



T. Boone Pickens Media Coverage 5/28/11 – 5/31/11

Total of 14 Placements • Print: 7 • Blog/Online: 7

Coverage Summary

Autogas for America issued a release commending the introduction of the "Propane GAS Act" (H.R. 2014/S. 1120) in the House and Senate last week. The bill calls for the extension of current and previous incentives for propane autogas. The release states that Autogas for America opposes the NAT GAS Act, calling it "the T. Boone Pickens experiment" and stating that they oppose government favoritism. The release continues that Autogas for America is seeking extension of propane autogas incentives to ensure equal footing with other alternatives already receiving government aid.

The Houston Chronicle has a piece stating that a Texas bill incentivizing natural gas is before the Governor, but that HR 1380 is losing support amongst some Republicans. The piece includes commentary from an FBR Capital Markets analyst stating that concerns over fracking may threaten the bill. The Houston Chronicle also has a post on its politics blog reiterating the piece's salient points.

Highlighted Placements (Full Articles Below) • Legislative Parity in Sight with Introduction of Propane Green Autogas Solutions Act - Press Release - 5/31/11 <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/legislative-parity-in-sight-with-introduction-of-propane-green-autogas-solutions-act-122877664.html> • Natural gas vehicle incentives fuel debate - Houston Chronicle - 5/28/11 o San Antonio Express-News <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/business/energy/7585213.html> • Four Republicans drop sponsorship of Boone Pickens' Natural Gas Act - Houston Chronicle, Texas on the Potomac Blog - 5/30/11 <http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2011/05/four-republicans-drop-sponsorship-of-boone-pickens-natural-gas-act/>

Highlighted Placements (Full Articles Below) • Graves: Government: No. 1 job destroyer - The

Washington Times - 5/30/11 <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/may/30/government-no-1-job-destroyer/> • Huntsman says presidential race 'wide open' - The Salt Lake Tribune - 5/28/11 <http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/politics/51903647-90/huntsman-former-portrait-presidential.html.csp> • Business Diary: Johnson chokes on his coffee - The Independent - 5/30/11 <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/diary/business-diary-johnson-chokes-on-his-coffee-2290896.html> • Congressmen Pat Meehan, billionaire T. Boone Pickens tour natural gas facility - News of Delaware County - 5/31/11 http://www.delconewsnetwork.com/articles/2011/05/31/news_of_delaware_county/news/doc4dde9c661397c531073911.txt?viewmode=3

Blog/Online Placements (Full Articles Below) • Sarah Palin Opposes All Energy Subsidies - [RedState.com](http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2011/05/31/sarah-palin-opposes-all-energy-subsidies/) - 5/31/11 <http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2011/05/31/sarah-palin-opposes-all-energy-subsidies/> • This Week in the Congress - [GlobalWarming.org](http://www.globalwarming.org) - 5/29/11 <http://www.globalwarming.org/2011/05/29/this-week-in-the-congress-8/> • Commentary: Why we should NOT be fracking for natural gas - [Syracuse.com](http://www.syracuse.com) - 5/31/11 [http://www.syracuse.com/news/index.ssf/2011/05/commentary_why_we_should_not_b.html] (http://www.syracuse.com/news/index.ssf/2011/05/commentary_why_we_should_not_b.html) • Green Panic and Growing Anti Shale Gas Propaganda - [OilPrice.com](http://oilprice.com) - 5/31/11 <http://oilprice.com/Energy/Natural-Gas/Green-Panic-and-Growing-Anti-Shale-Gas-Propaganda.html> • Boone Pickens: We Are Fueling Terrorism by Paying OPEC - [GuruFocus.com](http://www.gurufocus.com) - 5/31/11 <http://www.gurufocus.com/news/134921/boone-pickens-we-are-fueling-terrorism-by-paying-opec> • Obama Budget: Zero% Approval in the Senate - [HumanEvents.com](http://www.humanevents.com) - 5/30/11 <http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=43793&s=rcmp>

HIGHLIGHTED COVERAGE

Legislative Parity in Sight with Introduction of Propane Green Autogas Solutions Act - Press Release - 5/31/11

WASHINGTON, May 31, 2011 /PRNewswire/ -- Autogas for America, the unified voice of the U.S. autogas market, commends the introduction of the Propane Green Autogas Solutions Act ("Propane GAS Act") of 2011 (H.R. 2014/S. 1120) in the House and Senate last week. The bill calls for extension of current and previous incentives for propane autogas and represents an important step toward legislative parity for this American-made alternative vehicle fuel.

"After months of pushing for parity in alternative fuels legislation, we're pleased to see this bill

introduced," says Autogas for America founder Stuart Weidie. "It means lawmakers recognize the importance of promoting all alternative fuel technologies on an even playing field."

Autogas for America Stakeholders were vocal in opposition to the NAT GAS Act (New Alternative Transportation to Give Americans Solutions Act) introduced in the house earlier this year to incentivize what Weidie calls "the T. Boone Pickens experiment." The NAT GAS Act would offer generous federal incentives that apply only to natural gas. Autogas for America is fundamentally opposed to government favoritism and is seeking extension of propane autogas incentives to ensure equal footing with other alternatives already receiving considerable attention from lawmakers.

"Ultimately, alternative fuels should be able to stand on their own merits, without incentives. The government shouldn't be shouldered with underwriting innovation," says Weidie. "But, if they're going to incentivize certain technologies - like natural gas, ethanol and electric vehicles - they should also incentivize propane autogas. Failing to do so would directly conflict with the core values of a free market economy."

Weidie says using American-made fuels like autogas is essential to driving national energy security and that this bill is critical to giving autogas parity alongside other alternatives that receive government subsidies.

The Propane GAS Act would extend existing tax credits for the purchase of autogas fuel, autogas-powered vehicles and autogas refueling infrastructure through 2016. These incentives have helped grow the use of autogas, particularly among fleet users, according to Autogas for America.

The bill was introduced by House Republican Conference Secretary Representative John Carter (R-TX) and Senator Ben Cardin (D-MD). Original cosponsors were Representatives Dan Boren (D-OK) and Mike Rogers (R-AL) in the House of Representatives, and Senators Roy Blunt (R-MO) and Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) in the Senate.

"Autogas is significantly cheaper than gasoline, and that price differential is growing every day," says Joe Thompson, Autogas for America stakeholder and president of ROUSH CleanTech. "Because conventional fuels like gasoline and diesel have such a stranglehold on the market, the ability to discount the price of autogas an additional 50 cents, and to offer substantial incentives on autogas vehicles, has helped us get an increasing number of America's fleets running on this clean-burning fuel."

