MEMORANDUM TO TODD STERN

'97 SEP 6 PM3:12

FROM: Natalie Wymer

DATE: September 6, 1997

RE: Op Eds

The following list shows a status report of various contacts doing opinion editorials around the country. I have just listed our contact's name and the relevant newspaper.

Writing
Cynthia Rosenzweig
New York Daily News

Robert Stempel
Detroit Free Press

Nancy Bacon
Detroit News

Bill Moomaw
Hartford Courant
NOTE: Wrote one for Scripps Howard chain which was recently published.

Karl Rubago
San Antonio Express-News

Stephen Decanio
Orange County Register
NOTE: Yes, but can't do in next couple weeks.

Under consideration
Ken Lay
Dallas Morning News

Steve Percy
Cleveland Plain Dealer

Bud Cherry
Miami Herald

Terry Thorne
Houston Chronicle

Calls pending
Richard Sandor
Chicago Tribune

Stan Changnon
Chicago Sun Times

William Reeves
San Francisco Chronicle

James McCarthy
Boston Globe

Jerry Mahlman
Philadelphia Inquirer

Walter Oechel
San Diego Union Tribune

Nancy Bacon
Detroit News

Michael Glantz
Rocky Mountain News

Jane Lubchenco
Portland Oregonian

Michael McElroy
Boston Herald

Rita Colwell
Baltimore Sun

Bill Easterling
Pittsburgh-Post Gazette

Gerald North
Fort Worth Star-Telegram

Norm Christianson
Charlotte Observer

Don Wilhite
Omaha World-Herald

Jerry Franklin
Seattle Times

Tony Earl
Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

Herman Shugart
Richmond Times-Dispatch

Hazel O'Leary
St. Paul Pioneer Press

Oklahoma City Daily Oklahoman
(Paul working as a result of PCSD)

Steven Hamburg
Providence Journal Bulletin

Robert Shope
Austin American-Statesman

Eric Barron
Allentown Morning Call

Tulsa World
(Paul working as a result of PCSD)

Lawrence Kalkstein
Wilmington News Journal

Newspapers likely to be assigned soon
Newsday
Newark Star Ledger
Minnepolis Star Tribune
New York Post
Phoenix Arizona Republic
St. Louis Post-Dispatch
Atlanta Constitution
Buffalo News
Kansas City Star
Denver Post

Sacramento Bee
Columbus Dispatch
Louisville Courier-Journal
Indianapolis Star
New Orleans Times-Picayune
NOTE: Letter to editor recently published from Gary Groesch. See attached.

Newspapers yet to be assigned
The majority of these newspapers are in significantly smaller media markets than those in the lists above.
St. Petersburg Times
San Jose Mercury News
Orlando Sentinel
Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel
Tampa Tribune
Seattle Post-Intelligencer
Cincinnati Enquirer
Philadelphia Daily News
Memphis Commercial Appeal
Des Moines Register
Jacksonville Florida Times-Union
Little Rock Democrat-Gazette
Palm Beach Post
Norfolk Virginian-Pilot
Asbury Park Press
Dayton Daily News
Riverside Press-Enterprise
Birmingham News
Hackensack Record
Akron Beacon Journal
Fresno Bee
Toledo Blade
Raleigh News and Observer
Grand Rapids Press
Nashville Tennessean
Rochester Democrat and Chronicle
Las Vegas Review-Journal
Columbia State
Tacoma Morning New Tribune
Salt Lake City Tribune
Spokane Spokesman-Review
Knoxville News-Sentinel
Long Beach Press-Telegram

Albuquerque Journal
Sarasota Herald-Tribune
Lexington Herald-Leader
Roanoke Times and World-News
Worcester Telegram and Gazette
San Francisco Examiner
Wichita Eagle

The Times-Picayune

Founded in 1837

GEORGE WILKINS KENDALL
and FRANCIS A. LUMSDEN, *Publishers, 1837-1864*
ALVA MORRIS HOLBROOK, *Publisher, 1864-1867*
ELIZA HOLBROOK NICHOLSON, *Publisher, 1867-1896*
NICHOLSON ESTATE, *Publisher, 1896-1914*
ASHTON PHELPS, *Publisher, 1914-1922*
LEONARD K. NICHOLSON, *Publisher, 1929-1952*
JOHN F. TIMS, *Publisher, 1952-1967*
ASHTON PHELPS SR., *Publisher, 1967-1979*

YOUR OPINIONS | Letters

Fixing global warming good for state's economy

New Orleans

I have good news for those who think solutions of the problem of global warming are too expensive ("Warming threatens state, but solutions too expensive," July 6). They are not, especially compared with the do-nothing alternative.

