ERIN Q V

Re: Energy Independence and Security Act
(Article from the New American Magazine – January 21, 2008)

Bush Signs Stringent Energy Bill

President Bush signed H.R.6, The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 into law on December 19, ushering in the next era of government regulation of our nation's energy marketplace. Notable provisions of the new law include: -Increased fuel economy standards to achieve a combined fuel economy average for the 2020 model year of at least 35 miles per gallon.

> **Question: How can the increased fuel economy standards be accomplished by adding Ethanol content in each gallon of gasoline when Ethanol's BTU (British Thermal Unit) is only 66% of that of gasoline?**

Excerpt continued from same article:
- Establishing a national tire fuel efficiency rating system for motor-vehicle replacement tires;
- Federal Grants to state and local government and to private or non-profit entities to encourage the use of plug-in electric drive vehicles;
- Grants to automobile manufacturers and supplier to encourage domestic and advanced diesel vehicles;

> **Question: Where will the additional electrical power come from for the new plug-in electric drive vehicles? Are there provisions to build new electrical energy sources?**

Excerpt continues:

- Revising regulations to ensure that fuel sold in the United States contains a specified volume of "renewable fuel, advanced biofuel, cellulosic biofuel, and biomass-based diesel", the most common being ethanol;

> **Question: Currently, the addition of Ethanol is at 10% per gallon of gasoline. However, even at 10%, the United Nations found that market prices for cereals, dairy products, meat, sugar, and oils rose 57% from March 2007 to March 2008. What will the price of food be when government mandates Ethanol content at 85% of every gallon of gasoline?**

American taxpayers are now spending eleven billion dollars a year to subsidize the production of Ethanol at a 10% per gallon gasoline content rate. How does this make economic sense when our goal is to reduce our dependence on foreign oil? Scientists, including Professor David Pimentel of Cornell University concur that corn ethanol uses 29% more fossil fuel energy in its production than it replaces.

Question: Can we expect this irresponsible game to continue with US taxpayer subsidies that will surely encourage the destruction of our country's conservation reserve, and marginal land and water resources?

Excerpt Continues:

The bill repeatedly references greenhouse gases. It provides that "each year, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue guidance identifying the makes and model numbers of vehicles that are low greenhouse gas emitting vehicles" and take into account the most stringent standards for vehicle greenhouse emissions applicable to and enforceable against motor vehicle manufacturers."

The bill orders the EPA administrator "to ensure that transportation fuel sold or introduced into commerce in the United States…achieves at least a 20% reduction in lifecycle greenhouse gas emission." It also establishes an executive branch "International Clean Energy Foundation" to serve "the long-term foreign policy and energy security goals of reducing global greenhouse gas emissions."

The International Clean Energy Foundation is just another federal government bureaucracy to further stagnate this nation's free enterprise system … preventing it from accomplishing real energy independence for America in the 2lst century…and doing so without destroying our country's environment, economy, and automotive industry.

Does this "solution" truly represent the best effort that Congress has to offer the American taxpayer? When will we begin to put America first in this country?


Frederick B Wiggins

Frederick B. Wiggins
Rochester Hills, Michigan

Encl.

Energy for America

We can achieve energy independence for the 21st century without destroying the environment. There's no need to deindustrialize or sacrifice our standard of living.



A.P. Images

by Arthur B. Robinson and Noah E. Robinson

The single most important human component in the preservation of the Earth's environment is energy. Industrial conversion of energy into forms that are useful for human activities is the most important aspect of technology. Abundant inexpensive energy is required for the prosperous maintenance of human life and the continued advance of life-enriching technology. People who are prosperous have the wealth required to protect and enhance their natural environment.

Currently, the United States is a net importer of energy, as shown in Chart #1 (page 22). Americans spend about $300 billion per year for imported oil and gas — and an additional amount for military expenses related to those imports.

Political calls for — in the words of the "7 Point Pledge" announced by Al Gore, Nancy Pelosi, and Harry Reid — cutting "global warming pollution in developed countries by 90-percent" are obviously impractical. A 90-percent reduction of U.S. hydrocarbon use would eliminate 75 percent of America's energy supply, and this 75 percent of U.S. energy cannot be replaced by alternative "green" sources. Despite enormous tax subsidies over the past 30 years, green sources still provide only 0.3 percent of U.S. energy.

Technological Options

The United States clearly cannot continue to be a large net importer of energy without losing its economic and industrial strength and its political independence. It should, instead, be a net exporter of energy.


Water vapor rises into the atmosphere from the Palo Verde nuclear plant near Phoenix. Originally planned for 10 nuclear reactors, only three reactors were completed due to public hysteria caused by false information.

There are three realistic technological paths to American energy independence: increased production of hydrocarbon energy, nuclear energy, or both. "Global warming" alarmism notwithstanding, there are no climatological impediments to increased use of hydrocarbons, although local environmental effects can and must be accommodated. Human use of hydrocarbons is not measurably affecting the Earth's climate. Nuclear energy is, in fact, less expensive and more environmentally benign than hydrocarbon energy, but it too has been the victim of the politics of fear and claimed disadvantages and dangers that are actually negligible.