Autogas is gaining national attention as our country faces skyrocketing gasoline prices, growing

demand to reduce harmful emissions and the critical need to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

Autogas-vehicle operators save on average more than \$1 per gallon versus gasoline and often cite reduced vehicle maintenance. Autogas is a clean burning fuel, displacing harmful greenhouse gases by more than 20 percent. Also, 90 percent of the U.S. autogas supply is made in America. Weidie, Thompson and Autogas for America are pleased to see autogas take its place alongside other alternative fuels as an important part of a balanced American energy equation.

Weidie says, "No one fuel is the only solution to America's energy challenges, but autogas is right here, right now. Each American fleet that switches from gasoline to autogas is significant step in the right direction."

SOURCE Autogas for America

Natural gas vehicle incentives fuel debate - Houston Chronicle - 5/28/11 o San Antonio Express-News

By Tom Fowler and Jennifer A. Dlouhy

Texas lawmakers showed some love this week for a bill to provide incentives for natural gas-fueled vehicles, but a similar bill at the federal level is beginning to get the cold shoulder.

The Texas Senate sent Gov. Rick Perry a bill on Thursday that will establish incentives for companies to buy natural gas-fueled vehicles and help fund fueling stations in the "Texas Triangle" linking Houston, San Antonio and Dallas-Fort Worth.

Senate Bill 20 would redirect funds from the existing Texas Emissions Reduction Program specifically toward vehicles that use natural gas. The fund replaces or retrofits heavy-duty construction equipment and other vehicles to reduce pollution.

Natural gas producers are pushing such measures across the country to expand the market for the fuel, which has been in a price slump in recent years due to ample domestic production as drillers have perfected techniques in prolific shale formations.

"This legislation will foster the development of a Texas Clean Transportation Triangle by increasing the number of natural gas refueling stations and replacing the heaviest fuel-hungry diesel trucks with

natural gas-powered trucks, thus improving Texas' air quality and economy," said James Hackett, CEO of Anadarko Petroleum Corp. and chairman of America's Natural Gas Alliance.

But in Washington, the "Natural Gas Act" pushed by billionaire Texas oilman T. Boone Pickens has lost a few of its key Republican sponsors. It would provide a tax credit to cover as much as 80 percent of the cost of buying a natural gas vehicle.

GOP Reps. Tim Griffin of Arkansas, Glenn Thompson of Pennsylvania, Todd Akin of Missouri and Stevan Pearce of New Mexico have asked to be removed as co-sponsors.

Griffin said his decision followed weeks of analysis.

The bill "is well-intentioned in that it seeks to promote natural gas as a clean-burning, abundant and American energy source," Griffin said. "However, I am concerned that (the bill) might be inconsistent with my goal of simplifying the tax code by lowering the overall tax rate and simultaneously ending industry-specific incentives."

Conservative groups including the Club for Growth and Americans for Tax Reform stepped up campaigns against the legislation they say is full of unwise tax credits that would distort the market.

Grover Norquist, the head of Americans for Tax Reform, made his case against the bill in a letter to House members. His chief argument: Tax policies for specific energy sources, be they natural gas or renewable power, skew the energy market away from the most reliable, cheapest options.

Chris Chocoma of the Club for Growth decried the bill in a blog post Thursday on Redstate.com.

Chocoma took issue with a provision in the measure that he says lends credibility to the Environmental Protection Agency's push to regulate greenhouse gas emissions.

The federal measure still has 187 co-sponsors in the House, with more than 100 Democrats on board. The sponsorship list includes representatives from Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Pennsylvania and other areas with natural gas production.

But the growing backlash against the production technique called hydraulic fracturing may cut further into support for the bill, FBR Capital Markets analyst Benjamin Salisbury said.

Hydraulic fracturing injects a mixture of water, sand and chemicals deep underground at high

pressures to break up dense shale rock to release gas and oil. Environmentalists and some Democratic leaders oppose fracturing because of the high volumes of water used in the process and concerns that the technique may have tainted some water supplies.

Not all the activity around natural gas vehicles is taking place in Washington or Austin.

Apache Corp. recently donated a \$1.5 million compressed natural gas fueling station to the city of Houston to run a new fleet of shuttle buses serving the city-owned parking lot at Bush Intercontinental Airport.

And Houston-based Waste Management has been aggressively expanding the use of compressed natural gas in its fleet of trash trucks.

Fowler reported from Houston and Dlouhy from Washington.

Four Republicans drop sponsorship of Boone Pickens' Natural Gas Act - Houston Chronicle, Texas on the Potomac Blog - 5/30/11

By Jennifer Dlouhy

Billionaire Texas oilman T. Boone Pickens is still fiercely championing legislation that would create billions of dollars in tax credits to encourage businesses and motorists to adopt natural gas powered vehicles - but his circle of fans on Capitol Hill is shrinking.

Four Republicans who had signed on as cosponsors of the so-called Natural Gas Act withdrew their backing this month, even as conservative groups such as the Club for Growth and Americans for Tax Reform stepped up campaigns against the legislation they say is full of unwise "market-distorting tax credits."

Three of the GOP lawmakers withdrew their sponsorship last week: Rep. Tim Griffin of Arkansas, Rep. Glenn Thompson of Pennsylvania and Rep. Todd Akin of Missouri. Rep. Steve Pearce, R-N.M., asked to be removed as a bill cosponsor on May 10.

Griffin said his decision followed weeks of analysis about the bill. The measure "is well intentioned in that it seeks to promote natural gas as a clean burning, abundant and American energy source," Griffin said in a statement. "However, I am concerned that (the bill) might be inconsistent with my goal

of simplifying the tax code by lowering the overall tax rate and simultaneously ending industry-specific incentives."

Fiscally conservative groups who support a fundamental rewrite of the U.S. tax code - including a wipeout of specific tax incentives, credits and deductions - have been arguing that the Natural Gas Act is an unfair giveaway to a single industry. Similar opposition also has been mounted against subsidies for ethanol that critics say is designed mainly to benefit corn-growing farmers.

Grover Norquist, the head of Americans for Tax Reform, made his case against the bill in a letter to House members earlier this month. His chief argument: Tax policies for specific energy sources, be they natural gas or renewable power, skew the energy market away from the most reliable, cheapest options.

"An energy market which most benefits consumers is one largely absent of government intervention," Norquist wrote. "Conservatives must begin peeling back the numerous duplicative regulations and laws that facilitate or impeded certain types of energy. Unfortunately, HR 1380 takes the opposite approach - piling more rules, grants and tax policies onto America's already encumbered energy sector."

