

Perhach, William

From: Catanzaro, Michael J.
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2005 6:50 PM
To: mlewis@cei.org
Subject: Re: EIA numbers

That's fine.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: Marlo Lewis <mlewis@cei.org>
To: Catanzaro, Michael J. <Michael_J._Catanzaro@ceq.eop.gov>
Sent: Fri May 27 18:48:38 2005
Subject: RE: EIA numbers

Mike, here's what I'm going to write, unless you advise otherwise: The plan would also lead to the loss of 171,000 non-farm jobs in 2025, according to unofficial estimates not published by EIA.

-----Original Message-----
From: Catanzaro, Michael J. [mailto:Michael_J._Catanzaro@ceq.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2005 6:08 PM
To: Marlo Lewis
Subject: Re: EIA numbers

Marlo, still waiting to hear back from phil on how to cite.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: Marlo Lewis <mlewis@cei.org>
To: Catanzaro, Michael J. <Michael_J._Catanzaro@ceq.eop.gov>
Sent: Fri May 27 17:24:15 2005
Subject: RE: EIA numbers

Thanks Mike. How can/should I cite the job loss estimates? My contact at EIA denied having such estimates.

-----Original Message-----
From: Catanzaro, Michael J. [mailto:Michael_J._Catanzaro@ceq.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2005 4:55 PM
To: Marlo Lewis
Subject: EIA numbers

Marlo,
Here's the information. Let me know if you need anything else.

Best,
Mike

Q. What is your reaction to the recent EIA report that indicates that greenhouse gas caps would only have a minor (0.4%) impact on the us economy?

A.

* The President has previously spoken to his position opposing regulation of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases through a "cap-and-trade" program.

* The EIA report analyzed a proposal by the National Commission on Energy Policy that would reduce cumulative GDP growth by \$570 billion dollars between now and 2025.

* The NCEP proposal would also lead to the loss of 171,000 non-farm jobs in 2025. Job losses over the 2006-2025 period average 62,000 non-farm jobs.

* While the NCEP proposal included a "safety value" of \$7/ton C to limit costs, that still equates to \$0.05/gal of gasoline which further constrains disposable income and limits savings, investments, or opportunities for education.

* In contrast, the President's approach to climate change delivers greater mitigation benefits at less cost - in fact, the NCEP proposal will only reduce emissions intensity of the U.S. economy by 16.8% in 2012; compared to the President's 18% goal.

* The President's climate policies promote improved near-term efficiency while supporting broad-based economic growth.

* Through investment in cleaner, more efficient energy technologies such as hydrogen, carbon capture and storage and advanced nuclear energy, we set a path to slow the rate of emissions growth, stop it, and - as the science justifies - reverse that growth.

* Unlike the NCEP approach which affects only the U.S., the President's approach involves all nations in a common effort to meet our multiple objectives:

- o promoting and maintaining economic growth
- o enhancing energy security
- o reducing pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, and
- o delivering access to enhanced energy resources to support poverty reduction.