

PickensPlan

T. Boone Pickens Media Coverage 4.3.10-4.5.10

Total of 20 Placements

Print: 6
Blog/Online: 4
Broadcast: 10

Coverage Summary:

The Philadelphia Inquirer ran a feature piece on Pickens discussing the Pickens Plan and why Pickens thinks natural gas is the best choice for the US right now.

Pickens was interviewed on *NPR's Weekend Edition Saturday* to talk about offshore drilling. During the interview Pickens said that although drilling in the US will produce some oil, it's not going to solve our dependence on foreign oil. He said that we need to pass energy legislation now in order to get on our own resources. Here is a link to the interview:

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=125533464&ft=1&f=1001>

The Street quoted Pickens' statement on President Obama's decision to promote offshore drilling, highlighting his view that we should capitalize on domestic resources to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Highlighted Placements (Full Articles Below)

Pickens: Drilling Isn't The Answer – *Philadelphia Inquirer* – 4/4/10

Offshore Drilling's Payoff May Not Be Energy – *NPR Weekend Edition Saturday* – 4/3/10

Biggest Names in Business Share Forecasts – *The Street* – 4/5/10

Print Placements (Full Articles Below)

Offshore Drilling And Those Dead Armadillos In The Road – *Fort Worth Business Press* – 4/5/10

Cheap And Plentiful Shale Gas Might Prove To Be The Real Deal – *The Baltimore Sun* – 4/4/10

Georgians Wary Of Tapping For Oil Along Shores – *Atlanta Journal Constitution* – 4/4/10

The Upside of Depending on Foreign Oil – *The Atlantic* – 4/2/10

Turbine Turmoil In Goodhue Co. – *Finance & Commerce* – 4/2/10

Blog/Online Placements (Full Articles Below)

How To Save In The 'New Era' Of Cheap Natural Gas – *Baltimore Sun Blog* – 4/5/10

Offshore Rigs: Pragmatism and Abhorrence – *The Huffington Post* – 4/2/10

HIGHLIGHTED COVERAGE

Pickens: Drilling Isn't The Answer – *Philadelphia Inquirer* – 4/4/10

The Texas oilman says Obama's plan to lift bans won't provide America energy independence.

By Andrew Maykuth

DALLAS - T. Boone Pickens, the famous Texas oilman, billionaire investor and energy evangelist, listened the other day to President Obama's plan to expand offshore oil and natural-gas drilling. He was not particularly impressed.

"It was kind of disappointing," Pickens said Thursday in the office of BP Capital L.P., the hedge fund at the center of his empire.

He's fine with offshore drilling. But he said that there were no substantial Atlantic oil reserves where Obama lifted a ban on drilling, and that untapped oil in Alaska would provide only a fraction of the nation's supplies. Neither would aim the country where Pickens said it needs to go - energy independence from America's "enemies" in OPEC.

The 82-year-old businessman and philanthropist has a plan, of course: the Pickens Plan, his relentless, self-funded crusade to displace foreign oil with domestic wind farms and natural gas - though wind has become less economical in the recession, and natural gas has become more prominent because of discoveries such as the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania.

"This is our chance," Pickens said. "I think it's almost divine intervention that we had all this gas show up at this time in the deal."

Yes, yes, yes: His motives are not entirely altruistic - he has a dog in this hunt. He's an energy investor and chairman emeritus of Clean Energy Fuels Corp., formerly Pickens Fuel Corp., which owns and operates fueling stations for natural-gas vehicles. But Pickens said there was more to his campaign than financial interest.

"If I was trying to make money, I wouldn't spend \$62 million going on there, and a helluva lot of time - I put 629 hours on a plane in 2009," Pickens said about his campaign. "So I think there's no question about my patriotism and sincerity about trying to get us on our own resource."

Pickens said he was inspired to act because every president since Richard Nixon has promised to make America energy-independent, yet oil imports have increased from 24 percent of the nation's supply in 1970 to nearly 70 percent now. The news media failed to hold the presidents accountable, he said.

So Pickens launched his crusade two years ago. He has spent 184 days on the road, visited 37 states and 82 cities, and bought ads to appeal to sympathizers to sign his petition and support the cause. More than 1.6 million have joined the Pickens Plan Army.

The media campaign alone consumes considerable time and energy. During an interview with *The Inquirer*, Pickens' public-affairs director, Jay Rosser, broke in so his boss could do a scheduled interview on speakerphone with Dylan Ratigan, a New York radio talk-show host.

Pickens told New York listeners he was mystified by the uproar gas drilling had caused in the Marcellus Shale region, where environmentalists oppose hydraulic fracturing (fracking), an extraction technology involving high-pressure injections of sand and drilling fluids into a well. The EPA recently announced it would study fracking.

"You've been fracking wells in Texas and Oklahoma for 50 years," Pickens said. "I've never heard anybody complain about your damaging the water. We're just amused that people in Pennsylvania and New York are crying about messing up their water."

At the radio interview's conclusion, Rosser congratulated Pickens for getting in multiple mentions of the Pickens Plan Web site, then hustled him off to the boardroom, where Pickens was about to record an interview on Bloomberg Television.

In the wood-paneled boardroom, where a map of the Marcellus was displayed prominently with other maps, Pickens' team of traders tracked energy and equity prices on a wall-size computer screen.

Pickens, master of the sound bite, watched himself on the screen saying the same thing he says to everyone: "Natural gas. It's cleaner, cheaper, and it's ours."

The Pickens Plan aims to persuade fleet owners to convert truck and buses from diesel to compressed natural gas. Fleets can be refueled from a central CNG station, and Pickens says a typical trash truck consumes as much fuel each year as 325 automobiles.

According to the national trade group Natural Gas Vehicles for America, natural gas-fueled automobiles emit 20 to 30 percent less greenhouse gas than diesel and gasoline-powered vehicles, as well as fewer particulates and other pollutants.

But CNG vehicles are more expensive - a natural-gas-fueled truck comes at a \$50,000 premium over a conventional truck.

And so Pickens and Natural Gas Vehicles for America are lobbying for legislation now in Congress that would provide federal tax credits up to \$32,000 per vehicle, an incentive to buy in.

Pickens said he had nothing against electric vehicles and hybrids - he just thinks it will take too much time for them to penetrate the market of 220 million vehicles in America to have much effect on petroleum consumption.

And electric vehicles don't enter into the equation when it comes to heavy trucks, the biggest consumers of motor fuel; there is currently no commercial battery-driven vehicle capable of powering a tractor-trailer rig.

"If you replace eight million 18-wheelers with natural gas, you have cut OPEC in half," Pickens said.

He clearly loves the spotlight and what celebrity can help one accomplish.

His office is decorated with mementos: framed magazine covers on which he appeared during his heyday as a corporate raider; a 10-foot satellite image of his vast West Texas ranch; formal photos with former Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush; photos representing many causes to which he has donated a total of more than \$750 million; the framed scorecard from when he shot an eagle on the 11th hole at the Augusta National Golf Club, where he is a member; a trophy from Swift Boat Veterans for Truth expressing gratitude for supporting its 2004 campaign against John Kerry.

But he hungers for something more out of life.

"I never was in the service," he said. "I was too young for World War II. The Korean War was my war, and I was married and had a child and I was deferred. And I never have felt real good about that. And then Vietnam, I was too old for Vietnam."

