



## **T. Boone Pickens Media Coverage 7.23.11 – 7.25.11**

**Total of 6 Placements** • Print: 3 • Blog/Online: 3

### **Coverage Summary**

Jim Cramer spoke at length on Mad Money regarding the Pickens Plan and his hopes that the new Senate Bill would pass. Cramer stated that he was hopeful the bill would pass and that he believed its prospects were better now because of oil price increases, heightened visibility for the benefits of natural gas, and the President's support for the House bill. A link to the video can be found here:

<http://www.cnbc.com/id/43886544>

Politico has a piece reporting that the Senate bill will be introduced. Commentary from Senator Richard Burr is included stating that he cannot imagine why any American would disagree with waning America off OPEC oil. The piece states that the Senate bill has the support of Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and also mentions the President's support in the House.

Bloomberg's editorial board authored an editorial in support of utilizing hydraulic fracturing in conjunction with heavy oversight.

Reuter's market analyst Chris Kimmerlee has an op-ed regarding LNG as a transportation fuel. Kimmerlee states that proposed EPA emissions and fuel consumption standards for heavy-duty vehicles, if implemented, will accelerate the transition from oil to cleaner natural gas. He also notes that continued natural gas penetration into the transportation fuel market could significantly reduce the U.S. trade deficit and reduce dependence on imports from potentially unstable supplies. Kimmerlee concludes by stating that LNG cost must remain well below diesel to compensate for higher capital, operating, and maintenance costs as well as the risk associated with participation in an emerging market.

**Highlighted Placements (Full Articles Below)** • Is the US Closer to Adopting Nat Gas? – [CNBC.com](http://www.cnbc.com) – 7/15/11 <http://www.cnbc.com/id/43886544> • Politico Duo to debut Pickens plan in Senate – Politico – 7/25/11 • View: Cleanly Exploit the Promise of Fracking – Bloomberg – 7/24/11 <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-07-25/cleanly-exploit-the-great-promise-of-shale-gas-fracking-view.html> • LNG poised to become a transportation fuel: Kimmerle – Reuters – 7/25/11 <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/07/25/ls-column-Ing-idUSN1E76O1YF20110725>

**Blog/Online Placements (Full Articles Below)** • The Need for a Real Domestic Alternative Energy Policy in the USA – [OilPrice.com](http://oilprice.com) – 7/25/11 <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Renewable-Energy/The-Need-for-a-Real-Domestic-Alternative-Energy-Policy-in-the-USA.html> • Soros Making More Cash With Congress – [BigGovernment.com](http://biggovernment.com) – 7/25/11 <http://biggovernment.com/capitolconfidential/2011/07/24/soros-making-more-cash-with-congress/> **HIGHLIGHTED COVERAGE**

**Is the US Closer to Adopting Nat Gas? – [CNBC.com](http://www.cnbc.com) – 7/15/11**

By Drew Sandholm, Web Producer

Has the U.S. have realized that natural gas has to be harnessed as a fuel for vehicles?

That was the question on Cramer's mind Monday after a newspaper reported two senators are set to introduce legislation that would provide juicy incentives to trucking companies for buying nat gas-powered vehicles. Right now, most over-the-road truck engines use diesel fuel and are responsible for 25 percent of the oil imported into the USA. This legislation would change that.

Senators Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) and Richard Burr (R-N.C.) are behind the legislation, which is also known as the Pickens Plan. Named for T. Boone Pickens, an oil man who has pushed for domestic fuel independence by way of alternative energy sources. This legislation has failed before, but Cramer thinks it has better prospects now for a few reasons.

First, Cramer said the nat gas story is more well known. Recent finds in several states has encouraged politicians to push this issue because it would create jobs and lessen the U.S.'s dependency on foreign oil. Second, higher oil prices coupled with the apparent natural gas glut make nat gas appealing. Finally, President Obama has come out in support of nat gas after the last time the issue died. Cramer thinks Obama's support could get things going.