For example, the "problem" of high-level "nuclear waste" from nuclear power plants has been given much attention, but this problem has been politically created by U.S. government barriers to American

Arthur B. Robinson, Ph.D. is a laboratory researcher and professor of chemistry at the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine (OISM). He is also the publisher/editor of the Access to Energy *newsletter. Noah E. Robinson, Ph.D. is a researcher and professor of chemistry at the OISM.* *This article is an adapted excerpt from their more extensive article entitled "Environmental Effects of Increased Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide," which appeared in the Fall 2007 issue of the* Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons. *A PDF of the full article, including source citations, is available at the* Journal's *website at www.jpands.org/vol12no3/robinson600.pdf.*

so it is probably the better choice for increased energy production. Solid, liquid, and gaseous hydrocarbon fuels provide, however, many conveniences, and a national infrastructure to use them is already in place. Oil from shale or coal liquefaction is less expensive than crude oil at current prices, but its ongoing production costs are higher than those for already-developed oil fields. There is, therefore, an investment risk that crude oil prices could drop so low that liquefaction plants could not compete. Nuclear energy does not have this disadvantage, since the operating costs of nuclear power plants are very low.



Energy economics: These estimates for the delivered cost of electrical energy in Great Britain in 2006, without CO_2 controls, include all capital and operational expenses for a 50-year period. The "micro wind or solar" cost estimate is for units installed for individual homes.

Nuclear Option

Consider, for example, one practical and environmentally sound path to U.S. energy independence.

At present, 19 percent of U.S. electricity is produced by 104 nuclear power reactors, with an average generating output in 2006 of 870 megawatts per reactor, for a total of about 90 GWe (gigawatts). If this were increased by 560 GWe, nuclear power could fill 100 percent of our current U.S. electricity requirements with an additional 230 GWe left over for export as electricity or as hydrocarbon fuels replaced or manufactured. This is illustrated by Chart #3.

Thus, rather than a $300 billion trade loss, the United States would have a $200 billion trade surplus — and installed capacity for future U.S. requirements. Moreover, if heat from additional nuclear reactors were used for coal liquefaction and gasification, the United States would not even need to use its oil resources. The United States has about 25 percent of the world's coal reserves. The heat from nuclear reactors could also be used to liquefy biomass, trash, or other sources of hydrocarbons that might eventually prove practical.

The Palo Verde nuclear power station near Phoenix, Arizona, was originally intended to have 10 nuclear reactors with a generating capacity of 1,243 megawatts each. As a result of public hysteria caused by false information — very similar to the human-caused global warming hysteria being spread today — construction at Palo Verde was stopped with only three operating reactors completed. This installation is sited on 4,000 acres of land and is cooled by wastewater from the city of Phoenix, which is a few miles away. An area of 4,000 acres is equivalent to a square 2.5 miles on a side. The power station itself occupies only a small part of this total area.

If just one station like Palo Verde were built in each of the 50 states and each installation included 10 reactors as originally planned for Palo Verde, these plants, operating at the current 90 percent of design capacity, would collectively produce 560 GWe of electricity. Nuclear technology has advanced substantially since Palo Verde was built, so plants constructed today would be even more reliable and efficient. The delivered cost of this electricity would be between 3 and 5 cents per kilowatt hour, which is substantially lower than most current U.S. prices.

Assuming a construction cost of $2.3 billion per 1,200 MWe reactor and 15-percent economies of scale, the total cost of this entire project would be $1 trillion — the equivalent of four months of the current federal budget or eight percent of the annual U.S. gross domestic product. Construction costs could be repaid in just a few years by the capital now spent by the people of the United States for foreign oil and by the change from U.S. import to export of energy.

The 50 nuclear installations might be sited on a population basis. If so, California would have six, while Oregon and Idaho together would have one. In view of the great economic value of these facilities, there would be vigorous competition for them.

In addition to these power plants, the United States should build fuel reprocessing capability, so that spent nuclear fuel can be reused. This would lower fuel cost and eliminate the storage of high-level nuclear waste. Fuel for the reactors can be assured for 1,000 years by using both ordinary reactors with high breeding ratios and specific breeder reactors, so that more fuel is produced than consumed. Long before the nuclear fuels in use today were exhausted, new energy technologies would surely be invented.

Technological advances reduce cost, but usually not abruptly. A prescient call in 1800 for the world to change from wood to methane would have been impracticably ahead of its time, as may be

Mr. Frederick B. Wiggins
3380 Fairgrove Ct.
Rochester Hls., MI 48309-3991

ROYAL OAK MI 480

07 JUN 2008 PM 3 L

USA42

06/14/2008 08:32 AM

THE HONORABLE VIRGIL H. GOODE JR.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515