 3:59 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:46 PM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'; 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

23

(b)5



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/13/2001 02:30 PM

To: Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Heads up on NEP

Thanks for all your help in yesterday's mad rush. We are still expecting to have to produce the final document by Feb. 23.

The VP Task Force is meeting at 3:00 today to review the outlines submitted yesterday. We expect to get next marching orders by 4:00 today.

Please note the availability of the P drive directory for the NEP at:

P://Analysis/Calls/External Requests/NEP2001

Under this directory you will find a file with "key documents" (various guidances as we receive them; I'm still loading these) and a file for "assessment chapter outlines" (that has the two final outlines from yesterday). The "old stuff" folder, of course, has old drafts in case we wish to recover your initial inputs or previous versions.

As we work on this project, we will refer you to these directories as needed. Feel free to post your submissions to the P drive. For edits, we'll try to maintain the discipline of red-line/strikeouts to keep to a minimum the confusion over competing drafts and who's filing what changes. However, in the interest of product control, please don't edit documents without a heads-up to the planning office.

15556

DOE017-0184

Crystal,


Margot

—Original Message—

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:35 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC; Seifert, Roger - KN-DC
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information
Importance: High

> <<DSI paul info.doc>> <<McCook pr final.doc>>

FIGURE 1: NORMAL BASE ELECTRICITY TRANSFERS AND FIRST CONTINGENCY INCREMENTAL TRANSFER CAPABILITIES (NONSIMULTANEOUS), MW



Definitions and Notes to Figure 1

The nonsimultaneous transfer capabilities shown represent the ability of the transmission network to transfer electricity from one area to another for a single demand and generation pattern. Different patterns of demand and generation cause variations in transfer capabilities on a day-to-day (or hour-to-hour) basis. Therefore, the numbers given in this diagram should be considered as representative, rather than definitive. If you would like more information, refer to the interregional studies for this peak demand season.

First Contingency Incremental Transfer Capability (FCITC) is the amount of electricity, incremental above normal base electricity transfers, that can be transferred over the transmission network in a reliable manner, based on the following conditions:

1. With all transmission facilities in service, all facility loadings are within normal ratings and all voltages are within normal limits.
2. The bulk electric system is capable of absorbing the dynamic electric swings and remaining stable following a disturbance resulting in the loss of any single generating unit, transmission circuit, or transformer.
3. After the dynamic swings following a disturbance (resulting in the loss of any single generating unit, transmission circuit, or transformer, but before operator-directed system adjustments are made), all transmission facility loadings are within emergency ratings and all voltages within emergency limits.

First Contingency Total Transfer Capability (FCTTC) is the total amount of electric power (net of normal base power transfers plus first contingency incremental transfers) that can be transferred between two areas of the interconnected transmission systems in a reliable manner based on conditions 1, 2, and 3 in the FCITC definition above.

Specific Diagram Notes


- A. The base limit for the Phase II tie HVDC facility between New England and Québec ranges between 1,200 and 1,800 MW, and can be increased when west-to-east transfers in the MAAC Region and New York ISO (NYISO) are below their limits.

The transfer capability from Québec to New England is expected to total 2,085 MW (60 MW through the Stanstead-Derby tie, 225 MW through Highgate, and 1,800 MW through Phase II).


- B. Transfer on the Phase II HVDC facility from New England to Québec is in the range of 700–1,500 MW and is limited by the ability of the New England, New York, or PJM systems to reliably sustain a loss of load contingency or by the ability of the Québec system to reliably sustain a source contingency. The transfer capability from New England to Québec is expected to total 1,250 MW (zero through the Stanstead-Derby tie, 50 MW through Highgate, and 1,200 MW through Phase II).
- C. The maximum approved limit for total transfers from Québec to the New York ISO is 1,800 MW. The FCTTC is about 1,800 MW over the Chateaugay-Massena 765 kV interconnection, on which the power flow is controlled by the HVDC facility at Chateaugay and radial generation. However, this limit is highly dependent on internal NYISO schedules and flows through the Central East and Total East NYISO interfaces. The 1,800 MW FCTTC does not include the Hydro-Québec generation that can be radially isolated to the Niagara Mohawk system.

- D. Under normal operating conditions, the only transactions between Ontario and Québec consist of isolated demand and generation; there are no synchronous ac ties or HVDC interconnections between the two systems. A maximum of nearly 1,200 MW can be isolated onto the Ontario system by Hydro-Québec, and about 570 MW can be isolated onto the Québec system by Ontario. Under extreme emergencies, on either one of the two systems, additional demands can be transferred to the neighboring system. Thus, an additional 200 MW of Ontario demands can be isolated onto the Québec system and 400 MW of Québec demands can be isolated on to the Ontario system.
 - E. Transfer capability between NPCC and ECAR assumes 1,500 MW of generation at Ontario's Lambton generating station.
 - F. Includes 100 MW Big Rivers Electric Corporation to Southern Subregion wheeled through TVA and 50 MW Entergy to Southern Subregion (Oglethorpe Power Corporation) wheeled through TVA.
-

- * Indicates that First Contingency Total Transfer Capability is listed.
- ** Indicates that an operating procedure must be in effect to allow the noted capability to be used.
- + Indicates no significant transmission limit found at this level.
- ++ Requires an emergency operation procedure to be in place.



NERC Regions and Control Areas



15669

----- Dynamically Controlled Generation

As of January 1, 2001

357

35

Williams, Ronald L

From: Poche, Michelle [Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 2:42 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: FW: Transmission Map



Transfer Capability Map
Summer...



NERC Map.ppt



NERC CA Map.pdf

Margot,

—Michelle

—Original Message—

From: Dave Nevius [mailto:dave.nevius@nerc.com]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 2:11 PM
To: Poche, Michelle <OST>
Cc: Istuntz@sdsatty.com; dcook@nerc.com; mike.gent@nerc.com;
Joseph.Kelliher@hq.doe.gov
Subject: Transmission Map

Michelle

I'm responding to your note to Mike Gent requesting a map that depicts the electric transmission lines across the United States, and illustrates where the bottlenecks are.

It turns out that we did prepare a simplified map of North America showing the general areas of congestion that have occurred recently, but not identifying specific facilities. It is attached as a PPT file.

This map is representative, not definitive, because congestion does not occur in the same places all the time. There are certain weak portions of the network that show up as limits a good portion of the time. Such is the case of the path between Minnesota and Wisconsin, known as the Eau Claire - Arpin line. But, as conditions change, due to unavailability of generating units, weather extremes, or generation costs, what might be a limit today can disappear and be replaced by another. One well-known example is Path 15, which is between central and southern California within the PG&E system and south of Los Banos substation. Path 15 is made up of the following lines:

- Midway-Los Banos 1 and 2 500 kV lines
- Gates-Panoche 1 and 2 230 kV lines
- Gates-Gregg 230 kV line
- Gates-McCall 230 kV line

This path was cited frequently this past winter by the California ISO as limiting the flow of power from southern to northern California. But, last week during the statewide rolling blackouts, it was not limiting. As we move into the summer, it is entirely possible that other paths will be limiting. For example, Path 26, which consists of the 3-500 kV Midway - Vincent lines running between PG&E and SCE, may show up as a limit to north to south transfers. It all depends on which generators are running and which ones are not. In the case of California, the availability of generation at hydro plants in northern California and the Pacific Northwest (including Canada) will be a determining factor.

Further to the point of shifting limits is the situation that occurred last summer in the Midwest. Because of hot temperatures and high gas prices in the South and Southwest, and cool temperatures in the upper Midwest, over 9,000 MW of power was transferred north to south. This was very unusual, but brought into play a number of limiting paths and interfaces running across the middle of the country that had not all come up before (see my simplified map.)

Just 2 or three years ago, there were limits to moving power from the Mid-Atlantic area into the East Central area. The very next year, things turned around and the limit was in the other direction!

I guess the point I'm trying to make is that it is not a simple matter to show limits and bottlenecks on a map and have that mean something. Best thing for you and the folks you work with is for us to come down and give you a face-to-face briefing on the whole transmission situation.

This week, most of our folks are in New Orleans where our three technical committees are meeting. Then on Friday we have a special meeting of our Board in Chicago. How about next week sometime?

Dave

PS I should mention a couple other things that we produce, just so you know about them.

We publish a detailed Transmission Line Map covering the contiguous United States and most of Canada. The map is approximately 40 x 50 inches and features generating plants and substations, transmission lines 230 kV and above that will be in service as of January 1, 2000, and the boundaries of the NERC Regions. We don't have this in electronic form, but could send you a copy to evaluate for inclusion in your report. Let me know and we can even overnight it to you.

In each of our reports on upcoming summer and winter conditions we include a map showing incremental transfer capabilities between Regions and subregions. I included another PDF file for the map that was included in our Summer 2000 report. I included the footnotes too to give you a sense of how these numbers can change as system conditions change. Also, note that these are "non-simultaneous" power transfer capabilities. That means that when Region A imports power from Region B, up to the limit shown in the map, Region A's ability to simultaneously import from Region C may be (and often is) much less than the value shown. Such are the intricacies of interconnected AC power systems and why old transmission planners like me have had so much fun throughout our careers.

Last but not least, I've included a map (PDF) showing the Control Areas in North America and the connections to other Control Areas, superimposed on the NERC map. The connections can be a single transmission line or multiple lines. The map only shows connectivity.

W11 50r

65

Williams, Ronald L

From: Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov%internet [Charles_M._Smith@ovp.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 3:03 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; Kjersten_drager@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Mieblanc@ceq.eop.gov%internet; Bruce.Baughman@FEMA.gov%internet; Charles.m.Hess@USACE.army.mil%internet; akeeler@cea.eop.gov%internet; commcoll@aol.com%internet; Karen_E._Keller@omb.eop.gov%internet; Carol_J._Thompson@who.eop.gov%internet; Sandra_L._Via@omb.eop.gov%internet; Megan_D._Moran@ovp.eop.gov%internet; Janet_P._Walker@opd.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
Subject: Commerce Recommendations



DRAFT Commerce Recs.doc

Attached are Commerce's draft recommendations for your review

(See attached file: DRAFT Commerce Recs.doc)

358
DARRELL BESCHEN

03/06/2001 04:07 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: FEMP's Policy Recs, Take 2

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschon/EE/DOE on 03/06/2001 04:06 PM -----

• Ellyn Krevitz 03/06/2001 04:00 PM

To: Darrell Beschon/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Joan Glickman/EE/DOE@DOE, Beverly Dyer/EE/DOE@DOE, Elizabeth Shearer/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: FEMP's Policy Recs, Take 2

Darrell:

Thanks,
Ellyn and Bev

15682

DOE017-0310

359

b(5)

David Rodgers 03/06/2001 01:15 PM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Gross, richard.moore@hq.doe.gov, Ed Wall,
margaret.singh@ee.doe.gov

Subject: List of policy ideas for OTT

15683

DOE017-0311

360

0.5



Jerry Dion

03/02/2001 11:11 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Barbara Sisson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP Comments

MaryBeth,

15684

DOE017-0312

15685

DOE017-0313

361

615



MaryBeth Zimmerman


05/18/2001 09:53 AM

To: Elizabeth Shearer/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL@HQDOE, Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Joan Glickman/EE/DOE@DOE, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE, Schuyler Schell/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: National Energy Policy - clarification

Thanks for the feedback.

Elizabeth Shearer



Elizabeth Shearer
05/18/2001 09:42 AM

To: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL@HQDOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Joan Glickman, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Schuyler Schell/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: National Energy Policy - clarification


Thanks, Beth Shearer, Director, FEMP

15686

DOE017-0314

362

0-5



Elizabeth Shearer
05/18/2001 09:42 AM

To: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL@HQDOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Joan Glickman, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Schuyler Schell/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: National Energy Policy - clarification

Thanks, Beth Shearer, Director, FEMP

15687

DOE017-0315



364



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/12/2001 01:38 PM

To: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: Cheney report

Gail McKinley



Gail McKinley
02/12/2001 01:29 PM


To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Cheney report

15690

DOE017-0318

365

 Gail McKinley
02/12/2001 01:29 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: Cheney report

36
Buddy Garland

02/12/2001 08:16 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Abe.Haspel@ee.doe.gov
cc:

Subject: Re: national energy strategy assignments

MaryBeth,

This looks straightforward for us (if we had 2 days to write and a day to polish), so let's see what we can do in the time available.

I'll talk to you before the 11:00 staff meeting.

THanks,
Buddy

Abe.Haspel@ee.doe.gov on 02/12/2001 07:29:28 AM

Abe.Haspel@ee.doe.gov on 02/12/2001 07:29:28 AM



To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy
Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

cc:

Subject: national energy strategy assignments

Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/09/2001 07:00:24 PM

To: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Conti@HQMAIL, Paula Scalingi@HQMAIL, Jay
Braitsch@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL, JOHN GEIDL@HQMAIL
cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL

Subject: national energy strategy assignments

All,

15692

DOE017-0320

Jay - this might be all greek to you - give me a call on Monday and I'll fill you in.

Outlines due by 3:00 Monday, Feb 12. Let's regroup on Monday morning for coordination if necessary. Have a good weekend. —

Margot



- taskoutst1.doc

15693

DOE017-0321

364

4(5)

DAKRE BESUCHEN

02/21/2001 10:26 AM

To: Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, abe.haspel@ee.doe.gov, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

cc:

Subject: linda, here is a draft outline for the new NEP chapter (alternatives and renewables) we spoke to



chapter7 renewables and alternatives outline.doc

15694

DOE017-0322

369


b(5)

Lawrence Mansueti 02/21/2001 08:46 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Robert Dixon/EE/DOE@DOE, David Bassett/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: A major typo in the renewables NEP submission to Margot

Forwarded by Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE on 02/21/2001 08:42 AM

 Robert Dixon
02/20/2001 04:01 PM

To: Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, David Bassett/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: RE: two remaining submissions

Linda, Larry and David:

Bob

Forwarded by Robert Dixon/EE/DOE on 02/20/2001 04:00 PM

 MaryBeth Zimmerman 02/20/2001 03:57 PM

To: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE, Robert Dixon/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: RE: two remaining submissions

15695

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/20/2001 03:25 PM -----

Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/20/2001 03:16:24 PM



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

Subject: RE:

B-6

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

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2001 3:10 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Haspel, Abe; Sullivan, John; Garland, Buddy
Subject:

15696

DOE017-0324

>>

<< File: promised edits.doc

364

MaryBeth Zimmerman
02/20/2001 08:55 PM

To: Robert Dixon/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: New Renewable chapter

(PS – my apologies that my home e-mail access lacks spell check)

Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL on 02/20/2001 07:22:46 PM

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

Subject: RE: NEP drafts

2. Let me think about that.

3. Thank you.

—Original Message—

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2001 6:33 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Haspel, Abe; Sullivan, John
Subject: NEP drafts

I have a couple of brief follow-up questions/items related to the energy plan:
—

Of course, please let us know if you need anything further.

Thanks,

Mary Beth Zimmerman

8-6
L<< File: Chapter 4 -- efficiency mbzsfb.doc >>

15699

DOE017-0327

5/11
Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL on 02/20/2001 07:22:46 PM



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

Subject: RE: NEP drafts

2. Let me think about that.

3. Thank you.

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

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2001 6:33 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Haspel, Abe; Sullivan, John
Subject: NEP drafts

15700

DOE017-0328

L 13

I have a couple of brief follow-up questions/items related to the energy plan:

Of course, please let us know if you need anything further.

Thanks,

Mary Beth Zimmerman

B.B

--<< File: Chapter 4 - efficiency mbzsfb.doc >>

15701

DOE017-0329

371



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/20/2001 06:52 PM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Eilyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE

cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Yet another NEP update!

