UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2001

The meeting came to order at 9:00 a.m., in Salon I of the Ballroom of the Ritz Carlton Hotel, 1150 22nd Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., Archie W. Dunham, Chair, National Petroleum Council, presiding.

PRESENT:

ARCHIE DUNHAM, Chair, National Petroleum Council DAVID J. LESAR, Chair, NPC Committee on Critical Infrastructure Protection

MARSHALL W. NICHOLS, Executive Director, National Petroleum Council

HON. E. SPENCER ABRAHAM, Secretary of Energy KYLE McSLARROW, Chief of Staff, U.S. Department of Energy

ROBERT S. KRIPOWICZ, Acting Assistant Secretary of Fossil Energy

PAUL KELLY, Sr. Vice President, Rowan Companies, Inc.

CHUCK DOMINY, Chair, Coordinating Subcommittee, CIP

JOE FOSTER, Non-Executive Chairman, Newfield Exploration Co.

NEAL R. GROSS

A-G-E-N-D-A

		PAGE
I.	Call to Order and Introductory Remarks	. 3
II.	Remarks by the Honorable E. Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy	. 5
III.	Consideration of the Proposed Final Report of the NPC Committee on Critical Infrastructure Protection	45
IV.	Reports of NPC Administrative Committees	
	A. Briefing on Natural Gas Study Follow-up Activities	62
	B. Cochairs' Coordinating Committee	84
	C. Finance Committee	85
	D. Nominating Committee	86
٧.	Discussion of Any Other Business Properly Brought Before the NPC	
VΤ	Adjournment	89

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 (8:58 a.m.) 2 CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Good morning. 3 Good morning. ALL: 4 CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Welcome to the 109th 5 meeting of the National Petroleum Council. I really 6 appreciate your willingness to serve in this advisory 7 capacity to the Secretary of Energy, and also to our 8 nation and industry. 9 We have what I hope will be an interesting 10 and a very worthwhile session scheduled this morning. 11. And the check-in across the hall will serve as our 12 official attendance record. And so if there's no 1.3 objection, I will dispense with the calling of the 14 15 roll. Before I introduce the head table, I would 16 like to relay the regrets of our Vice Chair, Bill 17 Weis, for not being here this morning. Bill's mother 18 is very seriously ill, and so he's there with her this 19 morning, and our prayers go out to Bill and his family 20 21 during this time. Now I would like to formally introduce for 22 the record the participants at the head table. On my 23

Now I would like to formally introduce for the record the participants at the head table. On my far left is Marshall Nichols, Executive Director of the Council. Next to Marshall is the Chair of the NPC

24

Committee on Critical Infrastructure Protection, Dave 1 2 Lesar. On my far right is Bob Kripowicz, Acting 3 Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy. Next to Bob is 4. Kyle McSlarrow, Chief of Staff of the Secretary of 5 Energy. And then on my immediate right, of course, is 6 7 Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy. Our first order of business this morning 8 is to hear from our new Secretary of Energy, Spence 9 And as most of you know, prior to being 10 sworn in as the tenth Secretary of Energy in January, 11 Secretary Abraham served in the Senate representing 12 the State of Michigan. 13 Mr. Secretary, most of us in this room 14 have seen numerous energy secretaries, and most of 15 them have been very effective. A few have been global 16 But nearly every one I've visited 17 embarrassments. with --18 (Laughter.) 19 Don't ask me which ones. 20 (Laughter.) 21 Because you all know. But nearly every 22 one that I've visited with since your confirmation, 23 both in the United States and globally, are impressed 24 with your performance in a very tough job, your 25

willingness to learn our industry, and also for your 1. leadership in helping us solve the nation's energy 2 3 problems. So we are honored to have you with us this 4 We look forward to your comments. Please 5 morning. in welcoming Secretary of Energy, 6 7 Abraham. (Applause.) 8 SECRETARY ABRAHAM: Archie, thank you very 9 I appreciate your setting the bar so low. 10 much. (Laughter.) 11 I can't help but feel comfortable that I 12 can meet the standard you've just outlined, and at 13 least be no worse than an international embarrassment. 14 (Laughter.) 15 But I won't speculate as to who did well 16 and who didn't. I just look forward to working with 17 the Council to try to make some progress on a variety 18 of challenges which we have before us. 19 And as Archie indicated, we've got some 20 folks from our team here today. Bob Kripowicz, who I 21. think most of you probably have known for some time 22 and worked with, and who I've really appreciated -- in 23 his Acting Director role for our Fossil Energy 24 appreciated very much his counsel and 25 Programs,

assistance during my first two months in the job. hope you'll all get to know 5 8 9 10 But in any event --11 (Laughter.) 12

1

2

3

4

6

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21.

22

23

24

25.

McSlarrow, who is Chief of Staff at the Department now, who has brought a tremendous background in both energy as well as government to this job, and works very closely with me, which means that whenever you issues that constitute serious, virtually unsolvable problems, I hope you'll take them to Kyle and reserve opportunities for ribbon cuttings and great accomplishments for your meetings with me.

-- please do stay in touch with us through Bob, through Kyle, through others. We're still in the process of putting the Department together in terms of As you're all aware, the process of personnel. confirmation, particularly when a cabinet is just starting up, requires some time to meet the various standards of selection processes that go on to meet really, in of challenges, various confirmation that include security checks and other sorts of things.

But I'm happy; in our Department we now have sworn in our energy problems --

(Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

-- challenges. 1 I thank the advanced team for having --2 (Laughter.) 3 You can still hear me out there, right? 4 (Laughter.) 5 You're still -- I've had a variety of 6 audiences try to, you know, sort of discreetly leave 7 during my speeches before. But this is probably the 8 most overt attempt I've ever --9 (Laughter.) 10 Archie said this is kind of -- this is the 11 first taste of a rolling blackout in the east 12 hemisphere. 13 (Laughter.) 14 But in any event, I just -- I do want to 15 express right off the right my interest in working 16 And, fortunately, as I closely with the Council. 17 noted last night when I stopped by for the events that 18. quite a few of the members are people I've had the 19 chance to work with, either in Michigan or in my role 20 in the U.S. Senate, or given the brief period of time 21 since I assumed office, and so I'm confident we can 22: have the kind of strong relationship and productive 23 relationship that the Council is intended to produce. 24

And I think a quick examination of some of

the accomplishments already in previous work done by 1 this organization is pretty clear evidence of the 2 important role that you play. 3 today in especially interested 4 reviewing the results of the study on critical 5 Infrastructure protection will be a infrastructure. 6 key priority in DOE, so I'm sure the action plan that 7 will be provided today will provide a significant road

map for addressing some of these challenges.

already attempted to We have addressing some infrastructure issues in the four months that we've been installed, particularly in areas like cyber security, where we have already in the budget resolution that we've presented to the Congress proposed a very substantial 43 percent increase in cyber security expenditures in this next recognize the period, because we that budget challenges in these areas are growing ones.

I also would note that the Council's past studies have had a major impact. I think your look at America's natural gas supply found some 40 percent was virtually out of bounds to development in federal land areas in Wyoming and Colorado. That was I think a clear warning.

By the year 2020, we'll consume some 50

8

9

10

11.

12

13

14

15.

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

percent more natural gas than we do today. And so with that increasing domestic supply, the gap has to be filled otherwise by foreign import.

Interestingly, the Department of Energy followed up on the NPC natural gas study, and I can announce today that our findings show that some 68 percent, not 40 percent, of the Rocky Mountain region considered is now closed to development or under major access restrictions. And as I'll discuss later, we've taken steps in our national energy plan to try to address this problem in an environmentally responsible manner.

headlines and of central concern to all American families -- our national energy policy. Over the course of the last several weeks I've had the chance to visit the last refinery built in the United States, and that was over 25 years ago. In fact, I was there, as I told several of you yesterday, in Garyville, Louisiana. And I've also had the chance to visit the first nuclear powerplant to be relicensed for the next 20 years.

These facilities help us define America's energy challenges. Both the refinery in Garyville and the nuclear plant not too far from here in Calvert

4.

10 Cliffs, Maryland, have superb environmental records. 1. They performed an absolutely essential function. They 2 run at virtually peak capacity. They operate safely, 3 and they are good citizens in their local community. 4 capacity, Our refinery however, 5 We need more Garyvilles. seriously strained. 6 7 demand for electricity is soaring, but our interest in adding to the supply has for too long been missing in 8

We need more Calvert Cliffs.

The consequences are clear for everyone to see. We have an energy supply crisis. It is serious. It's not going to cure itself. And it's going to affect every single family in this country. going to cause dramatic changes in lifestyles if unaddressed, and it's going to get much worse if we don't act now to meet the challenge.

Let me also make something quite clear. There are no quick fixes to our energy supply crisis. Our energy problems were years in the making, and they will take years to overcome. But in many ways this crisis, like every other crisis the country has ever faced, is going to be a test of our willingness to make tough decisions, to stick with our decisions, and to take responsibility for our actions.

We use an enormous amount of energy in

NEAL R. GROSS

action.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this nation, and yet we are too often reluctant to do
the things that need to be done in order to maintain
a secure supply of energy. Everyone likes power, but
no one likes power generation or delivery. Everybody
says they are for conservation.

But, unfortunately, no one likes high
prices. Not a surprise. You can't have it both ways.

But, unfortunately, no one likes high prices. Not a surprise. You can't have it both ways. And yet we are told that there's an easy and rather uncomplicated way out. When prices soar, apply price caps. When demand exceeds supply, beg OPEC for more oil. When energy supplies drop, claim that conservation and the promise of renewable power, all by themselves, can save the day.

The simple course of action will be popular in the short run until the lights really do go out, and then we will need a solution. Our judgment is that we should not wait until the kind of crisis that now grips California works its way eastward and engulfs the entire United States.

That's why the President's national energy plan offers us a way to address our energy challenges. His approach is long term, it's balanced, and it is comprehensive. It touches on every aspect of our problem from environmental protection to new sources in the Caspian Sea, from conservation to nuclear

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25.

energy.

б

1.3

18.

22.

So what I'd like to do today is just spend a few minutes reviewing some of the challenges we see on the horizon, and then I'd like to look a little bit at some of the things we have specifically outlined in the energy plan to try to address them.