If the legislation goes through, Cramer thinks it would be a huge gain for Chesapeake Energy, Devon

Energy, EQT Corp. and Southwestern Energy. It may also bode well for Clean Energy Fuels, which is a national nat gas fueling station chain operator.

Cramer doesn't think this legislation is a shoe-in, but he does feel good about its chances.

## **Politico Duo to debut Pickens plan in Senate – Politico – 7/25/11**

Duo to debut Pickens plan in Senate

By Darren Goode

A bipartisan Senate duo is preparing to debut their version of a T. Boone Pickens-led plan to boost natural gas vehicles.

Sens. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) and Richard Burr (R-N.C.) will be leading the effort, which looks to provide incentives to put more natural gas vehicles on the market, from big long-haul trucks to passenger cars.

Key to the Senate talks is the all-important question of how to pay for the new tax incentives.

"I think what we'd like to do is go ahead and get the pay-fors in place," Burr told POLITICO last week. "We will have a pay for. It will not be one that will be smoke and mirrors, it'll be one that everybody understands. We've got a lot of options we just haven't finalized what we're going to use" to pay for the bill.

Burr and Rep. John Sullivan (R-Okla.) — who is leading similar bipartisan effort in the House — both said they expected the Senate version to be unveiled this week. An aide to Menendez, though, said late last week that it was still being worked on and did not know when it would be released.

The House bill has attracted both a broad bipartisan array of co-sponsors and some tea party-fueled enmity.

The measure led by Sullivan, John Larson (D-Conn.), Kevin Brady (R-Texas) and Dan Boren (D-Okla.) has attracted 182 co-sponsors — generally coupling those in both parties housing areas with high natural gas reserves and those who view natural gas as a cleaner fuel alternative.

But more than a dozen Republican co-sponsors have dropped off at least in part due to an aggressive lobbying effort by fiscal conservatives and industries that use natural gas as a key feedstock in their operations.

The bill would “create a massive new subsidy for a market that is already developing on its own in sectors where the economics support it, at a time when Congress is struggling to cut spending,” the American Chemistry Council argued in a July 13 letter to House Speaker John Boehner. It would also “artificially inflate prices,” the group contended.

ACC has hired Matthew Schlapp — a former vice president for federal affairs at Koch Companies and deputy assistant and political director for President George W. Bush — to lobby on its behalf against the House bill.

Burr said he isn’t concerned about the push against the idea.

“I’ve got the responsibility to try to write energy policy. And in the absence of the leadership from the White House to do a comprehensive bill, I see it absolutely essential that we begin to address those areas that we can predictably do,” he said.

“And I don’t know any American that would disagree with an initiative to try to move part of the fleet of 18-wheel vehicles in this country to natural gas so we’re less reliant on the Middle East and more importantly so we affect the supply and demand so that we can bring down the cost of petroleum and therefore gasoline,” he added.

The overall effort by Pickens earned early backing from Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid.

“That’s important to have the majority leader,” Burr said.

President Barack Obama supports the House bill as well.

Sullivan said a price tag for the House bill is still being worked on by the Joint Committee on Taxation and expects it to be “about \$3 billion or a little more than that.”

He is promising that that cost will be completely paid for with offsets, which he is not detailing yet. “Well we’re trying not to talk about it right now, we got some stolen from us last time,” he said, regarding a version introduced last Congress.

There will "very likely" be a subcommittee hearing on the House bill in the Ways and Means Committee before the August break, Sullivan said, although a Ways and Means spokeswoman said there is nothing yet scheduled.

The bill was also referred to the Energy and Commerce Committee — of which Sullivan is a member — and the House Science, Space and Technology Committee.

## **View: Cleanly Exploit the Promise of Fracking – Bloomberg – 7/24/11**

By the Editors

Hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, the extraction of natural gas from rock thousands of feet below ground, is the latest point of strain in the energy-versus- environment tug of war. We side with those who focus on the technique's promise.