"Well, maybe this is my mission - to fix energy for America. I may get lucky and do it. You're bucking a lot of egos in Washington."

Offshore Drilling's Payoff May Not Be Energy – *NPR Weekend Edition Saturday* – 4/3/10

SCOTT SIMON, host:

This week, President Obama ended a ban on oil and gas drilling along some parts of the U.S. Atlantic coast and northern Alaska. The president's decision has staggered some of his own environmental supporters, but others say the decision is necessary to help decrease U.S. dependence on foreign oil or win bipartisan support for an energy and climate change bill.

We're joined now by T. Boone Pickens. He's chairman, CEO of BP Capital, which runs energy-related commodity and equity funds. Of course, he's earned billions in investing in oil and natural gas and has pushed for more investment in alternative energy sources. He joins us from his office in Dallas. Mr. Pickens, thanks so much for being with us.

Mr. T. BOONE PICKENS (Chairman, CEO, BP Capital): Sure.

SIMON: There seems to be some skepticism over the past couple of days that there is a whole lot of oil to be found out there in those fields off the Atlantic and northern Alaska. How do you feel about that?

Mr. PICKENS: Well, I mean, people would like to think that off the east coast of the United States you might have another Gulf of Mexico, and that's not even prospective. Geologically, it does not have that kind of opportunity at all. So, I heard some guy on TV said it accesses you to 14 billion barrels immediately. What's he talking about? There's not 14 billion barrels there to be accessed to.

I would say that east coast, Anwar and the eastern Gulf of Mexico, all added up, I would be surprised if you could get one to two million barrels a day out of it.

SIMON: Then why do it if the yield is that low?

Mr. PICKENS: That would be my thought but I don't want to shut down any drilling, you know, let's drill if that's what they want to do. And that creates jobs and money spent. And there'll be some oil and gas found but you're not going to...see, we're importing daily 14 million barrels of oil and we're producing seven in the United States. So, we're importing two-thirds of what we use.

And there's 85 million barrels a day produced in the world every day and we're using 21 million barrels of that. So, we're using 25 percent of all the oil with 4 percent of the population. I don't think that's sustainable.

SIMON: But it's interesting, Mr. Pickens, I would hazard to guess that the president and his administration are grateful to have your verbal support. But I must say the arguments you're citing to explain your support might not give them much comfort at all.

Mr. PICKENS: Well, if they're counting on solving imports...now, the president, he clearly said no oil will be imported from the Mideast in 10 years. So, it's very clear he knows what he's saying but I have not seen a plan yet that's going to solve the problem.

SIMON: Well, let me ask you also as someone who has invested in the future of wind energies. Does a decision like this, given the scale of commitment it represents, detract or distract from investing in alternative energies like wind?

Mr. PICKENS: I don't think he said anything that hurt wind energy. You're going to have to pass some legislation to get wind and solar kicked off. It's moving slowly but there will be, I think, legislation passed this year that will give ... In the legislation, I think you'll have a renewable energy standard, and with that

that will require utilities in the United States to have alternative supplies of power, and that would come from wind and solar.

So, I think that, you know, that's going to move along fine. I'm not concerned about that. But if you want to reduce the five million barrels that we import from OPEC - and I consider that oil to be, in some cases, you're actually buying oil from the enemy and I think you're probably paying for both sides of a war. And I don't think it's smart for us to do that. And we do have a resource in America that we could use.

If we don't get on our own resource when we have the opportunity to do it, this generation could go down as probably the dumbest crowd that ever came down the street.

SIMON: T. Boone Pickens, chairman and CEO of BP Capital, speaking from Dallas. Thanks so much for your time, sir.

Mr. PICKENS: You bet. Thank you.

Biggest Names in Business Share Forecasts – *The Street* – 4/5/10

By Theresa McCabe

BOSTON (TheStreet) -- With a growing economy that's starting to create jobs, U.S. investors are looking out at the rest of 2010 and trying to decide where to put their money.

Here are some of the investment views of the brightest minds in business.

T. Boone Pickens

Oil tycoon T. Boone Pickens has spoken out against the U.S.'s dependence on foreign oil, advocating that America capitalize on its domestic resources, such as wind and solar power. Pickens released a statement Monday praising President Barack Obama's decision to promote offshore drilling.

"Even if the estimates of the reserves are correct, we are 10 years away from being able to use them. It's imperative that we promote other immediately available domestic alternatives to solve the national security crisis created by foreign oil dependency.

"Transportation has to lead the way-- it accounts for two-thirds of our oil imports. No energy strategy can be effective unless it promotes the use of domestic natural gas as a transportation fuel alternative to foreign oil/diesel, and the focus has to be on America's eight million heavy duty vehicles. The Nat Gas Act, a bipartisan bill proposed in both sides of Congress, would advance the use of natural gas as a transportation fuel."

John Silvia, Wells Fargo

Wells Fargo (WFC) Chief Economist John Silvia recently published his views on the recently passed health care bill and his outlook for Treasuries.

On health care, he says higher tax rates on investment earnings will eventually lead to lower investment throughout the economy. "The new tax on medical devices and pharmaceutical companies will modestly reduce profitability of these firms and increase their cost of capital. This could lead to less innovation and product development."

On Treasuries, he says the dollar could gain against other currencies when the Federal Reserve boosts rates. "If the Federal Reserve pushes short-term rates higher before other central banks, as we currently

expect, it should prove modestly positive for the value of the dollar. Relative interest rates will likely favor dollar-dominated assets for the rest of this year and into 2011."

Warren Buffett

Billionaire investor Warren Buffett looks for long-term return and considers railroads the future. "They don't need the government to build them new highways and airports," he said in an interview with USA Today last month. "They've already invested heavily in their infrastructure and technology, and they plan to invest more to keep up with the growing demand. They're the only mode of freight transportation that can handle growth. What's not to like about that?"

In Buffett's most recent letter to shareholders, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/27563128/Berkshire-Hathaway-Annual-Report> he explains his and partner Charlie Munger's business tactics at Berkshire Hathaway(BRK.B). "Just because Charlie and I can clearly see dramatic growth ahead for an industry does not mean we can judge what its profit margins and returns on capital will be as a host of competitors battle for supremacy. At Berkshire, we will stick with businesses whose profit picture for decades to come seems reasonably predictable. Even then, we will make plenty of mistakes."

However, he doesn't want to discourage being aggressive when the market permits.

"Big opportunities come infrequently. When it's raining gold, reach for a bucket, not a thimble."

Bill Miller, Legg Mason

Bill Miller, manager of the Legg Mason Value Trust(LMVTX), recently revealed his positive outlook for the coming quarter at a press conference in Hong Kong. Now that the health care reform has been approved, Miller expects cheap U.S. health care stocks to perform well in the coming months.

"The political benefits of the health care reform will come first, and the more painful aspects such as higher taxes will come later, so cheaper healthcare stocks will do better in the next few months," he said.

"Given how strong the market has been in the last month, I would not be at all surprised to see the U.S. market pull back in a 3% to 5% range, and I'd be surprised if it's more than that," he said. "But the outlook is quite positive in the U.S." He favors technology and financial companies because of their valuations, and he is looking to "low quality" and "very cheap" technology companies to help the economic recovery process.

Bill Gross, Pimco

Bill Gross, the manager of the biggest bond fund in the world, has advised investors to reduce their expectations. "Instead of 8% to 10% in terms of return for risk assets, you should expect 4 to 6%," he recently told CNBC.