As you all remember, 22 summers ago a national survey of service stations by the American Automobile Association found that over half were shut down on Saturday, June 23rd, and that 70 percent had their gas pumps shut off on the subsequent Sunday.

So on the first weekend of summer in 1979 there was simply little gasoline to be found in America at any price. At the same time, independent truckers were staging strikes to protest fuel shortages, snarling traffic and adding to the sense of crisis.

Fortunately, today's energy crisis has not resulted in national shortages or gas lines or worker strikes. But it is a deeply serious problem in its own way as the one our nation was facing 25 years ago. Scarcity is not a problem.

Few now live under the illusion which was popular in the past that we're running out of natural resources, nor is the nation confronted with the same

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

kind of international political environment of a 1 perilous cold war on the one hand and a prolonged 2 hostage crisis on the other. 3 But consider what the data is telling us 4 about America's energy future. In the next 20 years, 5 we expect overall United States energy consumption to 6 increase by 30 percent. We expect oil demand to 7 We expect consumption of increase by one-third. 8 natural gas to increase by 62 percent. We expect 9 electricity demand to increase by 45 percent. 10 We now produce 39 percent less oil than we 11. did in 1970, and yet 40 percent of our domestic gas 12 resources are, as you well know, off limits or subject 13 to restrictions that make it virtually impossible to 14 15. develop. Hydroelectric power generation is expected 16 to fall sharply over the next 20 years. 17 been no nuclear power permit granted since 1979, and 1.8 there are many people who want to see coal, which now 19 supplies over half our electricity, go the way of 20 21 whale oil. Our energy supply network is also in 22 Thirty-seven U.S. refineries have closed 23 since 1992, and, as I said, yesterday I visited the 24

last one which was built 25 years ago. An aging power

grid prevents power-rich regions of the nation from selling power to areas that need it the most.

America now consumes about 98 quads of energy a year. That's all energy forms. If we assume normal economic growth and continued significant improvements in efficiency, we will consume 127 quads by the year 2020. This means over the next 20 years we're looking at a gap of some 30 quads of energy after we make all expected efficiency gains to keep our homes warm and our factories running.

In other words, efficiency helps. It plays a big part. Indeed, our projections are that without gains in conservation we would need about 175 quads in 20 years. But we still have to generate an additional 25 percent more energy supply over the next two decades to make up the final difference.

Under current policies, because we've had relatively flat and stable lines of supply in the last decade, imports would be our primary option for filling that gap. But I suspect that few Americans wish us to become even more energy dependent. Alternatively, we could attempt to fill the gap by drastically cutting our consumption of energy on top of the major conservation savings we already foresee.

But are Americans really prepared for

NEAL R. GROSS

steep taxes on gasoline and electricity, CAFE standards high enough to virtually ban SUVs from the highway, or the moving of our energy-intensive businesses and jobs offshore? I doubt that.

That's why the President has set a difference course for America. It's a course that's balanced and comprehensive. Our national energy plan balances concerns for environmental protection with our need to increase domestic supplies of energy. It balances the need to look to the future and to new sources of energy with today's pressing requirements for additional power.

It balances the need for an increased focus on conservation, with greater attention to enhancing our own domestic supplies. And, finally, the President's plan looks to a balanced source of supply, from wind to nuclear, from coal to solar, because we believe that diversity of supply is the best way to ensure energy security.

So let me now turn to some of the more specific components of the plan. First, there is conservation. You know, some critics actually attacked this plan before it was even written on the theory that it would not pay enough attention to conservation.

1.

1.5

But energy efficiency not only stands alone as a central feature in our pursuit of energy security, it is an idea woven into every facet of our strategy. Few people know it, but we are already the world's most efficient users of energy. Since 1973, the United States economy has grown five times faster than energy use, and we are determined to build on that impressive record.

1.9

25.

We'll consider higher appliance standards and expanding the scope of that program to include appliances not yet covered. We recommend energy efficiency based tax credits for purchases of new hybrid fuel cell vehicles. The plan helps working families save energy and money by doubling funding for a weatherization assistance program.

Combined heat and power technologies have great potential for increasing efficiency and reducing emissions. By itself, one plant can reduce the annual emissions of nitrogen oxide by over 600,000 tons. We back more chip programs by shortening their depreciation life or providing an investment tax credit.

Conservation, therefore, is a central part of the plan, and there are many other proposals in the conservation area in addition to the ones I've

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

mentioned. But as I said at the outset, on its own it's not enough to make up the difference between the expected rise in energy demand over the next 20 years and the current projections with respect to the growth of energy supply.

so the President's plan also looks to increasing domestic supply from diverse sources of energy. Just consider this. With electricity demand expected to jump 45 percent over the next 20 years, we are looking at the need for between 1,300 and 1,900 new powerplants in this country. That amounts to somewhere between 60 and 90 new plants per year, which works out to obviously more than one new plant per week. And yet the last time we added that much power in a single year was 1985.

Even if we meet the construction challenge with all the permits required, the transmission lines to be conducted, and the frequent local political opposition, virtually all of these new plants would be fired by natural gas unless we change course.

Now, we believe that natural gas has many advantages, but we also believe it's kind of risky to rely on just one fuel. We believe it would endanger national security by leaving us defenseless against foreign supply disruptions, because obviously import

18.

22.

levels would rise, and we believe it would almost certainly trigger very tight markets with resultant price spikes.

That's why the President's plan is a balanced approach that seeks the security that comes from a diverse source of energy supply. So we'll strengthen all available sources. Hydro power must remain a key electricity source, so we propose streamlining the current cumbersome process and very costly relicensing process that at least in one case took 23 years to complete.

Coal supplies half of our nation's electricity but presents environmental challenges. Through our clean coal technology initiatives we're going to invest \$2 billion over the next 10 years to help make coal a cleaner burning fuel. Just as urgent, we need to add some regulatory certainty to coal-fired electricity generation.

So our energy plan recommends a clear set of policies related to coal that are more easily applied to business decisions. Natural gas, as I noted earlier, will be an increasingly crucial part of our energy mix.

Our plan calls for a review of public lands restrictions with full public consultation to

NEAL R. GROSS

11.

15.

explore impediments to environmentally sound recovery 1 2 of natural gas reserves. Thanks for the NPC study, we have a better idea of the scope of the impediments. 3 Nuclear energy provides 20 percent of our 4. electricity, and, as we know, is the cleanest form of 5 major power generation known in the world today. 6 fact, if we had to rely on fossil fuels for the 20 7 percent of electricity now provided by nuclear energy, 8 it would be the same as adding the emissions of 94 9 million automobiles to America's highways. 10 We believe expanding nuclear energy makes 11 To do that, however, we need to overcome some 12. old thinking about nuclear power. Some people's image 13 of nuclear energy has been frozen in time for 22 years 14 by the accident at Three Mile Island. 15 We make no mistake about this. Three Mile 16 Island was a serious accident, and everyone from 17 industry to government has learned from it. 18 look at nuclear power today as if nothing has changed 19 since 1979 would be the same as looking at the 2.0 communications industry and ignoring the development 21 of the cell phone or the internet. 22 Technology in the nuclear industry has 23 Current reactors have been raced ahead, too. 24 They've become safer and more reliable.

upgraded.

20 And improved designs just over the horizon, like the 1. gas-cooled pebble bed reactor, are even safer than 2 today's reactors. 3 Nuclear energy is already a staple around 4 the world, as you know, with France, for example, 5 generating some 80 percent of its electricity from 6 Japan, Israel, and other nations are nuclear power. 7 also moving ahead with new plants. 8 As I mentioned at the beginning of my 9 speech, I recently visited the first nuclear plant to 10 be relicensed for the next 20 years in Calvert Cliffs, 11 It's an example of how consolidation of Maryland. 12 this industry fostered a huge boost in safety and 13 percent Calvert Cliffs runs at 98 efficiency. 14 efficiency, up from 70 percent in the years gone by. 15

In the past, plants had only homegrown talent available for highly-skilled operator jobs. With consolidation, all plants take advantage of the best talent available around the country. Technology and fundamental changes in this industry, most of which have gone unrecognized, have transformed nuclear power generation.

We take account of these changes in our energy plan in a variety of recommendations designed to maintain and expand nuclear power generation.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

First among them is our expressed commitment to safety. We encourage the relicensing of plants like Calvert Cliffs that meet the highest safety standards, and we support applications for licensing new advanced technology nuclear reactors.

The Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with DOE, will look at the potential for nuclear energy to improve air quality. We recommended more money for safety enforcement. We support legislation, ensuring that decommissioning funds are not taxed as part of the transaction, thus removing additional roadblocks to further consolidation of the industry. And we support extending the Price-Anderson Act to ensure speedy compensation in the case of access.

But no progress, obviously, can be made on nuclear power until we solve the challenge of a permanent waste disposal site. The President's energy plan requires that the best science and the most rigorous process be employed to settle on a long-term disposal site.

And, clearly, one of the challenges I face as the Secretary of Energy and that our Department will face is to both complete the site characterization science work that's been going on for

NEAL R. GROSS

1.3

25.

some time and to fully evaluate it and to make a recommendation to the President at the earliest practicable time, so that we, in fact, can move forward with this process.

Along with traditional sources of energy we also have to harness the power of renewable energy, so we recommend extending and broadening tax incentives for wind as well as biomass generation, and we have proposed new tax credits for using solar generation.

Our plan pays special attention to the significant promise of next generation energy, such as hydrogen and fusion. There is great potential here for moving us some day in the future forward in these new areas, and we look forward to working together with this group and others to explore those opportunities as well as to invest in the research and development called for.

Along with ensuring that we meet the growing demand for electricity, we've also got to meet the growing demand for oil. Back in 1973 at the height of the oil crisis, as you know, America imported about 36 percent of its oil from abroad. Today we import about 54 percent.

And that figure is not going to drop. In

18.

22.

fact, it is likely to rise. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't do everything we can to boost our domestic supply. Here again, technology has forged ahead and changed the exploration industry as much as it has changed everything else.

I don't have to tell anybody in this group about the developments with respect to drilling technologies and other sorts of geological survey technology that have taken place in the last 25 years. The marriage of oil exploration with cutting edge technology means fewer rigs, fewer roads, fewer pipelines, and more success.