Chris Chocola of the Club for Growth added his voice to the chorus Thursday, when he posted a blog entry on Redstate.com decrying the bill. Chocola took issue with a provision in the measure that he says lends credibility to the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to regulate greenhouse gas emissions. "Several fiscal conservatives in the House have been duped into thinking this is a good bill," Chocola said.

The measure still has a long list of co-sponsors in the House - 187 of them, with more than 100 Democrats on board. The sponsorship list looks like a who's who of the nation's shale plays, with plenty of supportive representatives hailing Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Pennsylvania and other areas where natural gas production is under way.

For supporters, the allure is building a stronger market for natural gas now being extracted from the dense shale rock formations nationwide - and at the same time helping to transition the U.S. transportation sector away from dirtier burning petroleum-based fuels.

The legislation would offer a tax credit covering as much as 80 percent (up to \$7,500 for passenger vehicles and \$64,000 for ultra heavy trucks) of the incremental cost of buying a natural gas vehicle. It also would provide tax credits to help cover the cost of building natural gas filling stations and other

infrastructure to support the cars.

Some critics raise say that spending is unwise in the current fiscal environment, as Congress works to pare the federal budget deficit. A big question for lawmakers is how to pay for the added tax breaks. Some Republican lawmakers may be reluctant to offset new natural gas vehicle tax incentives by hiking taxes elsewhere (such as by slashing tax breaks for oil producers).

But there are other concerns on Capitol Hill, noted FBR Capital Markets analyst Benjamin Salisbury in a research note this morning. And they are tied to environmental concerns about the hydraulic fracturing process that is being used to unlock natural gas.

Hydraulic fracturing injecting mixtures of water, sand and chemicals deep underground and at high pressures to break up dense shale rock. The decades-old technique is being used in combination with horizontal drilling to extract previously unrecoverable natural gas from shale formations nationwide, but environmentalists have warned about the high water demands of the process as well as the risks that water supplies could be tainted by gas that escapes from poorly cemented wells.

"Many Democrats (are) ambivalent about shale gas," and plenty of "environmentalists remain concerned about using resources to fund a program that encourages hydraulic fracturing," Salisbury said. "We see potential support for natural gas sector incentives as hindered by the controversy. We would expect progress of the Nat Gas Act to be used as an opportunity to attach environmental regulation of hydraulic fracturing."

PRINT COVERAGE

Graves: Government: No. 1 job destroyer - The Washington Times - 5/30/11

By Rep. Tom Graves

Thursday was a bad day for government in the United States. You see, hundreds of job creators from across the country gathered in Dalton, Ga., for a summit about creating manufacturing jobs in America. By the time the summit ended, attendees had heard five hours of damning accounts of how government rules and regulations have kept jobs on the sidelines or shipped them away altogether.

The government's recklessness over the past several years - a combination of overreach and overspending that has resulted in our economy taking a prolonged bath - has been well documented.

However, it's most jarring to hear about those offenses from the men and women who run our businesses and employ our people and on whom we ultimately rely to deliver us from 9 percent unemployment.

Thomas A. Fanning, CEO of Southern Co., caused a stir when he discussed the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed Utility Maximum Available Control Technology [MACT] rule, which threatens to shutter half of our nation's coal-generated power resources.

Werner Braun, president of the Carpet and Rug Institute, spoke in detail about California's proposal to severely limit the use of caprolactam, an organic compound vital to making nylon carpet fiber. Such a rule would stifle carpet manufacturing for more than one-third of the carpet produced in the United States.

Chip Howalt, president of Textile Rubber and Chemical Co., described the extensive regulatory burden on chemical manufacturers as well as the competitive disadvantage created by sales taxes on energy, the death tax and rising costs associated with Obamacare.

In fact, since becoming law, Obamacare has transformed from a 2,000-page bill into more than 6,000 pages of regulations and Federal Register notices.

Much of the summit also focused on how diminished access to domestic energy supply and related regulations stymie manufacturing jobs. As federal policies (or the lack thereof) drive up the price of energy, the cost of manufacturing increases dramatically, forcing companies that want to expand and compete globally to consider cheaper offshore locations.

Energy tycoon T. Boone Pickens, the summit's keynote speaker, spoke of his decades-long struggle to push Washington to develop a long-term national energy strategy. The consequence of the failure to act, he said, is that we import 65 percent of our oil, compared to just 24 percent in 1970.

Our relying so heavily on imported oil gives foreign countries a disturbing level of control over the cost of doing business in America. Yet, rather than focus on increasing domestic energy supply, the Obama administration has focused on controlling consumption. There has been a costly rash of regulation, from the de facto moratorium on lease sales for offshore drilling to the threat of a "cap-and-trade" energy-regulation system.

Taken as a whole, the Small Business Administration estimates that total federal regulatory costs in America amount to \$1.75 trillion annually - a number that dwarfs the federal government's entire

discretionary budget for 2011 and exceeds Canada's gross domestic product.

The cost of compliance is stunning, and it speaks to the heart of the employment issue in manufacturing and every sector of our economy. It's clear that to create more jobs, government at the federal and state levels must change course and embrace policies that drive down the cost of doing business in America.

One such policy in Congress is called the REINS (Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny) Act. This bill would require Congress to approve any proposed regulation that carries an economic impact of more than \$100 million annually. This would put accountability for any new red tape squarely on elected representatives and end the threat of unelected bureaucrats circumventing the legislature. The bill, led by Rep. Geoff Davis, Kentucky Republican, has garnered 142 co-sponsors and grown in popularity and is part of the major House Republican plan for job creation.

So, for the unemployed in America, the greatest hope is for the regulatory burden to take a prominent place in the national conversation. Imagine if the trillions of dollars spent on government controls were used instead to create good-paying jobs. The manufacturing summit in Dalton was the start of that dream, and as job creators continue speaking out, they further expose excessive government for what it is: a destroyer of jobs.

Rep. Tom Graves is a freshman Republican from Georgia.

Huntsman says presidential race 'wide open' - The Salt Lake Tribune - 5/28/11

By Robert Gehrke

Former Utah Gov. Jon Huntsman Jr. said he was encouraged after a series of recent meetings in California and Nevada with potential financial backers for his prospective presidential bid.

"[I have] a very good feeling. The race is wide open," he said in a brief interview Saturday. "A lot of the fundraisers who were committed before are wide open. They're looking for the message, they're looking for the approach. They're looking to have the point proved to them that a winnable candidate can emerge."

Huntsman met with potential supporters in San Francisco, Los Angeles and Las Vegas last week. He said there was "a lot of interest" and now they want to see where the would-be candidate goes in the

next few weeks.

The former governor is scheduled to discuss energy policy on Monday with oil billionaire T. Boone Pickens - whose "Pickens Plan" for expanding wind and natural gas energy Huntsman supports.