Gross says the 30-year bull market in bonds is fading. In an interview with Bloomberg News, he said "excess borrowing in nations including the U.S., U.K. and Japan will eventually lead to inflation as governments sell record amounts of debt to finance surging deficits."

Gross looked at the recently passed health care reform bill with a critical eye in his most recent market commentary. "The trend promises to get worse, not better. The imminent passage of health care reform represents a continuing litany of entitlement legislation that will add, not subtract, to future deficits and unfunded liabilities."

PRINT COVERAGE

Offshore Drilling And Those Dead Armadillos In The Road – Fort Worth Business Press – 4/5/10

By Robert Francis

President Obama isn't from Texas, but he may have felt a bit like a dead armadillo March 31 when he announced a five-year drilling blueprint that expands oil and natural gas drilling in several offshore locations.

If you recall former Texas Agriculture Secretary Jim Hightower used to say, "There's nothing in the middle of the road but yellow stripes and dead armadillos."

Others said it, too, but Hightower seems to have received credit.

Obama's offshore drilling plan was, on the face of it, the only decision he could make. The U.S. needs power and shifting to renewable fuels is not exactly quick, easy or cheap. (More about that shortly.)

With his decision, the president seemed to have alienated many of his political supporters, particularly those who wear their environmental stripes on their sleeves, and received tepid praise from those in the oil and gas industry.

Obama did receive a rare pat on the back from Jack Gerard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, an organization that has to a large extent been against just about every other administration proposal short of a Mother's Day proclamation.

"We look forward to reviewing the details of the proposal, and we stand ready to work with them to make this a reality," Gerard said. "We appreciate the administration's recognition of the importance of developing our nation's oil and natural gas resources to create jobs, generate revenues and fuel our nation's economy."

House Republican leader, Rep. John Boehner, R-Ohio, while supporting the decision, had a slight caveat:

"At the same time the White House makes today's announcement, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is plotting a new massive job-killer that the American people can't afford: a cascade of new EPA regulations that will punish every American who dares to flip on a light switch, drive a car, or buy an American product."

Maybe that wasn't a caveat. It was more like a knife in the back.

If Obama was looking to his supporters for solace, he wouldn't find it.

From the Sierra Club:

"There's no reason to drill our coasts. We can achieve real energy independence and economic vitality by investing in clean energy like wind and solar and efficiency. This kind of power creates good, lasting American jobs and positions our nation to become a global leader in the new clean energy economy."

It was that rare moment when the Sierra Club and the Republicans were united; both armed with brass knuckles waiting in a dark alley to take a potshot at the president – together as one.

This political back and forth was particularly relevant as I'm in the middle of reading an advance copy of Robert Bryce's new book, *Power Hungry: The Myths of "Green" Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future*.

Bryce, as you may recall wrote *Gusher of Lies*, a book that challenged the concept of energy independence, a concept that all political candidates seem to embrace, particularly in campaign season.

Power Hungry, due out April 27, takes a close look at green technology and renewable energy. It's not a pretty sight. Bryce, by the way, doesn't take an obsessive, "I'm right, they're wrong" stance. There are lots of objective, if mind-numbing, facts and figures in the book as well.

The opening chapter starts in a coal mine in Kentucky to show how the U.S. uses coal for a very good reason: it's incredibly efficient. On an average day, Bryce points out, the mine he visits in Kentucky produces about 75 percent as much raw energy as the total energy produced by of all U.S. wind turbines and solar panels.

Pretty sobering stuff.

Bryce's conclusion (I admit, I skipped ahead) is the U.S. needs to embrace two fuels: natural gas and nuclear for future energy needs in the 21st Century.

T. Boone Pickens probably spoke for many in the Fort Worth energy community when he noted that production of domestic offshore oil reserves is at least 10 years off, but that natural gas is available today.

"No energy strategy can be effective unless it promotes the use of domestic natural gas as a transportation fuel alternative to foreign oil/diesel, and the focus has to be on America's eight million heavy duty vehicles," he said.

Bryce and Pickens certainly understand why Obama made the decision he did.

Obama's enemies – and friends – sure didn't.

Robert Francis is editor of the Fort Worth Business Press.

Cheap And Plentiful Shale Gas Might Prove To Be The Real Deal – *The Baltimore Sun* – 4/4/10

By Jay Hancock

Drill, baby. Just not in the ocean, where there probably isn't much new oil anyway. Head for the mountains, where newly available reserves might hold 10 times the energy estimated to be off the East Coast.

Hopes for a new way of extracting natural gas have been bright for more than two years, after claim-staking "landmen" stormed Appalachia from New York to Tennessee. Now interest from Exxon Mobil and other corporate giants has prompted some smart people to start portraying "shale gas" as a very big deal that shatters assumptions about energy prices, America's power supply and the future of transportation.

Some are calling this "the natural gas century" and calculating that natural-gas prices will stay near present low levels for years or decades.

"An age of plenty for gas consumers" seems to be dawning, The Economist magazine wrote a few weeks ago. "Those in the vanguard of this global gas revolution say it will transform the battle against carbon, threaten coal's domination of electricity generation and, by dramatically reducing the power of exporters of oil and conventional gas, turn the geopolitics of energy on its head."

Pay no attention to the president approving offshore oil drilling last week. That was about trying to generate political energy, not the kind that runs a car. The real action is a hundred miles inland, where drillers releasetrapped gas by blasting underground shale with high-pressure water.

"Shale gas is the real deal," says Stephen Schork, who runs an eponymous, Pennsylvania-based energy analysis firm. "Ten years ago, nobody thought shale gas was possible. In less than 10 years, we went from 'North America is running out of natural gas' to 'North America has enough natural gas to last' - I don't know, what are they saying? - '100 years, 150 years, 200 years.' "

People are shale-gas silly because analysts estimate U.S. deposits could yield the energy equivalent of 110 billion barrels of oil - not only much more than what's on the Atlantic shelf but also about 10 times what's estimated to be in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Much of the stuff comes from the Marcellus shale underneath the northern Appalachians, so it's near and economical for big East Coast cities - including Baltimore.

Shale gas is already helping consumers. I spent \$100 less heating my house this winter than I did two years ago, even though it was a lot colder this year. Raw natural gas costs a third what it did in the middle of 2008, thanks partly to lower demand from the recession but largely to shale gas. Cheap natural gas, often used to power electricity generators, has helped lower the cost of household kilowatts.

Globalization also helps drag down natural-gas prices. Thanks to foreign investment in liquefaction equipment and oceangoing tankers, Marylanders have unprecedented access to growing overseas supplies. Qatar pumps out enormous amounts of natural gas and has little choice these days but to dump much of it at the Cove Point terminal on the Chesapeake for whatever price it can get.

But even at today's low prices, people can still make money drilling for shale gas, analysts say. That suggests prices will remain low for years, especially if nascent shale-gas exploration in Europe and elsewhere bears fruit. Recent multibillion-dollar investments by Exxon and French petro-giant Total suggest the U.S. shale-gas boom will last for a long time.

Natural gas is cheap for the planet, not just the pocketbook.

True, there are serious concerns about the chemicals and pressurized water that companies use to fracture shale and extract the gas. Maryland regulators are correctly taking their time to approve four applications for shale-oil drilling in Garrett and Allegany counties. You don't want nasty stuff getting into creeks or drinking water.