The solutions are inexpensive, can be implemented quickly and especially benefit the Louisiana economy.

Louisiana is by far the state most at risk from global warming. According to the prestigious 2,100-member United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, approximately 9,000 square miles of low-lying wetlands and salt marshes in the United States will be inundated by a sea level rise due to global warming, an estimate used by president Clinton in a recent speech.

Half of the damage — 4,500 square miles, an area nearly the size of Connecticut — will be sliced out of southern Louisiana.

Louisiana's productive wetlands, conservatively valued at $100 billion, would be largely destroyed. No other state comes close to this level of damage.

Energy efficiency (e.g., compact fluorescent lights, super-efficient refrigerators, motors with variable-speed drives, etc.) is the cheapest and fastest way to avoid producing carbon dioxide. The U.N. panel's study concludes that "10 percent to 30 percent energy-efficiency gains above present levels are feasible at little or no net cost."

The panel also concludes that "the potential for (reductions in) greenhouse gas emissions . . . Exceeds the potential for energy-use efficiency because of the possibility of switching fuels and energy sources."

In the short run, switching fuels means changing from coal, which emits much carbon dioxide per unit of energy, to natural gas, which emits far less.

Louisiana, which has no coal, is second in natural gas production in the United States and supplies one third of the domestic natural gas market. Marketing natural gas to replace coal would enhance Louisiana's recent energy industry rebound and create thousands of new jobs.

In short, Louisiana has the most to lose geographically from a do-nothing or go-slow policy and the most to gain economically from slowing carbon dioxide atmospheric buildup now.

Coal-state politicians such as Sen. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., must be very grateful to Louisiana's elected officials, who are evidently satisfied to follow his thinly veiled efforts to scuttle a meaningful international carbon dioxide treaty. Meanwhile, the world's best climate scientists are predicting that southern Louisiana's wetlands and culture are condemned to disappear beneath rising sea levels within our children's lifetimes.

Where is Louisiana's leadership?

Gary L. Groesch
Executive Director,
Alliance for Affordable Energy

Tuesday, July 15, 1997

COMMENTARY

U.S. Must Lead The Way In Fight Against Global Warming

By Peter Raven

Since 1971, I have led the Missouri Botanical Garden, one of the premier research institutions in the world, in a race to catalog and understand plants from the tropical rain forest and other areas in an effort to build global sustainability. Through the years, I have often said that the destruction of each area of rain forest is one more step toward creating a world in which we cannot live.

Global warming is the life-sustaining phenomenon whereby our atmosphere retains some of the sun's heat in our atmosphere, thus making life possible. Human-induced climate change, however, is the result of our massive burning of fossil fuels which throw this heat-trapping function out of balance. The result is global climatic disruption.

The consequences of disturbing the balance of gases in our atmosphere are becoming self-evident. Rising sea-levels will threaten small island nations and coastal areas generally. It becomes more likely that infectious diseases such as dengue fever, cholera, and encephalitis will spread to new territories.

In my own field, additional pressures will be created on already threatened species. As we continue to increase carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, we will create a world increasingly unlike the one that has been so favorable to our expanding civilization, a world that is likely to have more frequent and severe storms, with more flooding in some areas and more droughts in others.

Although shifting our economy away from its dependence on fossil fuels may sound difficult, it pales in comparison with the threats we face to our economy and our environment if we do nothing. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reached a consensus in 1995, among its 2,500 independent scientists, that humans are having an impact on global climate. It went on to predict further temperature increases of between 1.8 and 6.3 degrees Fahrenheit during the next century and a further sea-level rise of between six inches to three feet by 2100.

This is not a world anyone would wish on the next generation. Fortunately, it's avoidable. In fact, more that 2,000 economists recently came out in support of policies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, for which total benefits outweigh the total costs.

This group inspired five of my colleagues and me to write a statement urging the United States to take a leadership role in reducing greenhouse-gas emissions. This is particularly important as the international negotiations on climate change rapidly approach a December meeting in Japan, expected to produce an international agreement to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. In just a few months, more than 2,000 scientists have answered our call to sign the statement.

Leadership now by the United States will certainly incur the wrath of the fossil fuel industry, but it will soon be remembered and cherished by the world as it positions the United States to lead the world in energy efficient technologies.

Peter H. Raven is director of the Missouri Botanical Garden and home secretary of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.

White House Climate Change Task Force

734 Jackson Place, N.W. • Washington, DC 20503

FAX

To: Natalie Wymer

Organization/Title:

Fax: 456-2215 Phone:

Pages (including cover): Date:

From: Andrew Kanders

Phone:

Message: Nat:
Here's a list of calls made/status re ed boards.
- Blanks indicate no calls were made yet or press contact was not available.
- Will write indicates good possibility of an article being written in the next couple of days.