Huntsman will meet Tuesday with Texas Gov. Rick Perry, who has recently said that he would consider his own bid for the Republican presidential nomination. Huntsman said he would welcome Perry or former vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin to the GOP field.

"The more the merrier," he said.

Huntsman is in Utah this week for his son's graduation and is spending time with family, discussing whether he will take the plunge and declare his candidacy for the White House.

He has said repeatedly that he expects to make a decision sometime in the coming weeks.

On Saturday, Huntsman was attending the unveiling of his new portrait during a private event at the Governor's Mansion. Huntsman joked that he didn't want a portrait - that's for someone who has died or done something great - and he said he has done neither.

The painting was done from a photograph taken before Huntsman left Utah to serve as U.S. ambassador to China in 2009.

Once the paint is dry - it takes oil paint several months to fully dry - the portrait will hang in the Hall of Governors in the Utah Capitol.

The former governor said he also hopes to attend motorcycle races at Miller Motorsports Park with his family.

He will be back in New Hampshire - which hosts a crucial early primary - over the next two weekends but will not participate in a June 13 candidate debate there.

"We didn't qualify until a day or two ago and then we were scheduled and things wouldn't work and we're not announced, and until we announce we're not going to do that," he said.

Fundraising could pose a major challenge for the former governor, who has never had to raise more than a few million dollars to run for statewide office and never has had to raise money under federal

limits on campaign contributions.

He funded much of his first bid for president with a loan from Zions Bank that he repaid out of his own pocket before going to China.

Business Diary: Johnson chokes on his coffee - The Independent - 5/30/11

Luke Johnson, the private equity mogul, might want to check staff aren't spitting in his latte next time he pops into Starbucks for a pick-me-up. Johnson is less than complimentary about the coffee chain in the latest issue of Management Today - and particularly its chairman Howard Schulz. The Starbucks founder's latest tome, How Starbucks Fought for its Life Without Losing its Soul, is on sale in the chain's coffee shops. "This book is 350 pages of self-indulgent claptrap," Johnson says.

No pipe of peace for Ryanair

it's yet another brush with authority for Ryanair. The budget airline's policy of testing staff to check they have not been using drugs is causing some disquiet in Belgium. The test for cannabis use requires staff to submit a hair sample for lab examination and is compulsory under Ryanair's staff contracts. However, disgruntled employees in Belgium claim the tests are illegal under the country's privacy laws - and they have now been publicly condemned by the transport minister.

Britain, the home of entrepreneurs

so you thought Britain was full of jobsworths totally incapable of seizing the initiative, right? Think again: a survey from Société Générale suggests that British billionaires are much more likely to be self-made than their American counterparts - or indeed the super-rich of almost any other country. Some 80 per cent of British billionaires are self-made, SocGen reckons, compared to 68 per cent in the US. Only Russia scored more highly than the UK in the bank's survey.

Oil's role in the war on terror

US energy magnate T. Boone Pickens thinks he knows why terrorists are able to continue targeting his country. "I am trying to get away from the terrorists," he has told CNBC. "I think the money we pay to Opec gets in the hands of the Taliban." It isn't entirely clear how the great man has arrived at this view, but he is fed up about the fact that the US is selling so much natural gas to countries such as China. "So here we are, we're exporting our clean-burning fuel and importing dirty oil from the

enemy," he adds. "We're gonna go down as the dumbest crowd in history that's ever come to town."

Congressmen Pat Meehan, billionaire T. Boone Pickens tour natural gas facility - News of Delaware County - 5/31/11

By Vince Sullivan

WEST CHESTER - Billionaire energy tycoon T. Boone Pickens visited West Chester University Friday with US Congressmen Patrick Meehan (R-7) and Jim Gerlach (R-6) to tour the college's natural gas fueling facility.

The co-sponsors of the House's New Alternative Transportation to Give America Solutions Act (NATGAS Act) were there to gather information about ways to reduce America's dependence on foreign oil and to see first-hand how West Chester University utilizes natural gas in their motor pool.

The university has 22 vehicles that run on compressed natural gas, seven of which run on natural gas only. The on-campus transportation facility is home to two natural gas pumps that have been servicing the specially-outfitted vehicles since 1998. The stations provided 9,800 gasoline gallon equivalents (gge) of compressed natural gas last year, or about 25 percent of the fuel used by the university. At a cost of \$1.65 per gge, the cost of using natural gas is far more economical than using gasoline.

"The fuel is so much cheaper," Pickens said. "It'll pay for whatever the conversion cost is."

The university pays just under \$8,000 extra for each vehicle, which are converted by the manufacturer after coming out of the factory.

"Scale will take care of it," Pickens said.

The push for natural gas use is nothing new for Pickens, who advocates any kind of energy source that is produced domestically and reduces the country's dependence on other nations for fuel. He has been a vocal proponent of wind, solar and natural gas energy. He started out as an oil tycoon, but has since shifted his focus to cleaner sources of energy.

America's consumption of oil is a dangerous addiction, Pickens said, noting that we far exceed our

portion of the world's oil use, based on the population.

"We use 20 million barrels of oil a day in the United States," Pickens said. "Of that 13 [million] are imported, and of that 5 [million] are from OPEC."

With an immensely large deposit of natural gas discovered in recent years underneath Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and West Virginia, known as the Marcellus Shale formation, Pickens believes that now is the time to make the move to natural gas and stop burning so much oil. According to Pickens, the amount of natural gas could help fuel our country for years to come, reducing the amount of oil we import.

"We have a lot of room before we have to start exporting [natural gas]," he said. "I'd hate to think that we're gonna export clean-burning natural gas and import dirty Saudi oil. We'd go down as the dumbest crowd that ever came to town if we export clean and import dirty."

During a town-hall style meeting following the tour of the university's transportation facility, Meehan, Gerlach and Pickens talked about their plan to facilitate a change from gasoline and oil to natural gas, despite the fact that America has no cohesive plan for future energy sources.

"We are the only country in the world that has no energy plan. Why don't we have a plan? Because we get cheap oil," Pickens said.

Meehan suggested converting the 8 million heavy trucks that consume 23 percent of the country's oil-based fuels to natural gas.

"Converting just a single garbage truck to natural gas would be the equivalent of taking 300 cars off the road," Meehan said.

Pickens elaborated on that plan, saying that it could be done in five years by urging businesses to buy natural gas-burning trucks when they replace their fleets. They would not have to get rid of any oil-burning vehicles. Pickens suggested offering tax incentives that would cover the added costs of the converted trucks for those five years.