"We're just kind of in a holding pattern," waiting for permit approvals, says Joyce Bishoff, interim president of the Garrett County Chamber of Commerce.

With luck, however, regulators will be able to set rules that protect the countryside and allow shale-gas drilling at reasonable cost. Some local environmental damage might be acceptable because of the larger planetary dividends that natural gas delivers.

For one thing, it emits half the carbon dioxide when burned than gasoline does. Achieving the carbon-emission and mileage goals announced last week by President Barack Obama - a day after backing offshore drilling - would be easier if the nation adopted oil baron T. Boone Pickens' idea of converting en masse to natural-gas cars and trucks.

Natural-gas cars cost a bit more than regular ones. But at today's fuel prices, they're cheaper to operate. Last fall, when gasoline was going for \$2.64 a gallon, natural-gas drivers were paying the equivalent of \$1.86 a gallon, according to NGV America, a trade group backed by Pickens and others promoting natural-gas vehicles.

Taking much more of the electricity-generation burden from filthy coal, a realistic goal if natural-gas prices stay low, would be an even bigger environmental coup.

So shale gas can cut coal's mercury and sulfur pollution, reduce growth in greenhouse gases, increase U.S. energy security and deliver cheap power to Americans struggling with a bad recession. Maybe it really is a big deal.

Georgians Wary Of Tapping For Oil Along Shores – *Atlanta Journal Constitution* – 4/4/10

By Jim Tharpe

The potential hunt for black gold off Georgia's coast has raised red warning flags among some of the state's tourism and environmental leaders, even as geologists question how much recoverable oil exists beneath the Atlantic seabed.

President Barack Obama announced last week that the Atlantic coastline from Delaware to the mid-section of Florida would be opened for "exploration, study and potential development" for oil and natural gas, reversing a long-standing ban.

For the near future, there will be only research and study off the coasts of Georgia and other mid- and south Atlantic states. The Interior Department doesn't plan to consider leasing gas and oil development rights until sometime between 2012 and 2017.

But even the potential for oil rigs, transfer stations or production facilities near the fragile, marsh-lined Georgia shoreline and its multibillion-dollar tourist industry is making some coastal residents shudder.

The barrier islands of Glynn County attract more than 2 million visitors a year, who pump \$1 billion annually into the economy. Savannah attracts about 7 million visitors who spend about \$2 billion each year.

On the environmental front, David Kyler, director of the St. Simons Island-based Center for a Sustainable Coast, said oil drilling anywhere along the Atlantic coast from Delaware to Florida could harm the Georgia coast.

"Georgia should not be our only concern," said Kyler. "Currents, winds and waves could carry any contamination here. It also could contaminate species in other areas that migrate here. There's no way of containing it."

State Rep. Jerry Keen (R-St. Simons Island) said he is wary of anything that could potentially harm the coastal environment in his district. But Keen said he believes technology has evolved to the point where oil drilling and recovery can be done without environmental damage. And he said the nation needs to reduce its dependence on foreign oil.

"I'm supporting the [Obama] decision, and hopefully we'll get some good, clean exploratory drilling going on out there in the near future," Keen said. "There are some safeguards in place to make sure you don't have a gold-rush situation with a bunch of cowboy explorations going on that could damage the reefs or the oceans or the wildlife."

Concerns for tourism

Keen said any drilling — and potential problems — will first take place far north of the Georgia coast.

"The good news for us is Virginia gets to be the guinea pig," he said. "If things go well there, they can transfer that technology to our coast and we should be fine."

David Egan, co-director of the Initiative to Protect Jekyll Island, said there is too much at risk to permit drilling offshore when delicate ecosystems hang in the balance.

“We have too many examples where those safeguards have not held up,” Egan said. “It only takes one disaster. I don’t know how our tourism and fisheries economy would survive a catastrophic spill.”

Woody Woodside, president of the Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce, said he thinks the chance of an oil spill damaging the coast is “very low.”

“My question is: ‘Where would they take any oil they find and what they would do with it?’ ” Woodside said. “Our interest in hosting a refinery in Glynn County would be remote.”

Federal waters extend from three miles offshore to 200 miles. Most of the known oil reserves in the newly opened areas are thought to be along the Outer Continental Shelf, at least 50 miles or so offshore. Drilling supporters say that means most rigs would not be visible from shore.

William W. Hubbard, president & CEO of the Savannah Area Chamber and Convention Visitors Bureau, noted that the number of hotel rooms in the port city mushroomed from 9,000 to 15,000 over the last decade as tourism blossomed.

“We certainly would have concerns about the natural environment and the barrier islands,” Hubbard said. “Those concerns have to be balanced against a sensible economic strategy for the U.S. My gut factors tell me our risk factor is reasonably low.”

John Wallace, past president of the 60-member Georgia Shrimp Association, said he believes any oil rigs in Georgia waters will be so far from shore they will not affect the shrimp fishery.

“We don’t see anything wrong with the plan,” he said. “It could help some of us get some off-season jobs. In the Gulf [of Mexico] a lot of shrimp-boat crewmen got jobs on oil-crew boats.”

A moot point?

Paul Ferraro, a Georgia State University professor of economics, said that by encouraging drilling, the Obama administration could make it harder for the nation to change the way people use energy. If states become more dependent on oil revenues, they could be less agreeable to calls for cleaner, alternative forms of energy, he said.

But the buzz about lifting the drilling ban has overshadowed what some believe is a more important geological reality — there might not be much oil or gas to be found off the Georgia coast. Or the petroleum reserves discovered there might be too costly to retrieve compared to other oil and gas fields.

“I don’t think anyone is going to be going offshore in Georgia poking holes in the seabed anytime soon,” said University of Georgia geology professor Paul Schroeder. “For whatever reason, nature has not been kind to that area for oil and gas reserves.”

Schroeder, who once worked for Texaco in Houston, said it costs the oil companies millions of dollars for every well drilled. And only a fraction of those drilled are productive, he said.

“The oil companies are pretty smart,” he said. “There may be reserves and deposits out there, but they have to figure out what it costs to get at them.”

The nation’s most-celebrated oil man agrees with Schroeder. T. Boone Pickens doubts the entire multi-state coastal area will give up much crude.

“You can drill in those areas,” Pickens said in a television interview. “I do not think you’ll come up with very much oil. But, let’s do it. I am for anything American.”

The Upside of Depending on Foreign Oil – *The Atlantic* – 4/2/10

By Max Fisher

When President Obama opened the coastline to offshore oil drilling, nearly every aspect of the plan came under heated debate. The only thing everyone agrees on, it seems, is the need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Statements from the Environmental Protection Agency to automakers to T. Boone Pickens to Obama himself, whether supporting or condemning offshore drilling, all cite the dangers of relying on foreign energy. It's not hard to see why. Shipping oil from halfway around the world is environmentally costly, economically inefficient, and lands us in bed with some of the world's least democratic regimes. But our ties to these states might not be categorically terrible things for us, as they're often assumed to be. Hidden unexamined among the many downsides of our dependence on foreign oil is an upside: It gives us leverage over the countries that sell us oil.

The top ten oil exporters to the U.S., which account for half of all U.S. consumption, read like a State Department tourism warning list: Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Nigeria, Iraq, Angola, Russia, Colombia, and Brazil. (To be fair, Canada has long been our number one oil source, and Mexico alternates with Saudi Arabia for the number two spot.) But keep in mind that most of these countries need our money a lot more than we need their oil. If Saudi Arabia and the U.S. suddenly ended our trade tomorrow, for example, the U.S. and global economies would not suffer nearly as much as Saudi Arabia's. The Saudis understand this and so want to keep U.S. and Saudi interests aligned.