The rest is self-explanatory.

Please call w/ questions,
Ad

202 343-1060 • Fax 202 343-1162

WHITE HOUSE CLIMATE CHANGE TASK FORCE
STATUS ON CABINET POLICY CALLS

Bruce Babbitt, Secretary, US Department of the Interior
(Press: Stephanie Hanna @208-6414; Scheduling: Maura McManimon @ 208-7351)

PUBLICATION	STATUS
New Orleans Times-Picayune	Not interested
Phoenix *Arizona Republic*	Re-assigned to Glickman
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette	Left message
Portland Oregonian	Scheduled next week
San Diego Union-Tribune	Scheduled next week
San Francisco Chronicle	Dep. Secretary
Seattle Post-Intelligencer	Left message

Carol Browner, Administrator, USEPA
(Press: Stephanie Cutter @ 260-9828; Scheduling: Brendan O'Neil @ 260-0680)

Chicago Tribune	
Ft. Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel	
Hartford Courant	Scheduled for Monday
Miami Herald	Will write
Newark Star-Ledger	
Orlando Sentinel	Will write
Palm Beach Post	Scheduled for Tuesday
Philadelphia Inquirer	Will write
St. Petersburg Times	Will write
Tampa Tribune	

Dan Glickman, Secretary, US Department of Agriculture
(Press: Jim Petterson @ 720-4623; Scheduling: Mary Beth @ 720-3631)

Detroit News	
Indianapolis Star	
Kansas City Star	
Louisville Courier-Journal	
Minneapolis Star-Tribune	
Oklahoma City *Daily Oklahoman*	
Omaha World-Herald	
Phoenix *Arizona Republic*	In Phoenix next week
St. Paul Pioneer Press	
St. Louis Post Dispatch	

Frederico Pena, Secretary, US Department of Energy
(Press: Brooke or Carmen @ 586-4940; Scheduling: Marcus King @ 586-5534)

PUBLICATION	STATUS
Boston Herald	Not interested in writing but will talk
Denver *Rocky Mountain News*	Pena placed call (not sure if they will write)
Detroit Free Press	Pena placed call (not sure if they will write)
Fort Worth Star-Telegram	
Houston Chronicle	Requested Pena to submit op-ed
Milwaukee Journal	
Orange County Register	
Richmond Times-Dispatch	Not interested
Sacramento Bee	Re-scheduled for next week
San Antonio Express-News	
San Jose Mercury News	Pena placed call (not sure if they will write)

Tim Wirth, Undersecretary for Global Affairs, US Department of State
(Press: Suzanne Petroni @ 647-5442; Scheduling: Sandra Ulmer @ 647-6704)
Note: information provided below is from the scheduler, not press contact. Press contact out until Monday)

Atlanta Constitution	
Baltimore Sun	
Boston Globe	
Charlotte Observer	
Chicago Sun-Times	
Cleveland Plain Dealer	
Columbus Dispatch	Scheduled for Monday
Dallas Morning News	
Denver Post	
Il Diario	
Long Island/New York *Newsday*	*Wirth placed call*
New York Daily News	
New York Post	
Seattle Times	

op Eds

MEMORANDUM TO TODD STERN

FROM: Natalie Wymer

DATE: September 12, 1997

RE: Op Eds

Here is an updated status report of various contacts doing opinion editorials around the country. I have attached some recent regional opinion editorials (*Chicago Tribune and Boston Globe*) that have appeared.

NATIONAL

Written
John Browne, BP
Denied but now working different news hook.

Writing
Ken Lay , Enron

Thomas Kasten, Trigen

Roger Sant, AES

Richard Sander, Chicago Board of Trade

Ev Erlich

Under Consideration
Fred Buckman, PacificCorp

Charles Bayliss, Tuscon Electric

Frank Nutter, Reinsurance Association

Calls Pending
William Reilly

Bill Ruckleshaus

George Mitchell

Need to Call
Norm Augustine

REGIONAL

Writing
Cynthia Rosenzweig
New York Daily News

Robert Stempel
Detroit Free Press

Nancy Bacon
Detroit News

Bill Moomaw
Hartford Courant
NOTE: Wrote one for Scripps Howard chain which was recently published.

Karl Rabago
San Antonio Express-News

Stephen Decanio
Orange County Register
NOTE: Yes, but can't do in next couple weeks.

