

PickensPlan

T. Boone Pickens Media Coverage 04.20.10

Total of 3 Placements

- Blog/Online: 3

Coverage Summary:

MediaBistro.com, a media trade, highlights Pickens' upcoming appearance at the Washington Correspondents dinner. The posts list all notable guests.

The blog Gas 2.0 posted a piece on reducing our dependence on foreign oil and looking to use multiple domestic resources to do it. Pickens' testimony is included noting his desire to provide tax incentives to convert heavy-duty trucks and fleet vehicles to natural gas. The piece features the opposition to natural gas from oil companies and scientists, who note the high costs of natural gas infrastructure. Lastly, the post references Robert Howarth, a geology professor from Cornell, who says that by using natural gas you are actually doing more harm to the environment than using diesel in large trucks.

Highlighted Placements (Full Articles Below)

- **NBC/MSNBC's Gets Bon Jovi, Cooper, Fallon, Hargitay, McGregor, Baldwin, Greenspan, Jarrett, Albright and More...** – *MediaBistro.com* – 4/20/10
- **Coal, Oil, Natural Gas Industries Butt Heads; Natural Gas May Not be as Clean as Thought** – *Gas 2.0.Blog* – 4/20/10

Blog/Online Placements (Full Articles Below)

- **The Energy Policy Morass** – *ThePowerLine.com* – 4/20/10

HIGHLIGHTED COVERAGE

NBC/MSNBC's Gets Bon Jovi, Cooper, Fallon, Hargitay, McGregor, Baldwin, Greenspan, Jarrett, Albright and More... – *MediaBistro.com* – 4/20/10

By Betsy Rothstein

The guests of NBC Universal/NBC News/MSNBC for the White House Correspondents' Association Dinner are: Alec Baldwin, Angela Kinsey - NBC's "The Office", Anna Kendrick - Academy Award Nominee for "Up in the Air", Bradley Cooper, Elizabeth Moss - "Mad Men", Ewan McGregor, Fred Armisen, Jimmy Fallon, Jon Bon Jovi, Lindsey Vonn, Mariska Hargitay.

There's more:

Alan Greenspan, Frm. Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Carol Browner, Director of the White House Office of Energy and Climate Change Policy, Cindy Chang, National Security Council, Honorable Deborah Hersman, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, Howard Dean, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Jake Siewert, former White House press secretary, Former Gov. Jon Corzine, Former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Melissa Winter, Mrs. Obama's Deputy Chief of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, Rocco Landesman, National Endowment for the Arts Chairman, Sen. Susan Collins (R-ME), Amb. Susan Rice, T. Boone Pickens, entrepreneur, Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner, Valerie Jarrett, Senior Advisor to the President

Coal, Oil, Natural Gas Industries Butt Heads; Natural Gas May Not be as Clean as Thought – *Gas 2.0.Blog* – 4/20/10

By Nick Chambers

As we chugg along into whatever alternative transportation and energy future we're creating for ourselves, it is clear that it shouldn't involve such a singular dependence on one energy source as we've had. If anything, our last 100 years have taught us that relying so completely on oil can have many disastrous effects, ranging the gamut from economic to social to environmental. And, while plentiful access to oil has clearly brought about an unprecedented amount of good, at this point we know that we can build a better and more sustainable system.

So the discussions going on right now at the highest levels of government on how to structure any future energy and transportation framework highlight the pitfalls that lie ahead in weening ourselves off of our stubborn and all-encompassing addiction to oil.

>> Interested in solar power? See if group discounts are available in your city

>> Don't forget to: Sign up for our electric car interest list.

Step 1: Electric Cars

If we're smart, our future will involve multiple and flexible sources of energy that are suited to whatever region they're being used in. The majority of personal driving on any given day can be accomplished with electrical power. The beauty of electrical power is that it is ultimately flexible: it can be made from a wide variety of "ultra local" sources ranging from wind and solar, to hydro and nuclear, to coal and natural gas. While some of those are clearly more polluting and less sustainable than others, the mix of sources adds to the ultimate stability of such a system... and as our energy mix gets cleaner over time, so do our vehicles. Which is why, smartly, our government seems to have seen the rationality in such a system. Initially, pure electric cars won't be for everybody, which is why we'll also have cars like the Volt that run mostly on electricity but are more expensive. But in the end, most everybody could be driving plug-ins and not even notice a difference in their daily lives.

And What to Do with Everything Else?

But what do you do with all the cars that are already on the road? What about trains, planes and freight trucks? Clearly our battery technology is not far enough along to make electric freight trucks a reality, and nobody's yet come up with a way to make large commercial planes fly on anything but combustion. All of our diesel locomotives could be converted to run on electricity from overhead lines, but the amount of new infrastructure involved would be mind boggling. What all of this leads to is that we need to find other sources of energy to run these all-important pieces of our global supply and transportation chain. This is where biofuels and natural gas come in.