As a result, buying Saudi oil gets us a lot more than just energy. It gets us a dedicated ally that wields unparalleled influence in a part of the world where we desperately need it: the Middle East. The Saudi royal family has put their wily intelligence service at our disposal and allowed sprawling U.S. military bases onto their soil. In 1992, the Saudis even exiled one of their own on America's behalf: A prominent, wealthy, and popular humanitarian and freedom fighter named Osama bin Laden. Saudi royalty risked a violent backlash by expelling bin Laden to Sudan, but U.S. officials had demanded his ouster. That's no small favor. It would be almost as if the United States deported Google CEO Eric Schmidt to Honduras at the request of angry Chinese officials. The Saudis came to our aid again in 1996 when they convinced the Sudanese regime to themselves deport bin Laden.

Bin Laden's anti-American terrorism did not begin until he fled to Afghanistan, where the United States then had little influence. In the decade since, he has moved between there and Pakistan, two countries with which the U.S. has no meaningful economic ties save foreign aid. Unlike with Saudi Arabia, our pleas to those governments to help us rout bin Laden went largely ignored.

If our oil-greased relationships with other top producing states are half as close as the U.S.-Saudi partnership, it will give us much-needed leverage over some of this century's biggest emerging threats. In Nigeria, we can pressure the government to peacefully contain the state's alarming increase in terrorism. For Iraq, the economic ties with America would be an important counterbalance to Iran's religious and political influence. As for Venezuela, no matter how antagonistic President Hugo Chavez gets, he would be a lot worse if we didn't take close to a million barrels off his hands every day.

The point isn't that dependence on foreign oil is a good thing. The political, economic, and environmental costs are severe, unsustainable, and require long-term alternatives. But as we seek to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, it's important to remember that our influence with certain key states will reduce as well.

Turbine Turmoil In Goodhue Co. – Finance & Commerce – 4/2/10

By Bob Geiger

Wind project dust-up pits health claims, economic benefits

There's an ill wind blowing in Goodhue County.

It pits wind-farm developers and local farmers whose land wind turbines are expected to stand on against a group that claims the three-bladed turbines could cause a variety of health problems, including insomnia, dizziness and epilepsy.

If nothing else, the flap has revealed that Minneapolis-based National Wind plans to purchase 52 of the 333 wind turbines from Texas billionaire T. Boone Pickens had left after he abandoned plans for a huge wind farm in Texas.

Leon Steinberg, chairman and CEO of National Wind, on Thursday confirmed that National Wind is purchasing the turbines from Pickens. At a per-megawatt cost of \$2.3 million, Steinberg said the turbines would more than \$179 million.

Erecting those turbines will create between 150 and 200 jobs on farmland near Red Wing where the turbines would be sited, in addition to providing tax revenue over the next 25 years and additional income for farmers with turbines standing in their fields, said Steinberg.

Emotions are decidedly mixed about Goodhue Wind, ranging from claims of negative appearance and health effects by the Goodhue Wind Truth group to the following feel-good letter from state Sen. Steve Murphy, DFL-Red Wing.

"I greatly appreciate the huge benefits that Goodhue Wind will bring to our community; improving the environment, creating jobs, enhancing agriculture, energy policy and economic development," Murphy said in a letter posted on the development's website, www.goodhuewind.com.

That site has been redesigned recently to include graphics with "Don't be misled by myths" and "Learn the facts" statements, in addition to sections describing National Wind's community wind business model and testimony from selected wind experts.

The development's website emphasizes increased landowner income, a higher local tax base from larger wind farms (from state taxes on energy production that is distributed to counties) and jobs and economic stimulus data.

Goodhue Wind's website also contains a defense against stray voltage claims being spread by those allied with the Goodhue Wind Truth group.

To fight suspicion, Goodhue Wind posted a 2006 statement by Albany, N.Y., consultancy AWS Truewind that said, "There is no reliable evidence indicating that wind energy systems produce stray voltage."

Health effects disputed

Steinberg said the dispute pits career farmers looking for an additional source of revenue against hobby farmers who purchased land and don't like the prospect of a wind turbine that's up to 400 feet tall, complete with flashing lights to warn aircraft of their presence.

On its website, the Goodhue Wind Truth group, www.goodhuewindtruth.com, includes several broadsides aimed at wind energy, such as a statement that the turbines are "massive industrial facilities, with fences,

access roads and high-voltage feeder lines,” and the well-known fact that turbine energy generation is between 30 and 35 percent of rated capacities.

It all comes down to a “not in my back yard” (NIMBY) approach to installing renewable energy.

“This NIMBY type attitude can’t work,” said Steinberg, who has met with several landowners who are disappointed to find that a turbine might be located within 1,500 feet of their property.

One farmer and investor in the Goodhue Wind development, Dennis Gadiant, grows corn and soybeans on 160 acres of land in addition to raising livestock.

Gadiant, a lifelong farmer, helps manage 280 acres owned by his father, estimated that he will have three turbines when siting for the wind turbines is complete.

“This is another way to have a revenue stream,” he said. “What other revenue can you produce in farming that is guaranteed for 20 years?”

Anti-wind-energy activists point to research conducted by New York Dr. Nina Pierpoint, which warns that people living too close to wind turbines can suffer heart disease, vertigo, panic attacks, migraine headaches and sleep deprivation.

Steinberg said Pierpoint’s research is dubious at best.

“In Minnesota there are thousands of farmers who live near wind turbines and there have been two complaints,” said Steinberg. “One didn’t like the noise; the other said someone has had trouble sleeping.”

However, there are instances of poor wind turbine placement — just not in Minnesota.

“I just visited one last week,” said Steinberg. “They sited a turbine 100 feet from someone’s house. I [was made to think] it was coming out of the house.

“I looked at that and said, ‘This is the stuff that gives the industry a bad name.’”

Even politics entered the issue, with Pickens telling *The Hill*, a newspaper, which covers Congress, that Pickens would visit Minnesota to announce with Gov. Tim Pawlenty a possible 2012 Republican presidential candidate.

Bruce Gordon, a spokesman for Pawlenty, said Friday, “Generally, Gov. Pawlenty appreciates investment and jobs in Minnesota, including projects involving renewable energy. Such projects typically are evaluated on a case-by-case basis.”

Continued Gordon: “The governor had a brief conversation with Mr. Pickens some time ago about this project, but he does not have any knowledge about an announcement.”

BLOG/ONLINE COVERAGE

How To Save In The 'New Era' Of Cheap Natural Gas – *Baltimore Sun Blog* – 4/5/10

By Jay Hancock

Sunday's column was about the hoopla over natural gas from shale formations in the Appalachians and other parts of the country. Even if only part of the promise from shale gas bears fruit, natural gas stands to stay affordable -- more affordable than oil heat and gasoline -- for years.

If you have natural-gas heat, think twice before locking in any long-term contracts for gas. Deals out there are OK -- in the 70-cents-per-therm range. But the futures market says gas will be cheaper than this next winter. BGE's commodity gas price has been between 73 cents and 59 cents in recent months. (You pay more for delivery.) Even when the economy starts picking up, natural gas prices are more likely to stay in present ranges than gasoline prices, for example, analysts say. I've always stayed with BGE's standard, monthly floating natural gas price and rarely regretted it.