"We've gotta do something for ourselves, and now is the time to do it," Pickens said. "We could replace that oil from OPEC," whom Pickens referred to as "the enemy" several times.

Meehan views the fact that the US is beholden to the Middle East for oil as an issue of national

security.

"I'm really very concerned about the tremendous and continued reliance that we have on foreign oil, particularly from the Middle East," he said. "This is a great opportunity we have to focus on the chance to exploit the resource we have with natural gas." The economic impact is not lost on the freshman Congressman, though. The potential for job creation, an issue on which Meehan has spoken frequently, is great with the development of natural gas.

"Half a million jobs could be created by trying to make natural gas one of the things that fuels our energy here in the United States," he said.

He dropped some staggering statistics on the amount of money spent on foreign oil and how keeping that money stateside would greatly improve the country's economic situation.

"Estimates are that we send about \$1.2 billion to \$1.5 billion a day out of this country to purchase this oil," Meehan said. "That is one of the greatest transfers of wealth in history."

When it comes to the environment, Pickens believes that the concerns over hydro-fracturing, or fracking, are misplaced. He said that of the 80,000 or so wells bored using the practice, in which chemicals like hydrochloric acid and water are injected into rock formation to break them up and unleash the gas deposits, none have resulted in contaminated groundwater. According to him, he has seen wells bored through aquifers to reach deposits below them, and none of them have failed.

The emissions statistics show that a vehicle burning natural gas is much better for the environment than a traditional gasoline-burning car or truck.

According to statistics released by West Chester University, carbon monoxide emissions are reduced by 90 percent and carbon dioxide is cut down 25 percent. The trucks at West Chester University get similar fuel economy as gasoline-powered vehicles, but their range is typically 50 to 100 miles less than gasoline trucks.

BLOG/ONLINE COVERAGE

Sarah Palin Opposes All Energy Subsidies - [RedState.com](#) - 5/31/11

By Daniel Horowitz

Another vote against corporate 'cornyism'

As the presidential election heats up, we will continue to track where the candidates stand on ethanol and energy subsidies. The issue of ethanol subsidies is vital to conservatives for several reasons. First, ethanol epitomizes everything that is wrong with onerous government interventions; corporate cronyism, market distortions, higher prices for vital goods and services, and government dependency. Also, with food and energy prices at an all time high, ethanol subsidies will provide the eventual Republican nominee with a unique opportunity to use bread and butter issues to educate voters about the virtues of the free market.

Finally, and most importantly, if the Republican nominee lacks the temerity to rebuff a handful of corn welfare recipients in Iowa, he/she will certainly lack the moxie to cut trillions from the millions of dependents on the welfare state.

Last week, Mitt Romney embraced ethanol, Tim Pawlenty disavowed his support for ethanol (while speaking in Iowa), and Newt Gingrich..well, he is Professor Cornpone. Today, Sarah Palin rejected all energy subsidies in a brief interview with reporters in Gettysburg. Scott Conroy of Real Clear Politics reports from Gettysburg:

Asked Tuesday whether she supports the federal subsidy of ethanol, an always critical issue in the presidential nominating cycle, former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin went one step further and called for the elimination of all energy subsidies.

"I think that all of our energy subsidies need to be relooked at today and eliminated," Palin told RCP during a quick stop at a coffee shop in this picturesque town tucked into the south-central Pennsylvania countryside. "And we need to make sure that we're investing and allowing our businesses to invest in reliable energy products right now that aren't going to necessitate subsidies because, bottom line, we can't afford it." ..

"We've got to allow the free market to dictate what's most efficient and economical for our nation's economy," Palin said. "No, at this time, our country can't afford the subsidies. Before, though, we even start arguing about some of these domestic subsidies that need to be eliminated - should be - we need to look at ending subsidies and loans to foreign countries and their energy production that we're relying on, like Brazil."

It's good to hear the presidential candidates taking on all energy subsidies along with ethanol. Although ethanol is the most odious and ineffectual of all the subsidized energy sources, we should not be subsidizing any form of energy. Consequently, every presidential candidate should oppose subsidies for natural gas as well. This would keep up the pressure on House Republicans to renounce their support and co-sponsorship of the T. Boone Pickens handout-H.R. 1380.

This Week in the Congress - GlobalWarming.org - 5/29/11

By Myron Ebell

Update on the Boondoggle Bandwagon

The controversy over the T. Boone Pickens Earmark Bill, H. R. 1380, continued to grow this week. Three more Republicans joined Rep. Steve Pearce (R-NM) in getting off the Boonedoggle Bandwagon and withdrew as co-sponsors. They are Rep. Todd Akin (R-Mo.), Glenn Thompson (R-Pa.), and Tim Griffin (R-Ark.). The complete list of 187 co-sponsors can be found [here](#).

A joint letter organized by Heritage Action for America and signed by seventeen conservative organizations opposing the bill was sent to the Hill. Pickens himself published an op-ed co-authored by flack-for-hire Denise Bode in Politico that was full of his usual blend of self regard, bluster, and misinformation. Pickens and Bode claimed in the op-ed that the House Republican Study Committee has endorsed his bill. It has not, and Politico quickly corrected Pickens. They also claimed that wind power is now cheaper than new coal-fired power.

Pickens continues to claim that he is not in this for the money, but only to reduce America's reliance on foreign oil. See my CEI colleague Marlo Lewis's blog on GlobalWarming.org detailing Pickens's BP Capital Management's investments in a wide range of companies that would benefit by enactment of the Pickens-Your-Pocket Plan.

Commentary: Why we should NOT be fracking for natural gas - Syracuse.com - 5/31/11

Adrian Kuzminski of Cooperstown spoke May 24 at a National Press Club newsmaker forum about drilling for natural gas in Marcellus shale.

He is the moderator of a group called Sustainable Otsego.

Here is the text of his comments. Share your thoughts in the comment section below:

My name is Adrian Kuzminski. I'm the Moderator of Sustainable Otsego, an advocacy group in the Cooperstown, NY, area. We have played a key role in the growing grassroots resistance to fracking for natural gas in the Marcellus shale region. As part of this effort, we have brought together a collection of documents, "Frack Facts," which covers most aspects of gas extraction from leases to pollution problems to effects on economics and property values. This collection, periodically updated and expanded, currently has hundreds of items running to over 2,000 pages.

This document was originally undertaken at the request of Congressman Michael Arcuri in 2008. Earlier versions of it were submitted to the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation and to the EPA during their recent public comment periods on gas drilling. Copies are available here today. My remarks are based on the findings presented in these documents. Our conclusion is that the practice of fracking for natural gas should NOT be allowed to go forward.

