

THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

**PRESS CONFERENCE
ON
THE FINDINGS OF
THE UNITED NATIONS INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL
ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

**WITH
SECRETARY SAMUEL W. BODMAN,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

**STEPHEN JOHNSON, ADMINISTRATOR,
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**VICE ADMIRAL CONRAD LAUTENBACHER,
ADMINISTRATOR,
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION**

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2007
10:00 A.M.
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

*Transcript by:
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.*

SECRETARY SAMUEL BODMAN: Good morning. I'm Sam Bodman, the secretary of Energy. Thank you all for being here today. I'm joined today by EPA administrator Steve Johnson, my colleague on my right, and my old colleague, Vice Admiral Lautenbacher on the left, who is undersecretary of Commerce and the administrator of NOAA. Each of us will make some brief comments and then we will open it up for questions.

The real purpose of the gathering here is to take note of the publication of the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change -- IPCC. We're very pleased with it, we're embracing it, we agree with it, and the science behind it is something that our country has played a very important role in -- more about that from Admiral Lautenbacher.

As the president has said, and this report makes clear, human activity is contributing to changes in our Earth's climate, and that issue is no longer up for debate. The United States has been a very active participant, as I mentioned, in the development of this report, with scientists from both the government and the private sector involved in the drafting and review of the report.

In fact, the United States has been a leader in climate science. Since 2001, this administration has been investing roughly \$2 billion a year in just the science part of this -- the global climate science program -- Climate Change Science Program, in order to really get a better understanding of just what is causing these changes. This is a very difficult problem because of the natural variability of climate that exists, and trying to get a sense of what the underlying processes are that may be changing things and apparently are changing things.

This administration has consistently supported the view that both the challenge and the possible solution to climate change must be based on sound science. So at the same time that we're seeking better answers to the scientific questions, the president also committed significant resources to developing new technologies to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants.

I served as the deputy for three years in the Department of Commerce, where I worked very closely with Admiral Lautenbacher and others there, and I now have the privilege of serving as the secretary of Energy. In those capacities, I have seen the extraordinary commitment of our government scientists and engineers and policy makers to confronting the challenge, to learn as much about it as we can, and to develop science-based solutions to tackle it.

I think the record of strong investment speaks for itself. I think each of us will cover this, but we've had, since 2001, the way we make it, about \$29 billion invested in both the science and the technology parts of this. We estimate that the U.S. has invested more in climate change science than the rest of the world combined. And while that is entirely appropriate given the size and the scope of our economy, that is, I think, a very remarkable statistic.

These investments are already yielding significant results. The president has set out an aggressive goal that the U.S. would cut the emissions intensity in our economy by 18 percent by the year 2012, and we're on track to meet that goal.

We must continue to develop solutions that are technically and economically sound -- that is also part of his policy. And we also have to complement our technology programs with common sense policies to encourage the development and commercialization of clean energy solutions that will help further the -- further curb the growth of emissions. An example of that is this 20-in-10 Program that the president announced: a 20-percent reduction in gasoline usage; 15 percent coming from the use of alternative fuels, 5 percent from an increase in CAFÉ standards that the president announced in his State of the Union address this year.

I want to sincerely thank the U.S. participants, particularly Susan Solomon of NOAA, for their strong commitment and their hard work. I will with that -- having said that, I will now turn this over to my colleagues; first, Admiral Lautenbacher, and then he will be followed by Administrator Johnson.

VICE ADMIRAL CONRAD LAUTENBACHER: Thank you, Secretary Bodman. Also, thank you for your leadership in this area. It's been very important, I think, to this process that we're involved in.

I would like to make a few points just on the science part of it, since that's where my portfolio lies. This is a report by scientists. It's an international body that was created a number of years ago. It's strongly supported by the United States, both by -- in the science community and from a monetary and international aspect.

I want to make a couple of comments about Susan Solomon. She was the leader of Working Group One, a major drafter of this report, and a very distinguished scientist. She was the leader in the field of determining the chemistry that caused the ozone hole, a prime contributor to our ability to set up the Montreal Protocol, which is nowadays contributing to closing that ozone hole.

NOAA also has many other scientists -- excuse me. We have nine lead authors of this reports, and probably in the order of a hundred or more government scientists within NOAA -- just within NOAA that have contributed to this report.