And drilling operations, as you're aware, that once took 65 acres in the 1970s need only 10 acres today. So anyone who believes that our plans to expand domestic production of oil and natural gas presents a threat to the environment simply hasn't kept up with the time.

Along with the challenge of boosting domestic supply we must continue to work with foreign suppliers like OPEC, but we must look at this question realistically. OPEC has demonstrated that they will act in their own self-interest. Therefore, it's clear to me that America should make decisions about oil based on our self-interest.

11.

1.2

15·

19.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So along with a continued honest dialogue with OPEC, we need to concentrate on getting our energy house in order. This means finding new international energy sources. It means enhancing energy production here at home. Ιt means straightforward dialogue with OPEC, but it does not mean basically going around the world begging for oil. That is a course which this administration will not follow.

There are countless sources of energy around the world, from the Caspian Sea to Asia to Africa, and within our own hemisphere. And our energy plan understands the global scope of energy and seeks wide-ranging, diplomatic efforts to increase energy supply around the world.

But even if we can find supply, moving energy to market requires a delivery system. Ours is out of date and in need of repair. Infrastructure improvement is the third key element in our energy plan. America is going to need an additional 38,000 miles of transmission pipeline and about 263,000 miles of distribution line just to bring natural gas to homes and to businesses.

Today's system is stressed. We need a new pipeline to deliver natural gas from Alaska to the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

rest of the nation, and we need to improve pipeline 1. Each of these issues is addressed in our safety. 2 plan. 3 We also need greater refinery capacity, as 4 I mentioned. I yesterday visited the last refinery 5 built in America 25 years ago. Such limited refinery 6. capacity is one of the major causes of gasoline price 7 spikes in the Midwest and elsewhere in the last few 8 Unless we take action, that problem will 9 summers. simply continue. 1.0 recommends streamlining Our plan 11 permitting and providing greater regulatory certainty 12 to give the industry confidence to expand. 13 infrastructure challenges don't stop there. 14 electricity grid needs to move from one designed to 15 meet regional energy needs to one able to send power 16 from coast to coast. 1.7 One of the reasons for blackouts 18 Northern California is simply an inability to get 19 power from Southern California to the north. And, 20 indeed, because power couldn't move into the state 21 from areas of the country that had a surplus. 22 such plan calls for an end to 23 bottlenecks by creating an electricity superhighway,

one where power can move from coast to coast as freely

24

as the family automobile.

25.

department has under the plan is to be -- to draft and to work to seek passage of legislation that can bring us closer to creating a true interstate highway system for electricity, and, most importantly, to break down some of the bottlenecks that today impede our capacity to deal with electricity crises and that, in fact, in many instances have diminished our capacity to have a competitive market with respect to electricity.

Too often an electricity producer can only look to the relatively small region in which they operate as a market for power. That's bad for consumers who are denied choice. We need to bring more sellers into these regional markets, which are now largely isolated. That would drive down prices by creating competition and consumer choice.

An electricity highway with all the stop signs gone will have another advantage, too. It will help us to transcend one of the major obstacles in America to building energy security -- the so-called not in my backyard syndrome, known as NIMBY.

Americans love energy. They just hate energy production. So it's become an effort worthy of the Manhattan Project to site a new powerplant or

27 build a transmission line in some parts of 1 Earlier this year, for example, plans to 2 country. build a 550-megawatt gas-fired generator in a suburb 3 of Los Angeles were scrapped after residents voted two 4 to one against the project -- this year. 5 The local mayor added a much-needed dose 6 of reason and maturity to the debate, I might add, by 7 staging a hunger strike in opposition to the project 8 during the days leading up to the election. 9 And yet there are communities in this 10 country, some of them quite isolated, that welcome 11 power generation, including nuclear power generation, 12 and would readily add new plants to their economic 13 base if they could only reach beyond their isolation 14 to find a large market for electricity. 15 16

Today that's not possible, but a truly national energy grid provides these communities with the broad base of customers they need to create their own hubs of power. And at the same time it moves beyond NIMBY to IMBY, communities that say to powerplants, "Yes, in my backyard."

So we believe our energy policy that looks to modernizing our complex energy delivery systems, that enhances energy efficiency and increases domestic production of all sources of energy, as well as

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

looking ahead to the next generation of energy fuels, is the kind of comprehensive and balanced approach America is looking for.

And I would just say in summary that I do know, as I look out on this audience, there are a lot of people here who have been waiting for America to put together a national energy plan with executive leadership and support at the White House, so that the country would have a steady course to follow into its energy future.

We have tried to do that with this plan, and I very much look forward to taking your questions on it. But also I hope in the days ahead to engage all of you and urge you to become engaged in this discussion. There are a lot of different viewpoints on energy policy, and no single viewpoint ultimately prevails, because in America that's the way we do business -- through discussion and dialogue and debate.

But I believe, just based on the few months I've been in this office, that there really needs to be a significant focus on these energy issues. For too long they have not been on the front burners of America's public policy discussions.

A lot of people aren't as familiar as the

NEAL R. GROSS

11.

15.

19.

people in this audience with some of the issues and the considerations that will go into energy policy decisionmaking, and so you have a unique opportunity, as well as I think responsibility, to help to make 4. sure that this discussion takes place in the kind of fashion, the thoughtful fashion, that we need for us to forge the kinds of decisions that will allow us to implement this plan in a fashion that really does make sure that America meets its energy challenges over the next 20 years in a fashion that guarantees that it's a successful completion of the project which the 11 President has begun. 12.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In closing, let me just thank you for your work and commitment to the Council. I'm very proud to be part of the role here and look forward over the course of my tenure in this job to having a close, ongoing relationship.

I was joking a little earlier comments about my Chief of Staff Kyle and I. do welcome your input and advice and counsel when you're in Washington for these meetings, look forward to continuing to have the opportunity to meet together and to benefit from the work that's done by the Council, as well as to suggest some topics for the future that would be of help to us as we forge ahead

in a variety of different ways to meet the energy 1. crisis we now confront. 2 help is indispensable, and I'm 3 appreciative for it. Thank you very much. 4 (Applause.) 5 DUNHAM: Thank Mr. 6 CHAIRMAN you, 7 Secretary, for that outstanding presentation. I think maybe we're going to have to raise the bar a little. 8 (Laughter.) 9. But the Secretary has graciously agreed to 10 take your questions, and so we appreciate your doing 11 that, Mr. Secretary. 12 So the floor is now open for questions for 13 14 the Secretary. Bobby Parker? 15 MR. PARKER: Mr. Secretary, you identified 16 imports as being very important. You identified the 17 Caspian as being very important, probably the largest 18 new supply in the world today. We're there. We need 19 a better relationship with Khazakstan which controls 20 both production and distribution. 21 I was wondering if your office or the 22 State Department which is related to that, it is very 23 important to our future. I was wondering if you'd 24 25 comment on that.

SECRETARY ABRAHAM: Well, what I can say 1 is two things. First of all, I had the opportunity to 3. meet with my counterpart in Khazakstan just a few days 3 ago when he was in Washington, and so we've opened up 4 I think a very fruitful dialogue on a personal level. 5 And the State Department, as well as our 6 Department, the Department of Commerce, have been 7 through our energy plan, as you know, charged with the 8 responsibility for trying to foster the possible 9 developments of a variety of Caspian-based energy 10 initiatives. 11 And so we look very optimistically, as I 12 in my remarks, towards diversifying our 13 implied international sources. And I would just say that with 14 respect specifically to Khazakstan that I felt our 15 meetings here in Washington were very profitable ones. 1.6 How does the Democratic MR. FOSTER: 17 control of the Senate affect your plan to get the 18 19 energy policy implemented? SECRETARY ABRAHAM: Well, I would say, 20 first of all, the plan that we have produced has about 21 105 separate recommendations in it. About 20 percent 22 of those relate to legislative initiatives. About 80 23 percent or so are things which for the most part can 24 be done by executive action, either in the White House 25

or in various departments of government.

And in our department, where about half of those directives and recommendations have been initiated, we're moving forward to put them into action as soon as possible.

With regard to those that remain on the legislative calendar, or which would get there, I had the chance -- our staff at least had the opportunity to sort of sit down and compare the components of our plan with the components of plans that have been offered both by Senator Bingaman, the new Chairman of the Energy Committee, and Senator Murkowski, the ranking Republican.

And we found, I think, that there were 30 elements in common between things that were in our plan and each of the bills that they have introduced already this year. So there's a lot of common ground I think to begin with. And I think the Energy Committee, if you just look at the membership, is comprised of a number of people on both sides of the aisle who have a real interest in and commitment to moving this country forward in a very positive way on energy issues.

So I feel that, notwithstanding the change of party control of the Senate overall, that within

1	the energy set of issues there's a lot of common
2	ground. We will intend to build on those. We
3	certainly expect, of course, to continue to take a lot
4	of the legislative work to the House side, where
5	Congressman Tauzin and I work closely together. We
6	expect to see some of the legislation begin on that
7	side as well.
8	And so how things may shape at some, you
9	know, later point in terms of conference committees,
10	and so on, is a little hard to project. But I think
11,	notwithstanding Senate control there is a lot of
12	issues that begin with commitment from both Senator
13	Bingaman, Senator Murkowski, and the President, that
14	should, in my judgment, yield positive results.
15,	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Should the President
16	grant California's request for an oxygen waiver for
17	the performance of gasoline?
18	SECRETARY ABRAHAM: That's a decision that
19.	the Environmental Protection Agency is working on.
20	It's kind of outside of our Department's purview.
21	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Should it be granted?
22	SECRETARY ABRAHAM: I leave that to people
23.	who have that portfolio.
24	Yes, sir.
25	MR WYLEY: Mr. Secretary, a followup to

Joe's question. There has been some speculation, and that's all it is, that because of the broad-based nature of the energy plan that the President has put forward that during the negotiations, particularly now with a Democratic Senate, that some of this may be foregone. In other words, it's not -- it may be negotiated away and/or unclear.

Just how solid are the components of the plan, in your mind? And will you stay the course in a broad-based energy plan?