15702

DOE017-0330

372

02/20



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/20/2001 06:33 PM

To: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL @ HQDOE, Abe Haspe/EE/DOE@DOE, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: NEP drafts

I have a couple of brief follow-up questions/items related to the energy plan:

Of course, please let us know if you need anything further.

Thanks,

Mary Beth Zimmerman
6-7249



Chapter 4 – efficiency r


69

15



Ed Wall
02/20/2001 05:36 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Robert Kirk/EE/DOE@DOE, Richard Moorer/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Gross/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: new version of overview sections 


We took a quick look at the revised Section 1 and have a few comments on the second part.

15704

DOE017-0332

377

S...



Gail McKinley
02/20/2001 12:43 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: Re: new version of overview sections



sec1 1 ik mbz redline.doc

MaryBeth Zimmerman



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/20/2001 09:18 AM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Ellyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wal/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overhol/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: new version of overview sections

Thanks.

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/20/2001 08:59 AM -----

Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/19/2001 05:22:12 PM



To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, TREVOR COOK@HQMAIL, Paula Scalingi@HQMAIL, Robert Kripowicz@HQMAIL, WILLIAM MAGWOOD@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL, JAMES KENDELL@HQMAIL, jksuer@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL
cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

15705

Subject: new version section 1

All,

15706

DOE017-0334



sec1 2 ik.E

15707

DOE017-0335

3/15



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/19/2001 04:13 PM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Eilyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE

cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overhol/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baktwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP, draft 2



sec1 1 ik mbz redl regional effects from

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/19/2001 03:57 PM -----



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/16/2001 06:26 PM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Eilyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE

15708

cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP, draft 1

So far, no deadline on this project has slipped, so let me thank you again for getting responses in quickly. (Obviously, we're hoping for the same next week.)

15709

DOE017-0337

46

25



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/19/2001 02:46 PM

To: "Bill Noel" <william.e.noel@erols.com>
cc:

Subject: Re: Fw: NEP, draft 1



"Bill Noel" <william.e.noel@erols.com> on 02/19/2001 02:04:30 PM



To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark
Bailey/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject Fw: NEP, draft 1
:

25

MaryBeth:

15710

Bill Noel

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

From: William.Noel@ee.doe.gov <William.Noel@ee.doe.gov>
To: william.e.noel@erols.com <william.e.noel@erols.com>
Date: Saturday, February 17, 2001 4:23 PM
Subject: NEP, draft 1

>
>
>

>----- Forwarded by William Noel/EE/DOE on 02/17/2001 04:22
PM

>-----
>
>

>MaryBeth Zimmerman
>02/16/2001 06:26 PM

>
>To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry
Dion/EE/DOE@DOE,
> Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Ellyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed
Wall/EE/DOE@DOE,
> David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE
>cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William
> Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence
Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE,
> Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael
> York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE,
Philip
> Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE
>
>Subject: NEP, draft 1
>

15711

>
>So far, no deadline on this project has slipped, so let me thank you again
for
>getting responses in quickly. (Obviously, we're hoping for the same next
week.)

>
>----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/16/2001
>06:06 PM -----

>
>
>Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/16/2001 05:48:00 PM

>
>To: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL,
MaryBeth
> Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Robert Kripowicz@HQMAIL, Robert
> Portere@HQMAIL, WILLIAM MAGWOOD@HQMAIL, David Pumphrey@HQMAIL, James
> HART@HQMAIL, Paula Scalingi@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL, LARRY
> PETTISE@HQMAIL, jkstier@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL,
> cball@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL
>cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

>
>Subject: NEP, draft 1
>
>Here are sections 1.2, 4, and 5.
>

>Thank you all for pushing so hard - we have a lot of very good material here.

>

>Attending Monday

>Larry Pettis (FE)

>Cook (NE)

>Mary Beth Zimmerman, John Sullivan (EE)

>Bob Kripowicz (FE)

>Margot Anderson (PO)

>Paula Scalingi (SO)

>Joe Kelliher (OSEC)

>Joe Stier or Crystal Ball (BPA)

>

>What did I miss?

>

>Margot

>


>


>


>


>

>

 - section 1 draft 1.DOC

 - Section 4 draft 1.doc

 - Section 5 draft 1.doc

 - section 2 draft 1.doc

377

LS



"Bill Noel" <william.e.noel@erols.com> on 02/19/2001 02:04:30 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Bailey/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: Fw: NEP, draft 1

MaryBeth:

Bill Noel

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

From: William.Noel@ee.doe.gov <William.Noel@ee.doe.gov>
To: william.e.noel@erols.com <william.e.noel@erols.com>
Date: Saturday, February 17, 2001 4:23 PM
Subject: NEP, draft 1

>

>

>

>----- Forwarded by William Noel/EE/DOE on 02/17/2001 04:22

PM

>-----

>

>

>MaryBeth Zimmerman

15714

DOE017-0342

>02/16/2001 06:26 PM

>

>To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry
Dion/EE/DOE@DOE,

> Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Ellyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed
Wall/EE/DOE@DOE,

> David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE

>cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William

> Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence
Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE,

> Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael

> York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE,
Philip

> Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

>

>Subject: NEP, draft 1

>

15715

DOE017-0343

>So far, no deadline on this project has slipped, so let me thank you again for getting responses in quickly. (Obviously, we're hoping for the same next week.)

>
>----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/16/2001 06:06 PM -----





>
>
>Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/16/2001 05:48:00 PM

>
>To: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Robert Kripowicz@HQMAIL, Robert Porter@HQMAIL, WILLIAM MAGWOOD@HQMAIL, David Pumphrey@HQMAIL, James HART@HQMAIL, Paula Scalingi@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL, jkstier@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL, cball@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL
>cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

>
>Subject: NEP, draf: 1
>
>Here are sections 1,2, 4, and 5.
>

>Thank you all for pushing so hard - we have a lot of very good material here.
>
>Attending Monday
>Larry Pettis (PE)
>Cook (NE)

>Mary Beth Zimmerman, John Sullivan (EE)
>Bob Kripowicz (FE)
>Margot Anderson (PO)
>Paula Scalingi (SO)
>Joe Kelliher (OSEC)
>Joe Stier or Crystal Ball (BPA)
>
>What did I miss?
>
>Margot
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

-  - section 1 draft 1.DOC
-  - Section 4 draft 1.doc
-  - Section 5 draft 1.doc
-  - section 2 draft 1.doc

3/2/01



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/19/2001 01:33 PM

To: Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Revised regional

Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/19/2001 01:28 PM

Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/19/2001 12:44:15 PM



To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Paula
Scalingi@HQMAIL, TREVOR COOK@HQMAIL, Robert Kripowicz@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL,
JAMES KENDELL@HQMAIL, jkstier@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL
cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

Subject: Revised regional

All,

I took another stab at the regional piece. Comments and additions, please.

15718


DOE017-0346



regional effects †

349

St... e... v... clear



Jerry Dion
02/19/2001 09:33 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: NEP, draft 1

MaryBeth,

The attached file for Chapter 4 contains none of the materials we provided to you on Friday. Did you attach the wron file?

Jerry

MaryBeth Zimmerman
02/16/2001 06:26 PM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Ellyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject:NEP, draft 1

So far, no deadline on this project has slipped, so let me thank you again for getting responses in quickly.
(Obviously, we're hoping for the same next week.)

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/16/2001 06:06 PM

Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/16/2001 05:48:00 PM

To: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Robert Kripowicz@HQMAIL, Robert Porter@HQMAIL, WILLIAM MAGWOOD@HQMAIL, David Pumphrey@HQMAIL, James HART@HQMAIL, Paula Scalingi@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL, jkstier@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL, cball@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL
cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

Subject:NEP, draft 1

Here are sections 1,2, 4, and 5.

Thank you all for pushing so hard - we have a lot of very good material here.

Attending Monday
Larry Pettis (FE)
Cook (NE)
Mary Beth Zimmerman, John Sullivan (EE)
Bob Kripowicz (FE)
Margot Anderson (PO)
Paula Scalingi (SO)
Joe Kelliher (OSEC)
Joe Stier or Crystal Ball (BPA)

What did I miss?

15721

DOE017-0349

Margot

15722

DOE017-0350

385

5(-)

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 9:05 AM
To: Garrish, Ted; Kolevar, Kevin; Anderson, Margot
Subject: national energy policy options

Importance: High

Here is the list where it now stands .

86

(15)

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Magwood, William
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 4:36 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Cook, Trevor; Garrish, Ted; Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: Comments on National Energy Policy Task Forces initiatives

Importance: High

You will also soon receive these papers for your reference. Please call me on ⁵¹⁶ if you have any questions.

5(5)

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Johnson, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 12:20 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert
Cc: Kolevar, Kevin; Solit, James; Harding, Todd
Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting

Importance: High

The potential conflict involving the Secretary traveling to Mexico on June 6 no longer exists; that meeting has been rescheduled for fall 2001 according to IA sources.

Please inform how best to proceed.

JIM: Per your discussion with Margie Biggerstaff, I looks at though we're back on the schedule for June 6.

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

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 1:53 PM
To: Johnson, Nancy
Subject: FW: NPC June 6th meeting

Per my voice mail message.

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

From: Kolevar, Kevin
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 1:37 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert
Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting

That's a good idea. Ask them to coordinate with Todd Harding at scheduling

Kevin

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

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 9:49 AM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

How do you want to proceed with nailing this meeting date down?? My staff can assist you in dealing with Marshall Nichols if you desire, and we'll do whatever you want us to do with scheduling.

Thanks.

284

6/5)

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Dandy, Majida
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 2:31 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin; Solit, James
Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting

This is not correct.

---Original Message---

From: Kolevar, Kevin
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 2:15 PM
To: Dandy, Majida; Solit, James
Subject: FW: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

Let's check with the expert. Majida?

---Original Message---

From: Solit, James
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 12:31 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: FW: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

The Office of Fossil Energy seems to think that the June 6 NPC meeting is on and that the Secretary is not going to Mexico.

Is this true?

---Original Message---

From: Johnson, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 12:20 PM
To: Knpowicz, Robert
Cc: Kolevar, Kevin; Solit, James; Harding, Todd
Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

The potential conflict involving the Secretary traveling to Mexico on June 6 no longer exists; that meeting has been rescheduled for fall 2001 according to IA sources

Please inform how best to proceed.

JIM: Per your discussion with Margie Biggerstaff, I looks at though we're back on the schedule for June 6.

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

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 1:53 PM
To: Johnson, Nancy
Subject: FW: NPC June 6th meeting

Per my voice mail message.

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

From: Kolevar, Kevin
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 1:37 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert
Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting

That's a good idea. Ask them to coordinate with Todd Harding at scheduling.

Kevin

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

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 9:49 AM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

How do you want to proceed with nailing this meeting date down?? My staff can assist you in dealing with Marshall Nichols if you desire, and we'll do whatever you want us to do with scheduling.

Thanks.

5-6

390

(1)

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 2:39 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: FW: NPC June 6th meeting

Importance: High

Bob

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

From: Johnson, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 12:20 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert
Cc: Kolevar, Kevin; Solit, James; Harding, Todd
Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

The potential conflict involving the Secretary traveling to Mexico on June 6 no longer exists; that meeting has been rescheduled for fall 2001 according to IA sources.

Please inform how best to proceed

JIM: Per your discussion with Margie Biggerstaff, I looks at though we're back on the schedule for June 6.

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

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 1:53 PM
To: Johnson, Nancy
Subject: FW: NPC June 6th meeting

Per my voice mail message.

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

From: Kolevar, Kevin
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 1:37 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert

Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting

B6

That's a good idea. Ask them to coordinate with Todd Harding at scheduling.

Kevin

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

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 9:49 AM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

How do you want to proceed with nailing this meeting date down?? My staff can assist you in dealing with Marshall Nichols if you desire, and we'll do whatever you want us to do with scheduling.

Thanks.

391

6:55)

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Solit, James
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 2:38 PM
To: Johnson, Nancy
Cc: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting

This meeting is not yet back on the schedule. I would confer with Kevin Kolevar before I did anything.

He is waaaaay closer to this than I am.

But if I hear something I would be pleased to let you know.

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

From: Johnson, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 12:20 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert
Cc: Kolevar, Kevin; Solit, James; Harding, Todd
Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

The potential conflict involving the Secretary traveling to Mexico on June 6 no longer exists; that meeting has been rescheduled for fall 2001 according to IA sources.

Please inform how best to proceed.

JIM Per your discussion with Margie Biggerstaff, I looks at though we're back on the schedule for June 6.

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

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 1:53 PM
To: Johnson, Nancy
Subject: FW: NPC June 6th meeting

Per my voice mail message

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

From: Kolevar, Kevin
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 1:37 PM
To: Kripowicz, Robert

Subject: RE: NPC June 6th meeting

That's a good idea. Ask them to coordinate with Todd Harding at scheduling.

Kevin

5/10

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

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 9:49 AM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: NPC June 6th meeting
Importance: High

How do you want to proceed with nailing this meeting date down?? My staff can assist you in dealing with Marshall Nichols if you desire, and we'll do whatever you want us to do with scheduling.

Thanks.

247
6(5)
Kolevar, Kevin

From: Kripowicz, Robert
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2001 5:41 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: FW: NPC Meeting -- Next Steps?

Importance: High

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

From: Johnson, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2001 11:00 AM
To: Kripowicz, Robert
Cc: DeHoratius, Guido
Subject: FW: NPC Meeting -- Next Steps?

Margie will pick up the letter approving the June 6 meeting of the National Petroleum Council and get the ball rolling on the FR notice. The Office of Scheduling has reaffirmed that no decision has yet been made on whether Secretary Abraham will attend.

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

From: Solit, James
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2001 6:08 PM
To: Biggerstaff, Margie; Johnson, Nancy
Subject: NPC Meeting

I have approval for a letter to be autopenned approving the holding of the June 6 NPC meeting.

It is silent on the issue of the Secretary's participation, which I don't know anything about.

We can dispatch the hard copy.

410

(6)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Poche, Michelle [Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 3:18 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: DOT Comments

Here are all but one of the sources.....we are verifying the GDP number.



chapter 6 sources.doc

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2001 1:29 PM
To: 'Poche, Michelle'; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'
Subject: RE: DOT Comments

Michelle,

Margot

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

From: Poche, Michelle [mailto:Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2001 4:18 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'
Subject: DOT Comments

Joe and Margot,

Here are some comments from DOT policy staff on your chapters. Since our systems don't always talk to each other, I'll paste them below into this email as well as attaching a document. Please let me know if you have questions, and I'll run them down with the folks who have offered these suggestions.

Please note the suggested text for Chapter 6 includes some policy recommendations and pro and con stuff that we might agree should be deleted or rephrased. But I wanted to submit it to you as drafted by our policy folks as a starting point for discussion.

Jeremy, Joe and Margot,

Thanks,
Michelle

417

Williams, Ronald L

From: Poche, Michelle [Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 3:18 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: DOT Comments

Here are all but one of the sources....we are verifying the GDP number.



chapter 6 sources.doc

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2001 1:29 PM
To: 'Poche, Michelle'; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'
Subject: RE: DOT Comments

Michelle,

Margot

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

From: Poche, Michelle [mailto:Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2001 4:18 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'
Subject: DOT Comments

Joe and Margot,

Here are some comments from DOT policy staff on your chapters. Since our systems don't always talk to each other, I'll paste them below into this email as well as attaching a document. Please let me know if you have questions, and I'll run them down with the folks who have offered these suggestions.