If you have a choice between an electric water heater and gas, go with the gas. Water tanks use up large amounts of energy. Your best bet is to heat with the kind of energy that looks like it'll be more affordable. Of course, if you have a brand-new electric heater it might not make sense to switch. Even with the cheaper BGE bills it'd take years to earn back what a new heater cost. But if you're in the market for a new heater anyway and have a gas hookup, go with that.

Theoretically you can buy a stock natural-gas car -- the Honda Civic GX. But they seem hard to obtain, and they're not very practical for families. I called around to a couple local dealers, who said they've never sold any to individuals. All the customers for natural-gas cars and trucks are government and corporate fleets. Natural gas works for fleets because the vehicles return daily to corporate HQ, where they can fill up on compressed natural gas for the next day's run. It's tougher on individuals, because there's nowhere to fill up. Published range on the GX is only 250 miles.

But if Boone Pickens gets his way and Washington starts promoting NG vehicles, the technology might improve, and gas stations would start offering NG ports as well as diesel and petrol.

Offshore Rigs: Pragmatism and Abhorrence – *The Huffington Post* – 4/2/10

By Janet Ritz

Unlike many of my colleagues, I was not all that surprised by President Obama's announcement that he will open up specific locations to offshore drilling. The urge to demand a consistent position of the president when it comes to the climate seems like the right thing to do. But I have long been aware of the pragmatic and, quite possibly, cynical considerations that may have led to the president's decision.

It is about the climate -- not the long-term trends of weather and geophysics, but the political and factional climate currently in our country. A storm is brewing, come November, and it could make last August look like a picnic.

How is a president to deal with climate legislation in such a poisonous atmosphere? The rigs give a clue. Offshore drilling on the locations he cited could take years to put in place and longer to see results. By that time, if we're not getting our energy from alternative sources, those rigs will be the least of our problems.

The "drill-baby-drill" mantra, however, despite the evidence to the contrary of the advantage it would provide, has become a talking point that flares whenever gas prices rise. (Gas prices that rise in the summer also rise in conjunction with election cycles.)

Is it possible that certain industries might not want democrats reelected to the slim majorities they now hold?

With the initiatives President Obama will be putting through on energy in the next few months, as evidenced by the new fuel standards set the other day, and with the climate legislation that is coming up this summer, he faces an easy (for his opponents) talking point (among many) with drill-baby-drill.

Do you remember last summer? The demonstrations and town halls that turned into hate-fests? Behind many of those who protested was a group, Americans for Prosperity, that is run by the former Rep. Dick Armey. That has received some publicity. What had not been widely publicized is Armey's connection to one of world's biggest polluters, Koch Industries:

Koch Industries could be the biggest oil company you have never heard of -- unless, that is, you hang around the halls of government in Washington.

Koch Industries (pronounced "coke") is a huge oil conglomerate controlled by brothers Charles and David Koch, two of the country's richest men and among the biggest backers of conservative and libertarian causes. With estimated revenue of about \$40 billion last year, Koch is bigger than Microsoft, Merrill Lynch and AT&T.

The tie to Armey's organization, Americans for Prosperity, should have been anticipated given Koch's history of using front groups to manipulate climate legislation:

From Promoting Acid Rain To Climate Denial: Over 20 Years Of David Koch's Polluter Front Groups.

The corporate-backed front group, Americans for Prosperity (AFP), is again leading the charge for industry against environmental protections. Earlier this month, AFP kicked off its "Regulation Reality Tour" -- a roadshow through the states of pivotal senators, pressuring the Environmental Protection Agency not to regulate carbon emissions, as outlined by the Clean Air Act .

The campaign is part carnival, part sophisticated K Street lobbying. Attendees are welcomed by an inflatable moonbounce for children, free food and drinks, and AFP staff dressed as "carbon cops" distributing freebies to the crowd. The rallies serve as a platform for AFP to scare voters with stories of bureaucrats regulating churches and "radio controlled thermostats." Moreover, operatives from AFP collect names and train attendees on how to lobby Congress to defeat clean energy reform.

If they were willing to go far beyond the bounds of any sense of truth (or decency) to fight health care reform, it should not be surprising that they plan to similarly fight climate legislation which has more of an impact to their profit center.

Some have argued the president's decision was to get republicans to vote for the climate bill, especially in light of the special interests at work in this. That may have been a consideration. I wonder about it as the primary motivation. There are a few who have signed on (Lindsay Graham; Olympia Snow, maybe; Susan Collins, maybe), but the president has to know he can't count on their vote. At the same time, he may have to try for their votes, because some of the climate legislation may not be eligible for reconciliation and he doesn't have 60 votes without a few Republicans.

But I doubt that's the only reason.

President Obama (and many U.S. citizens) had a big win in a divided country on health care. What remained was the division. The President has to start bringing the country together to counter a very dangerous reality. That reality is the corporate interest behind the "death panels." The corporate interests that are primed to do worse during climate legislation and who have proven they have no conscience about what they will incite to get their way. The demagoguery that we've seen could turn into violence or something worse and it yet may.

I'm not sure what the president can do about the hate that exists and has existed long before his presidency. But the way they're being ginned up? That's new. One of the calls planned during upcoming "ginning" was drill-baby-drill. By removing the mantra that democratic incumbents would have heard

throughout summer -- a repeat of last August, but louder and with well financed opposition -- the president may have attempted to put all but his most shameless opponents in a vise.

The vise works like this: When the screaming flash mobs are directed to shout against the climate legislation, those who support it and who are running for reelection can say: Our opponents' corporate masters are against us finding new sources of oil at home. They don't care if we send our tax dollars to those who are trying to destroy us. They don't care if we're indebted to China and lose millions of jobs overseas. They don't care about our national security since they want to keep us dependent on oil from Saudi Arabia and Iran. It is us democrats and President Obama who are trying to keep us safe. Why don't our opponents care about the safety and well being of your children like we do?

I have to remind myself it's been a while since we had a president with such a significantly high IQ. We all want the candidate we voted for, but we also need a leader who can govern and who can get his incumbents reelected to, hopefully, keep a minimal majority that will enable him to put through his legislation. What we did not count on during the campaign -- though we had a hint of it during the bizarre Palin rallies -- was the extent to which the opposition would go in their efforts to delegitimize an Obama presidency. We saw a hint of it with Clinton. But with race factored in, the situation has become almost untenable and clearly volatile.

So, what's a president of all the people, by the people, for the people, supposed to do while he is working to get legislation through a broken system. Does he stand on the side of right and get nothing done? Or does he function like a politician who has weighed his options and has taken the road that can lead to some progress while attempting to defang those inciting violence and race wars; opponents who will say or do anything in order to hold on to their corporate profits that are destroying the planet. Some personal thoughts. Am I happy about those rigs? No. They're obscene. Do I think they will be as useful when they come online as they might be perceived now? I hope not, because we're in more trouble than anyone can deny (although they'll try), if we do not separate ourselves from our dependency on fossil fuels. T. Boone Pickens argues we should concentrate on natural gas. But it's not as clean, ultimately, either, when compared to solar, wind, or other upcoming technologies. As a bridge to other opportunities, maybe it is a valuable consideration. I prefer the idea of natural gas to nuclear (another subject), but feel that any dependency on fossil fuels is not sustainable in the long run.