Let me go through the major pro-industry arguments one by one, and point out why they fail:

1. "We have an insatiable appetite for energy and need to find replacement resources for oil."

Natural gas is not a replacement resource for oil; it is an extension of oil, with all its problems. It is a polluting fossil fuel apparently as bad if not worse than oil and coal. The methane gas which escapes during the full cycle of production and distribution ends up polluting groundwater locally, and compounding the greenhouse effect globally. A recent Duke university study of drilling in PA and NYS show methane able to migrate thousands of feet to contaminate drinking water. Methane is a worse greenhouse gas than CO₂ by many orders of magnitude. Robert Howarth's recent research at Cornell -- based on data from the state-of-the-art Russian gas system -- shows unacceptable levels of methane emissions from wellheads, compressors, and distribution lines. Natural gas appears no cleaner than any other fossil fuel.

We should be putting our diminishing investment capital into conservation and sustainable, decentralized, renewable energy sources. Investment in a dead-end technology like fracking starves out sustainable renewables, leaving us that much worse off. The short-term benefits go mainly to a few leaseholders and the gas companies. Every dime invested in natural gas is a dime in T. Boone Pickens' pocket, and that's a dime denied to desperately needed renewables. We can no longer afford to invest in an obsolete oil and gas industry which provides energy and profits only at the cost of

cannibalizing our most basic resources, both locally and globally. We shouldn't have to choose between water and energy. Shale gas development and subsidies to increase gas use are bridges to nowhere.

1. "We need national energy independence and the Marcellus shale will help provide it."

Just as Gresham's law tells us that 'bad money drives out good money,' so in ecological economics bad energy drives out good energy. A bad energy like natural gas requires us to sacrifice more and more of our environment to keep our over-consumptive lifestyles going a little longer; in effect, we are burning the furniture in the house to stay warm. That's not energy independence; that's energy suicide, whether the fossil fuel comes from Pennsylvania or Saudi Arabia. We're addicted to bad energy for a good reason: because there isn't enough good energy to replace bad energy. To get to energy independence we need conservation, rationing, and downsizing of our fossil fuel lifestyles, plus all-out investment in renewables. It's going to be rough.

1. "Marcellus gas is an economic shot in the arm to depressed rural economies who need it most."

Who wants to buy a house in a gas field? Realtors report residential buyers avoiding leased areas. Many banks will not give mortgages on leased property, and many insurance companies will not cover for damages from gas extraction.

Fracking for natural gas compromises property rights through "compulsory integration" and other unfair leasing practices. It leaves communities to pay for direct and indirect costs of a degraded environment. It puts water and air at serious risk of long-term and permanent pollution. It introduces a transient but intensive, widespread heavy industry on a massive scale. This immediately compromises public health, tourism, recreation, cultural and educational settings, residential development, organic agriculture, and other value added industries depending on clean water, air, and soil, not to mention community life in general.

Fracking for natural gas replaces steady economic activity with a destructive boom and bust cycle, in the process reducing property values and the tax base, while raising mitigation costs for local governments. All of this is a drain not a boost to the economy.

In my part of NYS, where Cooperstown is an international tourist destination, many prominent businesses and institutions have seen the threat and called for the outright prohibition of fracking. These include the Ommegang brewery, the National Baseball Hall of Fame, the Cooperstown Chamber of Commerce, the medical staff of Bassett Healthcare, and the Board of Trustees of the

Village of Cooperstown. In typical language, Cooperstown "unanimously supports all efforts to stop natural gas drilling and hydrofracking in New York State." These reactions are similar to many others across NYS and the Northeast.

In sum, the transient jobs and short-term tax opportunities the industry promises do not appear to compensate for the multiple losses the industry brings to the community.

1. "Drilling allows farmers to continue farming instead of going bankrupt."

The main agriculture growth in the Marcellus region has come from the small-scale, organic, locavore movement, for whom drilling is death. A gas well puts nearby water and air at risk, something neither organic farmers nor the value-added industries they support can tolerate. The future of agriculture in this area lies in non-industrial, specialty, boutique farming, the kind we see in Europe, for example, or read about in the Leisure section of the New York Times, where local varieties, quality, and high environmental standards are the key. The old-time dairy industry in the Northeast died a generation ago, the victim of a punishing national milk-pricing system and mega-farming in the mid-West, and it's not coming back anytime soon. Most leased land in the Marcellus region is not under cultivation; much of it is held by absentee owners. Those gas royalty checks will be great for a few lucky leaseholders in rural communities -- if their wells come through as predicted. Little if any of this money is going to be invested in agriculture.

1. "Industry CAN extract gas safely under the watchful eye of our regulators."

If drilling is so safe, why does the industry insist on exemption from environmental review? The fracking process uses very high pressures -- many thousands of psi -- to forcefully release gases trapped in shale; these gases and fracking residues can follow fissures and faults to reach and contaminate groundwater.

This concern, confirmed by the recent Duke University study, was a principal reason for NYC to call for a ban on fracking in its upstate NY watershed. They did so on the basis of the Hazen and Sawyer report, perhaps still the most thorough independent study done of fracking in the Marcellus shale region. If fracking is too dangerous for NYC's watershed, then why isn't it too dangerous for the whole Marcellus region?

Millions of gallons of toxic wastewater are produced by each fracked well. As reported in a recent New York Times series, this water is a permanent hazardous waste, often containing radioactive residues and other toxins for which there is no satisfactory purification or disposal option: either it will

be diluted into surface waters, or injected underground.

Dr. Theo Colburn of the Endocrine Disruption Exchange has identified many of these chemicals not only as carcinogens but as endocrine disruptors. Endocrine disruptors are unusual stealth toxins: tolerable at higher doses, but increasingly dangerous as doses get smaller and smaller, even when not detectable; for some, no safe thresholds have been found.

Not only methane but other volatile organic compounds are emitted in the vicinity of the production and distribution of natural gas, compromising air quality. Ground-level ozone concentrations in rural areas with fracking -- previously pristine, like Wyoming -- now rival those of metropolitan areas.

Until now, deregulation and defunding pushed by the industry have left state and federal agencies unable to effectively monitor gas industry activities, let alone regulate them. By exempting itself from public accountability for its actions, the industry -- ironically -- has only succeeded in undermining its own credibility. So far fracking has not been done safely, and apparently can't be, and there is no "watchful eye."

Some concluding points:

The true long-term harms and costs of natural gas extraction, considered cumulatively, decisively outweigh, in our assessment, any short-term benefits. Yet these direct and indirect costs are conspicuously ignored or dismissed by the industry. Defunding and deregulation have ensured that few objective studies of natural gas extraction have been done, allowing the gas industry to claim, as the tobacco industry used to do, that harms are unproven.