SECRETARY ABRAHAM: Well, I think you all know the President's commitment to moving forward on this. It's, in my view, as strong as his commitment to move ahead with initiatives in education and on taxes. And, again, I think there's a lot of common ground to begin with.

Now, remember, the way the Senate rules work, as I all too clearly remember from the last six years, once a bill is on the floor, whatever the bill might be, it's subject to amendment and there's no germaneness requirement, which means that you can bring -- if somebody says, "Well, we're not going to bring a bill on ANWAR to the Senate floor," that doesn't preclude ANWAR from being attached as an amendment. So the debate can happen.

12.

16.

20.

Now, where the votes are, that hasn't 1 changed. The same 100 bodies are in the Senate. They may have a different floor configuration, but they're

the same people with the same viewpoints, I think.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13:

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of course, it doesn't preclude And. something that is passed on the House side from then becoming an issue in conference. So I think that most of these issues, one way or the other, are going to be brought to consideration. I can't project today how every single vote will go, but we feel that there can be a full hearing of this.

And I think the American people will My personal assessment of the public's the Senate, from six attitudes about that the American people, шy experience, was constituents in Michigan, expected the party in the majority not to prevent things from being debated but to make sure that the issues the public felt strongly about did get a chance for debate.

And energy issues are ones the American people want to see government take action on. And so I think you're going to see these issues in the Senate as well as the House have their day of debate, and we'll see where -- I mean, I can't project where they'll go, but I don't think they will be prevented 1 from discussion.

2.

1.4

MR. SIMMONS: One of the important distinctions, I believe, in the Bingaman plan from Murkowski's is on Lease Sale 181 and chopping off the shallow water shelf portion which gets close to the coast in Florida. How serious do you think this is? Because that's the only realistic short-term natural gas supply.

SECRETARY ABRAHAM: Well, obviously, the Department of Interior, you know, will make that decision from the standpoint of the administration. I can't project at this point where an energy bill might end up on trying to take some sort of legislative course to redefine boundaries.

So it's a little -- I'm not trying to be coy. I just don't know whether that particular component of a bill would -- how far that would continue to be part of a legislation, if you think through -- all the way through a conference with the House, where presumably you'd have members with pretty strong views that were different from that on the -- as conferees. I just mention it.

John?

MR. MILLER: I think you have touched on a very vital thing -- that is, the national energy

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And you can sense the deep interest by this 1 group in that plan. 2 Unfortunately, backward, looking 3 we started to try to develop an energy plan 30 years ago, 4 and we have not achieved one yet. And I think you 5 sense the questions that are coming, that we have a 6 great concern over whether or not we're going to get 7 anything now. 8 And I quess the question to you is: what 9 can be done now that hasn't been done in the past, 10 either through the Council or through the industry or 11 politically, to really achieve an energy plan? How do 12 we get the American public aware of the real problem 13 and get the political process in the background, so 14 that something meaningful can be achieved? 15 SECRETARY ABRAHAM: Well, first, John, the 16 matter is is, as Ι said. the 17 fact of approximately 80 of the recommendations in this plan 18 are ones that the administration will initiate and can 19 In my Department, about half of execute on its own. 20 those fall, and we've already begun moving ahead to 21 those which are within our power to 22 implement implement. 23 action with the President's think 24

respect to calling upon agencies to expedite the

permitting process, as an initial directive, his call to all of the agencies to begin taking into account basically energy impact of their rules, regulations, and actions, has begun already. These are things that have not transpired.

1.7

1.8

19.

23.

one of the 105 recommendations, including those that require legislative, will pass into law in the next 12 months? Probably that won't happen. But I think a lot will for the reasons I've said, because I think Americans are demanding this action, people who are frustrated by what they perceive to be inattentiveness in recent years to energy issues.

But I did say at the end of my remarks that the people in this room have a vital role to play, and that's a role of helping really, in the process of this discussion, to make sure that all Americans are better informed about energy issues.

When I testified at my confirmation hearing, Senator Gordon Smith of Oregon made a very, I thought, amusing but poignant statement when he said, you know, in his state he encountered -- he said a lot of people believe that electricity comes from the wall, that gasoline comes from, you know, the service station.

(Laughter.)

1.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12.

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They think of energy in terms of the sort of delivery point instead of all of the steps that are required along the process to be able to deliver it. And the lack of understanding of the risks involved in that -- that process, of the impediments that now have been over a long period of time placed in the way of that delivery, has to be I think better understood.

One of the things I have said in other remarks is this. You know, over the last 20 years in this country we've had plentiful and reasonably affordable supplies of energy. That has translated in a certain kind of way into a public opinion that I mentioned in my remarks of people who -- in this country who very much like energy, and to be able to use energy, but don't particularly like the source.

The reason for that is that during the last 20 years when there has been a plentiful, affordable supply, opposition to virtually every Coal obviously had energy form has developed. has Nuclear energy emission problems. renewables have come under Even the problems. Hydro-power kills fish. Windmills kill assault. birds.

And so there is sort of an opposition to

NEAL R. GROSS

every form of energy that has influenced and shaped 1 public opinion. And I'm not saying it has always been in a misinforming way, but perhaps because only one side of the issue has been heard it has distorted the way the public views the process of energy production and supply. 6 And I think people on the Council and in 7

2

3

4

5

8

9.

10

11

12

13'

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other roles who have expertise really need to share it at this time for public support for the plan's components to develop, because as people recognize the connection between supply shortages and higher prices, and perhaps understand which policies have played a role in diminishing supply, then I think that may shape the viewpoints of Americans a little bit differently on some of the components of the plan.

Certainly, one of the reasons I'm -- one reasons I went to Garyville, Louisiana, yesterday was to highlight the fact that we haven't built a new refinery in 25 years. Something most Americans, including this American, didn't know until just a few months ago.

One of the reasons that we went up -- I went up last week to Yonkers, New York, was to visit transmission bottleneck point that precludes, transmission limited amount οf the of because

capability at that point, it basically precludes a significant amount of electricity to be imported into 2. the city of New York. So that if there are -- and New York, fortunately, isn't in a situation like California this summer, but they're in a situation that's -- where they are just a little better than the margin, but they can't do anything about it from external sources. One of the most frustrating things to me 10 14

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the job so far was when I went down to the International Energy Ministers meeting in Mexico City in March and met with Mexico's electricity and energy ministers and found that they were willing to try to increase the amount of electricity they could supply to California from their facilities in Baja, only to discover that on the American side of the border, due to transmission limitations, the maximum amount of megawattage we can take from the border to San Diego is 408 megawatt.

As I indicated in my speech, because of the State of limitations within transmission California, the so-called Path-15 problem, part of the rolling blackout problem is that there isn't enough capacity just to move things within the state.

> think а lot of folks don't And

NEAL R. GROSS **COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

understand some of these critical ingredients in the challenges we face. So I think we can do a lot of things with respect to the plan through executive action. I think we can pass a significant amount of legislation.

What I hope everybody will take some comfort in is the fact that we do have a plan. We

comfort in is the fact that we do have a plan. We didn't take a year or two to develop it. We took basically 90 days. It was put together in a very intense timeframe with principals being the participants, not a lot of staff, but senior-level cabinet members and the Vice President sharing it.

And so we are now no longer just sort of debating abstractly. We really do have a set of recommendations, which I think if implemented will address most of these challenges. But we do need help, obviously, to make sure that the discussion is one that's balanced.

And what I would say is if you see something in an editorial that you regard as being in need of response, I hope people in this room will write a response that offers a different perspective or a fuller perspective.

We have time for one question -- one more
-- so -- if there is one more. And if there's not --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

3.

1.2

1.4

yes, Jim.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1,5

1.6

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23.

24

25

MR. EMMISON: Mr. Secretary, would you talk a little more about what the administration intends to do with respect to some sort of multicountry energy policy?

SECRETARY ABRAHAM: Glad to. One of the President's campaign proposals was that in addition to our hemispheric energy initiative we add a separate more or less trilateral component to our hemispheric policy, where we would work with our neighbors in Canada and Mexico on a North American energy framework.

And so I've had the opportunity in the last couple of months to have separate meetings with both Ralph Goodale and with Ernesto Martins, as well as a trilateral meeting in Mexico City, where the three of us met with our staffs to talk about fleshing this out and moving forward. And we're all I think in agreement that there are a set of issues common to us in North America that can be very profitably addressed if we begin to work on them together.

Our goal is not to form a North American energy policy per se, but it is to try to identify some of the common issues and challenges that we face, and to see if there aren't ways, through collaborative

efforts, that we can address them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24'

25

And we've already got a working group trying to identify what would be a set of agenda items for a more formal meeting sometime this year. I think we're hoping to have that -- that working group meeting take place in the next month or so, and then go from there.

so we look to this as a real profitable opportunity to address some of these issues, whether it's international transmission issues which we find sometimes need to be expedited, or other things with respect to international trade issues on energy between the three countries.

Secretary Evans will be part of the process on the trade side and will be working on it with respect to some of the permitting issues. So we're looking at other -- and we expect there will be obviously, because mean, more. interconnectivity of the grids, and because of other common interests, there are a lot of opportunities. There's a great interest, as everyone knows, in Mexico in terms of reforms of their system. And so as that process moves forward, it may bring additional issues into the framework.

But we feel that it's a very important

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

component of our international approach. And as I 1 said, in meetings that were -- this hemispheric energy 2 meeting in Mexico City, while some might expect the 3 United States to, in terms of its international energy 4 policy, either exclusively look to its relationships 5 in the Middle East or exclusively look towards its old 6 alliances in Europe, this administration -- and I 7 think the President's initial meetings with Prime 8 Ministers Chretien and with President Fox reflect a 9. desire to place our hemispheric energy activities on 10 an equal status with those that we will initiate in 11 other parts of the world. And we hope to do that, 12 especially within North America. 13. Thank you all. 14 (Applause.) 15 CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Thank Mr. 16 you, Secretary, for those generous remarks. And we're 17 especially thankful that you agreed to take questions 18 this morning. 19 We will now consider the final report from 20 Infrastructure NPC Committee on Critical 21 the Protection. And I especially want to thank Dave Lesar 22 for chairing this important committee. The original 23 chair, who was the previous Chairman of Halliburton, 24

decided that the NPC assignment was too difficult.