I look at fossil fuels as not only a threat to our planet's ecosystem, but also to the world's security. If the climate becomes even more unstable, how many wars will be fought over resources? How much of a disadvantage will we find ourselves to countries like China, who are making a concerted effort to become the leader in green technology while taking advantage of shady currency practices that cost us millions of U.S. jobs -- a situation against which we are at a disadvantage since China holds our debt.

How will the world handle climate refugees that are set to explode in numbers and the lack of opportunity for their large and largely uneducated populations under twenty-five who are ripe for exploitation by extremists?

A group of respected military leaders testified before Congress last year that climate change presents a real and present danger to our national security:

A panel of 12 distinguished retired generals and admirals has just released the latest in a series of reports over the past two years warning that global climate change is not just an environmental issue, or an economic issue, or a public health and welfare issue. It's an urgent matter of national security.

Do I like that President Obama might be gaming the coastlines to a) put his opponents in a vise, to b) prove to independents who don't yet viscerally hate his presidency that he might be worth a second look? to c) make sure he at least holds onto the congressional districts that voted for him? to d) weigh the upcoming climate legislation with something that those legislators on the fence can grab onto as their reason to vote for it? to e) acknowledge our dependence on foreign fossil fuels funds those who want to destroy us?

There may be more reasons, which are currently unclear. The amount of money that special interests pour into our broken government and the reelection coffers of those who make our laws cannot be discounted. What must also be counted: the opponents to climate legislation have proven they have little or no allegiance to the truth. Whether the president's move to open up some areas for drilling will pull any of their teeth remains to be seen. By doing so, however, he may have at least blunted some of the cries of drill-baby-drill during the summer driving season.

BROADCAST COVERAGE

1. CNN Saturday Morning

CNN, National | DMA: 0

04/03/2010, 06:00 AM - 07:00 AM

[CC] 00:33:36 And the president's also addressing a 20-year ban on offshore drilling in this country. He's now ready to expand **oil** and **naturalgas** thriving in the Atlantic coast, parts of the eastern Gulf of Mexico and as well as areas in Alaska. I want to show you what that means. All of these area that is are shaded, now that's fair game under the president's proposal. He's selling new leases off the coast of Virginia. It is a green light to start the drilling. Now, another green light off the gulf coast of Florida, as well. And green light for exploration out of the South Atlantic. Green light, as well, for Alaska's Cook Inlet and red light for Alaska's Bristol Bay. Here's the other half of the story. The Department of Interior estimates could be more than \$4 billion of fossil **fuels** off the waters of Georgia, South Carolina and Florida. Those figures are based on a 25-year-old research that's old and American **energy** icons like **Boone Pickens** said he has doubts to make a big difference. I ready to drill in the offshore. I don't have any problem with that but don't look for big reserves off the east coast of the United States. One, you know, if you try to compare it to the Gulf of Mexico, Texas and Oklahoma and then you go off into the gulf, there are big old fields all over the south Texas and south Louisiana. But off the coast of Virginia, South Carolina, there's no **oil** fields on shore there. Why do you think there are going to be big **oil** fields offshore. Republicans, they have long backed offshore drilling in the United States, supporting this. But when the prospect is made by a democratic president, apparently doesn't look quite as good....00:35:21

Audience: 395,159 **Spot Cost:** \$2,714

2. Stossel (Rebroadcast)

Fox Business Network, National | DMA: 0

04/02/2010, 10:00 PM - 11:00 PM

[CC] 00:18:25 The other bad argument is it will reduce our dependence on oil dictators? We consume 15 billion barrels of crude oil per day but produce five. How will we even that up even with and more or the Gulf of Mexico? John: then may go up to number six it does not make sense if we were energy independence would that protect us? If there is a supply disruption crude-oil will become more expensive that is why great Britain that is largely independent is on a prices lower than the global average they pay the same because it does not matter where the crude oil is from their global supply and demand curves. John: what about the democrats the windmills and solar power feels good and that will make a big dent? The problem with renewable energy is it is the technology of the 12th century we relied on that before the industrial revolution. [Laughter] the reason we moved away from those sources it is highly dispersed and needs a lot of land and very expensive to harness the energy and ver hard to store the energy and give it to where consumers are aware of the wind blows strongest and shai as the brightest is where people don't live that is why **T. BoonePickens** when he talks to his plan when senate government to pony up hundreds of billions of dollars that is something the wind energy are to pay for itself. John: what percentage of a difference? It is hard to ... of the country with the windmills but it is variable it does not always blow when you need it most comes during the winter, not in the summer and at night.... hot summer --The wind generally does not blow. It is not a very good source of energy. John: and give me a percent if it were 12 or retarding 50%? Depends your assumptions you can get a lot but not necessarily when you need to review need it.00:20:46

Audience: N/A **Spot Cost:** N/A

3. The Dylan Ratigan Show

MSNBC, National | DMA: 0

04/02/2010, 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM

[EC] 00:56:57 Today's town square is viewer E-Mail and tweets. Let's cut in on the president's decision to drill, baby, drill. Drawing attention and a woman who robbed a bank because it was on her bucket list. Sometimes you want to change things on the list before you do them. Let's start with drilling.

TBoonePickens moving from **gas** powered trucks or diesel powered trucks to **naturalgas**-powered trucks which is abundant in this country. ... We received an anonymous country not a bad idea. I would be fully with you and to the extent to which we can convert to 18 wheelers and the extent to which it is true that natural gas extraction is meaningfully less pollutive and disruptive to the environment than oil

extraction is and burping meaningfully cleaner and for each garbage truck they switched in Los Angeles from diesel to natural gas, that's the equivalent of removing 325 cars for each truck. Anyway, I am really trying to push for an honest transition of oil in this country to get out of the business of funding foreign powers to use that money to try to kill us. Maria, from another name I can't pronounce from Georgia, let's put a bunch of words in front of dylan and see if he can stumble through it made an interesting point. If switching all the demands a demanded by half, I'm all for it. If you want to sell the idea that would be **TBoonePickens** and get Sarah Palin. she is out of our price range. The viewer wrote about the politics of the move as the president adopted a plan to drill, baby, drill. Obama is the same as any other politician with the tone of corporate money.... 01:01:42

Keywords:TZ; Mailbag: Drilling; President Obama; Bucket List; Bank Robber; Hybrid; Los Angeles; Sarah Palin; Republicans;

Visuals:**TBoonePickens**, BP Capital Management; Sarah Palin; John McCain; United State Postal Service workers;

Audience: 444,737 **Spot Cost:** \$4,398

4. Weekend Edition

NPR, National | DMA: 0

04/03/2010, 08:00 AM - 09:00 AM

00:10:36 This week President Obama ended a ban on **oil** and **gas** drilling along some parts of the US Atlantic coast and northern Alaska. The president's decision has staggered some of his own environmental supporters but others say the decision is necessary to help decrease US dependence on foreign **oil** or win bipartisan support for an **energy** and climate change bill ... I am joined now by **TBoonePickens**, he is chairman, CEO of BP Capital which runs **energy** related commodity and equity funds. Of course he's earned billions in investing in **oil** and **naturalgas** and has pushed for more investment in alternative **energy** sources. He joins from his office in Dallas. Mr. Pickens, thanks so much for being with us. There seems to be some skepticism over the past couple of days that there's a whole lot of **oil** to be found out there in those fields off the Atlantic and northern Alaska ... How do you feel about that? Well, I mean people would like to think that off the east coast of the United States you might have another Gulf of Mexico....that is not even prospective geologically ...does not have that opportunity at all... 00:11:26