Bud Cherry
Miami Herald

Walter Oechel
San Diego Union Tribune

Michael Glantz
Rocky Mountain News

Tony Earl
Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

Ken Lay
Houston Chronicle

Stan Changnon
Chicago Sun Times

Steve Percy
Cleveland Plain Dealer

Calls pending
William Reeves
San Francisco Chronicle

James McCarthy
Boston Globe

Jane Lubchenco
Portland Oregonian

Michael McElroy
Boston Herald

Rita Colwell
Baltimore Sun

Bill Easterling
Pittsburgh-Post Gazette

Gerald North
Fort Worth Star-Telegram

Norm Christianson
Charlotte Observer

Don Wilhite
Omaha World-Herald

Jerry Franklin
Seattle Times

Herman Shugart
Richmond Times-Dispatch

Oklahoma City Daily Oklahoman
(Paul working as a result of PCSD)

Steven Hamburg
Providence Journal Bulletin

Robert Shope
Austin American-Statesman

Eric Barron
Allentown Morning Call

Tulsa World
(Paul working as a result of PCSD)

Lawrence Kalkstein
Wilmington News Journal

Warren Washington
Denver Post

Ronald H. Pulliam
Atlanta Constitution

Michael A. Mullett
Indianapolis Star

FOR ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS

Chicago Tribune

Chicagoland North

50¢ Newsstand

Tuesday, September 9, 1997

A call to not repeat our fuelish mistakes

By Chris DeCardy

Want to know how the current economic expansion will end? One place to look is outside your window at the cars and trucks on the street. New reports find that Americans are driving more miles with less fuel-efficient cars, trucks and sport utility vehicles. Not surprisingly, we are using more gas than at any time in history—and though no one seems concerned, they should be.

In 1973 and again in 1979, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries controlled just under 40 percent of the world oil market. In 1974 and again in 1980, the cartel raised prices and plunged our economy into the worst recessions of the past two generations. The Iran/Iraq war and other circumstances kept the OPEC market share below 25 percent through the late 1980s, but it is now on the rise. OPEC's current market share sits just under 40 percent, and analysts predict the cartel could (if members can find a way to act in unison) once again hike prices and fizzle our economic boom.

While many sectors of our economy have reduced dependence on oil, transportation use has increased. The problem with our dependence on oil is that once prices go up, it's not easy to quit using it. Most people can't afford to immediately replace their gas guzzler or sell their house and move closer to work. Another problem is that other oil-producing nations can't provide lower-cost oil for a long time. So we're stuck paying high prices for a lot of oil.

The total cost to our economy due to cartel oil prices has been staggering—$4 trillion from 1972 to 1991, according to a report by analyst David Greene of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. That figure nearly equals the entire amount spent on defense during the period, and is twice the total interest paid on the national debt over the same time. It also approaches the entire economic output of our nation for one year.

The report goes on to predict that "a given OPEC price hike in the future will almost surely cause a greater loss of U.S. wealth than in the past because the U.S. will be importing more oil."

Using the entire strategic petroleum reserve would barely dent the impact, and there is little hope that we'll be able to produce more oil at home compared to the rest of the world. Of the estimated remaining sources of oil (and there is a lot left), 55 percent is located beneath OPEC countries while just 6 percent is in the U.S.

Given our current oil consumption pace, the question is not if the next oil price shock will come, but simply when. The only surefire way out of our destiny is to find viable alternatives to oil.

There is another equally compelling reason for action. Oil is a fossil fuel that emits carbon dioxide and other pollutants when burned. It is a cause of lung-searing air pollution that triggers ozone action days in Chicago and other urban areas. It is also a contributor to the build-up of greenhouse gases in the upper atmosphere—global warming—that many scientists believe is causing Earth's climate to change. The resulting weather changes, farming disruptions and spread of diseases may have grave and very expensive impacts.

At the celebrated 1992 Earth Summit in Brazil, industrial nations including the U.S. listened to the climate scientists and pledged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2000. We adopted primarily voluntary programs to reach that target, but it has become clear that the effort will fall far short. Now President Clinton has committed the U.S. to presenting a new plan for reducing greenhouse gases at an international negotiating session later this year. To reach 1990 levels by 2010, the U.S. would have to reduce current emissions of carbon dioxide, the major greenhouse gas, by somewhere around 20 percent.

Dozens of economists from industry, academia, government and other groups have studied the potential costs of such a reduction. Some predict huge costs while others predict new technologies would actually boost the economy. In fact, 2,500 leading economists recently signed a statement organized by the research group Redefining Progress which said that "sound economic analysis shows that there are policy options that would slow climate change without harming American living standards, and these measures may in fact improve U.S. productivity."