One of the important aspects and contributions from the United States was the improvement in our modeling ability -- our ability to model the climate. We spent and put a considerable amount of effort into improving our ability at the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, as we call it, in Princeton, which is a NOAA laboratory, and worked to build models which are well above the state of the art that was available for the last report that came out. So we have a number of advances that have come out in this, and this work is very important both to NOAA and our people.

But I want to go beyond that because it's a federal government report basically. We have a Climate Change Science Program created early in the administration to bring the efforts of 13 agencies together, including the three that you see up here today, to work together collaboratively

to build the best science possible and to make advances in our -- in this, what I would call a very strong team effort to gain improvements in our ability to predict climate. And as mentioned, 5 billion (dollars) annually, both in science and technology, and in the area that I'm responsible for, over \$9 billion spent in the science area since 2002. This IPCC report is a result of that.

Now in addition, the U.S. Science Program is now producing assessments. We produced the first one last year, which is labeled "Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences." This was a landmark report that reconciled some of the issues that we had in determining lower temperatures in the troposphere based on different observational data sets.

It has been published and received very well. It helped to increase confidence in our understanding of climate changes and showed clear evidence of human influence on the climate system. We will be producing 13 more of these reports this year, and the balance of the 21 will come out next year. So there is a great deal more work to be done.

I might mention that one of the next -- and one -- and -- reports that actually influenced the IPCC report is something we call "Aerosol Properties and Their Impacts on Climate." Aerosols are one of the major unknowns. Areas where we need to determine exactly what the forcing functions are of aerosols. A great deal of work has been done, that report will be coming out this year.

I also want to, again, emphasize our commitment to sound science, our commitment to take into account these reports and use them for the benefit of the nation.

With that, I would like to step aside and allow my colleague from the Environmental Protection Agency, Steve Johnson -- Administrator Steve Johnson talk.

Thank you.

STEPHEN JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Admiral. I appreciate it, and thank you all for being here today.

The release of the IPCC report marks a great day for the scientific body of knowledge on climate change, and I really do want to congratulate my colleagues, both here at home as well as abroad, for their years of research and assessment and for their deliberative review of this extraordinary report.

As a lifelong scientist, I am a true believer in the power of science to improve our lives. And as the head of the premier environmental agency in the world, I'm very proud of the Bush administration's unparalleled efforts to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions.

Since 2001, the EPA and the entire administration have invested more than \$29 billion to not only study climate change science, but to promote energy-efficient and carbon-dioxide-reducing technologies, and fund tax incentives. Over the past five years, as science has evolved, this administration has moved forward, developing the technological solutions today which will drive our environmental successes tomorrow.

Through common sense programs like Energy Star, President Bush, the EPA and the Department of Energy are reducing our nation's carbon footprint by offering consumers and businesses environmentally friendly energy choices. In 2005 alone, Americans, with the help of purchasing Energy Star products, saved \$12 billion on their bills and prevented greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to 23 million automobiles. Let me put that in perspective. That equals the emissions of all of the cars in California and Illinois combined. The Bush administration's aggressive yet practical strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is delivering real results.

Again, I'd like to congratulate my colleagues, and I look forward to using their scientific findings as we continue our nation's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Through our commitment to sound science and innovation, the Bush administration has built a solid foundation to address the environmental challenges of the 21st century. Thanks so much.

(Cross talk.)

SEC. BODMAN: I'm going to say a couple of words first about the technology -- Climate Change Technology Program, and then we will be happy to take questions.

The Climate Change Technology Program is run out of the Energy Department and coordinates the work of scientists and engineers -- mostly engineers, I think -- from about 10 different agencies. As the admiral just pointed out, the science program is coordinating and aggressively funding the underlying science that is helping us to understand how our earth's environment is changing and what options we have to mitigate those changes. This is really extraordinarily important work.

But to complement those efforts, the CCTP -- the technology program -- aims to develop advanced technologies that enable their commercialization; in other words, to take the science and help get it to the marketplace. The program's work is centered in -- really around four goals: to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, one -- that's from the end uses of energy infrastructure; secondly, to reduce emissions of our energy supply; thirdly, to better capture and sequester carbon dioxide; and fourthly, to reduce emissions from non-carbon dioxide gases -- non-carbon dioxide greenhouse gases. Substantial work is already underway to address each of these four goals in the near, the medium and the long term.