Please note the suggested text for Chapter 6 includes some policy recommendations and pro and con stuff that we might agree should be deleted or rephrased. But I wanted to submit it to you as drafted by our policy folks as a starting point for discussion.

Jeremy, Joe and Margot,

Thanks,
Michelle

Alternative Fuels: Myths And Facts

Proponents of a shift away from oil-based fuels say they should be replaced by "alternative fuels." They argue that gasoline is incompatible with a clean environment and that alternative fuels pollute less, perform well, and are good for jobs and the economy. They further maintain that greater reliance on alternatives would reduce oil imports, fix the U.S. trade deficit, end America's vulnerability to oil supply disruptions, and substantially cut America's defense budget.

In part because of these arguments, the U.S. government and state governments are now spending well over \$1 billion of taxpayer money annually to promote programs that either mandate or subsidize the use of alternatively fueled vehicles (AFV's) and alternative fuels.

Yet most of the benefits claimed for alternatives either don't exist or have been substantially overstated. Here are some of the myths advanced to promote alternative fuels and the facts that challenge them.

Myth #1. Gasoline is incompatible with clean air.

The Facts. That's simply not true. The air in the United States is cleaner, and growing cleaner still, thanks in large measure to 25 years of improvements to the internal combustion engine and to gasoline itself.

According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), between 1984 and 1993 (the latest year for which statistics are available) hydrocarbon, carbon monoxide,

nitrogen oxide, and lead emissions from highway vehicles declined by 36 percent, 24 percent, 11 percent and 96 percent, respectively. And these reductions occurred even though motorists drove 33 percent more miles.

Moreover, EPA data show that vehicle emissions are a declining percentage of the total emissions pie. For example, in 1983, hydrocarbon emissions from highway vehicles constituted about 40 percent of total hydrocarbon emissions; in 1992, they constituted only about 27 percent.

Another measure of progress: Today, a new vehicle that uses cleaner-burning gasoline emits some 95 percent fewer pollutants than a 1960s-era vehicle.

The decline in vehicle emissions has contributed to significant overall reductions in air pollution. EPA data show that from 1984 to 1993, smog dropped by 12 percent, carbon monoxide levels by 37 percent, nitrogen dioxide levels by 12 percent, and lead levels by 89 percent.

In short, many more people are breathing cleaner air. In 1993, about 190 million Americans, or roughly three-quarters of the population, lived in parts of the country where the air met all of the standards for ambient air quality set by the Clean Air Act. This is over 40 million more people than in 1987.

In addition to improvements in vehicles, five advances in fuels helped contribute to better air quality:

- Low-sulfur diesel fuel, with 85 percent less sulfur to reduce such airborne particles as soot and smoke.
- Lead-free gasoline.
- Gasoline with low Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) that evaporates more slowly to reduce smog in the summer.
- Oxygenated gasoline that burns more completely to cut carbon monoxide emissions in the winter.
- Reformulated gasoline that further reduces smog and cuts toxic emissions.

The latter three gasolines—low RVP, oxygenated and reformulated—are currently sold in areas of the United States with significant air quality problems.

Myth #2. Oil received help from the U.S. government as a “fledgling industry” during its early years. Now alternatives deserve encouragement from government.

The Facts. The oil industry received no federal help in its early years. Not a penny. And the alternative fuels industry, which already receives substantial government support, is hardly a fledgling industry.

From 1859, when the first well was drilled in Pennsylvania, to 1919, when government first provided help to oil because of the strategic value it proved to have in World War I, the oil business did not receive a cent of federal assistance. During that time, the industry grew from a highly speculative venture to one that supplied some 12 percent of the nation’s total energy needs.

On the other hand, many of today’s alternative fuels manufacturers and distributors receive large government

subsidies, despite the fact that they are well-established, well-financed companies. Total government subsidies to such companies easily exceed \$1 billion a year. One primary beneficiary is Archer Daniels Midland, the agribusiness giant and the nation’s largest ethanol producer. Federal and state subsidies for ethanol alone amount to over \$800 million a year, or more than 55 cents for every gallon produced.

Myth #3. Alternative fuels will make a significant difference in air quality.

The Facts. This contention is wrong. Alternatives would not make the air much, if any, cleaner for three reasons:

- One, all vehicles, whatever their fuel, have to meet current and prospective air emission standards. Since there is no incentive to exceed the standards, manufacturers will tend to build vehicles that merely meet them. The practical effect is that alternative-fueled vehicles won’t perform significantly better than conventional vehicles.
- Two, technical data show there is only a small difference in emissions performance between the best conventional vehicles powered by cleaner-burning reformulated gasoline and many alternative fuel vehicles. Both the U.S. General Accounting Office and the U.S. Congressional Research Service have stated that it is unclear that alternatives perform significantly better.
- Three, automobiles are responsible for a declining share of the nation’s remaining air pollution problems. For example, in 1993, according to EPA, sources other than highway vehicles produced nearly three-quarters of the nation’s man-made hydrocarbon emissions. As a result, even a large decline in remaining auto emissions may not reduce air pollution much. For example, some scientists have found that even if all auto emissions were eliminated in

Los Angeles, ozone concentrations would decline by only about 10 percent.¹

All alternatives produce some pollution, even electric vehicles. According to Amory Lovins, director of research at the Rocky Mountain Institute, electric vehicles are "elsewhere emission vehicles—wholly reliant on electricity whose generation pollutes chiefly (but not exclusively) other airsheds."

Lovins is referring to the air pollution produced by electric power plants, which can be considerable. A study by Sierra Research concludes that, even when power plant emissions are counted, total hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions associated with electric vehicles are far lower than those from gasoline-powered cars; but total sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate emissions may be higher and could pose a threat to health.

Methanol and ethanol also produce pollution—and provide little, if any, improvement in emissions, compared to reformulated gasoline.² Compressed natural gas (CNG) reduces certain emissions more than reformulated gasoline, although some tests show that it generates slightly higher levels of smog-forming nitrogen oxide emissions. Liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), which is manufactured by processing natural gas and refining oil, yields about the same benefits, also producing somewhat higher nitrogen oxide emissions.³

¹ J.G. Calvert, J.B. Heywood, R.F. Sawyer, J.H. Seinfeld, "Achieving Acceptable Air Quality: Some Reflections on Controlling Vehicle Emissions," *Science*, 2 July 1993, p. 44.

² Calvert et al., p. 42.

³ T.Y. Chang, R.H. Hammerle, S.M. Japar, I.T. Salmeen, "Alternative Transportation Fuels and Air Quality," *Environmental Science and Technology*, 1991, Volume 25, No. 7, p1196.

Myth #4. Alternatives offer the public a level of performance and convenience comparable to gasoline.

The Facts. This is untrue. For example, electric cars—one of the most talked about alternatives—suffer from serious performance problems, particularly reduced range. The lead acid batteries that will likely provide power for these vehicles for the near term will take a vehicle 80 to 100 miles at best on a full charge, assuming limited or no use of the heater or air conditioner, no cold weather, and operation on roads over flat terrain. On a cold day, the range of most electric vehicles on the road today drops to about 20 miles. According to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), "current technology is best suited for [a] range of less than 50 miles between charging." As Amory Lovins has pointed out, "Batteries have only one percent of the energy per kilogram that normal fuel does...."

Some people claim that the electric vehicle is the car for the 21st Century. The truth is, it was more suitable for the late 19th Century, when society was geographically compact and people tended to travel much shorter distances.

Warren Brown, automotive writer for The Washington Post, recently pronounced electric vehicles "not ready for prime time." He reported that recharging one electric car's battery to 90 percent capacity—with a conventional, grounded, 110-volt house outlet—took 32 hours, "so slow, you might as well travel by stagecoach." The most widely used power source in electric vehicles today is the lead-acid battery. The life span of such batteries is about two years, and the cost of replacing them is roughly \$6,000.

Other alternatives also fail to provide performance equal to gasoline. Both methanol and ethanol pack substantially less

energy per gallon than gasoline, which means vehicles equipped with a fuel tank the same size as that on a gasoline-powered car have significantly less range. A gallon of methanol, for example, will provide only about half the mileage of a gallon of gasoline.

Compressed natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas contain less energy than gasoline in a given volume. For example, CNG contains only about one-quarter the energy. That's why CNG vehicles must be equipped with large, heavy fuel tanks. The tanks take up most of a car's cargo capacity, yet provide a range of only about 150 miles. LPG vehicles also need larger fuel tanks.

Myth #5. Mandating alternatives will be good for the economy because they will spur new investment and create new industries.

The Facts. No, they won't. That's because alternatives generally cost more than conventional gasoline-powered technology. People will have to pay more for transportation, leaving less to spend on other goods and services. This will hurt the economy. Mandating the use of new products that are not as good as those already available does not promote economic vitality.

The cost of alternative vehicles varies, depending on the alternative. The electric car is one of the most expensive. If larger quantities of electric vehicles are produced in the future, per unit costs will decline, but they are still expected to remain high. For example, the economic consulting firms, DRI/McGraw-Hill and Charles River Associates, estimate that in 2010 the additional cost of manufacturing electric vehicles to meet California's electric vehicle mandate requirements could exceed \$20,000 per vehicle. DOE says that by 2010 electric vehicles will cost about \$10,000 more than gasoline-powered vehicles.

Most other alternatives are also more expensive. Methanol has historically been somewhat more expensive than gasoline; recently, wholesale methanol prices have increased to two or three times the price of gasoline. Ethanol costs about twice as much to produce as gasoline. New methanol and ethanol vehicles cost up to \$250 more than comparable gasoline vehicles.

CNG and LPG are both less expensive than gasoline and both are well-suited for use in fleets, where centralized refueling is possible. However, vehicle costs are higher. According to DOE, new CNG vehicles cost between \$3,500 to \$7,500 more than conventional gasoline vehicles, and new LPG vehicles cost about \$1,000 more. The National Petroleum Council—an advisory panel to the U.S. Secretary of Energy—anticipates lower incremental costs with mass production: \$600 to \$1,200 more for CNG vehicles and \$150 to \$675 more for LPG vehicles.

Myth #6. Alternatives are needed because petroleum supplies are dwindling rapidly.

The Facts. Not true. There's enough oil in the earth to last for generations. It's true that "proved" reserves in the United States would last only ten years at current rates of production. However, reserves that are categorized as proved are only a very small portion of the total amount of petroleum expected to be eventually recovered. In fact, recent estimates of the remaining petroleum resources in the U.S., both in known fields and those yet to be discovered, should last between 40 and 80 years at current rates of production. Technological advances, which are making it possible to identify new reserves more efficiently and to extract a greater percentage of oil in each reservoir, could double that estimate.

In 1950, the world consumed about 10 million barrels a day. At that rate, according to annual reports developed by the Oil and Gas Journal, the world had 24 years of proved reserves. Since then, consumption has climbed to a current rate of about 70 million barrels of crude oil a day, yet the world still has 45-years' worth of proved reserves. In other words, oil companies have been finding oil faster than people have been consuming it—to such an extent that the world's proved reserves have actually doubled since 1950.

The petroleum industry's ability to find more oil has been surprising experts for decades. For example, in 1874 a Pennsylvania state geologist predicted that "...the United States [has] enough petroleum to keep its kerosene lamps burning for only four years...." In 1919, the chief of the U.S. Geological Survey predicted that U.S. oil production would soon peak, "possibly within three years."

In 1944, Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and wartime petroleum czar, predicted that America's oil would run out in 14 years. America, he pointed out, had only 20 billion barrels of proven reserves. Since the Ickes prediction, America's oil fields have produced 320 billion barrels of oil, and proven reserves now amount to about 24 billion barrels.

Ultimately, of course, oil is a finite resource. So, in theory, someday we could run out. But this is highly unlikely so long as markets are allowed to operate freely. Long before oil reserves are exhausted, higher costs of production will encourage faster development of substitutes. This is a typical market phenomenon, as history has repeatedly demonstrated—as when whale oil used in lamps was replaced by kerosine, a petroleum-based product. And when oil succeeded coal as the nation's chief source of energy.

Myth #7. Alternative fuels will reduce oil imports.

The Facts. Current programs and proposals for promoting alternatives might reduce oil imports, albeit at a high cost. But many of the alternatives replacing oil also would be imported, in whole or part. That's true of methanol and natural gas, for example.

In any case, substituting alternatives that cost more than imported oil would make the nation worse off economically. It would raise the costs of energy-intensive goods and services, such as products made from aluminum and fruits and vegetables that are transported great distances. People couldn't buy as many other goods and services as a result, and demand for them would lessen. Factories would produce less, jobs might be lost, and the ability of U.S. manufacturing facilities owned by firms like Alcoa or Reynolds Metals to compete in world markets would be diminished.

Myth #8. Alternatives will cure our growing trade deficit.

The Facts. Just the opposite is likely. Forcing American companies to use more expensive energy in the form of alternative fuels will hurt their competitiveness in world markets and hence is no way to go about reducing the trade deficit. It would take massive government mandates and subsidies to force the switch to alternatives, imposing huge costs on American businesses and consumers. For example, U.S. wheat farmers, forced to use more expensive alternative forms of energy, would be placed at a competitive disadvantage on world markets with wheat farmers from Canada and Argentina. So what the U.S. gained through declining imports of oil not only would be lost through other energy imports but also could

well result in declining exports of wheat and other products.⁴

Myth #9. Alternatives will reduce U.S. vulnerability to oil supply disruptions.

The Facts. Not really. We'd still be major participants in the world oil market and so would be directly affected by any such disruptions. But in any case, such vulnerability has already been reduced. There are three major reasons for this. First, the world oil economy has become highly interdependent. Oil exporting nations need U.S. dollars at least as much as the U.S. needs their oil. So there is a huge incentive for both to maintain undisrupted trade. According to a World Bank report, given "the urgent financial requirements of all oil exporters it is unlikely that a major oil exporter would deny supplies to the U.S." for political reasons.

Moreover, countries that are successful oil exporters, including those in the Middle East, often buy portions of refinery or distribution operations in other countries. That has happened in the United States, and those investments also moderate any inclination to disrupt oil trade.

Second, U.S. oil companies, as well as companies elsewhere in the world, have been diversifying their sources of production and relying more on futures contracts to buy their oil. As a result of the supply disruptions of the 1970s, the world's oil industry has stepped up its exploration efforts outside of such volatile areas as the Middle East. In fact, since the mid-1970s, Middle Eastern oil production has declined from almost 40 percent to just over 30 percent of the world's production. More such diversification is likely in the future. Sizable oil reserves are thought to exist in such

countries as Peru, China, and a number of the states of the former Soviet Union.

The third major reason is that the United States now has its own Strategic Petroleum Reserve with nearly 600 million barrels of oil in storage which could replace all oil imports from all countries for over two months in the event of an emergency. According to then-Rep. Philip Sharp (D-Ind.), speaking in Congress at the time of the 1990-1991 Persian Gulf conflict, this reserve "may have prevented a large oil price increase when the tanker war broke out between Iran and Iraq. Its existence may also have limited the price increase we are currently seeing."

To these three reasons could be added a potential fourth: The best way of reducing oil imports, and thus our vulnerability to supply disruptions, would be to replace imports with energy that costs less than foreign oil. In many cases, that is domestic oil and gas. The U.S. still has plenty of oil and gas to be developed. Some of it lies offshore in areas like the Gulf of Mexico and off the California and Florida coasts. Some of it is located on such federally owned land as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. But, unfortunately, the U.S. government has closed many of these promising areas for environmental reasons, despite the fact that it has been demonstrated time and time again that, with appropriate environmental safeguards, wildlife and vegetation and resource recovery can happily coexist. Domestic production would certainly increase domestic petroleum supplies and reduce imports at far less cost than mandating alternatives. Whatever merit lies in reducing oil imports, producing more of the nation's own oil and gas reserves would achieve that end better than alternatives.

