

February 19, 2006

Jake Krohn
340 South Atlantic Avenue #4
Pittsburgh, PA 15224

Senator Rick Santorum
511 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Santorum:

Thank you for taking the time to respond to my letter concerning energy exploration and development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). While our views on the matter couldn't be any more different, I appreciate the discourse.

I was pleased to see the defeat of the ANWR drilling provisions in December 2005, but I doubt it is the last time this issue will be broached. According to Matthew Cooper of *Time*, President Bush's 2007 budget "strangely projects \$4 billion in oil leases for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge." I remain optimistic that any attempt to revive the defeated legislation will be soundly beaten back.

I know you are aware of the numbers behind ANWR, so please forgive me if I find your talk of an obligation to "balance a healthy and sustainable environment...with protecting the economic and national security interests of Pennsylvania's and America's citizens" to be less than sincere, and your reasons "why oil exploration is ANWR is good energy policy" to be imprudent.

First, the sincerity: Your status as the recipient of over \$73,900 in campaign contributions from the oil and gas industry is troubling, and goes a long way towards explaining your reluctance to acknowledge the wrong direction ANWR development represents. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, you rank near the top of the list in this category. You are certainly not keeping good company at the top, what with the likes of Tom DeLay and Joe Barton, whose crusade against climate change (and science as a whole) was prompted by a news story about climate change "research" performed by a Canadian businessman and economist. You can claim the dubious distinction, however, of keeping Texas congressmen from making a clean sweep of the top three spots. Congratulations, I guess. I find it hard to believe that you can keep your politics separate from your finances.

And your imprudence? Simply put, there will never be enough oil in Alaska to even begin to wean the U.S. from our addiction to foreign oil. According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), we use approximately 20 million barrels of oil per day. Prudhoe Bay, Alaska's largest oil field and the only super-giant oilfield ever discovered in U.S. territory peaked in 1989 at about 1.5 million barrels/day. Since then, it has been in steady decline and now puts out about 300,000 b/d, a scant 1.5% of our total daily consumption. Again,

according to the EIA, the U.S. oil fields can only produce about 5.5 million b/d, a little less than 25% of what we use.

If we're generous and allow that ANWR drilling could produce another Prudhoe, our total daily output would only rise to 7 million b/d, or 35% of our total consumption. "Energy independence" this is not. And remember, on top of this all is the fact that ANWR is a finite resource. Just like Prudhoe before it, ANWR will one day run dry.

Better to take the wasted effort that has gone into exploration and pro-ANWR legislation and direct it to something that might actually make a difference. One possibility? Improvements to automobile efficiency. Given the incredible advances in technology we have made in the last 20 years, it's astounding to note that the overall fuel economy for cars and light trucks peaked in 1987. Government needs to step in and take a stronger stand with respect to Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) requirements. As Larry Schweiger, the President and CEO of the National Wildlife Federation, wrote in a recent *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* editorial:

Improving automobile efficiency by just three miles a gallon would conserve more than 1 million barrels of oil each day – more than would ever be recovered from the Arctic Refuge – while saving Americans \$25 billion a year at the pump.

That's \$25 billion in immediate savings, income that can be put back into the economy or personal savings. And it compares favorably against your estimated \$20.7 billion savings that ANWR would "save" the U.S. economy by redirecting overseas spending domestically.

The end of the oil economy is upon us. Conservation is the next wave. If the United States is to continue to be a dominant player in the world, we must recognize our Achilles' heel and transform all that we do to meet the challenges of a future without easy energy.

Sincerely,

Jake Krohn
Pittsburgh, PA