(Laughter.)

2.

So he elected to become Vice President of the United States.

(Laughter.)

So, Dave, we appreciate your willingness to do this, and the floor is all yours.

MR. LESAR: Well, I guess now you know the reason that Dick Cheney left Halliburton.

(Laughter.)

Thank you, Archie, and I'm very pleased this morning to present the final report that was prepared for consideration by the committee and subcommittee. In the interest of time this morning, I want to give only a brief introduction and then have Chuck Dominy, who is the chairman of the subcommittee, go over the group's findings and recommendations.

Let me just go back a bit and start with a brief reminder of the charge that the Council got and accepted from the Secretary of Energy in 1999. The Secretary, at that point, asked the National Petroleum Council to, and I quote, "To review the potential vulnerabilities of the oil and gas industries to attack both physical and cyber, and to advise him on policies and practices that industry and government, separately and in partnership, should

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

adopt to protect or recover from such attacks." 1 Also, at the Secretary's request, 2 Council agreed to serve as the sector coordinator for 3 the oil and gas industry during the course of this 4 study. We were very fortunate to have an excellent 5 group of both industry and government experts in the 6 oil and gas sector as part of this group and were a 7 great team. 8 And I know many of those members are in a 9 meeting today, and I want to thank them on behalf of 10 the NPC. 11 As to the study's conclusion and bottom 12 line, it's very simple: our infrastructures are very 13 vulnerable to attack, particularly cyber attack, and 14 there is a very strong business case for industry 15 action in this area. 16 While our industry today does a very good 17 job in protecting and safeguarding our physical 1.8 assets, we are becoming increasingly dependent on 19 Those systems improve our electronic systems. 20 operating efficiencies in the way we 21 businesses every day, but they also introduce new 22 risks. 23 Today we see threats that have greatly 24 increased in this global, interconnected e-economy in 25

today,

which we're operating today. We face threats ranging from simple human error to organized electronic attacks on our businesses. Today's existing processes and laws are very inadequate to deal with the changes and the in our businesses that see threats we especially as we have more dependence on electronic systems. Critical infrastructure

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23.

24

25

protection thinking needs to be adopted as part of their foundation and acting in the best interest of each of our individual companies and in the industry as a whole. It's clearly in our self-interest to implement the steps in the study for identifying and reducing our infrastructure vulnerabilities. These threats are real, and the recommendations and the solutions I believe are very cost-effective.

I hope that you will be joining us, and your organizations will join us, in the formation of an industry-run -- and I emphasize an industry-run -oil and gas information-sharing and analysis center. You'll be hearing more about this from Chuck in a couple of minutes.

So, Chuck, why don't you come up and give us an overview of the findings and recommendations of this fine team.

12.

16.

MR. DOMINY: Thank you, Dave.

Mr. Secretary, Chairman Dunham, and NPC colleagues, it's been pleasure the last 18 months to chair this subcommittee. But I have to tell you, Dr. Paul Scholinge -- please stand up -- from DOE has been my government co-chair and been very valuable. So we've got a public-private partnership already, and we thank you for that.

I'm pleased to be able to share some of our findings and recommendations. Initially, we had a study outline, which you see on this chart. Those are the topics we went down. We felt like if we did due diligence on each of those, wrung out all the best thoughts on that, that we'd answer the mail, and that sort of was our blueprint and our focus.

our industry's ability to survive in what we call "the new economy." When we look at ourselves we see an industry that has changed dramatically over the last 10 years. The footprint looks the same, but what's key is the fact that there's been an irreversible move to automated control systems and electronic transactions.

The globalization of the industry is

NEAL R. GROSS

profound with increased foreign partnerships.

Interdependencies with other infrastructures are much more acute. Environmental mandates and restrictions have increased, as has our dependency on foreign imports.

There has been a convergence, if you will, of the energy enterprise between providers, marketers, and systems. We've undergone mergers, alliances, and joint ventures, and that has sort of blurred the lines between traditional oil, natural gas, power, and pipeline companies.

Information has become universally and instantaneously available. This has led to a new challenge for our industry, and that's the challenge of information assurance as a condition of doing business in today's world.

So with that new business environment there comes vulnerability. And then you look at that list -- we sort of prioritized the vulnerabilities as we saw them as a team. And the key point is that that top bullet -- information technology and telecommunications -- a disruption there in any of the critical infrastructures is something that shuts you down, and we've got to be sensitive to that and integrate that into our planning. And that kind of

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1.

9.

1.8

guided much of our study.

1

2 .

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The integration of information technology and telecommunications in the business is creating some interdependencies that we have to be sensitive to. And these interdependencies are difficult to analyze and difficult to understand, and that's another area where we've got to put additional work.

Now, political and regulatory uncertainty It makes it difficult to make long-term prevails. look decisions. And when vou strategic internationally there's a lack of consistent business and frameworks, legal financial rules. and international recourse. Makes it tough to do business globally.

So out of that comes a focus on risk management, if you will, and in the new economy cyber risks add to the complexity of being able to do your own internal risk management. This interconnectedness and this dependency is the new model, and so our risk management approaches have to be upgraded.

We've got to be able to share vulnerabilities and threat information across our industry. We've got to develop some technical standards and business best practices that bring us right up to the state of the

involved

And we've got to take a look at insurance. There's a role for insurance options for the impact on cyber attacks or their disruptions. Now we, as a group, felt that the Y2K model, year 2000 effort, was a good model. multinational government, and involved And when you're looking for a private sector. blueprint on how to work together as a team, we felt that the Y2K Act was a very, very special example. Now, response and recovery planning plays a major role in mitigating business risks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

concluded that cyber response and recovery processes are not as mature as what we've been able to do looking at our physical infrastructure over time.

major that some recommend So enhancements needs to be made there, focus on data backup policies and procedures, focus on automation control systems design redundancy. Think about protection of cyber systems that operate your most critical infrastructures.

We've got to look at the inconsistency in how nations legally address cyber issues. lack of an international cyber security standard. And when you, as a company, take a look at these issues you've got to include all of your stakeholders,

business partners, suppliers, customers, reps from local and state governments. And when you do response and recovery tests, integrate all of those pieces into the whole.

Now, there's a role for federal government in all of this in our judgement, and they think -- we think it's important to help clarify response and recovery roles within this vast array of federal, state, and local enterprises. And this includes FEMA, which has a very vital role.

We think we need to -- the government can help improve industry's awareness of what the government's capabilities to assist in response and recovery are. And, importantly, we think government can assist in understanding the interdependencies that are critical to all of the infrastructures, and maybe do some R&D role modeling in that area.

Now, the next subject is a very pertinent one, and that's information sharing. Our analysis and studies show that early warning of incidence of new vulnerabilities affecting information technology and telecommunications is vital to protecting your critical infrastructure. So we've concluded that we in our industry need an information sharing and analysis capability.

19.

23.

1 2 3 companies 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12.

13

14

15

16.

17

18

1.9

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, many companies do not have adequate IT security staff. Many of our smaller companies have Yet you'll find that many of these smaller contract work the doing are multinationals and others, and they have access to your information systems.

companies throughout the So infrastructure, therefore, are not receiving all of the vulnerability information that might be available. A well-structured information-sharing and analysis center governed to support us can help solve that problem, and we think it should have the following kinds of capabilities -- access to the broadest range qlobal of threat vulnerability, data from perspective, ability to prioritize it and meet just our needs, handle a high volume of information, and be able to provide a single repository with total ownership and retention by industry.

And there are some examples of that out there, and I'll talk about that more a little later.

Now, legal and regulatory issues There must be an absolute guarantee that sensitive or proprietary information is protected. We have to work through the implications of sharing with Some of that will make sense; foreign affiliates.

NEAL R. GROSS

55 We've got to have clarifications on some will not. 1 antitrust laws. Liability from participation must be 2 addressed, as well as the potential liability for not 3 being involved. 4 Freedom of Information Act issues are very 5 pertinent, and they have got to be absolutely resolved 6 before we can go forward in any kind of interface with 7 the government. 8 In the area of a sector coordinator, it 9.

was the conclusion of our group that the governing body of an information-sharing and analysis center would be a logical entity to be the interface point for a sector coordinator. And, Mr. Secretary, that will be our fundamental recommendation.

We think that there is clearly a role for government in research and development, and we think it would best be focused on that highly-sophisticated issue of interdependencies, the effective cascading impacts from blackouts, shutdowns, disruptions, what happens at a regional, national, or international level. That kind of analysis I think can be done well by your DOE labs, and we make a recommendation that way.

So in summary of our recommendations, you can see that we think, as an industry, we ourselves

NEAL R. GROSS

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1.9

20

21

22

23

24

can become more sophisticated in our vulnerability assessments and get that cyber dimension into our 2. traditional risk models. That we can push industry and government for global IT management processes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's a good example out there, and that's that ISO called the Standard for Information Security Management, an example of where we ought to be going -- improve response and recovery plans, stand up an ISAC, designate that ISAC governing body as our sector coordinator, and, of course, we encourage government to keep critical infrastructure protection as an important issue.

And I'll close with one implementing point about standing up an ISAC. We believe it should be modeled after the one created by the banking and finance industry. That model provided for management by an industry-only board, not-for-profit limited liability corporate structure, information collection It provided alerts by a separate service provider. solutions prioritized and tailored to the individual members' needs.