⁴ It should be noted that oil accounts for only a small portion of all goods and services imported into the United States—about 6 percent in 1994. Mandating alternative fuels does nothing about the remaining 94 percent.

Myth #10. Alternatives will substantially cut America's defense costs in the Middle East.

The Facts. This isn't likely. America has reasons other than oil—both strategic and historic—to keep a major military presence in that region. In fact, U.S. troops were deployed in the Middle East well before oil supplies from this area were a large source of U.S. imports. Furthermore, even if the U.S. completely eliminated oil imports, the rest of the world would not, including many of our most important trading partners such as Germany and Japan, which rely far more heavily on imported oil than the United States. Because our economic well-being is tied in part to theirs, we have an interest in maintaining the flow of oil to them even if we imported no Middle Eastern oil ourselves. So cutting U.S. imports with alternatives won't eliminate defense expenditures aimed at protecting the international trade of oil.

There are other reasons for our defense presence in the Middle East that are unrelated to oil. For example, the U.S. government wants to contain Saddam Hussein, Iraq's notoriously unstable ruler, who is trying to become a military superpower with a nuclear arsenal and other weapons of mass destruction. The U.S. is also concerned about his next door neighbor, Iran, the source of much terrorism in the world. Indeed, John Lichtblau, the noted energy analyst, writing in *The Energy Journal* in 1994, observed that "there is no direct relationship between the deployment of U.S. forces in the Middle East and our importation of Middle East oil. These forces were deployed there as part of our Cold War global strategy, just as they were deployed in Europe and the Far East."

It should also be kept in mind that the monetary costs of a defense presence are not nearly as great as might be imagined. According to a Congressional Budget Office

report, military expenditures during the 1990-91 Persian Gulf War amounted to approximately \$49 billion. The Gulf states paid all but about \$1 billion of that amount.

Myth #11. Replacing oil with alternative fuels will mean more jobs.

The Facts. Actually, it could turn out to eliminate jobs. Some jobs definitely will be created making, distributing and selling alternatives, but they will come at the expense of jobs lost in the traditional automobile and petroleum industries. In addition, if alternatives are more expensive than conventional gasoline fuel/vehicle technology, as would be likely, consumers will have to pay more for them. They will then have less to spend on other products, which will reduce demand for these products and cost jobs. Businesses will also face higher costs, which could diminish their competitiveness in world markets and reduce employment in their offices and factories. Finally, if consumers purchased more domestically produced alternative fuels, countries that now export oil to the United States would have less money to buy our goods and services. This would also tend to reduce U.S. jobs.

Myth #12. Government subsidies for alternatives are a good way to advance new technology.

The Facts. This simply isn't accurate. The assumption that lies behind this myth is that government must step in because, if left alone, industry will overlook promising new technology and fail to develop it. This assumption defies history and common sense. The advancing technology we enjoy today is the product of private initiative, and the government's track record directing the development of energy technology is abysmal.

According to Michael McKenna, an energy consultant writing last year in Policy Review, "Since 1980, the United States [government] has spent more than \$50 billion of taxpayer money to develop energy technologies that have either failed technically or lacked market appeal. A case in point was the nearly \$6 billion the government spent between 1980 and 1992 to develop renewable energy such as solar, geothermal, biomass, wind-generated energy, hydropower and others. Despite the massive investment, energy production from these sources fell by nearly 10 percent by the end of that period.

A classic example of the government's misguided attempts to advance new technology was the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, established in 1980 by the Carter Administration after a major oil supply disruption during the Iranian revolution. The aim of the program was to produce some 2.5 million barrels per day of synthetic fuels (synfuels) by 1990. Synfuels are gas and liquid fuels made from coal or oil shale feedstocks, which the United States has in abundant supply. Despite the expenditure of billions of dollars and the construction of synfuel plants, the program was a failure. The small amount of fuel that was produced cost far more than conventional fuels, and in 1986, Congress terminated the program.

Myth #13. Alternatives deserve subsidies because even today oil is heavily subsidized.

The Facts. Wrong again. The oil industry puts much more into the federal government's coffers than the government puts into the industry's coffers. And what money the industry receives is a disproportionately small share of what the federal government pays out in overall energy subsidies. According to a 1992 report by the Department of Energy's U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), the oil industry received about \$1 billion of the federal government's \$8 billion in

annual energy subsidies. This means that while oil meets 40 percent of the nation's energy needs, it receives only 12 percent of the subsidies. One billion dollars in subsidies is about 0.4 cents a gallon of gasoline or other oil products, and much of it goes exclusively to smaller companies within the industry.

What's more, the EIA pointed out that on balance the oil industry has been hurt rather than helped by government intervention. The industry is, in effect, the recipient of a "negative subsidy." That's because, in recent years, the federal government has begun to use the motor fuels excise tax, once reserved exclusively for highway construction and maintenance, for purposes like mass transit and shrinking the national debt. This portion amounts to a subsidy from the oil industry to other programs. In 1992, for example, excise taxes on motor fuels which were not dedicated to highways and roads amounted to more than \$6 billion—considerably more than the \$1 billion in subsidies the industry received that year.

The oil industry has historically been singled out for additional taxes. From 1980 to 1988, for example, the government collected an additional \$78 billion from the petroleum industry through the so-called Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax. This special tax was imposed only on oil produced in the United States and was paid by oil companies.

The subsidy that critics of the oil industry most often cite is the percentage depletion allowance, a tax deduction intended to reflect the gradual exhaustion of a natural resource, such as oil and gas or other mineral deposits. Some independent oil and gas producers receive limited tax breaks from the percentage depletion allowance, including those independent companies that produce natural gas for use in such alternative fuels as compressed natural gas and methanol. The large, integrated oil producers are not eligible to receive the

percentage depletion allowance. However, companies in every mineral extractive industry retain it.

Myth #14. Oil companies are really opposing alternatives because they fear the competition. They want the market all to themselves.

The Facts. Oil companies don't in fact oppose alternatives, and many produce one or more of them. What they want is for all fuels to compete on a level playing field. Certainly, like other businesses, oil companies want to be successful. They want to sell as much of their product as possible, and they want to meet and beat the competition—each other as well as the alternative fuels businesses.

But, unlike some alternative fuels interests, oil companies are not asking government to protect them from competition. They want all fuels to compete on their merits—and demerits. And in fact, the energy market continues to be quite competitive. All sorts of energy sources are used to power factories, heat homes and run appliances. While American consumers look to oil-based gasoline as the least expensive, most efficient form of motor fuel, American utility companies look to coal, nuclear and renewable energies to power their electric generators.

So the oil companies don't oppose alternatives. They do oppose government efforts to pick "winners and losers" by subsidizing certain fuels with taxpayer funds or by forcing consumers to buy alternative fuels and the vehicles that run on them.

*Editorial and Special Issues Department
Public Affairs Group
8/8/95 TL*

422

Williams, Ronald L

From: KYDES, ANDY
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 7:04 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: Chapter 8 (Increased production of U.S. Energy Resources)



CHAPTE~2.WPD

Margot, Here's our response;

Andy

—Original Message—

From: Margot Anderson_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2001 1:16 PM
To: Kydes, Andy
Cc: Kendell, James; Hutzler, Mary; Pettis, Larry
Subject: RE: Chapter 8 (Increased production of U.S. Energy Resources)

Andy,

Thanks. I'll wait until all the comments are pulled together. Buys me a little time to work on the other chapters.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: KYDES, ANDY
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2001 6:17 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: KENDELL, JAMES; HUTZLER, MARY; PETTIS, LARRY
Subject: RE: Chapter 8 (Increased production of U.S. Energy Resources)

Margot:

That's it for now.

Andy

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

From: Margot Anderson_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO

Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2001 10:40 AM

To: Kydes, Andy; John Conti_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; Andrea Lockwood_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; William Breed_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; Michael Whatley_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; Douglas Carter_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; Jay Braitsch_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; Elena Melchert_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; TREVOR COOK_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; jkstier@bpa.gov_at_internet at X400PO; Christopher Freitas_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; Mark FRIEDRICHS_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; David Pumphrey_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; Kevin Kolevar_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO; Abe Haspel_at_HQ-NOTES at X400PO; MaryBeth Zimmerman_at_HQ-NOTES at X400PO; Michael York_at_HQ-NOTES at X400PO

Cc: Joseph Kelliher_at_HQ-EXCH at X400PO

Subject: Chapter 8 (Increased production of U.S. Energy Resources).

15935

DOE017-0563

424

(b)5

Williams, Ronald L

From: Poche, Michelle [Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 4:21 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: DOT Comments

Margot,
Below is reply from DOT staff.
Thanks,
Michelle

The only additional barriers we would add are:

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2001 1:43 PM
To: 'Poche, Michelle'; Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'
Subject: RE: DOT Comments

Michelle,

Margot

Margot

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

From: Poche, Michelle [mailto:Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2001 4:18 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'
Subject: DOT Comments

Joe and Margot,

Here are some comments from DOT policy staff on your chapters. Since our systems don't always talk to each other, I'll paste them below into this email as well as attaching a document. Please let me know if you have questions, and I'll run them down with the folks who have offered these suggestions.

Please note the suggested text for Chapter 6 includes some policy recommendations and pro and con stuff that we might agree should be deleted or rephrased. But I wanted to submit it to you as drafted by our policy folks as a starting point for discussion.

Jeremy, Joe and Margot.

4/25

(b)5

Thanks,
Michelle

Chapter 3

- The CAFE program has the potential to raise fuel economy standards gradually, but has been frozen for six years by the Congress. New policies could be developed for this program, ranging from maintaining it as a floor, to raising standards, to changing its structure. This program is currently under review by the National Academy of Sciences, and any policy initiatives which consider changing this program should await the findings of that panel.
- The government should continue to support the Partnership for the Next Generation of Vehicles (PNGV) program, its partnership with industry to develop new advanced technologies. This program has been instrumental in today's interest in hybrids. Many more technological developments continue to emerge from it.
- A number of fiscal instruments might be considered to stimulate the interest in and deployment of energy conserving cars. Income tax incentives could be offered to purchasers of hybrids, or other tax benefits offered for the manufacturers who market them.

Potential impediments and competing policy objectives include:

- Transportation safety goals.
- Economic trends.
- Consumer preferences and other vehicle market characteristics.
- Cost, performance, and utility of different vehicles and technologies.

Alternative Fuels - The more alternative fuel that can be used, the more petroleum is conserved. In addition to electric vehicles, a number of dedicated and flexibly fueled vehicles are available today, and are finding some acceptance. These vehicles can operate on fuels such as ethanol, methanol, CNG, LPG, and some blends of such fuels (in particular, ethanol) with gasoline or diesel fuel. However, throughout most of the country, the cost and general unavailability of such fuels and lack of self-refueling stations has been one of the most significant impediments. Also, vehicles designed to operate on some alternative fuels can be significantly more expensive to own and maintain than their petroleum-based counterparts, and can underperform when operated on alternative fuel. These issues all hinder more widespread use of alternative fuels. Further, not all alternative fuels are environmentally friendly, and most are not currently cost-effective. The full costs of fuel production and delivery must be accounted for, from extraction and processing of feedstocks to distribution and use of finished fuels.

Major policy issues related to alternative fuels include the extent to which they reduce emissions and energy over the entire fuel cycle, the scale of investment that would be required for new fuel-related infrastructure, and the prices that would be required in order to cover variable production costs and recover those capital investments.

- Incentives for producing ethanol range from special exemptions, deductions, credits and deferrals of tax. One policy initiative could be to extend the incentives to more forms of alternative fuels, but tailor the incentives to reflect the actual life-cycle energy saved by their use.

A third potential means to conserve energy in the transportation sector is to apply more efficient practices in the use of transportation. These mobility strategies have been of interest at all levels of government, usually stimulated by the need for congestion mitigation. Car and van pooling; walking and bicycling; telecommuting; measures to increase transit choice, pricing of highway use during periods of peak demand; and incentivizing energy efficient land use all have some potential to conserve energy while reducing congestion. Although transportation energy consumption is influenced (via

changes in travel demand as well as vehicle and fuel selection) by fuel prices, most estimates suggest that the short-term elasticity of transportation demand is low. Technology will have a significant role to play in reducing congestion, through such applications as automatic toll collection, optimized signal timing, and centrally directed traffic advisories. For trucks, such applications as weigh-in-motion, and automatic credentialing, will smooth continued movement.

However, these individual measures to reduce motor vehicle use and congestion have met with limited success to date, and have uncertain relationships to national-scale transportation energy demand. To achieve more significant reductions, new approaches at the national state and local levels are needed to achieve a coordinated, reinforcing, and integrated package of the strategies noted. This would involve substantial institutional cooperation among various public institutions and private companies.

- Make energy conservation one of the objectives of the state-wide metropolitan planning process. This objective would have a strong synergy with other metropolitan goals, such as reducing congestion and improving air quality.
- Fund research and sponsor projects demonstrating new strategies to reduce energy consumption through improved transportation coordination and usage. Disseminate the findings to state and local governments through a technical assistance program.
- Fund states and local governments efforts to monitor energy consumption and report annually on progress.

<< File: DOT comments.doc >>

429

(B)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Kelliher, Joseph
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 5:32 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: FW: Transmission Map



Transfer Capability Map
Summer...



NERC Map.ppt



NERC CA Map.pdf

FYI

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

From: Dave Nevius [mailto:dave.nevius@nerc.com]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 2:10 PM
To: Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov%internet
Cc: Kelliher, Joseph; Istuntz@sdsatty.com%internet;
dcook@nerc.com%internet; mike.gent@nerc.com%internet
Subject: Transmission Map

Micheile

I'm responding to your note to Mike Gent requesting a map that depicts the electric transmission lines across the United States, and illustrates where the bottlenecks are.

It turns out that we did prepare a simplified map of North America showing the general areas of congestion that have occurred recently, but not identifying specific facilities. It is attached as a PPT file.

This map is representative, not definitive, because congestion does not occur in the same places all the time. There are certain weak portions of the network that show up as limits a good portion of the time. Such is the case of the path between Minnesota and Wisconsin, known as the Eau Claire - Arpin line. But, as conditions change, due to unavailability of generating units, weather extremes, or generation costs, what might be a limit today can disappear and be replaced by another. One well-known example is Path 15, which is between central and southern California within the PG&E system and south of Los Banos substation. Path 15 is made up of the following lines:

- Midway-Los Banos 1 and 2 500 kV lines
- Gates-Panoche 1 and 2 230 kV lines
- Gates-Gregg 230 kV line
- Gates-McCall 230 kV line

This path was cited frequently this past winter by the California ISO as limiting the flow of power from southern to northern California. But, last week during the statewide rolling blackouts, it was not limiting. As we move into the summer, it is entirely possible that other paths will be limiting. For example, Path 26, which consists of the 3-500 kV Midway - Vincent lines running between PG&E and SCE, may show up as a limit to north to south transfers. It all depends on which generators are running and which ones are not. In the case of California, the availability of generation at hydro plants in northern California and the Pacific Northwest (including Canada) will be a determining factor.

Further to the point of shifting limits is the situation that occurred last summer in the Midwest. Because of hot temperatures and high gas prices in the South and Southwest, and cool temperatures in the upper Midwest, over 9,000 MW of power was transferred north to south. This was very unusual,

but brought into play a number of limiting paths and interfaces running across the middle of the country that had not all come up before (see my simplified map.)