Let me just give you one example related to the goal of reducing CO₂ emissions from our energy supply. To achieve near-term results, R&D projects are focused on developing stationary hydrogen fuel cells, making solar photovoltaic technologies cost competitive, and demonstrating the use of cellulosic ethanol, among other things. Mid-range projects are focusing on developing advanced biorefineries, co-producing hydrogen from coal and biomass, and bringing online the next generation of nuclear power plants and zero-emissions coal plants -- that's the FutureGen project.

And for the long term, we're focused on developing and deploying those technologies on a massive scale to enable widespread access to renewable energy, nuclear energy and zero-emissions fossil energy. Many of these projects will receive even more aggressive investment through the

Advanced Energy Initiative that the president talked about in last year's State of the Union address, which aims to dramatically change the way we power our homes, our automobiles and our businesses over the next 20 years.

The president's energy policies go hand in hand with our efforts to address climate change. They're really two sides of the same coin. The point is, the technology, we believe, will allow us to meet the president's ambitious challenge -- ambitious goals -- to cut the emissions intensity of our economy by 18 percent and to reduce our gasoline usage by 20 percent in 10 years.

It will also enable results that are yet unimagined. A lot of what goes on in this area really will go on in the private sector, and that's something that we don't know about. We do our own work here. But we are very pleased with it.

I should mention that the technology program has got a little summary book, and I think these are available, if I'm not mistaken, for you if you have an interest in taking a look at that at the end of the day. That's a paid political announcement from the Energy Department, since we're responsible for it.

With that, we'll be happy to take questions. Right in front.

Q: Thank you, sir. It's Chris Baltimore with Reuters.

SEC. BODMAN: Yes, sir.

Q: You've called this IPCC report extraordinary. You're embracing it. If that's the case, why can't the Bush administration move towards mandatory caps like many of your European colleagues are doing, like now many people on Capitol Hill are calling for? Would that be the next step, sir?

SEC. BODMAN: Well, you know, the whole issue of caps and, you know, mandatory changes -- first, we want to be careful that we don't -- that we follow the law of unintended consequences so that we want to -- you know, we want to look at all things carefully.

But secondly, we're trying to accomplish the various goals here as best we can by using market forces to take into the account the needs. This is a matter of continuous debate, in my own judgment, that we will need a global solution; that even if we were successful in accomplishing some kind of debate in the discussion about what caps might be here in the United States, we are a small contributor to the -- when you look at the rest of the world. And so it's really got to be a global solution. One would have a concern about the fact that it might be -- that there would be global consequences, that -- just as the Kyoto Protocol has got problems in terms of its adherence.

So we are fully engaged right now with Asia, particularly with India and China in the Asia-Pacific Partnership. We've worked actively with the Chinese in terms of their use of nuclear power. That's something that we had a hand in in terms of advocating for the use of nuclear power, which is an emissions -- or at least CO₂, greenhouse gas-emissions-free type of technology, clean-coal

technology in China as well. So in all cases we are attempting to make use of voluntary, market-based products.

Do you want to comment, Steve?

MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Let me just add to that. Thanks, Sam.

The real story here today is really twofold. One is complimenting the science and the science community in coming together in a collaborative way to address science issues. They -- and indeed, as you've heard from all of us, are praised.

The second part is really the true story. What's the true story? The true story is because of the Bush administration's investment -- \$29 billion, both in science as well as technology as well as in tax incentives -- that we are able to stand up here today and say we're advancing the science, we're advancing the technologies that will address the problem, and we're providing incentives, including tax incentives. So where -- we have aggressive, yet they're practical solutions that we're pursuing to address this important issue.

SEC. BODMAN: Yes, sir.

Q: Yeah. Darren Samuelsohn from Greenwire.

U.S. emissions have been rising. You have, as you say, tried to lower them relative to economic growth, but U.S. emissions are rising. This report describes, ultimately, a global stabilization level that is necessary to avert all the different scenarios that have been laid out here.

Taking all that into account, why can't the Bush administration try and actually lower emissions outright, as opposed to just limiting them to economic growth?

SEC. BODMAN: I've already spoken to that. I guess I'd try to say it in a different way.