Audience: N/A **Spot Cost:** N/A

5. Fox Sports Southwest Schedule

Fox Sports Southwest, Dallas/Fort Worth | DMA: 5

04/04/2010, 03:30 PM - 04:00 PM

[CC] 00:11:48 They wished they hadn't now. They ... decisions in athletics and the third one was when they cut **BoonePickens** off a \$25 scholarship. How about this one, the ready, aim, aim, aim, aim syndrome. Yeah, that was one I came up with, and there's a lot of leaders that can't pull the trigger. And they want another study.00:13:39

[CC] 00:17:12 You know, maybe you don't need a plane this big, but on the other hand, we haul a lot of people so you need an airplane, I can tell you that. There's no way the last year and a half what I've done without an airplane. Mr. **T. BoonePickens!** Give us an update on the **Pickens** Plan. What does the average American need to know in a what the message is, we're importing almost 70% of our oil. Over 50% of what we import comes from countries that are not friendly to us. That is not sustainable and it's not something that this country should expect. It's a security issue with me, that's number one. I want to use everything I want us to use our own I'm seriously asking you to help me and to go on that website, because we are very close to finally getting an energy plan you know, it's a pretty for America. Simple subject, you're talking about one resource, you're talking about foreign oil, so there you've got the problem and there you've got the solution. And, you know, you can really summarize it in three minutes. And that's what Rahm Emanuel said. He said it can't be this simple. It is, though. This has nothing to do with politics. There's not a democrat or republican angle to anything I'm talking to you about. It's about us, the people here in Stillwater, the people here in Oklahoma, people here in the it's our problem and we have got to solve it. In 1970 richard nixon made a speech that kind of got my attention and he said at the end of the decade in the '70s, we will not be importing any more oil. ...00:19:14

Audience: N/A **Spot Cost:** N/A

6. Primetime Report

News Channel 8, Washington, DC | DMA: 9

04/04/2010, 07:00 PM - 07:30 PM

[CC] 00:01:42 ... To break the deadlock you have to start somewhere, you have to make the first move. I really commend him for this. This is an act of saying that we have to do compromises, I don't he loves doing this, but he is doing it anyway. The right move. -**T. BoonePickens** --Here is his reaction. There are big oil fields all over south Texas and south Louisiana. But off the coast of Virginia, South Carolina, there is no oil fields on shore there. Why do you think there will be big oil field offshore? Why bother? The governor of Virginia loves the idea, he is thinking jobs. So do Virginia's two democratic senators, and Maryland's two democratic senators do not like it. We now --We know there is --... there is a Saudi Arabia of oil in Alaska. Anwr remains shut if we get started in 1996, when Clinton shot it down, we would have 1 million barrels, 10% o our import. The oil is in the west. That is why it is so odd. The oil and gas industry actually seemed pleased by this. ...00:05:00

Audience: 510 Spot Cost: \$20

7. Primetime Report

News Channel 8, Washington, DC | DMA: 9

04/03/2010, 07:00 PM - 07:30 PM

[CC] 00:01:47 ... To break the deadlock you have to start somewhere, you have to make the first move. I really commend him for this. This is an act of saying that we have to do compromises, I don't he loves doing this, but he is doing it anyway. The right move. -**T. BoonePickens** --Here is his reaction. There are big oil fields all over south Texas and south Louisiana. But off the coast of Virginia, South Carolina, there is no oil fields on shore there. Why do you think there will be big oil field offshore? Why bother? The governor of Virginia loves the idea, he is thinking jobs. So do Virginia's two democratic senators, and Maryland's two democratic senators do not like it. We now --We know there is --... there is a Saudi Arabia of oil in Alaska. Anwr remains shut if we get started in 1996, when Clinton shot it down, we would have 1 million barrels, 10% o our import. The oil is in the west. That is why it is so odd. The oil and gas industry actually seemed pleased by this. ...00:05:04

Audience: 5,244 Spot Cost: \$49

8. Clean Skies Sunday

WJLA-TV (ABC) CH 7, Washington, DC | DMA: 9

04/04/2010, 09:30 AM - 10:00 AM

[CC] 00:02:11 ... We also have plug-in hybrid technology that ultimately could power our cars with the wind and the sun and use little to no oil. And then obviously we need to continue investing in public transportation so that people have alternatives to driving. So we have much cleaner solutions. We can reduce our dependence on oil and we can protect our coast, so this proposal for increased offshore drilling just takes us in the wrong direction. Let's be clear, this drilling isn't starting tomorrow. The federal government hasn't conducted seismic studies of these offshore areas in several decades. And as **t. BoonePickens** put it following the announcement, even if the reserve estimates are correct here, we're still 10 years away from actually being able to use them, susan. So the president gives the thumbs-up. What happens next? The next step cos from the department of interior, that says there won't be any extensive lease sales any time before 2012. But the doi will offer offshore tracts sooner than that in part of Alaska and so 50 miles off the coast of Virginia, and that has reay been the big energy push for Virginia governor bob mcdonnell, pretty much ever since he took office, susan, back in January. So, Tyler, the headline was certainly offshore drilling this past week but the president did talk about other forms of energy. Right, a few handouts to the gre community, I suppose, on the heels of that offshore announcement. One of the policies, the finalization of new fuel economy standards. Another is the doubling of the number of hybrid cars and trucks in the federal fleet....00:05:30

Audience: 13,816 Spot Cost: \$127

9. Inside Washington

WJLA-TV (ABC) CH 7, Washington, DC | DMA: 9

04/04/2010, 09:00 AM - 09:30 AM

[CC] 00:01:49 ... To break the deadlock you have to start somewhere, you have to make the first move. I really commend him for this. This is an act of saying that we have to do compromises, I don't he loves doing this, but he is doing it anyway. The right move. -**T. BoonePickens** --Here is his reaction. There are big oil fields all over south Texas and south Louisiana. But off the coast of Virginia, South Carolina, there is no oil fields on shore there. Why do you think there will be big oil field offshore? Why bother? The governor of Virginia loves the idea, he is thinking jobs. So do Virginia's two democratic senators, and Maryland's two democratic senators do not like it. We now --We know there is --... there is a Saudi Arabia of oil in Alaska. Anwr remains shut if we get started in 1996, when Clinton shot it down, we would have 1 million barrels, 10% o our import. The oil is in the west. That is why it is so odd. The oil and gas industry actually seemed pleased by this. ...00:05:03

Audience: 25,989 **Spot Cost:** \$239

10. Midday's Weekly News Review

WYPR-FM (NPR) Freq. 88.1, Baltimore | DMA: 27

04/02/2010, 01:00 PM - 02:00 PM

00:34:00 what the caller is talking about is an idea that **TBoonePickens** , the Texas oil man has been promoting very aggressively, tv ads and all sorts of things . In fact he had conference call right after Obama announced offshore oil drilling to give his 2 cents on the matter so he is is trying to promote the idea that Michael's talking about I'm curious about ... I mean it ... it does seem to make science more sense I guess if you can ..I wonder who the elite are in western Pennsylvania ..aren't they buying up land pretty aggressively?... 00:35:59

Audience: N/A **Spot Cost:** N/A