Just 2 or three years ago, there were limits to moving power from the Mid-Atlantic area into the East Central area. The very next year, things turned around and the limit was in the other direction!

I guess the point I'm trying to make is that it is not a simple matter to show limits and bottlenecks on a map and have that mean something. Best thing for you and the folks you work with is for us to come down and give you a face-to-face briefing on the whole transmission situation.

This week, most of our folks are in New Orleans where our three technical committees are meeting. Then on Friday we have a special meeting of our Board in Chicago. How about next week sometime?

Dave

PS I should mention a couple other things that we produce, just so you know about them.

We publish a detailed Transmission Line Map covering the contiguous United States and most of Canada. The map is approximately 40 x 50 inches and features generating plants and substations, transmission lines 230 kV and above that will be in service as of January 1, 2000, and the boundaries of the NERC Regions. We don't have this in electronic form, but could send you a copy to evaluate for inclusion in your report. Let me know and we can even overnight it to you.

In each of our reports on upcoming summer and winter conditions we include a map showing incremental transfer capabilities between Regions and subregions. I included another PDF file for the map that was included in our Summer 2000 report. I included the footnotes too to give you a sense of how these numbers can change as system conditions change. Also, note that these are "non-simultaneous" power transfer capabilities. That means that when Region A imports power from Region B, up to the limit shown in the map, Region A's ability to simultaneously import from Region C may be (and often is) much less than the value shown. Such are the intricacies of interconnected AC power systems and why old transmission planners like me have had so much fun throughout our careers.

Last but not least, I've included a map (PDF) showing the Control Areas in North America and the connections to other Control Areas, superimposed on the NERC map. The connections can be a single transmission line or multiple lines. The map only shows connectivity.

431

Williams, Ronald L

From: Poche, Michelle [Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 6:28 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: DOT Comments

Margot,
This is wonderfull Thank you.
--Michelle

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 6:04 PM
To: 'Poche, Michelle'
Cc: Charles Smith (E-mail); Kelliher, Joseph
Subject: RE: DOT Comments

Michelle,

Margot

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

From: Poche, Michelle [mailto:Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 5:42 PM
To: Anderson, Margot

(6)

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

> **From:** Poche, Michelle
> **Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2001 3:18 PM
> **To:** 'Anderson, Margot'
> **Subject:** RE: DOT Comments

>
> Here are all but one of the sources....we are verifying the GDP number.

>
> <<chapter 6 sources.doc>>

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

> **From:** Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
> **Sent:** Sunday, March 25, 2001 1:29 PM
> **To:** 'Poche, Michelle'; Kelliher, Joseph
> **Cc:** 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'

> Subject: RE: DOT Comments

> Michelle,

> Thanks for the comments on chapters 3 and 6. Can you supply
> references for the numbers you quote in your re-written transportation
> section? Looks pretty consistent with EIA data but I just want to be
> sure.

> Margot

> —Original Message—

> From: Poche, Michelle [mailto:Michelle.Poche@ost.dot.gov]

> Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2001 4:18 PM

> To: Kelliher, Joseph

> Cc: Anderson, Margot; 'Symons.Jeremy(a)EPA.gov'

> Subject: DOT Comments

> Joe and Margot,

> Here are some comments from DOT policy staff on your
> chapters. Since our systems don't always talk to each other, I'll paste
> them below into this email as well as attaching a document. Please let
> me know if you have questions, and I'll run them down with the folks who
> have offered these suggestions.

> Please note the suggested text for Chapter 6 includes some
> policy recommendations and pro and con stuff that we might agree should be
> deleted or rephrased. But I wanted to submit it to you as drafted by our
> policy folks as a starting point for discussion.

> _____
> Jeremy, Joe and Margot,

> Thanks,
> Michelle

> _____
> Chapter 6

05

(b)(5)

1

> << File: DOT comments.doc >>

434

Williams, Ronald L

From: Breed, William
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 8:55 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Q's from Joe K

Margot:

attached is a 3-pager on Coal in Federal lands, pulled from a USGS report (July '99)

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



Coal Resources on Federal
Land...

434

Williams, Ronald L

From: Cook, Trevor
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 11:11 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: here are more fleshed out versions of the 6 papers I sent on Friday
Importance: High

Margot,

*The Friday submittal was pure placeholder, but these are good enough to critically evaluate.
Do you know which ones have made the cut????*

Trev.

(b)5

H41

Williams, Ronald L

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 11:19 AM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Yes, the shut downs are attributable to extreme electricity prices. And yes, the companies that remarketed power made a profit.

Crystal

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 11:08 AM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal,

Please tell Jeff all his e-mail is still bouncing back. I called him. He sent me mail but even my reply to his just sent e-mail

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

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 9:56 AM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 5:54 PM
To: 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'; 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Thank you.

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

From: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC [mailto:jkstier@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 3:59 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

(b)

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:46 PM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'; 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

← Crystal,

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:35 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC; Seifert, Roger - KN-DC
Subject: RE: BPA DSI Information
Importance: High

> <<DSI paul info.doc>> <<McCook pr final.doc>>

442

(b)(6)

Williams, Ronald L

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 2:03 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

I'll try to look for other examples.

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 1:02 PM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal,

Sorry to keep bugging you. What do you know about the Georgia Pacific paper mill laying off workers and shutting down operations due to high energy prices. Can you confirm?

Thank.

Margot

—Original Message—

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 11:19 AM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Yes, the shut downs are attributable to extreme electricity prices. And yes, the companies that remarketed power made a profit.

Crystal

—Original Message—

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 11:08 AM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal,

(b)

Please tell Jeff all his e-mail is still bouncing back. I called him. He sent me mail but even my reply to his just sent e-mail

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

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 9:56 AM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 5:54 PM
To: 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'; 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

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

From: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC [mailto:jkstier@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 3:59 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:46 PM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'; 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal,

Margot

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

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:35 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC; Seifert, Roger - KN-DC
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information
Importance: High

Please use the revised one-page summary. We received updated information on the amount of remarketing/curtailments due to our agreement with McCook Metals. Thanks!

> <<DSI paul info.doc>> <<McCook pr final.doc>>

444

(5)5

Williams, Ronald L

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 2:28 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

You could cite the Seattle Times (Feb. 6, 2001 Utility files suit, cites rate woes). I talked to BPA staff and checked out an article posted on the Web site.

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 2:20 PM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Do you have a source for this that I could cite in the document?

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

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 2:03 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 1:02 PM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal,

Sorry to keep bugging you. What do you know about the Georgia Pacific paper mill laying off workers and shutting down operations due to high energy prices. Can you confirm?

Thank.

Margot

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

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 11:19 AM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'

Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Yes, the shut downs are attributable to extreme electricity prices. And yes, the companies that remarketed power made a profit.

Crystal

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2001 11:08 AM
To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal,

Please tell Jeff all his e-mail is still bouncing back. I called him. He sent me mail but even my reply to his just sent e-mail

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

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 9:56 AM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'; 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 5:54 PM
To: 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'; 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

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

From: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC [mailto:jkstier@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 3:59 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

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

From: Anderson, Margot [mailto:Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:46 PM

10/5/

To: 'Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC'; Carrier, Paul
Cc: 'Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC'; 'Seifert, Roger - KN-DC'
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information

Crystal,


—
Margot

—Original Message—

From: Ball, Crystal A - KN-DC [mailto:caball@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2001 12:35 PM
To: Anderson, Margot; Carrier, Paul
Cc: Stier, Jeffrey K - KN-DC; Seifert, Roger - KN-DC
Subject: RE: BPA DSI information
Importance: High

> <<DSI paul info.doc>> <<McCook pr final.doc>>

445

 Tom Kimbis
02/16/2001 03:30 PM

(b)(5)

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: elec forecast

hi d and j

Tom

15999

446

(b) (1)

Tom Kimbis
02/16/2001 03:08 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Retail electricity rate increases in the West



Wellhead prices

----- Forwarded by Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE on 02/16/2001 03:07 PM -----

Tracy Terry@HQMAIL on 02/16/2001 02:53:02 PM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL
cc:

Subject: Retail electricity rate increases in the West

Tom -

I left a message for Bill Trapman at EIA about natural gas prices. I'll let you know what I hear back from him.

Tracy

Excerpt from Testimony by Tom Karier, Council Member, Northwest Power Planning Council, Spokane, WA
Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Hearing, January 31, 2001
To receive testimony on California's Electricity Crisis and Implications for the West

Tacoma Public Utilities implemented a 50-percent rate surcharge, which amounts to a 43-percent increase to residential customers and 75 percent to industrial customers. Dry weather is impacting Tacoma's hydropower operations, forcing the utility to make purchases in

16000

the spot market. Tacoma spent \$60 million for power in December and is facing continuing high prices with cash reserves of only \$130 million. The utility has secured diesel generators with 50 megawatts of capacity, called for conservation, imposed the rate surcharge, and is also planning to take on \$100 million in debt to get through the rest of the winter.

Tillamook Public Utility District in rural western Oregon is facing market exposure of \$20 million, while the utility's total annual budget is about \$11 million. Tillamook joined with several other rural utilities to buy a portion of its load on the market several years ago, and today the utilities' combined power bill has ballooned to \$117 million. While Tillamook recently announced a new agreement with Bonneville, Tillamook has asked its large customers to discuss cutting back electricity consumption. But these customers have orders to fill and are reluctant to jeopardize their production.

Puget Sound Energy of Bellevue, an investor-owned utility with some 900,000 customers, reported it is in a precarious stage of load/resource balance. Rising prices for natural gas are squeezing the utility's finances while Puget is operating with a five-year residential rate freeze. The utility may ask the state Utilities and Transportation Commission for emergency rate relief. High prices have caused some of Puget's industrial customers who are on market-indexed rates to shut down or curtail production.

Clark Public Utilities, which serves about 130,000 customers in the Portland suburb of Vancouver, Washington, recently raised its rates 20 percent to meet the increased price of natural gas and power from its generating plant, which supplies about half its load. Currently, the remainder comes from investor-owned utilities under long-term contracts, but those expire in July and Clark anticipates another rate increase in the fall when it goes back on the Bonneville system.

that a vastly
October, will force the
federal system. As a
rate increase over the
Bonneville acknowledged
60 percent, and some
100 percent higher.
spring runoff, Bonneville
\$1.3 billion more than

Last week the Bonneville Power Administration announced
increased demand for its products, beginning in
the agency
to make significant market purchases to augment the
result, Bonneville is proposing an average 60-percent
next five-year rate period, beginning October 1, 2001.
that the first year could be significantly higher than
Bonneville customers are anticipating rates as much as
Given the current market situation and the projected
believes it needs revenues that average annually about
its estimates made just last May.

recently announced
and may require a
proposing a 19-percent
credit rating of Seattle
water levels will impact the
purchases on the spot

There is other bad news, as well. Idaho Power Company
its power purchases are \$121 million above expectations
24-percent rate increase. Utah Power & Light is
increase. Moody's Investor Service recently changed the
City Light to negative because of concerns that low
utility's hydropower generation and force more power
market.

448

(b)(5-)

DARRELL BRESCHEN

02/16/2001 02:25 PM

To: Joel Rubin
cc:

Subject:

16004

HH9


(b)(5)



"Tom Kimbis" <tomjill@mris.com> on 02/16/2001 10:37:15 AM


To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:
Subject: diesel

here you go-- this may be a graph you want also.

 - diesel.html

451

(b)(5)

 Tom Kimbis
02/16/2001 10:29 AM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Data Request #2 

not sure what you mean
JOEL


**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/16/2001 10:20 AM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Data Request #2 

Tom Kimbis

 Tom Kimbis
02/16/2001 09:54 AM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Data Request #2 



Wellhead oirc
JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/16/2001 07:39 AM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Data Request #2

16007

(b)(3)

Tom -


This question also came from MBZ...

Could you check on this?

Joel

453

(b)(5)

 Tom Kimbis
02/16/2001 09:51 AM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Data Request (from MBZ) 

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/16/2001 07:37 AM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Data Request (from MBZ)

Tom -


MBZ asked that a sentence like the following be constructed (let's talk?):

16010

DOE017-0638

454

(b)(5)



Tom Kimbis
02/16/2001 09:24 AM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Chart change



Household Gvt Asstance
JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/16/2001 07:43 AM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Chart change

Tom -

Thanks,

joel

16011

456

6/27



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/16/2001 09:15 AM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: OIT example for you

457

(b)(3)



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/16/2001 08:28 AM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE

cc:

Subject: OTT comments

Joel, note a couple of items in OTTs submission for your chapter

Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/16/2001 08:27 AM



"One of the Zimmerman's" <czmbz@erols.com> on 02/15/2001 11:10:53 PM



To: Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE

cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: OTT comments

:



- att1.htm




- comments on OTT NEP expanded section.doc

HSE

4/60

(b)(6)



Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 06:23 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: question 3

don't know - no data on that...
JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 06:21 PM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: question 3

Thanks,

Joel
Tom Kimbis



Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 06:12 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: question 3

hope that helps

tom

JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 04:21 PM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE

cc:

Subject: question 3

Please don't forget to reference these answers

should i send these questions to Darrell?


Joel

16022


DOE017-0650

461

(b)(3)

 Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 06:22 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:


Subject: Re: question again 

Joel

tom
ps- remember, this is just an educated guesstimate for best numbers!
JOEL


**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 06:13 PM


To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE


Subject: Re: question again 

Excellent!!!!

Joel
Tom Kimbis

 Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 05:32 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: question again 

(b)(7)

Tom

JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 04:20 PM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: question again


Joel

16024

DOE017-0652

462

(0)(5)



Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 06:12 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: question 3

tom

JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 04:21 PM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: question 3

16025


DOE017-0653

should i send these questions to Darrell?

Joel

463

(b)(5)



Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 05:56 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: question 5

JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 04:24 PM




To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: question 5

16027

464

(b)(3)



Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 05:54 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: question 7?

JOEL

JOEL
RUBIN
02/15/2001 04:29 PM




To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: question 7?


16028

465

(b)(5)

 Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 05:54 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: question 7? 

JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 04:29 PM


To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: question 7?

464

(b)(3)



Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 05:32 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: question again

Tom
JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 04:20 PM




To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:
Subject: question again

Joel

16030

4/7

(b)(5)

 Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 05:11 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: ac 24

JOEL

**JOEL
RUBIN**
02/15/2001 04:18 PM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:


Subject: question

Joel

16031

469

(b)



Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 05:06 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: poverty

Joel:

As for poverty, the census bureau in its most recent releases (for 1999) state that 32.2 million Americans live in poverty, or 11.8% of the US Population*

Income and Poverty 1999 - Press Briefing

PRESS BRIEFING ON 1999 INCOME AND POVERTY ESTIMATES

Dr. Daniel H. Weinberg
Chief, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division
U.S. Census Bureau

September 26, 2000

Welcome to the press briefing on the 1999 income and poverty estimates. Your press packets contain a press r will be using today, and the two reports we are releasing. You can obtain additional unpublished detailed tables (www.census.gov).

Let me introduce some of the analysts who worked on the reports; they will be available to answer your questi Division Chief), Mary Naifeh (Chief of the Poverty and Health Statistics Branch), Edward Welniak (Chief of the I of the reports, Robert Cleveland, Joe Dalaker, Carmen DeNavas-Walt, and Bernadette Proctor. I =d also like to who work so hard to collect these data and the households who answer our survey questions.

Please hold your questions unless it's a technical clarification. The main presentation should take about 20 min

Let me first summarize the main findings. (Chart 1) Increases in income and declines in poverty were again wid household income adjusted for inflation increased 2.7 percent, to \$40,800 (that means that half of households level is the highest we have ever measured. For the first time, households in the United States have sustained f in their real median income. In addition, the poverty rate fell for the third consecutive year, from 12.7 percent i rate since 1979. The number of poor dropped significantly also -- from 34.5 million poor in 1998 to 32.3 millio did not change from 1998 to 1999.