There is a concern within this administration, which I support, that the imposition of a carbon cap in this country would -- may lead to the transfer of jobs and industries abroad that do not have such a carbon cap, and that you would then have the U.S. economy damaged on the one hand, and the same emissions -- in fact, potentially even worse emissions, because in many of these countries they don't have the kind of standards that Mr. Johnson works on day in and day out. And so, I mean, that's the -- that's the problem. And just setting up something just for the United States may well lead to hurting our economy and not improving the emissions picture of the globe.

Do you want to comment, Steve?

MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

Again, it's -- as the secretary has mentioned, I mean, we really in the United States have a comprehensive plan and approach and strategy for dealing with greenhouse gas emissions; not only here domestically, but internationally. And we've got a number of programs; for example,

methane, which is 20 times more potent a greenhouse gas than what CO₂ is. So we have activities and programs under way in the United States, but we also have programs in over 300 countries that we have launched -- it was the United States that launched it -- called Methane to Markets, where we have 60 percent of the methane emissions covered by this group of people and we're working actively -- it's technology driven. But we're seeing great things.

For example, Caterpillar just recently was awarded a contract in China to build a plant that's going to be fueled from the methane gas from a coal mine. And so here is -- we're capturing -- they're capturing the methane gas, a potent greenhouse gas, and using it as an energy source. And we're promoting that across the world; again, just one example of the many examples of how we are approaching and dealing with greenhouse gas emissions.

Q: Mr. Secretary or Administrator Johnson, this question has to do with the current report's lowering of its forecast of sea level increases compared to the last or the third annual report of two years ago. Does this raise the possibility from the administration's point of view that the next climate report will further reduce the ocean levels' increase and perhaps mitigate concern about global warming consequences?

SEC. BODMAN: Since a lot of this is science-based, let me ask the admiral to take that. I'll be happy to comment on it but --

ADM. LAUTENBACHER: Thank you.

SEC. BODMAN: We'll try to share the work here.

ADM. LAUTENBACHER: Obviously the report was just released, so our ability to detail and analyze every sentence that's in this large report will -- we will take a few days obviously to go through it, as you will. But the report does have a lower prediction for sea level rise for the next century than the previous report did -- that's very true. That's a basis of the -- on the refinement of the models, and it shows that we're making progress in trying to understand the complex dynamics that take place in these -- remember, these models run for three months for one run to determine what's going on. I mean, this is a big huge effort, so I would expect more advances in modeling.

Now one of the issues that we see that this didn't take into account -- and I think you'll get that from some of our scientists who we will make available today and throughout the day to talk to is that it doesn't take into account the latest research on the glacier dynamics that have been discovered in looking at the Greenland ice sheet, for instance, in detail, and the melting that's taking place, as well as some of the latest breakup mechanics on the Antarctic ice sheet. So those mechanics are not included in the models yet.

So we need to be sure that we -- this is a step in a process to determine how we understand what's going on in the earth -- on the earth and our ability to predict the future we need to continue to invest in the science and build more refined models so that we can answer your question in more detail. But that's where it stands today. It's less, but we believe there are other effects that haven't been taken into account yet.

Q: Kathy Cash (ph), Platts Electric Power Daily. The IPCC report concluded that global temperatures on average will rise 0.2 degrees Celsius per year over the next 20 years, and it said that global increases in CO₂ concentration are due primarily to fossil fuel use. Can you quantify how the voluntary programs that you discuss today will address these findings?

SEC. BODMAN: I can. I don't have it globally at this point in time but I'd be happy -- we'd be happy to, you know, to provide that for you at some point in time soon. I can tell you that the effects of what we are trying to accomplish in this country are something that we're very proud and we're very pleased with. We've made a lot of progress, as the administrator has already mentioned. We are continuing our efforts to work in a cooperative fashion with countries abroad.

I just -- I repeat what I said. For us to set up something that would limit carbon emissions in this country alone is not a solution to the problem. It would -- one would be concerned that one would find an export of jobs and industries abroad. You'd have the same effect or worse in terms of the impact of greenhouse gases on the global climate. This is a global problem, and our economy would be damaged -- doesn't make sense. So I would -- we'd be happy to try to provide further quantification for you. I don't happen to have it offhand.

Yes, sir?

Q: Dave Kramer (ph), Science and Government Report.