Natural Gas and the Pickens Aura

Leaving biofuels out of this particular argument we start to see an emerging theme. Last week, T. Boone Pickens, the oil billionaire who's already invested tons of his own money into natural gas infrastructure and adopted the new mantra of being a clean energy supporter, was in Washington D.C. to continue pushing his plan to convert all the freight trucks on the road to the cleaner burning natural gas. There is a bill currently making its way through congress that would authorize tax credits for natural gas vehicles, require 50% of the federal vehicle fleet to use natural gas and would require the US Department of Energy to provide financing to light- and heavy-duty natural gas vehicle manufacturers. But there are lots of folks who say that natural gas just doesn't make any sense.

From the oil industry you have people saying that to install all the required new natural gas refueling infrastructure and conversions would cost far too much money, and from the coal industry a lot of ruckus is being made about how a rush to natural gas electricity would irreparably harm their industry and that nobody can provide electricity as cheaply as them. They also are saying that they can implement new technologies that will make them just as clean as natural gas.

It's a Brand New World: Fossil Fuel Industry Strife

I'll leave it to you all to decide if any of the above makes any sense, but nonetheless it's an interesting turn of events that the fossil fuel industries have sensed their piece of the pie is getting smaller and they will all need to share it in the near future... it's leading to a cutthroat environment. It used to be that they all worked kind of nicely together as a group representing roughly the same thing — energy from fossil fuels — but now they're becoming enemies as the traditional government support is starting to dry up a bit.

But Wait, Even Scientists See Natural Gas Pitfalls

As those former allies bicker it gets harder to separate the truth from the trees, with all the rhetoric and pseudofacts. But now we're starting to hear from scientists who are also hesitant to get on the natural gas bandwagon. In particular, Robert Howarth, a geology professor from Cornell, says that by using natural gas you are actually doing more harm to the environment than using diesel in large trucks. His analysis is based on excess greenhouse gas — methane in particular — leakage during the mining and processing of natural gas. Methane is a far worse greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, so even if less of it is emitted than CO₂ it can still do much more damage. Reportedly his calculations have a few holes (even he admits that), but they still clearly indicate that we haven't done as thorough an analysis of the benefits and drawbacks of all the options as we should.

BLOG/ONLINE COVERAGE

The Energy Policy Morass – *ThePowerLine.com* – 4/20/10

The current issue of the Weekly Standard features a cover story written by my friend Steve Hayward. Steve is the author of books including the two-volume *Age of Reagan*, *Greatness*, and *The Real Jimmy Carter*. He is also the author of the annual review that he calls the *Index of Leading Environmental Indicators*.

In the current Weekly Standard cover story Steve turns his attention to energy policy, a subject that spans the period he has focused on as a historian as well as his extracurricular interest in environmental issues. Here is his opening paragraph:

If you think the health care debate is a tangled mess, try wading into the thickets of the energy sector, which is high on the Obama administration's list of targets to subjugate. Few areas of national policy offer as bad a ratio of blather to substance as energy. It is a field where cliché, wishful thinking, and wince-inducing ignorance dominate the discourse. No matter how patiently or repeatedly the myths and realities of energy are explained, a large portion of the public, along with giddy pundits like Tom Friedman, persist in thinking an energy revolution is one government-sponsored gadget away from being willed into existence. Liberals are the worst offenders, but conservatives have their own energy shibboleths that deserve to be candidly recognized as such. The energy industry itself, meanwhile—including old-line fossil fuel companies, but also rent-seeking manufacturers such as GE and Siemens—contributes to public ignorance and confusion by jumping on the "green energy" bandwagon for mostly bad reasons. Everyone from T. Boone Pickens to Ralph Nader has a plan to "solve" America's energy crisis, while Obama is practicing Clintonian triangulation to see whether Republicans will be cheap dates on an energy bill.

Among other things, I learn from reading Steve's article that American oil consumption has remained virtually flat over the last 30 years: "Today, we use only slightly more oil than we did in 1978, even though the economy has more than doubled in real terms." Turning to the current ambition of the left, Steve points to the left's ambition to control carbon dioxide emissions:

The target the climate campaigners have set for the United States—an 80 percent reduction in CO₂ emissions by the year 2050—would require replacing virtually our entire fossil fuel energy infrastructure. Substituting natural gas for coal would deliver only about a 15 percent reduction in CO₂ emissions, and even if we replaced every coal plant with a carbon-free nuclear plant, we'd still be less than halfway to the

policy target. For the United States, the 80 percent reduction target means reducing our fossil fuel use to a level the nation last experienced in 1910. But since our population in 2050 will be nearly five times larger than the population of 1910, on a per capita basis we're talking about going back to the fossil fuel use of about 1875. This is patently absurd.

Steve is a trustworthy guide to a difficult subject. His long article is worth reading in its entirety.