These statistics come from the March Supplement to the Current Population Survey, a sample survey of approx each month for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. These data reflect 1999 and not current conditions. As in all sur to sampling variability and response errors. All statements made in the reports and in this briefing have been te

16034

statistically significant differences. All historical income data are expressed in 1999 dollars and were adjusted up 1.5 percent between 1998 and 1999. The poverty thresholds are also updated each year for inflation; in 1999 the threshold for a family of three, \$13,290.

(Chart 2) presents the key estimates of median household income. As I noted earlier, median income for all U.S. households between 1998 and 1999 to \$40,800. Overall, real median household income has risen 24.5 percent since 1967 was first computed. Chart 3 shows that the Midwest and South regions reached all-time highs in median household income in 1999, while the Northeast and West.

As Chart 4 shows, the number of poor in the U.S. in 1999 has fallen to its 1989 level -- 32.3 million people -- and the decline of poor also leads to a lower poverty rate in 1999 than in 1998 at 11.8 percent, the lowest since 1979. When adjusted for inflation (Chart 5), in contrast to the income findings, it was the Northeast and West that had significant declines in poverty rates in 1999, while the Midwest and South. The poverty rate in the South remains at its all-time low, 13.1 percent.

Chart 6 presents the changes in real median household income by race and Hispanic origin between 1998 and 1999. For Asian and Pacific Islander households, all racial and ethnic groups experienced an annual increase in their real median household income was the highest ever reported for Whites, non-Hispanic Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics, while Pacific Islanders.

As this next chart (Chart 7) shows, poverty dropped for all racial and ethnic groups as well, the first time since 1973. While the national poverty rate is still above its historic low (set in 1973 at 11.1 percent), 1999 poverty rates for Whites have set or equaled their historic lows.

Beginning with this year, the Census Bureau is showing income and poverty data for American Indians and Alaska Natives. These estimates are much higher than for other race groups because of their relatively small sample size. Accordingly, the three-year-average median income for American Indians and Alaska Natives, \$30,800, is higher than that for Blacks, statistically equal to the income estimate for Hispanics, non-Hispanic Whites, and Asians and Pacific Islanders. The three-year-average poverty rate for American Indians and Alaska Natives is the same as that of Blacks and Hispanics, and higher than the poverty rate for non-Hispanic Whites and Asians. Results from the 1990 Census show that the poverty rate for those on American Indian reservations or in Alaska Native villages were significantly different from the poverty rates in other geographic areas.

Chart 9 illustrates two interesting developments about poverty rates by age. First, the poverty rate for those 65 and over in 1999, 12.1 million children were poor, down 1.4 million and 2.0 percentage points from 1993 (14.1 percent in 1999) is higher than for the other age groups shown here, but it is significantly lower than in 1993 at 22.7 percent. Children make up 38 percent of the poor but only 26 percent of the total population.

The real median earnings of men who worked full time, year-round increased by 1.0 percent between 1998 and 1999. The earnings for comparable women remained statistically unchanged, however. The combination led to a decline in the percentage of full-time year-round workers to 72 percent, down from its all-time high of 74 percent first reached in 1996.

Chart 11 shows the fraction of aggregate income going to each fifth of the population in 1999. For the sixth and seventh fifths, there was no change; that is, no statistically significant changes occurred between 1998 and 1999 in the share of aggregate income in the Gini index of inequality. Income inequality measures, of which there are only two, do not typically change in the Gini index since our measurement methodology changed in 1994. A more thorough discussion of income inequality measures of inequality, was presented in a recent Census Bureau report, *The Changing Shape of the Nation's Income*.

Based on a comparison of two-year moving averages for states (Chart 12), real median household income increased in 1999 in 10 states, the District of Columbia and fell in none. In the same period, the poverty rate fell in seven states and the District of Columbia, New York, and South Dakota had both increases in income and declines in poverty.

The Census Bureau also produces a series of experimental estimates on how noncash benefits and taxes -- which affect both income and poverty. The income report shows 17 experimental definitions of income. The Census Bureau's res

broadened definition of income that takes into account the effects of noncash benefits and taxes is roughly 8 p income definition. Government benefits do more than taxes to reduce income inequality.

Valuing noncash benefits and subtracting taxes also affects the estimated poverty rate. The Census Bureau has measures, based on recommendations made by the National Academy of Sciences, and will issue a new report benefits and taxes in income, but they also use a new set of experimental poverty thresholds.

Four of those experimental measures are presented in the final chart (Chart 13). All of these experimental meas and 1999 than does the official measure. Researchers point out that the experimental measures capture the eff Credit while the official measure of poverty does not.

Let me again summarize the main findings. Increases in income and declines in poverty were widespread in 19 income adjusted for inflation increased 2.7 percent, to \$40,800, the highest we have ever measured. For the fi sustained five consecutive annual statistically significant increases in their real median income. In addition, the 12.7 percent in 1998 to 11.8 percent in 1999, the lowest poverty rate since 1979. The number of poor dropp to 32.3 million poor in 1999. Finally, household income inequality did not change from 1998 to 1999.

I'll be glad to answer questions from the press at this time. Please identify yourself and your affiliation.

Contact the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division at 301-457-3242 or mail to hhes-info@censu

Go to Income 1999
Go to Income Statistics
Go to Poverty 1999
Go to Poverty Statistics

Created: September 20, 2000
Last Revised: February 02, 2001

Census 2000 | Subjects A to Z | Search | Product Catalog | Data Access Tools | FOIA

JOEL

JOEL
RUBIN
02/15/2001 12:49 PM



To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: graphics please



NEPA_Chap 2 Outline.doc

16036

DOE017-0664

H/10

(b)(3)

DARRELL BESCHEN

02/15/2001 04:39 PM

To: Joel Rubin
cc:

Subject: Stories and Graphics relating to Industry

it did come electronically....d.

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 02/15/2001 04:38 PM -----

[Redacted]

16037

475

6(5)



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/16/2001 06:26 PM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Eilyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP, draft 1

So far, no deadline on this project has slipped, so let me thank you again for getting responses in quickly. (Obviously, we're hoping for the same next week.)

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/16/2001 06:06 PM -----
Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/16/2001 05:48:00 PM



16062

To: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Robert Kripowicz@HQMAIL, Robert Porter@HQMAIL, WILLIAM MAGWOOD@HQMAIL, David Pumphrey@HQMAIL, James HART@HQMAIL, Paula Scalingi@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL, jkstier@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL, cball@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL
cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

Subject: NEP, draft 1

Here are sections 1,2, 4, and 5.

Thank you all for pushing so hard - we have a lot of very good material here.

Attending Monday

Larry Pettis (FE)

Cook (NE)

Mary Beth Zimmerman, John Sullivan (EE)

Bob Kripowicz (FE)

Margot Anderson (PO)

Paula Scalingi (SO)

Joe Kelliher (OSEC)

Joe Stier or Crystal Ball (BPA)

What did I miss?

Margot

16063

DOE017-0691



section 1 draft 1.D section 2 draft 1. Section 4 draft 1. Section 5 draft 1.

480

b(5)



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/19/2001 04:13 PM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Eilyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE

cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP, draft 2



sec1 1 jk mbz redline. regional effects from P

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/19/2001 03:57 PM -----



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/16/2001 06:26 PM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Eilyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE

16101

cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP, draft 1

So far, no deadline on this project has slipped, so let me thank you again for getting responses in quickly. (Obviously, we're hoping for the same next week.)

16102

DOE017-0730

482

b(5)



John Conti@HQMAIL on 03/12/2001 02:12:31 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL
cc:

Subject: RE: NEP - would like your thoughts

Mary Beth,

I would rather we had this conversation in person rather than through e-mail.
Give me a call and we can grab a cup of coffee together.

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

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 2:04 PM
To: Conti, John
Subject: NEP - would like your thoughts

16124

DOE017-0752

483

email 4(5) attached



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/20/2001 09:18 AM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Ellyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: new version of overview sections

attached. This replaces the draft for new sections I & II you received late yesterday.

1. Please review this draft ASAP per Margo Anderson's request below.
2. Please provide Darrell Beschen with any regional information that might be helpful for a chapter on regional energy issues.

Thanks.

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/20/2001 08:59 AM -----
Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 02/19/2001 05:22:12 PM



To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, TREVOR COOK@HQMAIL, Paula Scalingi@HQMAIL, Robert Kripowicz@HQMAIL, WILLIAM MAGWOOD@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL, JAMES KENDELL@HQMAIL, jkstier@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL
cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

Subject: new version section I

All,

Joe's revised draft. Thanks for all the comments

16125



sec1 2 jk.DO

16127

DOE017-0755

485

b(5)

DARRELL BESCHEN

02/20/2001 09:49 AM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Ellyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE, Douglas Kaempf/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: The Regional piece.....reminder

65,


7

16145

DOE017-0773

486

b(5)



Gail McKinley
02/20/2001 03:28 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: Energy Assistance Requests

H81

Return sent attached is b.(5)



MaryBeth Zimmerman


02/22/2001 10:37 AM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Old Chpt. 2, new Chap 3

Can you work on answering the editor's questions on this?

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 02/22/2001 10:36 AM -----



Michael York
02/21/2001 01:13 PM

To: commcoll@aol.com
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Chapter 2

Joan, attached is the first chapter to edit. We will be sending you the next chapter as soon as it is available. If you have any questions, please call me at [redacted] Thanks!

Michael York

(b)6




Chapter 2_Energy Impacts_2.16.01.doc

16147

DOE017-0775

489



Michael York
03/09/2001 05:21 PM

email; b(5) attachment

To: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL@HQDOE
cc: John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE, Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Revised EERE Policy Options

Attached is a revised set of policy options. These would replace the options sent to you by Mary Beth Zimmerman this morning. Thanks!



EERE Rev Summary Submission

494

b(5)

KENNETH FRIEDMAN

05/01/2001 11:30 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Status Updates 

Marybeth: this is very useful. thanks.
MaryBeth Zimmerman



MaryBeth Zimmerman

04/30/2001 10:47 AM

To: Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE, Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Randy Steer/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE, Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Lynn Campbell/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, Tina Kaarsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Patrick Booher/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE, Eilyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Joseph Malinovsky/EE/DOE@DOE, Brian Connor/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Status Updates

Time to get back in the habit of weekly reporting of the items we are juggling in the Planning Office (as best as we can make it out). The focus is on items done in conjunction with the sectors. Please let me know if you do not wish to be on this list.

16174

DOE017-0802

500

Lawrence Mansueti

05/02/2001 09:14 AM

To: Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE,
Patricia Hoffman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: additl Comments (DG) on NEP Ch. 3 re "alternative energy"

Phil --

16176

DOE017-0804

51

b15



<Charles_M_Smith@ovp.eop.gov> on 03/14/2001 04:57:50 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL
cc:

Subject: Chapter 7

Mary Beth:

in25

A

Give me a call if you want. I'm on
Charlie

(b)6

16177

502

b(5)

DARRELL BESCHEN

04/20/2001 04:01 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

cc:

Subject:

Sam Higgs



climate change 2 pager

16178

503

b(5)



Jerry Dion

03/07/2001 03:43 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: National Energy Policy - BTS Policy Responses Papers - OPBM Changes

FYI - BTS changes based on feedback.

----- Forwarded by Jerry Dion/EE/DOE on 03/07/2001 03:42 PM -----



Jerry Dion

03/07/2001 03:07 PM

To: ak.nicholls@pnl.gov, Edward Pollock/EE/DOE@DOE, John Talbot/EE/DOE@DOE, Qonnie Laughlin/EE/DOE@DOE, Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Bailey/EE/DOE@DOE, Ronald Shaw/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Barbara Sisson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: National Energy Policy - BTS Policy Responses Papers - OPBM Changes

Attached is a reworked set of bullets we should write to. I've discussed the changes Andrew has to deal with over the phone. I discussed with Gail her changes and Mark Bailey's changes.



NEP Policy Responses

Jerry

----- Forwarded by Jerry Dion/EE/DOE on 03/07/2001 03:01 PM -----



Jerry Dion

03/07/2001 09:27 AM

To: ak.nicholls@pnl.gov, Edward Pollock/EE/DOE@DOE, John Talbot/EE/DOE@DOE, Qonnie Laughlin/EE/DOE@DOE, Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Bailey/EE/DOE@DOE, Ronald Shaw/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Barbara Sisson/EE/DOE@DOE, JPHarris@lbl.gov

Subject: National Energy Policy - BTS Responses - Good News, Bad News

16179


DOE017-0807

Thanks,
Jcrry



NEP Policy Response

----- Forwarded by Jerry Dion/EE/DOE on 03/07/2001 08:52 AM -----



MaryBeth Zimmerman
03/05/2001 06:02 PM

To: Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, David Bassett/EE/DOE@DOE, Tina Kaarsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, David Boomsma/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, Eilyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Gartland/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Douglas Kaempf/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: template

- Mary Beth

Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 03/05/2001 04:55:58 PM

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

16180

DOE017-0808

Patricia Breed/CR/DOE@CRDOE@HQMAIL, John Conti@HQMAIL, Andrea Lockwood@HQMAIL,
William Breed@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL, Douglas Carter@HQMAIL, Jay Braitsch@HQMAIL,
Elena Melcher@HQMAIL, TREVOR COOK@HQMAIL, jkstier@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL, ANDY
KYDES@HQMAIL
cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

Subject:template

All,

Comments, please.

Margot

16181

DOE017-0809



template for policy ir



MaryBeth Zimmerman

02/20/2001 06:52 PM

To: #EE-DAS, #EE-ADAS, Kenneth Friedman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Linda Silverman/EE/DOE@DOE, Elyn Krevitz/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE

cc: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE, Peggy Podolak/EE/DOE@DOE, William Noel/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Yet another NEP update!

6(5)

16184

DOE017-0812

Williams, Ronald L

From: Freitas, Christopher
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 11:11 AM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: DeHoratiis, Guido; Johnson, Nancy; Braitsch, Jay
Subject: NEP-Chapter 3 - FE-30 edits

Importance: High

615

Sincerely,

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



Chapter 3 -FE-30 edits
March 2...

Williams, Ronald L

From: Breed, William
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 12:10 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: NEP chap 4 comments

Attached please find a file of comments --

69

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



Comments on NEP Chapter
4.doc

Lawrence Mansueti

04/12/2001 11:20 AM

To: Don Richardson/EE/DOE@DOE, John Flynn/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Patrick Booher/EE/DOE@DOE

Forwarded by Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE on 04/12/2001 11:17 AM

Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 04/11/2001 09:42:43 AM



To: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL, Kevin Kolevar@HQMAIL
cc: Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Paul Carrier@HQMAIL

Subject: hydro licensing for principal's meeting

Joe and Kevin,

65

Margot

16193

DOE017-0821

65

16194

DOE017-0822

Buddy Garland

04/13/2001 04:11 PM

To: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL@HQDOE
cc: John Sullivan/EE/DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Randy Steer/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Fred Glatstein/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Abe.Haspel@ee.doe.gov, "Tom Kimbis" <tomjill@mrts.com>, Amit Ronen/EE/DOE@DOE, Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE, Phillip Tseng/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: energy tax proposals

Joe,


Thank you,



Buddy Garland

Tax Policy Ideas For VP EPDWG 4-13-01

----- 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



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

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

16195

DOE017-0823

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:

16196

DOE017-0824

Buddy Garland

04/17/2001 10:10 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: RE: energy tax proposals

Mary Beth,

Can you give me some advice on how we should proceed?

thanks,

Buddy

----- Forwarded by Buddy Garland/EE/DOE on 04/17/2001 10:06 AM -----

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-----

16197

DOE017-0825

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

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:

16198

DOE017-0826

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



Buddy Garland


04/17/2001 10:11 AM

(b)(5)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, "Tom Kimbis" <tomjill@mris.com>

Subject: Re: Energy tax credits

Forwarded by Buddy Garland/EE/DOE on 04/17/2001 10:11 AM



Abe Haspel
04/17/2001 09:59 AM

To: Randy Steer/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: Energy tax credits

thanks. great job

From: Randy Steer on 04/16/2001 06:26 PM

From: Randy Steer on 04/16/2001 06:26 PM

To: Kevin Kolevar@HQMAIL@HQDOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Energy tax credits

16201

DOE017-0829

16202

DOE017-0830

Williams, Ronald L

From: Michael York
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 12:57 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Zimmerman, MaryBeth
Subject: Chapter 6 graphics and captions



Ch 6 (efficiency)
graphics.ppt...