SEC. BODMAN: Yes, sir?

Q: I was wondering other than the changes -- improvements in modeling, is there -- are there other factors that cause you to accept this so quickly without really even seeing the report, you know, going into the details? What makes this different from earlier IPCCs?

SEC. BODMAN: Let me try that and then I'd be happy to have my colleagues respond to that. One of the things that I want to emphasize to you is the impact that this administration -- that this president has had on the climate science efforts of the world.

In the last IPCC report -- they come out about every five years -- something like that -- and so it was about five years ago in '01 that the -- pardon me, in early '02 -- that the last report was published. The efforts there were largely dependent on science that was created outside the United States. At that point in time, the leading computer in the world was in Japan for this type of analysis and this type of work. With the investments that have been made, speaking -- I can -- again, it's a paid political announcement just in terms of the efforts here in the Energy Department -- but it's something like if you look at the top 20 supercomputers in the world, something like seven of them are owned and operated by the Energy Department, they're -- of this country. So the advances in science which have helped the scientists at the Princeton Laboratory that the admiral mentioned do the analysis has enabled us to do a lot more effective work.

And so I think it's fair to say that one of the reasons that we are as pleased and have been able to receive the report with such enthusiasm really relates to the fact that our folks have been

very deeply involved in this process for the last five, six years, and that's something we're very pleased and proud of, and it's very important.

Steve, you want to comment or -- (cross talk) --

MR. JOHNSON: And another for Connie as well.

One -- another aspect is, again, part of the -- part of the success story here today and with this report is that as climate change science has evolved, where we're at today is rather than the uncertainties expanding, the uncertainties have been narrowed. And so with this report where there have been a number of uncertainties -- uncertainties in our modeling approaches, uncertainties in some of the basic science issues -- those uncertainties have been reduced. And, of course, that's great from a science perspective. Also as a policy maker, it's much better and easier to make decisions.

And, of course, as I said again, the true story here is because of the president's \$29 billion commitment in both advancing the science and the technologies and approaches to help address it, like tax incentives or some of our other things we mentioned, that's why we're embracing this report. So thanks so much.

Connie, I don't know if you had a --

ADM. LAUTENBACHER: Yeah, I -- the question was have we -- are we embracing this report more than we embraced the previous reports -- the administration. And I think there's some -- been revisionist history brought about. I mean, if you look at what happened when the first report came out, it triggered an immediate round of Cabinet-level briefings by distinguished top scientists in the climate world in the United States directly to Cabinet members led from the White House, which led to a Rose Garden speech by the president, and then a very clear statement in beginning of 2002 that started investing in the programs we are talking about.

So it was taken very seriously then. The administration has never said that humans aren't contributing to global warming, we don't need to do something about it. The issue that we've been arguing about is what is the policy that will get us to the right level. And just before I leave the stage here -- if -- and we can provide these -- if you look at the actual results, the United States has done better in reducing the growth of greenhouse gases than the G-7 and the European nations. If you look at them on average, our program of trying to reduce the intensity by trying to keep into account the economy as well as becoming more efficient has actually lowered our rate of growth to a point where it's below the average of Europe and the G-7. So there's some benefit to what we're doing and we'd like to be able to share that with the world.

Thank you.

SEC BODMAN: Yes, sir?

Q: John Helpern (ph) with the Associated Press. Secretary Bodman, you said before that the United States is a, quote, "small contributor in terms of the rest of the world in terms of greenhouse gas emissions," yet we emit 25 percent or a quarter --

SEC. BODMAN: Right.

Q: -- of all the world's share. Is there a larger percentage at which you would rethink your views on this?

SEC. BODMAN: Is there a larger percentage?

Q: I mean, if we were to contribute a third or a half and you -- would you consider that to be a not small contribution in which you would rethink your views on --

SEC. BODMAN: Look, it is a -- you're quite right. It is roughly a quarter. We use roughly a quarter of the oil of the world and therefore probably the approximation is reasonable. That percentage is declining as we see the development of other economies in the world.

And so the point is, at least from my standpoint, that -- does it make sense to try to put a cap on carbon emissions in this country that would cause damage to this economy and move the industries and the jobs abroad to areas that don't have those kind of limits? It doesn't make sense to me.

Q: Yes. Joe Kalick (sp), Isis News, again.