And we, the ISAC, the industry, would retain ownership of all of your pertinent data. You could be anonymous in your participation, in the transfer of your information, and it would be a low-

1	cost and efficient operation.
2.	So that's a goal, that's a challenge,
3	that's the recommendation, and, Dave, I'll leave it to
4	you.
5	MR. LESAR: Thank you, Chuck. That was a
6	nice overview of what is a very complex subject and a
7	series of very fine recommendations.
8	I want to reiterate what I said earlier,
9	and I think what Chuck highlighted, that the study
10	does lay out a very compelling case and a very good
11	business case for strong action by industry. The
12	threats are real, and I think the solutions that are
13	outlined in this study are very cost effective.
1.4	So, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that
15	completes our recommendation, and I believe that the
16	report is responsive to the Secretary's request, and
17	I move that the National Petroleum Council adopt the
18	proposal subject to final editing.
19	CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Thank you, Dave and
20	Chuck.
21	We have a motion to adopt the report of
22.	the Committee on Critical Infrastructure Protection,
23	subject to final editing. Do I have a second?
24	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Second.
25	CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Thank you. Are there

any Council members with questions or comments for 1 Dave or General Dominy on the proposed final report? 2 Hearing none, all in favor indicate by saying aye. 3 (Chorus of ayes.) 4 Any opposed? 5 (No verbal response.) 6 The report is adopted. Thank you. 7 Thank you again, Dave, and your committee, 8 Chuck, the subcommittee, and the many, many volunteers 9 who helped complete this work. I think you've 10 prepared an excellent report, and I'm confident that 11 the Secretary and the Department will 12 extremely useful. 13 Mr. Secretary, I hope you'll find the 14 As Dave said, perhaps the most report helpful. 1.5 significant recommendation in the report is directed 16 to the industry, and we need to implement and actively 17 participate in a secure information-sharing mechanism. 18 I followed the work of the Infrastructure 19. Committee for several months and have committed myself 20 and Conoco to champion the formation of the oil and 21 information-sharing analysis and industry 22 gas And in anticipation of today's vote, we committee. 23. have already obtained the agreement of 11 companies to 24

join us in establishing an initial board that will

move this concept forward. And these companies are 1 Exxon Mobil, Duke Energy, El Paso, Enron, BP, 2 Halliburton, Peoples Energy, Phillips, Questar, Shell, 3 Texaco, and Conoco. 4 And later today representatives of these 5 companies will have their first meeting. And others, 6 if you wish to join, participate, please contact Bobby 7 Gillum from Conoco, who I've asked to chair this 8 initial group, or Chuck Dominy. 9 the first chair Chuck will 10 infrastructure meeting this morning in Salon II, which 11 commences at 11:30. 12. And also, assuming no objection from the 13 membership, I've asked the NPC staff to be available 14 to assist this group for the next 90 days as it 1.5 transitions into a self-supporting entity. 16, Mr. Secretary, I trust this meets your 17 expectations from our sector in the protection of our 18 nation's critical infrastructure. Thank you. 19 Next on the agenda we have a briefing on 20 the followup activities to the NPC's 1999 natural gas 21 This three-volume report was completed in 22 December of 1999 and has proven to be one of the most 23 popular and useful reports the Council has ever 24

issued.

Interest in the report remains quite high, 1. and follow-on activities have been numerous. This has 2 not been a report that has set on the shelf and 3 collected dust. 4 Thank you again, Mr. Secretary. 5 SECRETARY ABRAHAM: Thank you all. 6 (Applause.) 7 The Council should be very proud of its 8 thought you would and, therefore, Ι 9. work, interested in hearing a brief overview of how the 10 report is being used. Over 3,000 copies of the report 11 have been distributed by NPC, DOE, and various Council 12 members and their companies. 13 recipients include executive the 14 agencies, congressional departments and 15 branch committees with jurisdiction over industry matters, 16 state and local governments, the press, industry, and 17 many other interested parties. 18 The summary volume is available on the 19 internet and has been downloaded approximately 30,000 20 times from NPC's website alone. There continues to be 21 significant interest by the press with numerous 22 articles written. The NPC access map in particular 23 has been widely duplicated and is used 24

administration's natural energy policy report, as I'm

sure you've seen.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

study key importance, equal Of participants have given at least 30 presentations to industry ranging from diverse audiences associations to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The report has also been used by trade companies and of individual number associations in their advocacy work.

Council's the wish to express Ι appreciation to the Department of Energy for acting on the NPC report's recommendations.

The Department has been an advocate by setting up meetings with high-level executive branch policymakers in this and the previous administration, agreeing to request congressional testimony, pressing interagency actions, particularly on access issues, and hosting a workshop to review the report's milestones.

I am pleased to note that some of the report's key policy recommendations have been adopted in government policy reports and in various proposed legislation. We heard from the Secretary earlier regarding the recommendations in the administration's natural energy policy report.

In addition, the Interior Department's OCS

NEAL R. GROSS

Policy Committee issued a report last week that is 1 And supportive of examining new offshore areas. 2 several bills have been introduced in Congress that 3 reference the NPC report and include some of 4 primary recommendations. 5 I would now like to call on Bob Kripowicz, 6 DOE's Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, 7 and Paul Kelly, Senior Vice President of Rowan 8 Bob served as the government's co-chair 9 key member of the NPC Studies as a 10 Coordinating Subcommittee, and both have been very 11 involved in the numerous followup activities. 12 I've asked them to elaborate on what has 13 occurred since the report's completion, with a focus 14 on three areas of particular interest -- the DOE 15 workshop, the OCS Policy Committee report, and the 16 ongoing project to inventory the resources 17 regulations in the Rockies, and we hope ultimately all 18 federal lands. 19 Bob? 20 MR. KRIPOWICZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 Having served as the co-chair of the 22. Council's 1999 natural gas study, I'm happy to share 23 and to report on two followup activities. 24

note that the Council's report was widely distributed

within the Department itself, and we had it on our 1 website and had approximately the same kind of 2 experience that the NPC did on people looking at it. 3 I would also like to point out that a copy 4 of my remarks or slides, and Paul Kelly's, are in your 5 package. And there's more detailed information behind 6 it on the workshop and other activities. 7 The next chart shows the structure of what 8 was reviewed in the study. Earlier this year when 9 prices of natural gas were over \$10 a million BTU, and 10 the demand was up and supply seemed uncertain, there 11 were a lot of people who were questioning whether the 12 report's findings and recommendations were still 13 valid. 14 So we decided to have a workshop in March 15. to examine the report and to go over the items in the 16 structure and the critical factors and recommendations 1.7 of the report. 18 So with the assistance of the Council, we 19. held a workshop on March 5th and 6th, with industry 20 and government representatives -- approximately 60 2.1 people -- and Paul Kelly and I chaired the workshop. 22 And this included a lot of people who were involved in 23. the original study, so we had a lot of corporate 24

background and memory with regard to the study.

key

these

on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

assumptions that were used in the 1999 study, and some of them are indicated red where we spent a considerable period of time talking about the more robust economy than was anticipated in the NPC study, higher than expected increases in natural gas for electric generation, large natural gas -- a lag in natural gas production despite increases in drilling, some changes in public policy with regard to access during that period of time, and the still significant

The

need for new pipeline capacity.

agenda

focused

The next chart shows that the study itself showed a substantial increase over a period of time to a minimum of 28 TCF by the year 2010. But our looking at the actual demand data in 1999-2000 showed that demand was actually increasing faster than what was in the base case of the study, and in 2000 the demand was half a trillion cubic feet higher than the NPC assumptions.

What were the factors behind that? Well, clearly, the GDP grew over that period of time at a much faster rate, almost twice as fast as it was included in the -- it was assumed in the NPC study. And electric generation, another factor in demand, grew probably 30 percent faster than was projected in

the study.

1.

and I would point out that the demand grew even though in 2000 many people switched fuels. Many people in some industries switched fuels because of the higher prices during that period of time. So we had a substantial increase in demand over what was projected.

Back when we were putting this together, prices had already well gone beyond what was projected in the NPC study. And as we all know, they went over \$10 a million BTU later nationally, and considerably higher in California. What this said to us was that there was a problem in supply. Supply did not increase to meet the demand factor.

Now, it's not a question that industry didn't try. We saw -- we also examined the data in drilling, and it showed a tremendous increase in drilling in response to demand and to the increased prices. But basically production over this period of time did not respond as expected in the NPC report, and that was pretty much across the board except for some increase in unconventional gas.

So demand was basically met from two sources, one from what normally would have gone into storage, and, secondly, from a large increase in

imports from Canada. So after two days of looking through this, we came to a conclusion about the report that actually the critical factors that the report addressed were still valid, and there was probably greater urgency for some of the actions that had been specified in the report than we had seen before.

The general trend in demand, for example, was more than correct. Demand was actually growing faster than we had expected. So the critical factors, almost all of which address supply, became even more important, and we had considerable discussion about these factors. Access is one in particular that I'll go into a little bit more.

Now, during these two days, we also came up with a lot of questions that were unanswered, questions about depletion and questions about electric generation capacity, alternate sources such as LNG or an Alaska pipeline, things that bear further looking at. And some of those things you will find reflected in the proposed suggested National Petroleum Council future studies that you all have a copy of, and some of those things will be included in future studies.

Finally, the workshop came up with some conclusions about actions that were needed, and I think probably if you listen to the Secretary closely

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

1.3

14

15

.16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25.

and

you will find out that almost all of these actions that the workshop recommended are in the national energy policy. meeting went from this People Some of us went over and testified to Congress. briefed the Vice President's task force. We provided copies of the recommendations through the chain in the Department of Energy and also to the Vice President's it's clear lot that a office, and recommendations were rolled right into the national 10 energy policy. 11 12 13 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

So the report is being used. The workshop confirmed that its conclusions were valid, and it helped define the national energy policy. So I think you can say that this is a living document, and we should revisit it, as I promised to do, from time to time to make sure that those -- that the conclusions in the report remain valid over a period of time.

And some of the questions that arose in this two-day workshop, you know, will probably be reflected in future NPC studies.

Now I'd like to go into my second brief overview, and that has to do with the study that Secretary Abraham announced this morning as being completed -- an analysis of restrictions on access for

natural gas resources underlying federal lands in the 1 greater Green River Basin in Wyoming and Colorado. 2 A CD of the report, including all of its 3 maps, will be available outside, and there's a press 4 release covering -- a summary of the report will also 5 be available outside after the meeting. 6 Next slide, please. 7 The study was conducted actually as a 8 response, again, to the NPC's 1999 gas study. 9 Council conducted an assessment as part of that study 10 examining stipulations on -- restrictions on the use 11 of natural gas resources in the Rocky Mountains, and 12 extrapolated based on some raw data that approximately 13 40 percent of the resource was off limits. 14 recommended that the the NPC And 15. government continue this kind of a study throughout 16 the whole Rocky Mountain region, and so we at DOE 17 said, "Yes, we think that's a good idea, and we'll 18 implement that recommendation." And so we started a 19. seven-month study on natural gas resources and access 20 restrictions in the greater Green River Basin. 21 chose -- with the intention of finishing up the Rocky 22 Mountain areas eventually. 23 The greater Green River Basin was chosen 24

the

far

by

largest

amount

because

25

it

has

undiscovered natural gas in the region. While we provided the funding and much of the technical expertise, we also worked in cooperation, as we did in the original study, with BLM and the U.S. Forest Service. And these agencies provided their full cooperation and they supplied data and interpretations of the data and reviewed the final report.