Graphics Captions Ch6.doc

Williams, Ronald L

From: Breed, William
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 1:24 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP chap 4 comments

Comments on NEP Chap 6 from Fred

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

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

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 1:23 PM
To: Breed, William
Subject: RE: NEP chap 4 comments

send comments.

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

From: Breed, William
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 12:59 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: RE: NEP chap 4 comments

yep, send comments

or yep, already down the road?

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

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

From: Anderson, Margot
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 12:58 PM
To: Breed, William
Subject: RE: NEP chap 4 comments

Yep.

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

From: Breed, William
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 12:10 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: NEP chap 4 comments

Attached please find a file of comments --

do you want me to continue to send comments, such as on Chap 6? or is much of this OBTE?

William Breed

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

<< File: Comments on NEP Chapter 4.doc >>

Williams, Ronald L

From: Braitsch, Jay
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 2:22 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: FW: Comments on Chapter 10



CHAPTE~2.WPD

65

—Original Message—

From: KYDES, ANDY
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 3:09 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay
Subject: FW: Comments on Chapter 10

—Original Message—

From: Kydes, Andy
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2001 5:43 PM
To: Margot Anderson
Cc: Pettis, Larry; O'Donovan, Kevin; Hutzler, Mary
Subject: Comments on Chapter 10

Margot:

Here are our comments on Chapter 10.

Andy

Andy S. Kydes, EI-80
U.S. DOE/EIA
1000 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
email: akydes@eia.doe.gov
Tel: (202) 586-2222
fax: (202) 586-3045

Please see our website <http://www.eia.doe.gov> for access to EIA's energy information and publications. Please call NEIC at (202) 586-8800 or email them at infoctr@eia.doe.gov if you have general questions regarding such information or how to locate it.

Williams, Ronald L

From: Magwood, William
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 4:36 PM
To: Kelliher, Joseph
Cc: Anderson, Margot; Cook, Trevor; Garrish, Ted; Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: Comments on National Energy Policy Task Forces initiatives

Importance: High

6

Williams, Ronald L

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 4:47 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Cc: Haspel, Abe; York, Michael
Subject: Chapter 7 arrives!



Renewables Chapter
Edited32701...



Graphics Captions Ch7.doc



Renewable chapter
graphics(ch ...



wind, bio, solar, geo.ppt
[Rec...

Attached is Chapter 7 with our edits today. This has not been reviewed beyond me, given various other drills, but we understand your need to keep the ball rolling.

Williams, Ronald L

From: Breed, William
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 5:35 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: nep options input

Margot:

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



Background on Small
Business A...

Williams, Ronald L

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2001 5:51 PM
To: Anderson, Margot
Subject: Re: more graphics requests



ATTACHMENT.TXT



Ch 6 (efficiency)
graphics.ppt...



Renewable chapter
graphics(ch ...

Ch. 6 & 7 graphics with numbers

added to charts.

..... Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/28/2001 05:50 PM



Tom Kimbis
03/28/2001 05:37 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: more graphics requests

all done. the values have been added to the bar charts for chapters 6 and 7.



MaryBeth Zimmerman
03/27/2001 01:50 PM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: more graphics requests

can you take care of?

..... Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/27/2001 01:50 PM



Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 03/26/2001 02:02:47 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL
cc:

Subject: more graphics requests

MB,

65

16239

DOE017-0867

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 11:41 AM


To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc:

Subject: NEP response

Please Reduce the language in the description to:

69

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 11:33 AM -----



Elizabeth Shearer
05/18/2001 11:13 AM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: NEP response

I really, really tried to work in that Xcel spreadsheet and failed miserably. This is in Word. Two documents, same format.



Beth NEP Recommendation - NEP Recommend:

16249

DOE017-0877

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 11:54 AM

b(5)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE


cc:

Subject: NEP response

tom please change the descriptions in the first two recommendations as follows:

bs

Forwarded by Darrell Beschert/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 11:49 AM



Elizabeth Shearer
05/18/2001 11:13 AM

To: Darrell Beschert/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

cc:

Subject: NEP response

I really, really tried to work in that Xcel spreadsheet and failed miserably. This is in Word. Two documents, same format.



Beth NEP Recommendation - NEP Recommend:

16250

DOE017-0878

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 01:14 PM

6(5)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc:

Subject: National Energy Policy Recommendations of Particular Interest to EERE - Climate Change, REPI, tax credits, electric restructuring

65

Lawrence Mansueti

05/18/2001 11:39 AM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Patrick Booher/EE/DOE@DOE, Gloria Elliott/EE/DOE@DOE, Patricia Hoffman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: National Energy Policy Recommendations of Particular Interest to EERE - Climate Change, REPI, tax credits, electric restructuring

65

16251

DOE017-0879

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 01:20 PM

b(5)

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: nep exercise for der

15

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 01:18 PM -----

Patricia Hoffman 05/18/2001 11:47 AM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE, Patrick Booher/EE/DOE@DOE, Gloria Elliot/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Debbie Haught/EE/DOE@DOE, Ronald Fiskum/EE/DOE@DOE, Merrill Smith/EE/DOE@DOE, Joseph Galdo/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE, Tina Kaarsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Imre Gyuk/EE/DOE@DOE, Philip Overholt/EE/DOE@DOE, David Basset/EE/DOE@DOE, Gary Burch/EE/DOE@DOE, Nita Scotland/EE/DOE@DOE, Anne-Marie Borbely-Bartis/EE/DOE@DOE, Eric Lightner/EE/DOE@DOE, Gerakline Paige/EE/DOE@DOE, William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: nep exercise for der



NEP OPT Chart for

16252

DOE017-0880

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 01:58 PM

0(5)


To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE

cc:

Subject: Philadelphia Regional Office Input to NEPD Group Recommendations

65

Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 01:50 PM



James M Ferguson
05/18/2001 12:32 PM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE

cc: Jim Powell/ATL/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Philadelphia Regional Office Input to NEPD Group Recommendations

Hello Darrell, here is the Philadelphia Regional Office input for the National Energy Policy Development (NEPD) Group recommendations:

65

Thanks for the opportunity to comment, and please let us know if you have any questions or if you need anything else.

James

16253

DOE017-0881

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 02:03 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: National Energy Policy Recommendations of Particular Interest to EERE

65

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 02:00 PM -----

Lynda Wallace



▲ 05/18/2001 12:33 PM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Jim Powell/ATL/EE/DOE@DOE, Ronald Henderson/ATL/EE/DOE@DOE, Steve
Hortin/ATL/EE/DOE@DOE, Angela Young/ATL/EE/DOE@DOE, David Waldrop/ATL/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: National Energy Policy Recommendations of Particular Interest to EERE 

Darrell, Tom,

Attached is Atlanta's input. Let us know if you have questions.

Thanks,

Lynda



NEP Atl RO CI

16254

DOE017-0882

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 02:44 PM


6(5)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc:

Subject: NEP Solar Response

6/1

Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 02:40 PM



James Rannels
05/18/2001 12:35 PM

To: Wendy Butler/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Robert Dixon, William Parks, Patrick.boohar@hq.doe.gov, Gloria Elliott, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE,
richard.king@hq.doe.gov, Lew Pratsch, frank.wilkins@hq.doe.gov, lynne.gillette@hq.doe.gov, Thomas
Rueckert/EE/DOE@DOE, Glenn Strahs/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP Solar Response



NEP Solar Ch

16255

DOE017-0883

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 02:58 PM

6(5)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc:

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 02:57 PM -----

Karen Wilson



▲ 05/18/2001 12:49 PM

65

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Donna Hawkins/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Gross/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP OTT

Here is the input from OTT.



NEP OTT.xls

16256

DOE017-0884

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 03:01 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc:

Subject: NEP Input- OPT/Superconductivity

this looks good and simple and organized for a direct conversion to the spreadsheet

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 03:00 PM -----

James Daley

James Daley

05/18/2001 12:58 PM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE
cc:

Subject: NEP Input- OPT/Superconductivity

Darrell,

I sent this to Tom, but meant to copy you.

Sorry!

Jim

----- Forwarded by James Daley/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 12:57 PM -----

James Daley

James Daley

05/18/2001 11:38 AM

To: Wendy Butler/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Patrick Bocher@DOE, Gloria Elliott/EE/DOE@DOE, Robert Dixon/EE/DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE,
Marshall Reed/EE/DOE, Neil Rossmeiss/EE/DOE

Subject: NEP Input- OPT/Superconductivity

See attached.



NEP-OPT-Supercondi

16257

DOE017-0885

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 03:06 PM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: additional input from Biopower for NEP table

this is a small appropriate addition...d.

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 03:02 PM -----

Raymond Costello on 05/18/2001 01:49:05 PM



To: Patrick Booher/EE/DOE@DOE, Gloria Elliott/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom
Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Don Richardson, Paul Grabowski

Subject: additional input from Biopower for NEP table

Sorry, but we missed one additional item to the Nat'l Energy Plan
Please see the attached
Ray



- NEP OPT Chart_Biopower_additional input.xls

16258

DOE017-0886

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 03:35 PM


b15)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc:

Subject: Hydrogen Input for NEP

65

Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 03:21 PM

 Neil Rossmessel/EE/DOE@DOE 05/18/2001 12:51 PM

To: Wendy Butler/EE/DOE@DOE, Patrick Booher/EE/DOE@DOE, Gloria Elliott/EE/DOE@DOE, James Daley/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Sigmund Gronich/EE/DOE@DOE, Christopher Bordeaux/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Hydrogen Input for NEP



Hydrogen Input for N

16259

DOE017-0887

DARRELL BESCHEN

05/18/2001 03:40 PM


To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc:

b (S)

Subject: Re: Revised NEP Response

b5

Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 03:36 PM



Gail McKinley
05/18/2001 12:16 PM

To: Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Edward Pollock/EE/DOE@DOE, Ronald Shaw/EE/DOE@DOE, Faith Lambert/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Bailey/EE/DOE@DOE, Gregory Reamy/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: Revised NEP Response

b5

Jerry Dion



Jerry Dion

05/18/2001 11:13 AM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Edward Pollock/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Revised NEP Response

Darrell,

16260

DOE017-0888

Here is BTS response with requested modifications.



NEP BTS Chart Response V2

Jerry




MaryBeth Zimmerman

05/25/2001 11:09 AM

b(5)

To: Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, Randy Steer/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE

b5



Gail McKinley
05/25/2001 09:17 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Thomas Heavey/EE/DOE@DOE, Gregory Reamy/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Bailey/EE/DOE@DOE, Ronald Shaw/EE/DOE@DOE, Jean Diggs/EE/DOE@DOE, Denis Feck/EE/DOE@DOE, James Childs/EE/DOE@DOE, Tawanna Holloway/EE/DOE@DOE, James Fremont/EE/DOE@DOE, Marsha Penhaker/EE/DOE@DOE


b5

16262

DOE017-0890

16263


b(5)


 Gail McKinley
05/25/2001 09:17 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmermar/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, Thomas Heavey/EE/DOE@DOE, Gregory Reamy/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Bailey/EE/DOE@DOE, Ronald Shaw/EE/DOE@DOE, Jean Diggs/EE/DOE@DOE, Denis Feck/EE/DOE@DOE, James Childs/EE/DOE@DOE, Tawanna Holloway/EE/DCE@DOE, James Fremont/EE/DOE@DOE, Marsha Penhaker/EE/DOE@DOE

16264

b(5)


 Tom Kimbis
05/18/2001 04:21 PM

To: Darrell Beschert/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: Re: Revised NEP Response 

DARRELL BESCHERT
05/18/2001 03:40 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc:
Subject: Re: Revised NEP Response

----- Forwarded by Darrell Beschert/EE/DOE on 05/18/2001 03:36 PM -----

 Gail McKinley
05/18/2001 12:16 PM

To: Jerry Dior/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Darrell Beschert/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Edward Pollock/EE/DOE@DOE, Ronald Shaw/EE/DOE@DOE, Faith Lambert/EE/DOE@DOE, Mark Bailey/EE/DOE@DOE, Gregory Reamy/EE/DOE@DOE

16265

(3) Other editorial/typo corrections - anyone want them?

Jerry Dion



Jerry Dion

05/18/2001 11:13 AM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Mark Ginsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Gail McKinley/EE/DOE@DOE, Edward Pollock/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Revised NEP Response


Darrell,

Here is BTS response with requested modifications.



NEP BTS Chart Response V2

Jerry



Tom Kimbis
06/06/2001 03:57 PM

b(5)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: NEP Implementation Plan

[Still waiting on feedback from G. McKinley but as it stands now...]

Comments on the NEP Implementation Plan / Recommendations Matrix:

b(5)



Jay Braitsch@HQMAIL on 04/04/2001 05:44:28 PM

b(5)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, TREVOR COOK@HQMAIL
cc:

Subject: Photos for NEP

25

16267

DOE017-0895

65

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

From: MaryBeth Zimmerman
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2001 10:13 AM
To: Thomson, Margaret

16269

DOE017-0897

Subject: tax package review

6

16270

DOE017-0898

b(5)



Jay Braitsch@HQMAIL on 03/29/2001 10:00:03 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, David Basset/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL

cc:

Subject: Lock-out vs. CAA

b

16271

DOE017-0899

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Review of NEP draft renewables chapter

65

Forwarded by Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE on 03/27/2001 09:12 AM

David Bassett 03/26/2001 05:14

To: Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Peter Goldman/EE/DOE@DOE, Don Richardson/EE/DOE@DOE, James Rannels/EE/DOE@DOE, Patricia Hoffman/EE/DOE@DOE, Jack Cadogan/EE/DOE@DOE, Raymond Costello/EE/DOE@DOE, Lynne Gillette/EE/DOE@DOE, Anne-Marie Bobbely-Bartis/EE/DOE@DOE, William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE, Robert Dixon/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: Review of NEP draft renewables chapter

Larry,

Thanks for forwarding the NEP draft chapter.