But most important, a new summary of these major cost studies by the World Resources Institute indicates that the worst-case prediction for reducing greenhouse gases by 20 percent—which would mean significantly reducing our dependence on foreign oil—could cost the U.S. economy less than an OPEC oil price shock during that time.

By 2010, the Department of Energy predicts that OPEC market share of the world's oil supply could reach a record high of just under 45 percent. While a massive price shock would repeat history and plunge our economy into another deep recession, gradual reduction in our dependence on oil would ease the impact while creating new jobs and new markets for other fuels. Another advantage of action is that ending our dependence on foreign oil is a one-time effort, but OPEC oil price shocks can happen again and again.

In the end, even if the cost approaches the highest predicted (and it most likely will not) and even if there is no environmental and public health benefit from reductions (and there most likely will be), President Clinton could pay for dramatic reductions in greenhouse gas emissions simply in the avoided cost of a coming recession caused by our dependence on OPEC oil. It's cheaper to act now than to stare out the window and wait for our history with oil to repeat.

Chris DeCardy directs the Chicago office of Environmental Media Services, a non-profit environmental research and communications organization.

The Boston Globe

MONDAY, JULY 7, 1997

ROSS GELBSPAN

Thinking big for the planet

As President Clinton noted eloquently at Earth Summit II in New York, we are now confronted by "clear and compelling" scientific evidence of the potentially devastating impacts of heat-trapping coal and oil emissions in the upper atmosphere.

He cited a list of potential consequences that have been predicted by the world's leading 2,000 climate scientists reporting to the United Nations. They include rising sea levels that could swamp part of Florida, Louisiana, and other coastal areas; the spread of infectious diseases such as malaria, dengue, and yellow fever to higher elevations and northern latitudes; and increasingly severe hurricanes, floods, and droughts across the nation and around the world.

While the president spoke vaguely about reducing greenhouse gases, his adviser, Katie McGinty, said that 15 percent reductions in the United States of carbon dioxide – the most important greenhouse gas – by 2010 would be "impossible." Most environmental organizations – as well as governments in Britain, Germany and elsewhere – have called for a 15 percent cut in our oil and coal emissions. A coalition of island nations that fear being flooded out of existence by rising sea levels has staked cut the most ambitious position, calling for 20 percent cut below the 1990 level in our oil and coal emissions.

Such cuts promoted by politicians, business leaders, and even environmentalists don't reflect science, only what is politically feasible. Those cuts will not stave off massive, costly, and deadly disruptions to our existence. Regardless of what is politically acceptable or economically permissible, the laws of supply and demand do not supersede the laws of nature. The science tells us that we must cut emissions by 60 to 70 percent in order to stabilize the global climate.

The good news is that if we step back and think big, we can see that a large-scale effort to keep this planet hospitable to civilization by eliminating use of fossil fuels would also create an unprecedented global economic boom.

What is needed is a global partnership – enforced by the world's governments and implemented largely by the world's energy giants – to achieve a 10-year, worldwide transition to renewable, climate-friendly energy technologies. Such an effort should involve the major oil and coal companies in defossilizing their energy supplies in conjunction with solar, wind, and fuel cell manufacturers. It would create millions of jobs all over the world. It would reverse the widening economic gap between the North and South. And in short order, the renewable energy industry would eclipse high technology as the central engine of growth of the global economy.

On a worldwide scale, we should begin diverting part of the $2 trillion-a-year revenue stream from big coal and big oil to finance windmill plants in India, fuel cell factories in Germany, solar farms in the Middle East, photovoltaic factories in El Salvador, and hydrogen gas plants in Cleveland. The ultimate goal must be to replace all our coal-fired electrical plans, our oil-fired furnaces, our gasoline-burning cars with renewable energy sources with no decline in our standard of living. All that requires is the ramping up of renewable energies to mass production and economies of scale.

President Clinton's announced grant of $1 billion to developing countries for solar, wind and fuel cell energy was a nod in the right direction. But we must go farther. We should at the very least begin by switching the $25 billion in annual government subsidies for fossil fuels to support the development of climate-friendly energy sources. That alone would propel renewable energy into the big league of global industry.

Acknowledging the failure of his earlier, voluntary approach, the president said his next task would be to "convince the American people and the Congress that the climate change problem is real and imminent." He should begin by pointing out both the true scale of the crisis and the enormous opportunity it provides to create a healthy and prosperous future in which continuing development proceeds to meet human needs while observing the limits of the planet.

Anything less will leave us with a profoundly impoverished and almost certainly chaotic prospect.

Ross Gelbspan, a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist, is author of a new book, "The Heat Is On."