



Letters Editor, *The New York Times* (by E-mail)

March 28, 2002

**The Hidden Energy Consensus**

To the Editor:

Your March 27 editorial “One-Way Discussion on Energy” says unbalanced process makes bad policy. True, but unnecessary. The National Energy Policy Initiative ([www.nepinitiative.org](http://www.nepinitiative.org)) recently reached consensus on an energy vision, goals, and strategies that can meet America’s needs without compromise or conflict.

The NEP Initiative’s process was inclusive and transparent, run by two nonpartisan nonprofit organizations and funded at arm’s length by seven foundations. Interviews with 75 diverse constituency leaders revealed broad common ground. On this, a distinguished bipartisan group of private- and public-sector energy policy experts built an integrated policy framework emphasizing what most Americans agree about—efficiency, competition, innovation, fairness. That synthesis was released to Congress on March 14 by Sen. Bingaman (D-NM) and Rep. Bartlett (R-MD). Offering practical, innovative ways to create “an energy system that will not run out, cannot be cut off, supports a vibrant economy, and safeguards our health and environment,” its widely shared ends and win-win means can command wide support.

Already, 33 senior energy experts have endorsed the NEP Initiative’s policy framework. Half are or were senior energy-industry executives. Others’ backgrounds include two Presidential advisors, two Deputy Secretaries of Energy, five Subcabinet officials (Energy, State, Defense, Commerce, EPA), a CIA Director, two senior staff economists from the President’s Council of Economic Advisors, chairmen or members of two Federal and three State energy regulatory commissions, and a House energy leader. Their wide political spectrum makes their message especially timely for a fractured Senate.

Amory B. Lovins, CEO (Research)  
Rocky Mountain Institute, Snowmass, Colorado