65

Lawrence Mansueti

Lawrence Mansueti

03/26/2001 12:03 PM

To: Peter Goldman/EE/DOE@DOE, Don Richardson/EE/DOE@DOE, James Rannels/EE/DOE@DOE,
Patricia Hoffman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Jack Cadogan/EE/DOE@DOE, Raymond Costello/EE/DOE@DOE, Lynne Gillette/EE/DOE@DOE,
Anne-Marie Borbely-Bartis/EE/DOE@DOE, David Bassett/EE/DOE@DOE, William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: Review of NEP draft renewables chapter

larry

Forwarded by Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE on 03/26/2001 11:58 AM



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/26/2001 10:46 AM

To: William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: renewables chapter

16273

DOE017-0901

Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/26/2001 10:00 AM



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/23/2001 07:02 PM

To: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, czmbz@erols.com

Subject: renewables chapter

16274

DOE017-0902

Lawrence Mansueti

03/26/2001 02:02 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE, Robert Dixon/EE/DOE@DOE, Don Richardson/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Comments on NEP chapters dealing with Hydropower and Demand Side 

6/01



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/26/2001 01:02 PM

To: Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:


16275

DOE017-0903

6/6/1

Lawrence Mansueti 03/25/2001 12:06 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Subject: Would like to review the NEP chapters that deal with Hydropower and Demand Side 

5

16276

DOE017-0904



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/26/2001 01:04 PM

To: Tina Kaarsberg/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: cost curves for NEP renewables chapter

6/5

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/26/2001 01:03 PM -----

Lawrence Mansueti

03/26/2001 11:37 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Tina Kaarsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: cost curves for NEP renewables chapter

6/5

When do you need the cost curves by???? Answer direct to Tina please.....
MaryBeth Zimmerman



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/26/2001 10:46 AM

To: William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: renewables chapter

6/5

Please remember that these are internal documents. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/26/2001 10:00 AM -----



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/23/2001 07:02 PM

To: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, czmbz@erols.com

Subject: chapter

16277

DOE017-0905

Here you are. This is not reviewed beyond me. Also, I am taking it home for the weekend for a read all the way through, since so much had to be juggled to address all of the comments & keep it within 5 pages.



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/26/2001 01:02 PM

To: Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Would like to review the NEP chapters that deal with Hydropower and Demand Side

5

Lawrence Mansueti

03/26/2001 12:06 PM


To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Would like to review the NEP chapters that deal with Hydropower and Demand Side

Would like to review the NEP chapters that deal with Hydropower and Demand Side (Ch. 4), in addition to the Ch. 7 I am looking at now.

16279

DOE017-0907

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Tina Kaarsberg/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: Re: cost curves for NEP renewables chapter 

When do you need the cost curves by???? Answer direct to Tina please.....
MaryBeth Zimmerman



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/26/2001 10:46 AM

To: William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: renewables chapter

The attached is a reviewed chapter on renewables for the assessment report to the Vice President's energy policy task force. Revisions were per interagency comments and task force requests.

- Please review today if possible.
- I'd also like to get estimates of changes in renewable production costs over time for this chapter. Preferably with enough datapoints to do a graph. These must be supported with source citations.

Please remember that these are internal documents. Thanks.

Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/26/2001 10:00 AM



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/23/2001 07:02 PM

To: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, czmbz@erols.com

Subject: renewables chapter

Here you are. This is not reviewed beyond me. Also, I am taking it home for the weekend for a read all the way through, since so much had to be juggled to address all of the comments & keep it within 5 pages.

16280

DOE017-0908



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/26/2001 10:46 AM

To: William Parks/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE

Please remember that these are internal documents. Thanks.

Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/26/2001 10:00 AM



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/23/2001 07:02 PM

To: Margot Anderson@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc: Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE, Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, czmbz@erols.com

Subject: renewables chapter

Here you are. This is not reviewed beyond me. Also, I am taking it home for the weekend for a read all the way through, since so much had to be juggled to address all of the comments & keep it within 5 pages.

16281

DOE017-0909



To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Jay Braitsch@HQMAIL, DERRIEL CATO@HQMAIL,
MARK RODEKOHR@HQMAIL, JAMES KENDELL@HQMAIL, PHYLLIS MARTIN@HQMAIL
cc: Abe Haspe/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, MARY HUTZLER@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL

Subject: FW: visuals for Int'l chapter

Ms Wheeler of the State Department has asked us for some help regarding graphics in the international chapter of the NEP. Do we have any of these photos/graphs that we can pass on to her?

Andy

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

From: Wheeler, Evelyn [mailto:WheelerE@state.gov]

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2001 1:02 PM

To: 'akydes@eia.doe.gov'

Subject: visuals for Int'l chapter

here's the list and if any of these things ring a bell, let me know.
Thanks!

Suggested graphics:
(These are options)

6/1

16282

Evelyn Wheeler

EB/ESC/IEC/BPC - Room 3535

Phone: (202) 647-4557

Fax: (202) 647-4037

This message is unclassified under precepts of EO 12958.

16283

DOE017-0911

Lawrence Mansueti

03/21/2001 02:06 PM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Robert Dixon/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: RE: NEP and Voluntary Climate Opportunities

Folks --

----- Forwarded by Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE on 03/21/2001 02:01 PM -----

Robert Kane@HQMAIL on 03/19/2001 11:27:23 AM



To: Lawrence Mansueti/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL
cc:

Subject: RE: Voluntary Climate Opportunities

Larry,

65
Bob Kane
Carbon Sequestration/ Climate Change Issue Manager
DOE, Office of Fossil Energy

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

From: Lawrence Mansueti
Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2001 2:24 PM
To: jnovak@eei.org@DOE@HQ-NOTES; BILLFGC@EEI.ORG@DOE@HQ-NOTES
Cc: Kane, Robert; Dixon, Robert
Subject: Voluntary Climate Opportunities

John, Bill --

69
16284

DOE017-0912

16285

DOE017-0913

b(5)



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/20/2001 03:03 PM

To: Brian Connor/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:
Subject: Re:

BRIAN CONNOR

BRIAN CONNOR
03/20/2001 10:35 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject:

MaryBeth,

Please review the draft response to Pat Booher's "important question." He's been patiently waiting for an answer for a week. I have included Sam's comments.

Pat,

I've spoken with Sam Baldwin, and Mary Beth Zimmerman about your question on the Spring Budget Summit Guidance.

16286

DOE017-0914

16287

DOE017-0915



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/16/2001 05:29 PM

To: Sam Baldwin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Transportation R&D

16293

DOE017-0916

To: Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE

cc:

Subject: High Performance Buildings

6

16294

DOE017-0917

b(5)



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/16/2001 12:43 PM

To: Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: High Performance Buildings

Still plugging away on them.

Jerry Dion



Jerry Dion

03/16/2001 11:55 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: High Performance Buildings

b(5)

MaryBeth,

Thanks,
Jerry

MaryBeth Zimmerman



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/16/2001 09:28 AM

16295

DOE017-0918



To: Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE, David Rodgers/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wal/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Consumer information 2 pager

combined BTS, OTT submission on consumer information for your review. I took out long term energy



savings numbers because they reflect more than this one policy. 13



Jerry Dion

03/16/2001 11:55 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: High Performance Buildings

MaryBeth,

Did any of our other policy response papers (I think we submitted 8) make it into EERE's submission? If so, can I have copies?

Thanks,
Jerry

MaryBeth Zimmerman



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/16/2001 09:28 AM

To: Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: High Performance Buildings

If you have the chance, here's the final NEP 2-pager on high performance buildings to look at. It hasn't

changed much from the last time you saw it.

16297

DOE017-0920

565

b(5)



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/16/2001 09:28 AM

To: Jerry Dion/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: High Performance Buildings



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/14/2001 10:33 AM

To: Amit Ronen/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: bullets for budget text

6

Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/14/2001 10:31 AM



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/13/2001 06:32 PM

To: Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: Nancy Jeffery/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: bullets for budget text

6

16299

DOE017-0922

David Rodgers 03/13/2001 10:41 AM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: richard.moorer@hq.doe.gov, Tom Gross, Philip Patterson/EE/DOE@DOE, Ed Wall, Tien
Nguyen/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Review of the 74 NEP policy paragraphs

Dear Marybeth,

Richard Moorer said you wanted comments on the 74 NEP paragraphs. Do you have a timeline and/or format?

16300

DOE017-0923



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/13/2001 10:06 AM

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

Subject: NEP documents

Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/13/2001 10:04 AM

Margot Anderson@HQMAIL on 03/02/2001 05:32:47 PM



To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, John Sullivan/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Abe Haspel/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, TREVOR COOK@HQMAIL, Paula Scalingi@HQMAIL, jkstier@bpa.gov@internet@HQMAIL, Robert Kripowicz@HQMAIL, WILLIAM MAGWOOD@HQMAIL, Michael Whatley@HQMAIL, Jay Braitsch@HQMAIL, John Conti@HQMAIL, Douglas Carter@HQMAIL, David Pumphrey@HQMAIL, James HART@HQMAIL, William Breed@HQMAIL, LARRY PETTIS@HQMAIL, JAMES KENDELL@HQMAIL, ANDY KYDES@HQMAIL
cc: Joseph Kelliher@HQMAIL

Subject: Attachments for Monday NEP meeting

Margot

16301

DOE017-0924





MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/12/2001 02:03 PM

To: John Conti@HQMAIL @ HQDOE
cc:

Subject: NEP - would like your thoughts

6

16303

DOE017-0926



MaryBeth Zimmerman

03/08/2001 07:26 PM

To: czmbz@erols.com
cc:

Subject: Final package from OTT

----- Forwarded by MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE on 03/08/2001 07:26 PM -----

David Rodgers 03/08/2001 04:02 PM

To: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE, MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Final package from OTT

Dear Folks,

Here are final five policies.



OTT Smart Pricing Strategy OTT Federal Vehicle Leasing OTT local transportation inn OTT Auto research c



NEP R&D Biofuels

My understanding of what we promised and what you have gotten as follows. This concludes the final submission of 3 policies, plus the R&D.

16304

DOE017-0927

16305

DOE017-0928



Jay Braitsch@HQMAIL on 04/26/2001 09:50:24 AM

6 (5)

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Darrell Bescherv/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, Tom
Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE@HQMAIL, TREVOR COOK@HQMAIL
cc:
Subject: GCC S&T

16306

DOE017-0929

b(5)

From: Randy Steer on 04/19/2001 10:08 AM

To: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE, Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE, Buddy Garland/EE/DOE@DOE

cc:

Subject: Fwd: OPT's input to Tax Initiative

Since you're still working the tax initiative issue, here was a late submission from OPT on tax incentives.

----- Forwarded by Randy Steer/EE/DOE on 04/19/2001 10:06 AM -----

Lawrence Mansueti

04/17/2001 10:18 AM

To: Randy Steer/EE/DOE@DOE

cc: Robert Dixon/EE/DOE@DOE, Michael York/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: OPT's input to Tax Initiative suggestions needed

Randy -

16307

DOE017-0930

16308

DOE017-0931

615)

DARRELL BESCHEN

04/18/2001 02:04 PM

To: john.sullivan@ee.doe.gov
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: NEP

6

16309

DOE017-0932

DARRELL BESCHEN

04/18/2001 12:34 PM

6(5)

To: john.sullivan@ee.doe.gov
cc: MaryBeth.Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

16310

DOE017-0933

Kolevar, Kevin

161

From: Rob Goldston [rgoldston@pppl.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2001 5:09 PM
To: Braitsch, Jay
Cc: Kolevar, Kevin; Marlay, Robert
Subject: Fwd: RE: Fusion Briefing

Dear Jay,

As you can read below and have already seen, Kevin Kolevar asked me to contact Bob Marlay, who has asked me to contact you.

15
07

20
161

>X-Server-UUID: 0bf4d294-faec-11d1-a39a-0008c7246279
>From: "Marlay, Robert" <Robert.Marlay@hq.doe.gov>
>To: "'Rob Goldston'" <rgoldston@pppl.gov>
>cc: "Kolevar, Kevin" <Kevin.Kolevar@hq.doe.gov>,
> "Anderson, Margot" <Margot.Anderson@hq.doe.gov>,
> "Braitsch, Jay" <Jay.Braitsch@hq.doe.gov>
>Subject: RE: Fusion Briefing
>Date: Mon, 6 Aug 2001 11:45:59 -0400
>X-WSS-ID: 1770620A5407-01-02
>
>Rob: I believe that the "Energy Technology" working group will be
chaired
>by Jay Braitsch, who has lead DOE's energy R&D portfolio work for the
last
>two years. I would contact Jay directly. Jay is forming his team, and
>there will be an energy supply subgroup. Bob
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Kolevar, Kevin
>Sent: Monday, August 06, 2001 9:04 AM
>To: 'Rob Goldston'
>Cc: McSlarrow, Kyle; Marlay, Robert
>Subject: RE: Fusion Briefing
>
>
>Rob:

in

<
>Kevin

>

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

>From: Rob Goldston [mailto:rgoldston@pppl.gov]

>Sent: Friday, August 03, 2001 5:25 PM

>To: McSllarrow, Kyle; Kolevar, Kevin

>Subject: Fusion Briefing

>

>

>Kyle and Kevin,

>

>

>Thanks,

>Rob Goldston

>

>

>(I sent a similar email to Bob Card, but I got a response indicating
>that he will be out of town for a couple of weeks.)

>--

>

>Rob Goldston, Director, MS-37 rgoldston@pppl.gov

>DCE Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory Phone: (609) 243-3553

>P.O. Box 451, Princeton, NJ 08543-0451 Fax: (609) 243-2749

>

>You can visit DOE PPPL's Home Page at <http://www.pppl.gov>

Rob Goldston, Director MS-37

DOE Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory

F.O. Box 451, Princeton, NJ 08543-0451

rgoldston@pppl.gov

Phone: (609) 243-3553

Fax: (609) 243-2749

2

16312

DOE017-0935

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Easley, Kevin [Kevin_Easley@ak.wpi.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2001 12:48 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: FW: 8/1 Update

Kevin,

b(6)

Regards,

Kevin

6(5)

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Henderson, Robin (GC)
Sent: Friday, July 27, 2001 6:25 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: FW: OSTI Responses to Domenici and Santorum Letters

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Kevin,

6/27

Thanks,

Robin A. Henderson

---Original Message---

From: Henderson, Robin
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2001 4:28 PM
To: Warnick, Walter
Subject:
Importance: High

Walt,

6/27

b(5)

Kolevar, Kevin

From: Joseph, Toni
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 4:54 PM
To: Kolevar, Kevin
Subject: FW: Bullets for Sec. Abraham



SecAbrahambullets.doc

We sent up some bullets that we got from ANL institutional plan because we had not gotten any from ANL per our request. They have delivered and the attachment contains their list. Hope it is not too late. I will send it to NE, EE and FE.

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

From: Stefanski, Elizabeth M. [mailto:stef@anl.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 4:47 PM
To: Toni Joseph (E-mail)
Cc: Grunder, Hermann A.; Joyce, Donald; Beggs, Steven D.
Subject: Bullets for Sec. Abraham

Toni - I pasted them in below, and I also attached the file.
<<SecAbrahambullets.doc>> .

Best regards,
Liz

Elizabeth Stefanski, Ph.D.
Assistant to the Laboratory Director
CTD/201
Argonne National Laboratory
9700 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439

Phone: (630) 252-6493
Fax: (630) 252-7923
Email: stef@anl.gov

Ongoing work at Argonne National Laboratory (ANL)
that supports the President's National Energy Policy

**Ongoing work at Argonne National Laboratory (ANL)
that supports the President's National Energy Policy**

Kolevar, Kevin

b(5)

From: Magwood, William
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2001 2:17 PM
To: Card, Robert
Cc: Kolevar, Kevin; Longworth, Paul; Okey, Randi
Subject: Guidance Needed Re: Reprocessing

Importance: High

b
6
Bob,

Bill Magwood

Kolevar, Kevin

b(5)

From: Dobriansky, Larisa
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2001 11:55 AM
To: 'Murray.Jenny@epamail.epa.gov'
Cc: Otis, Lee; Bailey, Vicky; Kolevar, Kevin; Whatley, Michael
Subject: NSR/Comprehensive Strategy Press Release