Now, this study was actually underway when Congress passed the reauthorization of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and that Act included a provision requiring the Department of the Interior, in consultation with us and the Department of Agriculture, to conduct an inventory of oil and gas resources on federal lands in the entire United States, and look at the restrictions on access to those resources.

And the importance of this effort was reaffirmed by the national energy policy, which says not only do this study but expedite the study. Currently, an interagency group led by BLM is moving forward on the expanded study. The next basins we'll do after this one are the Yuenta and Pience Basins of Utah and Colorado.

Those basins will be done and funded by DOE in fiscal year 2001, and then beginning next year

12:

1.4

the funding for the interagency effort will be from BLM.

There's a hierarchy of stipulations and land use designation categories that are explained in detail in the report. Most of the stipulations are made for environmental reasons, and mainly for the protection of wildlife. There are some surface use restrictions having to do with stream lands and cultural resources, but they are mainly environmental and mainly geared toward wildlife.

On some of these parcels the stipulations overlap. In other words, there is more than one kind of stipulation, so we aggregated those stipulations to determine what the cumulative effect was. There are also some categories where access is completely closed and leasing is not available, including some that are statutory and some that are administrative, and I'll talk about that in more detail later on.

The next slide shows all of the parcels in the study area that are either closed to development or available for leasing with restrictions. The full color map which goes into this in complete detail is on display in the lobby that you can look at and also is available on the CD.

We took this map and superimposed it on

NEAL R. GROSS

1.

1.3

the map of the natural gas resources to determine the amount of resource that is restricted, and that's shown on the next map. The darker colors show where more of the restricted resource lies, and it's -- you can see it's in the northwestern portion of the study area, and in an arc through the Rust Belt down into Colorado.

Summary of the results -- we found that actually 68 percent of the natural gas resource in the study area is estimated to be either off limits or significantly restricted, and the other 32 percent is available on standard lease terms. Of course, the standard lease terms also have environmental requirements.

Of that 68 percent, 30 percent of it is completely closed to development, and 38 percent has restricted areas. Now, remember, as I mentioned the NPC report pilot study showed -- estimated that this number was 40 percent. So in this particular basin the restrictions are considerably higher.

Interestingly, the resource that's closed to development, the 30 percent, only about one percent of that is closed because of statutory withdrawals such as parks and wilderness areas. And the rest are administrative withdrawals, such as those in forest

www.neairgross.com

for plans, set aside and BLMorareas 1 consideration as possible wilderness area. 2 And that's a very important thing 3 remember, because the vast majority of this is set 4 aside administratively, so that it does not take 5 congressional action to change those designations if 6 that's desirable. 7 But the study does show that there could 8 be actually a more -- access could be a much more 9 serious problem in the Rocky Mountain area than we had 10 estimated in the original NPC study. 11 So, finally, I mentioned earlier that 12 Congress had mandated an inventory for the whole 13 country, and that the national -- and that 14 strategy had administration's national energy 15 recommended that this inventory be expedited. 16 This final slide shows the text of the 17 recommendation, and it basically says that. 18. Now, I want to emphasize that we think 19 this is a very important effort, but we also think 20 that the NPC can take full credit for initiating this 21 effort through the 1999 study. 22. I want to leave you with 23 assurance that we'll be working closely with Interior 24 and Agriculture to conduct the inventory and develop 25

the information that's needed for decisions that will 1 affect the oil and gas supply. 2 All of the information that I mentioned, 3 before I close, is also on our website, which is 4 www.fossil.energy.gov -- fairly simple. 5 And I'd like to thank you for your 6 attention to these two efforts that have followed on 7 to the NPC study. And with that, I'd like to turn the 8 podium over to Paul Kelly, who will tell you about the 9 activities of the OCS Policy Committee. 10 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Bob. 11. Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, as 12 the industry co-chair of the gas workshop that Bob 13 talked about, I wanted to thank your companies for 14 volunteering personnel to participate in the workshop. 15. We had over 55 of the best and brightest 16 who know an awful lot about the natural gas industry, 17 and we had an excellent representation from both 1.8 industry and government in that workshop. 19' wanted to reiterate what Bob said, that we all agreed 20 that it would be a good idea to try to put together a 21 similar group periodically to check the milestones of 22 the report, because the whole question of rising 23 natural gas demand is so critical. 24

wanted to tell you about another

development that related in many ways to fallout from 1 the NPC gas study, and that's the OCS Policy Committee 2 recommendations to the Secretary of Interior. 3 Shelf Policy Continental The Outer 4. Committee is an independent advisory committee charted 5 under the Federal Advisory Committee Act to give the 6 Secretary of Interior advice on the implementation and 7 management of the OCS Lands Act. And in many ways it 8 parallels what is done here at NPC in terms of giving 9 advice to the Secretary of Energy. 10 In October of the year 2000, the committee 11 established a natural gas committee to independently 12. review and evaluate information on natural gas, and 13 then make an assessment of the contribution that the 1.4 OCS can make to increasing supply to meet demand. 15 16 Secretary appointed by the are all 17 itself full committee the and Interior, 18

As you can see here, the subcommittee representatives of all the coastal states, plus a mixture of industry representatives, representatives community and such environmental of the organizations as fishing.

Here the subcommittee members who were appointed are shown here as a very diverse group with representation from Alaska, Louisiana, Delaware, North

1.9

20

21

22

23

24

Carolina, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and then, as you can see, two industry representatives that served on the subcommittee.

The recommendations that were considered

by the Policy Committee at its meeting on May 24th were preceded by our mailing to all of the members of the full committee -- a report that gave a lot of background data. The OCS Policy Committee started looking at the whole question of natural gas about two years ago, about the time that we started the NPC gas study.

There was a developing sense at MMS that the OCS could be more critical in meeting demand for gas that was obviously occurring at a faster rate than we thought before. And during a two-year period we repeatedly had panels meeting with the committee to discuss natural gas.

And, in fact, the day that this subcommittee was appointed by the OCS Policy Committee a panel on natural gas was organized at the meeting that included two of the representatives of the data integration and writing team who worked on the NPC report.

So we had cross communication going on all the time that this subcommittee worked, and, indeed,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1.7

1.9

2.0

they asked us for copies of the report and background 1 They also looked at the energy information 2 data. studies and GRI studies as well as some of their own 3 internal sources. 4 5

Now, after considerable debate over a twothe following meeting, year period at the recommendations were agreed to be transmitted to the Secretary of Interior. First, that the OCS should be viewed as a significant source for increased supply to meet national demand for the long term.

Secondly, congressional funding to the MMS and other critical agencies, such as Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, DOE, and EPA, should be assured to allow staff to accomplish the work necessary to increase production of gas. And we were aiming here at some of the critical roadblocks that we've seen occur with respect to OCS, such as problems with the Coastal Zone Management Act and EPA and coordination among these federal agencies.

Third, the committee is recommending that following the success of the deep water royalty relief program for the off-shore MMS should develop economic incentives to encourage new drilling for natural gas in an environmentally sound manner in deep formations, subsalt formations, and deep water. And that these

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25.

and existing leases. 2 As you're aware, in the March lease sale 3 for the central Gulf of Mexico, Sale 178, there were 4 incentives included for the first time for deep gas 5 drilling on the shelf for wells drilled in excess of 6 15,000 feet of water in less than 200 meters in -- to 7 a total depth of 15,000 feet in waters less than 200 8 meters deep. 9 in cooperation with Fourth, the MMS, 10 industry, should increase natural gas production in an 11 environmentally sound manner from existing OCS leases. 12 Next, the Policy Committee supports the 13 existing five-year leasing plan, and that plan does 14 include Sale 181 in the eastern Gulf of Mexico 15 scheduled for this coming December. 16 committee encourages the Sixth. 17 congressional funding for additional education and 18. outreach regarding the leasing program. 19 Secretary touched on that a little while ago. 20 Seventh, we call for greater input from 21 local communities and mitigation of social, cultural, 22. and economic impacts, and comparative assessments of 23 environmental risk between the offshore and onshore 24 production where onshore reserves exist in the same 25

incentives should be considered for both new leases

area as offshore reserves.

11.

15.

2.2

Now, we had a representative on the subcommittee, Mayor George Ahmagoak from -- who is the mayor of the North Slope Borough, and he made this point forcefully. And, as you know, there is some sensitivity on the North Slope about which resources should be developed first, the on shore or the off shore.

As far as the first statement is concerned, we all agreed that greater import from local communities is a principle that should apply not only in Alaska but elsewhere throughout the OCS.

The eighth recommendation is that MMS, partnering with DOE, should expand cooperative research with other agencies and industry seeking technical solution to the leading edge issues such as seismic imaging of subsalt areas and drilling in deep formations. Of course, one of the conclusions of the NPC '99 report is that if we're going to meet rising demand we're going to have to drill deeper.

MMS, in cooperation with DOE, should encourage international cooperation in the development of gas hydrates in an environmentally sound manner, with a goal of a pilot program in place within 10 years. As you know, these potential resources are

enormous, but they're long term, but the subcommittee felt that in the interest of meeting future demand it's time to start doing some work on this whole subject.

Number 10, a gas pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48 states would favorably encourage an in natural gas production by creating favorable economics for federal OCS production in Alaska. There has been a lot of attention given to the prospect of a new pipeline from Alaska, most of it focused on the potential of existing gas reserves on the North Slope.

Our subcommittee also thought that it might make a difference in the future in terms of the economics of prospects in the Beaufort Sea, and potentially other offshore Alaska areas that could potentially increase leasing and activity there over the long term.