It's been commonly accepted, I think, that the president's goal of 35 billion gallons of ethanol or other renewable fuels by -- over the next 10 years -- can't be reached without the development of cellulosic ethanol. Does the administration plan any further aid or incentives or support to getting the breakthrough necessary for cellulosic ethanol production on a commercial and cost-effective basis?

SEC. BODMAN: Well, there are a lot of things right now that are going on with respect to cellulosic ethanol. We in the Energy Department are doing research out at the Renewable Energy Laboratory in Colorado.

But I think of greater consequence are the efforts that are ongoing in the private sector. We have funded over the years -- over the past few years joint research work. One particular project at DuPont that we -- when I visited there with the president the morning after the State of the Union address, they were very encouraged by the results that they had accomplished. They showed us examples of what they had produced, where it came from. This is manufacturing ethanol and butanol using bioprocessing from switchgrass, from sawdust, from woodchips, from other waste materials. And so I came away much encouraged by what I saw there.

So I think it's important to recognize this is not just something that the government is spending money on; this is something that private industry is focused on. This is something that for the first time the venture -- the first time in my lifetime -- the venture capital industry is investing

large sums of money in new companies that have ideas in solar energy, wind energy and, indeed, cellulosic ethanol.

So there's a lot of activity going on, and they're doing it for the old-fashioned reason: They think they can make money doing this. And they're, I think -- I felt very encouraged by it. Yes, sir.

Q: Yeah. Manu Raju with CQ.

Mr. Secretary, can you say outright that President Bush would veto any legislation that Congress produces that comes to his desk that includes a cap on emissions either economy-wide or by an individual sector?

SEC. BODMAN: No.

Q: Can you elaborate? Is he --

SEC. BODMAN: That's a decision the president would make. I wouldn't -- I wouldn't make a judgment about that. That's a choice the president would make and --

Q: (Inaudible) -- the administration may soften its opposition to --

SEC. BODMAN: -- it's a judgment that the president would make, sir. And I can't be more explicit than that.

MR. JOHNSON: But, again, to add -- which the secretary's already mentioned -- is what's before the Congress right now, and that is the president, as part of his State of the Union message, said, one, we need to move toward more renewable and alternative fuels, obviously on the supply side. And on the demand side, we need to change the CAFE standard. Automobiles in the United States need to be more efficient. Those are two very specific legislative packages that will deliver real results not only from an energy security standpoint -- Sam's department -- but also from an environmental perspective -- my department.

So that's our focus. And we want to see, and certainly I know the president's very interested in having those two move forward because they will deliver real results.

SEC. BODMAN: This lady right back here.

Q: Yes. Felicity Barringer from The New York Times for the admiral and Mr. Secretary.

Admiral, you spoke about the European average on greenhouse gas reductions. But if you take individual countries in Europe, particularly Germany -- the largest economy -- they have had a carbon cap on, and their economy has grown while they have actually reduced emissions in at least two, I think, of the last four years.

So based on that example -- Germany is not a small economy, but it's nearly as large as ours -- have they lost jobs overseas? Have the consequences that you fear and are projecting as a reason

not to go for a mandatory cap, have those actually occurred in Germany, where this experiment is being tried?

ADM. LAUTENBACHER: Yeah, I'm not the expert to talk to you about the German economy, but I do know there's differences in each of the economies. And some of the reasons for being able to reduce greenhouse gases or increases in greenhouse gases are based on step functions in terms of changing from different kinds of energy. They're also representative of lulls in the economy, differences in immigration policies and things like that.

So to talk about a specific economy at this point, I'm not the expert to give you the answer on that. I'll ask Dr. Bodman if he's --

Q: The Germans do have an ongoing experiment in this, as do other European nations. Haven't we gotten some early signs from this experiment as to whether or not your fears of job loss and increased carbon emissions might actually happen?

SEC. BODMAN: The answer is I don't know. I haven't studied Germany -- the German economy. So I would tell you that we have seen significant job loss in a number of industries in our country that have come -- that have come about for economic reasons. And I don't have any doubt that if -- were we to enter into the kind of -- when you -- you talk about an experiment. The U.S. economy is not something to be experimented with, in my judgment. And one will have to be very careful in making whatever policy changes one made.

And so I can't comment. I don't know -- I don't happen to know about the German economy.