Individually, fracking harms are as well documented as can reasonably be expected. If they have not received the attention they deserve it is because the industry has kept the dots from being connected. When that happens, the rationale for public policy promoting natural gas using current technologies disappears.

Indeed, reports of the baleful consequences of drilling have become so widespread as to be undeniable. Thousands of incidents -- spills, contaminations, blowouts, etc. -- are now on record. In upstate New York, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere in the drilling areas, awareness of these multiple harms has galvanized local citizen responses into a widespread, grassroots movement against fracking.

This is an under-the-radar revolution, an outbreak of populist democracy, of people fighting to take

back their communities. Given the failures to date of federal and state governments to protect local communities, municipalities are taking matters into their own hands.

NYS enjoys "home rule" which allows cities and towns to prohibit uses such as heavy industry, including fracking for natural gas, through local zoning and land use laws. A number of towns in NYS - in Otsego, Tompkins, and Sullivan counties, among others - under public pressure have begun passing or improving such ordinances. The cities of Buffalo NY and Pittsburgh PA, and a number of PA townships, have also banned fracking within their borders.

In sum, the entire issue of natural gas and other fossil fuel production needs to be reframed. The conventional financial analysis of profit and cost fails to capture the true costs involved. In addition to conventional marketplace calculations, we need to determine the oil and gas industry's longer term ecological and social costs. Though it is difficult to integrate the tools needed to make cumulative calculations, the approximations we have gathered in our document collection strongly suggests that the industry, if it continues to develop, will do far more harm than good.

Adrian Kuzminski is the moderator of Sustainable Otsego, an advocacy network in the Cooperstown, NY, area since 2008. He is also the author of "Fixing the System: A History of Populism, Ancient & Modern" and other works.

Green Panic and Growing Anti Shale Gas Propaganda - OilPrice.com - 5/31/11

By Paul Driessen

Remember all this? America is running out of natural gas. Prices will soar, making imported liquefied natural gas (LNG) and T. Boone Pickens' wind farm plan practical, affordable and inevitable. Well, reality intervened. We are having an energy transformation, but just the opposite of what the non-market energy planners predicted.

Shale Gas Revolution

Barely two years later, America (and the world) are tapping vast, previously undreamed-of energy riches - as drillers discover how to produce gas from shale, coal and tight sandstone formations, at reasonable cost. They do it by pumping a water, sand and proprietary chemical mixture into rocks under very high pressure, fracturing or "fracking" the formations, and keeping the cracks open, to yield

trapped methane.

Within a year, U.S. recoverable shale gas reserves alone rose from 340 trillion cubic feet to 823 tcf, the Energy Department estimates. That's 36 years' worth, based on what the USA currently consumes from all gas sources, or the equivalent of 74 years' of current annual US oil production. The reserves span the continent, from Barnett shale in Texas to Marcellus shale in Eastern and Mid-Atlantic states - to large deposits in western Canada, Colorado, North Dakota, Montana and other states (and around the world).

Instead of importing gas, the United States could become an exporter. The gas can move seamlessly into existing pipeline systems, to fuel homes, factories and electrical generators, serve as a petrochemical feedstock, and replace oil in many applications. States, private citizens and the federal government could reap billions in lease bonuses, rents, royalties and taxes. Millions of high-paying jobs could be "created or saved." Plentiful gas can also provide essential backup power for wind turbines.

Production of this much gas would reduce oil price shocks and dependence on oil imports from the likes of Gadhafi and Chavez, while lowering greenhouse gas emissions. Talk about a game changer! 'Green' Panic-and New Propaganda

What's not to like? Plenty, it turns out. The bountiful new supplies make environmentalist dogmas passé: the end of the hydrocarbon era, America as an energy pauper, immutable Club of Rome doctrines of sustainability and imminent resource depletion, the Pickens' Plan and forests of wind turbines.

What to do? Environmentalists voiced alarm. HBO aired "Gasland," a slick propaganda film about alleged impacts of fracking on groundwater. Its claims have been roundly debunked (for instance, methane igniting at a water faucet came from a gas deposit encountered by the homeowner's water well - not from a fracking operation). A politically motivated Oscar was predicted, but didn't happen.

The Environmental Protection Agency revealed a multiple personality disorder. Its Drinking Water Protection Division director told Congress there is not a single documented instance of polluted groundwater due to fracking. (Studies by Colorado and Texas regulators drew the same conclusion.)

EPA's Texas office nevertheless insisted that Range Resources was "endangering" a public aquifer and ordered the company to stop drilling immediately and provide clean water to area homes. EPA officials then failed to show up at the hearing or submit a single page of testimony, to support their

claims.

Meanwhile, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson announced plans to conduct a "life-cycle" or "cradle-to-grave" study of hydraulic fracturing drilling and gas production techniques, to assess possible impacts on groundwater and other ecological values. Depending on whether the study is scientific or politicized, it could lead to national, state-by-state or even city-by-city drilling delays, bans - or booms.

The industry and many states that have long experience with drilling and are confident the needed regulations, practices and testing procedures are already in place. They voice few worries, except over how long a life-cycle study could take or how political it might become. In fact, it's a very useful tool.

But if a life-cycle study is warranted for hydraulic fracturing, because drilling might pass through subsurface formations containing fresh water, similar studies are certainly called for elsewhere: wind turbine manufacturing, installation and operation, for instance.

Turbines require enormous quantities of concrete, steel, copper, fiberglass and rare earth minerals - all of which involve substantial resource extraction, refining, smelting, manufacturing and shipping. Land and habitat impacts, rock removal and pulverizing, solid waste disposal, burning fossil fuels, air and water pollution, and carbon dioxide emissions occur on large scales during every step of the process. China Connection

Over 95% of global rare earth production occurs in China and Mongolia, using their technology, coal-fired electricity generation facilities and environmental rules. Extracting neodymium, praseodymium and other rare earths for wind turbine magnets and rotors involves pumping acid down boreholes, to dissolve and retrieve the minerals. Other acids, chemicals and high heat further process the materials. Millions of tons of toxic waste are generated annually and sent to enormous ponds, rimmed by earthen dams.

Leaks, seepage and noxious air emissions have killed trees, grasses, crops and cattle, polluted lakes and streams, and given thousands of people respiratory and intestinal problems, osteoporosis and cancer.

In 2009, China produced 150,000 tons of rare earth metals - and over 15,000,000 tons of waste. To double current global installed wind capacity, and produce rare earths for photovoltaic solar panels and hybrid and electric cars, China will have to increase those totals significantly - unless Molycorp and other companies can rejuvenate rare earth production in the US and elsewhere, using more

modern methods.