As long as the wells and wastewater pits are carefully built and maintained, fracking can be a relatively clean and safe way to obtain natural gas. Because natural gas can reduce U.S. consumption of crude oil and coal, it can lessen dependence on Mideast oil and significantly reduce greenhouse gases and acid rain.

The U.S. possesses an estimated 827 trillion cubic feet of gas available for extraction from rock, enough to meet current natural gas consumption for 35 years. The U.S. uses about 20 trillion cubic feet of natural gas a year, mostly for electricity production and home heating, but cars and trucks, the biggest consumers of oil, could also be configured to run on natural gas.

Plus, fracking creates jobs for people who do the drilling and build and service the rigs and pipelines. Salaries are relatively high, ranging from \$28,000 for roustabouts to almost \$100,000 for engineers. And the jobs are especially needed in regions that overlie the country's most expansive deposits, the Marcellus Shale -- in eastern Ohio and Kentucky, western Pennsylvania, upstate New York and West Virginia -- which holds some 262 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas.

### **Pennsylvania's Experience**

In Pennsylvania alone, fracking generated more than \$11 billion in economic activity and more than \$1 billion in state taxes last year, according to research done for the Marcellus Shale Coalition, an alliance

of shale gas drillers.

Those who worry that fracking can contaminate water sources have legitimate concerns. The well-drilling process involves digging straight down and then turning horizontally to bore into the layer of shale that contains natural gas. Then, huge amounts of water mixed mainly with sand but also with an assortment of chemicals are pumped at enough pressure to create fissures in the rock, so the gas flows through to the well.

Because the shale is thousands of feet down -- far below aquifers -- the gas and chemicals can be kept away from drinking water sources during the fracturing process. But the chemicals, including such toxic substances as benzene, toluene and xylene, can escape into the environment a number of ways.

### Radioactive Elements

One possible point of leakage is the well. Once the shale is fractured, tens of thousands of gallons of water flows back to the surface, carrying with it the drilling chemicals and sometimes small amounts of radioactive elements that occur naturally below ground. If the well casing is not water-tight, some of the flowback can seep from it.

If feasible, the wastewater is pumped back deep underground. If not, it is poured into pits before removal by truck for treatment and recycling. If storage pits are not lined properly, or the waste is not correctly disposed of, extraction chemicals can find their way into drinking water.

Increasingly, environmental groups and property owners are charging that chemicals used in fracking are turning up in wells and other water sources.

### Need to Know

Fracking is clearly a process that requires regulation. The public needs to know what chemicals are being used. Officials do, too -- in case they have to search for the source of suspected contamination. Proper monitoring is necessary to ensure that drilling and waste management are done safely.

So who should oversee regulation? At the moment, the burden is on state governments. Energy companies say this is ideal, because it allows states to take into account geologic differences and customize laws accordingly. But geology has had little to do with the environmental problems that have arisen so far. Well construction and disposal of waste are where the problems have been.

What's more, state regulators are scrambling to keep up with the fracking boom. The result is a national checkerboard of regulations to protect water, a resource that flows freely across state lines. Then there's that not insignificant matter of fraying state budgets.

### Oversight Needed

All of which leads to an inescapable conclusion: Federal oversight is needed, to provide minimum, uniform rules that protect drinking water everywhere. This will require an adjustment to federal law.

In general, the Environmental Protection Agency, in managing the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, regulates underground fluid injections. However, a 2005 amendment to the Act exempts injections related to oil or gas production, unless they involve the use of diesel (which is just one of about 750 chemicals and other components that suppliers use in their fracking mixes).

U.S. Representative Diana DeGette, a Democrat from Colorado, proposes to close this loophole by allowing the EPA to regulate the actual fracturing process. The proposal would require drillers to disclose to authorities the names and volumes of chemicals they use. To protect proprietary formulas, only the chemicals, not the volumes, would be made public.

Management of fracking waste falls under the federal Clean Water Act, which also needs tightening. An exemption that prevents the EPA from restricting runoff from oil-and-gas industry wastewater pits after rainstorms should be lifted.