Q: Geoff Brumfiel with Nature Magazine.

SEC. BODMAN: Yes.

Q: Do you have any plans to conduct a systematic analysis of the European economies that are doing cap and trade?

SEC. BODMAN: Do we have any -- we will no doubt be doing work on all the economies of the world and looking at what results they are getting, sure.

Sure, John.

Q: You have ongoing experiments in California and along the East Coast that are just in the budding stage. Do you have a way to follow those? I mean, if you're right, California will lose jobs.

SEC. BODMAN: If I am right, California will lose jobs, and of course we're going to follow those.

Anything else? Yes, sir.

Q: (Inaudible) -- Scott with BNA.

SEC. BODMAN: Yes.

Q: Following up on these last two questions, I wonder if there isn't a conflict here, though, because the administration has been supportive of these state efforts, saying they're examples of experiments in democracy --

SEC. BODMAN: Right.

Q: -- and under our system of government. So isn't there a conflict here? There's a sense that we'll lose jobs if we go to a federal mandatory cap, but there seems to be applause for the states for experimenting in this way.

SEC. BODMAN: Well, I don't think there's -- I don't think there's a conflict there. I mean, you know, in terms of the federal government, in many cases, if jobs were lost in a given state for whatever reason, the most likely place would be to move a business to an adjoining state that didn't have that kind of restriction.

So you know, we'll follow it, obviously, the -- whatever results are accomplished, so that we can inform ourselves. That's not something that is in our bailiwick here at the Energy Department, but there's no -- I have no doubt that we will be doing that.

MR. JOHNSON: Let me just add one other -- one other comment to that. And that -- again, this is from an environment perspective. But looking from an environmental perspective, when I look at where our energy supplies are and what the president's comprehensive plan has, we are investing in solar, we're investing in wind, we're investing in clean-coal technologies. He's made the call for investing in nuclear. We need nuclear power in the United States.

We need to get off the treadmill of dependence on foreign oil. We're investing in technologies that produce cellulosic ethanol more effectively. And so as you look at the comprehensive plan of how we're going to address our energy security issues, there's also the comparable good positive effect on the environment. And that's what we're doing at the federal level, and certainly the states are doing that.

And -- of course, I want to emphasize that as a citizen, each of us has the opportunity to make a difference. Environmental responsibility is everyone's responsibility, including just changing one light bulb from a incandescent light bulb to an Energy Star Compact fluorescent actually saves not only dollars, but it saves greenhouse gases.

So that's why the president and all of us and the entire administration are moving forward on all of these fronts, and that's what we've been doing and that's why we're excited about great science, as it's continued to evolve because of our investment, and we're also very excited about we're seeing changes in greenhouse gas emissions because of the various programs that we have in place.

Q: (Off mike.)

SEC. BODMAN: Yes, sir?

Q: If I could follow up, Congress seems to be moving forward -- Darren Samuelson from Greenwire -- Congress seems to be moving forward with different legislative proposals right now; you're seeing bills that take into account everything that you're talking about, from trying to protect the economy to engaging -- or calling on the United States to engage with other countries -- looking toward what Congress could be developing here in the future --

SEC. BODMAN: Sure.

Q: -- and the question will ultimately come down to will President Bush sign or veto. And I know you can't make that call right now, but --

SEC. BODMAN: Right.

Q: -- do you encourage Congress to continue to try and develop these policies and then you'll look and consider them? It seems like you're leaving that door open.

SEC. BODMAN: We think it's important that -- that all aspects of American society participate in this discussion, and that includes Congress. It includes corporations. There was a group of corporations that made some pronouncements recently -- within the last week, I believe -- about their views of -- on these matters. So I think it's important that all members of our society engage in this discussion and this debate.

I would point out that we still have a lot to learn; we are still learning. I think Admiral Lautenbacher mentioned that there was only one -- there are going to be 21, I think, Connie -- 21 reports that are going to come out of this research effort, and the -- only one of them has been published. There are going to be roughly 12 or 13, I guess, this calendar year, and the balance will come out next year.

So we are continuing to learn. And so as we learn, we not inform ourselves, but we also undertake the kind of -- the very kind of discussion which we encourage.

STAFF: Thank you very much.

SEC. BODMAN: Thank you all.

(END)