Made in China turbines are shipped to the USA, trucked to their final destinations, and installed on huge concrete platforms; new backup gas generating plants are built; and hundreds of miles of new transmission lines are constructed. That means still more steel, copper, concrete, fuel and land. Moreover, the backup power plants generate more pollution and carbon dioxide than if they could simply run at full capacity, because as backups for turbines they must operate constantly but ramp up to full power, and back down, numerous times daily, in response to shifting wind speeds. Industrial Wind: Anything but Green

Wind farms require roads and 700-1,000 ton concrete-and-rebar foundations, which affect water drainage patterns in farm country. The 300-500 foot tall turbines affect scenery, interfere with or prevent crop dusting over hundreds of acres, and kill countless birds and bats. Farmers who lease their land for wind turbines receive substantial royalty payments; neighbors are impacted, but receive no compensation.

Despite these ecological costs, wind farm projects are often fast-tracked through NEPA and other environmental review processes, and are exempted from endangered species and migratory bird laws that can result in multi-million-dollar fines for oil, gas and coal operators, for a fraction of the carnage.

Perhaps worst, all this is supported generously by renewable energy mandates, tax breaks, feed-in tariffs, "prioritized loading orders," and other subsidies, courtesy of state and federal governments and taxpayers. In fact, wind power gets 90 times more in federal subsidies than do coal and natural gas, per megawatt-hour of electricity actually generated, according to US Energy Information Administration data. And wind-based electricity costs consumers several times more per kilowatt-hour than far more reliable electricity from coal, gas and nuclear power plants.

Simply put, the wind is a free energy input when it blows. But to turn such a dilute, intermittent energy source into usable electricity, massive capital investment is required. So-called renewable, green, eco-friendly wind energy system is anything but cheap. Conclusion

The persistent problems with 'green energy' were summarized by Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger in their new essay, *The Long Death of Environmentalism*:

We need to acknowledge that the so-called "soft energy path" is a dead end. fossil fuels.. [R]enewable energy, which [Amory] Lovins and others were claiming even as early as the late 1970's was cheaper than fossil energy, remains expensive and difficult to scale. Renewables still cost vastly

more than fossil based energy, even before we calculate the costs associated with storing and transmitting intermittent forms of energy. Wind energy, according to the latest EIA estimates, still costs 50% more than coal or gas. Solar costs three to five times as much.

It might be far better all around to simply build the most efficient, lowest-polluting coal, gas, and nuclear generating plants possible, let them run at full capacity 24/7/365 - and just skip the wind power.

Life-cycle studies would be a positive development - for all energy sources. In fact . "Think globally, act locally" might be a very good motto for EPA and wind energy advocates.

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and Congress of Racial Equality, and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death.

Boone Pickens: We Are Fueling Terrorism by Paying OPEC - GuruFocus.com - 5/31/11

Pickens first started rolling his idea to transition American transportation fuel to natural gas in 2008. Of course it got kicked to the side for a while when oil prices subsequently collapsed.

He is back again, and it is a bit hard to see why his idea doesn't make a lot of sense.

Key points from the video:

- Pickens thinks money that is paid to OPEC often gets into the hands of terrorists.
- US natural gas is the lowest priced natural gas in the world. It is \$4 per mcf in the States versus \$10 per mcf in the Mid-East.
- He is looking for a government subsidy of \$1 billion per year for five years to get the transition to natural gas up and running.
- His proposal includes moving government vehicle fleets to natural gas as well as 18 wheelers.
- Koch industries (private company) opposes the Pickens plan because subsidies make for an unfair playing field. Pickens calls this gobbly-gook as Koch takes subsidies for ethanol.
- Natural gas is \$2 per gallon cheaper than diesel. Pickens thinks the market will cause truckers to

move to natural gas eventually but that government subsidies will greatly speed up the process.

- Natural gas is cheaper, abundant and cleaner.
- Cheniere is now planning an LNG facility to export natural gas outside the States. Pickens said we will go down as the dumbest crowd in history if we end up exporting natural gas which we have lots of and is clean and cheap while we continue to import expensive, less clean oil that comes from countries that hate us.

Obama Budget: Zero% Approval in the Senate - HumanEvents.com - 5/30/11

By Brian Darling

The Senate unanimously rejected President Barack Obama's budget for fiscal year 2012 last week. All but five Republicans stood behind the budget plan of Rep. Paul Ryan (R.-Wis.). The Senate is moving in the right direction-against free-spending, big-government policies and toward comprehensive entitlement reform.

Late last week, the Senate structured four votes on motions to proceed to the budget plans of President Obama, Rep. Ryan, Senators Pat Toomey (R.-Pa.) and Rand Paul (R.-Ky.) The vote on President Obama's budget was a humiliating 0-97. The President lacks any support for his \$3.7 trillion plan for next year, which would create \$8.7 trillion in new spending, \$1.6 trillion in new taxes and add \$13 trillion in new debt over the next 10 years.

The left has attacked the Ryan budget, yet it received 40 more votes than the President's-40-57, with Senators Scott Brown (R.-Mass.), Susan Collins (R.-Maine), Olympia Snowe (R.-Maine), Lisa Murkowski (R.-Alaska) and Rand Paul voting in opposition to the Ryan plan. Sen. Paul seemed to be the only Republican to vote against the plan because he wants a budget that balances sooner. Most Republicans went on the record to support the Ryan budget, with two senators, Pat Roberts (R.-Kan.) and Kay Bailey Hutchison (R.-Tex.) missing the vote.

Sen. Toomey's plan, which balances the budget in 10 years, failed 42-55. Sen. Paul's plan, which balances it in five years, failed 7-90. No Democrat plan received even one vote and the Democrat-controlled Senate continues a tradition of not producing a budget for the fiscal year.

Senate Budget Committee Chairman Kent Conrad (D.-N.D.) seems incapable of gathering enough Democrats to pass any budget plan for the year. Even though current spending levels on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security are bankrupting the nation, the left apparently does not want to subject those programs to any reforms that would make them more efficient and less wasteful.

Obama Causing High Gas Prices

Last week, Rep. Darrell Issa (R.-Calif.), chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, chaired a hearing on high gas prices. Issa accused the Obama Administration of implementing energy policies that drive up gas prices in an effort to force high-priced alternative energy sources on Americans.

Rep. Issa told Greta Van Susteren on Fox News before the hearing that "very clearly we are living up to [Secretary of Energy] Stephen Chu and President Obama's predictions and desire to get us to \$8 gasoline." The Obama Administration has done virtually nothing to expand drilling in an effort to reduce

Follow us on [Facebook](#)! Or Twitter @pickensplan