Getting toward the end here, the eleventh recommendation was to develop information and enhance an informed public debate on whether or not there are grounds for support for a limited lifting of moratoria in existing moratoria areas. MMS, in consultation with industry and affected states, should identify the topic -- five top geologic plays in the moratoria

1

2

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12.

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

areas, and, if possible, the most prospective areas 1. for natural gas in the plays that industry would like 2 to explore if allowed. 3 Now, this is -- OCS Policy Committee 4 meetings are normally very low key without any media 5 attention. But this is the recommendation that really 6 brought a lot of publicity to this meeting. 7 And some of the headlines read, "Bush 8 Considering Lifting of Moratoria," "Secretary of 9 Energy Considering Lifting of Moratoria," but those 10 were all incorrect. What this was was an effort on 11 the part of kind of an outside, impartial group to 12 look at the whole process of OCS leasing in the 13 natural gas and energy crisis we're facing in this 14 country and try to come up with an idea to change the 15 process. 16 So the subcommittee and the full committee 17 in the recommendation encourages congressional funding 18 to MMS for the acquisition of seismic data to assist 19 in narrowing down prospective areas. It's important 20 that these data be non-proprietary, which would be the 21 case if acquired exclusively by MMS. 22 Two, encourage congressional funding for 23 environmental and social human impact studies for 24

broad-based or specific to the five prospective

geological plays.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25.

site-specific establish а Next, stakeholder consultation process that would permit a sharing of information and discussion of concerns regarding the pilot areas.

The only thing I would add to this is that when this recommendation was made everyone asked, "Well, name the five plays." We really didn't try to subcommittee During the plays. five name deliberations there was discussion purely on as an example basis of the North Atlantic, in view of the developments that have occurred on the Scotian Shelf, with the Sable offshore gas project, and then the recently very encouraging discovery by Pan-Canadian of Deep Vanuk just south of Sable.

And by the way, when Bob mentioned that the half-TCF shortfall in production was met largely by Canadian imports as well as by withdrawals from storage, most of those Canadian imports came from the Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline from Nova Scotia coming down into New England about a year earlier than planned.

And there is some speculation among geologists that some of those trends could extend down off the North Atlantic. So the subcommittee felt like

this was an example of a prospect that might be looked at again, but only after discussion with the local states and with local input to see if there might be a way for a limited lifting of the moratoria.

I think the committee feels like we have a gridlock in offshore areas outside the central and western Gulf of Mexico, and the committee was simply trying to come up with a process where a reasonable approach might be taken to see if in some of these areas there could be a limited lifting of those moratoria areas.

finally, although the committee Now, recognized that these items were not within the purview of MMS, the committee recommended that a national energy policy should consider continuing to the national pipeline develop expand and corridor access, infrastructure, looking at and regulatory issues and environmental safety capacity, encouraging dual fuel capacity for new electricity generating plants, encouraging the review by the administration of cost-effective tax incentives to increase the production of natural gas.

And, finally, encouraging conservation and increasing efficiency in the use of natural gas as a part of the national energy portfolio.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

5

6

7

8

9

10

11.

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22.

23

24

	83
1	So I think you will find that most of
2	these things are consistent with both the NPC gas
3	study and with what we've seen in the new national
4	energy plan.
5	I think that concludes my remarks, Mr.
6	Chairman.
7	CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Okay. Thank you, Bob
8	and Paul.
9	Are there any questions or comments on
10	their reports?
11.	I want to recognize several companies that
12	contributed significantly to the leadership and
13	conduct of the study and contributed the people that
14	have carried the load on the followup activities, and
15·	these include Burlington Resources, El Paso, Rowan
16	Company, Simmons International, and Texaco.
17	In closing this discussion, I should note
18	that while much has been initiated toward meeting the
19	nation's future demands for natural gas, obviously
20	much remains to be done. The administration and
21	Congress must act to implement needed administrative,
22	regulatory, and legislative changes, and industry must
23	accept the challenges of supplying the growing volumes
24	that the marketplace is demanding.

the Secretary may noted earlier,

request the Council's continued assistance through a supplemental study addressing Frontier or other new gas suppliers from Alaska, Canada, the Atlantic and Pacific OCS, Mexico, and LNG -- areas that did not 4. receive much attention in the 1999 study. 5

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12.

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This leads me to the next administrative item which is the Cochairs' Coordinating Committee. As you know, this group monitors the allocation of NPC resources and works with the Secretary and his staff to identify issues on which the advice of the Council would be particularly useful to the Secretary.

In April, at my request, Bill Wise, along with Bobby Shackouls, Matt Simmons, and Dan Yergin, met with Secretary Abraham to introduce him to the At the end of that meeting, the Secretary Council. charged Bob Kripowicz to review the national energy policy and canvas DOE and other agency staff for a list of candidate issues.

Now, the list is diverse and includes many challenging questions on environmental and energy relations, international conservation, switching in the electric power and industry markets. A copy of DOE's preliminary list has been sent to the Cochairs' Coordinating Committee, and copy is among the handouts you received this morning.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I encourage you to review the list, and 1. please provide the committee, call Marshall, call me, 2 or anyone on the committee, with any suggestions for 3 additions or comments or areas of priority or emphasis 4 that you think we need to look at. 5 The Secretary and I hope to finalize the 6 list during the next 30 to 60 days, to determine where 7 the Council can be most helpful to him and the 8 administration. So your input will be very important 9 1.0 to that process. Next I would like to turn to the Council's 11 finances. And Ken Lay, the Finance Committee's chair, 12 is out of the country, and so I'll make his brief 1.3 14 report. The Finance Committee met this morning to 15 financial status of the Council. review the 16 Representatives of Ernst & Young, our independent 17 outside auditor, were at the meeting to review their 1.8 audit report for calendar year 2000. And based on 19 this review, I'm pleased to report that Ernst & Young 20 gave us a clean bill of health. Our accounting 21 procedures and controls received high marks, and the 22 financial condition of the Council is strong. 23 also reviewed calendar year 24 With the critical infrastructure expenditures. 25

1	protection study coming to an end, we are within the
2.	\$2.9 million budget you approved early this year. In
3	fact, we're projecting a small budget surplus,
4	depending, of course, on the timing, the scope, of
5	Secretary Abraham's request for new Council studies.
6	And given this uncertainty, the Finance
7	Committee has deferred until later in the year any
8	decision on the year 2002 budget.
9	And, finally, we looked at member
10	contributions, and the committee is pleased to report
11	that in a period of less than 90 days the Council has
12	received over 85 percent of the funds requested. In
13	the next few days we will be following up with those
14	of you who may have misplaced your contributions
15	request.
16	(Laughter.)
17	I really don't want to have to send you
18	another letter.
19	(Laughter.)
20	So please look in your in box, and if you
21	haven't mailed in your dues please do so quickly.
22	There are no items in the Finance
23	Committee report that require a vote by the Council,
24	but I would be happy to respond to any questions.
25.	Thank you.

Our final committee report this morning is 1 from the Nominating Committee, and Ray Hunt, Chairman 2 of the Nominating Committee, is out of the country. 3 And Joe Foster will now present the committee's 4 recommendations. 5 The NPC's Nominating MR. FOSTER: 6 Committee has agreed on its recommendations for NPC 7 officers, chairs, and members of the Agenda and 8 Appointment Committees of the Council, as well as the 9 members the NPC Cochairs' ο£ at-large five 10 Coordinating Committee. 11 And on behalf of that committee, and on 12 Ray Hunt, I am pleased to offer the 13 National Petroleum Council following nominations: 14Chair, Bill Wise; National Petroleum Council Vice 15 Chair, Bobby Shackouls. 16 For the Agenda Committee, we recommend the 17 following members: Bob Allison, Joe Foster, Bob Fri, 18 Ray Hunt, John Miller, Jim Mulva, Lee Raymond, Dick 19 Terry, Chuck Watson, Dan Yergin, with Larry Nichols 20 serving as the chair of that committee. 21 Committee, we For the Appointment 22. recommend the following as members: George Alcorn, 23 Dave Biegler, Bob Catell, Luke Corbett, Hector 24 Cuellar, Claiborne Deming, Tommy Munro, Dave O'Reilly,

1	Lew Ward, with Bob Palmer serving as Chair.
2	In addition, we recommend the following as
3.	the at-large members of the Cochairs' Coordinating
4	Committee: Claiborne Deming, John Hess, Mark Papa,
5	Matt Simmons, and Hank True.
6	So this completes the report of the
7	Nominating Committee and, on its behalf, I move
8	approval I move that the above be elected until the
9	next organizational meeting of the Council.
10	Thank you very much.
11.	CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Thank you, Joe.
12	I have a motion to adopt the report of the
13	Nominating Committee. Do I have a second?
14	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Second.
15.	CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Thank you. Are there
16	any further nominations from the floor? All in favor,
17	please indicate by saying aye.
18	(Chorus of ayes.)
19.	Any opposed, no.
20	(No verbal response.)
21	The report is adopted.
22	I think it's at this time that I say it's
23.	been a great pleasure for me to serve as your
24	Chairman, and I thank you for your active
25	participation and all of your support. And I'm sure

1	that Bill and Bobby will do a fantastic job during the
2	next couple of years.
3	Ladies and gentlemen, this brings us to
4.	the end of our formal agenda for the Council meeting.
5	Does any Council member have any other matter to raise
6	at this time? Does any non-member wish to be
7	recognized?
8	Before we adjourn, let me announce that
9	press questions will be addressed after adjournment,
10	beginning in about five minutes. I would ask that
11	members of the press come to the podium after the
12.	meeting adjourns.
13	There being no further business, do I have
14	a motion for adjournment?
15	AUDIENCE MEMBER: So moved.
16	CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: And a second?
17	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: All in favor, indicate
19	by saying aye.
20	(Chorus of ayes.)
21	The 109th meeting of the National
22	Petroleum Council is hereby adjourned. Thank you for
23	your participation.
24	(Whereupon, at 10:46 a.m., the proceedings
25	in the foregoing matter were adjourned.)
	NEAL D. ODOGG

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of:

Meeting

Before:

U.S. Department of Energy

National Petroleum Council

Date:

June 6, 2001

Place:

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

Allfully