Given the boom in shale gas drilling, the EPA can't possibly police it all and will have to depend on state agencies for inspections and enforcement. But the EPA must have more authority to set national standards for the states to follow.

To be sure, shale gas is not a perfect fuel. But then there is no such thing. Compared with coal and oil, gas burns relatively cleanly. Shale gas can help wean us from the dirtier fuels. And it can do so without polluting the water, while lessening dependence on imported oil.

To contact the Bloomberg View editorial board: [view@bloomberg.net](mailto:view@bloomberg.net)

**LNG poised to become a transportation fuel: Kimmerle – Reuters – 7/25/11**

Chris Kimmerle is a Reuters market analyst. The views expressed are his own.

By Chris Kimmerle

NEW YORK, July 25 (Reuters) - Across the United States, more than 11,000 transit buses, nearly 4,000 refuse trucks, over 3,000 school buses, 15,000 to 17,000 medium-duty vehicles and more than 30,000 light-duty vehicles in federal, state, local government and private fleets are already gas-fuelled, according to the Natural Gas Vehicles for America.

Most consume compressed natural gas (CNG) but liquefied natural gas (LNG) is slowly gaining momentum as a replacement for diesel in heavy truck and bus fleets.

LNG is produced by cooling and storing natural gas at minus 260 Fahrenheit (minus 162 Celsius). The result is a liquid that occupies about 1/600 of the volume of pipeline-quality gas on an energy equivalent basis. Under current market conditions, natural gas is less expensive than diesel, and gas-fueled vehicles have lower tailpipe particulate and carbon emissions.

The emergence of CNG and now LNG as transportation fuels is rooted in the growing gap between crude oil and U.S. natural gas prices, but now legislative and regulatory initiatives combined with long-term prospects for an abundant gas supply are stimulating further investment in LNG vehicles and fueling facilities.

Despite its potential advantages, the move to increased use of LNG as a transportation fuel will be evolutionary and is unlikely to disrupt the North American natural gas market over the near to midterm.

The Energy Information Agency has identified only 44 LNG vehicle fueling stations (35 in California, four in Texas, two in Utah, and the remainder in Alabama, Arizona and Connecticut) as of June 2011. Most are dedicated to private fleets thus discouraging wider industry acceptance.

## TRUCKS AND LNG

The transition to LNG-fueled trucks involves some significant corporations, including Cummings Westport, Daimler Trucks North America, Detroit Diesel, Freightliner, Kenworth, Mack, Navistar (NAV.N), Peterbilt, Volvo North America (VOLVb.ST), Republic Services (RSG.N), United Parcel Service (UPS.N), Wal-Mart (WMT.N), and Waste Management (WM.N).

On the supply side are Clean Energy Fuels (CLNE.O), Air Products & Chemicals (APD.N), the Linde

Group ([LING.DE](#)) and Southeast LNG. Each has a different business model: (1) In April, Encana Natural Gas, a subsidiary of Encana Corp (ECA.TO) announced an agreement to use its mobile LNG stations to provide fueling services for Heckmann Water Resources, a firm involved in delivering water to Encana and other gas exploration and production companies in northwestern Louisiana. In addition, Encana plans to build additional fixed-base public LNG fueling stations in Louisiana. [ID:nN05154332] (2) In the west, Boone Pickens' Clean Energy Fuels is the dominant LNG supplier to truck fleets. It owns and operates production facilities in Texas and California capable of producing 260,000 gallons per day and is planning to expand production to 340,000 gallons per day as demand increases. On July 11, Chesapeake Energy (CHK.N) announced its intent to provide \$150 million in financial support to Clean Energy's continued expansion. [ID:nN1E76A1PL] The funds will be dispersed over three years and take the form of convertible debt to be used for the construction of 150 LNG fueling facilities along the interstate highway system. The Chesapeake/Clean Energy initiative is a step to moving LNG from a niche market serving hub and spoke fleet operators to the broader long-haul truck market. (3) Southeast LNG, a joint venture between AGL Resources (AGL.N) and El Paso Corp (EP.N), is also positioning to enter the LNG market. El Paso is the owner of the Elba Island (Louisiana) LNG import terminal while AGL holds LNG peak shaving capacity, used to meet peak day demands of its existing gas distribution systems, in Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia and New Jersey. Their business model looks to leverage the value of their existing infrastructure by trucking LNG to new fleet fueling stations in the southeast. (4) The Linde Group is a major international liquid gas producer. Linde has developed world-scale base load LNG production facilities, small to mid-scale base load and peak shaving operations as well as floating production storage and offloading vessels. Now it is considering the deployment of pocket size liquefaction plants at truck fueling stations. To date, Linde is involved in joint ventures with Waste Management to convert landfill gas into a LNG truck fuel.

## POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Using LNG in the transport sector has significant policy implications -- for national security, the balance of trade and environmental policy.

The transportation sector consumed 28 percent of total U.S. energy demand of 94.6 quadrillion Btu in 2009. Within the sector, light-duty vehicles account for 59 percent of demand followed by freight trucks (16 percent) and air 10 percent. (PDF of transportation sector: [r.reuters.com/daz72s](http://r.reuters.com/daz72s))

Federal and state initiatives have the potential to drive substantial changes in the transportation fuel mix. California has led the western states into the LNG age through its low carbon fuel standards and a suite of economic incentives. Now, according to NGV America, 24 states have either recently enacted or are in

the process of passing legislation supporting the use of natural gas as a vehicle fuel.

At federal level, the Environmental Protection Agency and National Highway Transportation Safety Administration are establishing greenhouse gas emissions and fuel consumption standards for heavy-duty vehicles. The new standards will apply to combination tractors, heavy-duty pickup trucks and vans as well as vocational vehicles. If implemented, new emission standards will accelerate the transition from oil to cleaner burning and lower CO<sub>2</sub> natural gas.

Continued penetration of LNG and CNG into the transportation fuel market, at the expense of imported oil, could significantly reduce the U.S. trade deficit and reduce dependence on imports from potentially unstable supplies from the Middle East and Africa as well as Venezuela.

But wider uptake of LNG as a transport fuel also faces challenges.

The transition from the existing diesel fleet to LNG is being tempered by a number of factors: truck tractors have a 20-lifecycle; access to private LNG fueling facilities is still limited; new LNG tractors cost \$250,000 to \$300,000 more than diesel units; maintenance costs are higher; and fuel economy is lower than diesel.

LNG vehicles need pressurized cryogenic fuel tanks that are one-third larger than diesel to maintain equivalent driving ranges. The result is a weight premium of 1,000 to 1,200 lbs over comparable diesel units and an associated reduction in payload in order to comply with highway weight limits.

The evolution of the LNG market will require adoption of uniform standards for design and operation of fueling facilities including risk mitigation standards to address the hazards associated with handling a fuel with a lower flash point than diesel.

Widespread introduction of LNG onto the nation's highways will require training for first responders called on to deal with a leaking fluid having a temperature of negative 260 F. Existing laws restricting the movement of "hazardous" gas through urban areas and transportation choke points such as bridges and tunnels will also have to be reviewed.

But the biggest impediment to adoption of LNG, for long-haul fleets, is the need to reach a critical mass of public refueling stations and, by extension, the assurance of a competitive fuel market.

To overcome the barriers to entry, LNG cost must remain well below diesel to compensate for higher capital and operating and maintenance costs as well as the risk associated with participation in an

emerging market.

(Editing by John Kemp and Lisa Shumaker) ([Chris.Kimmerle@thomsonreuters.com](mailto:Chris.Kimmerle@thomsonreuters.com); Reuters messaging: [Chris.Kimmerle@thomsonreuters.com.net](mailto:Chris.Kimmerle@thomsonreuters.com.net); 646-223-7914))

## **BLOG/ONLINE COVERAGE**

### **The Need for a Real Domestic Alternative Energy Policy in the USA – [OilPrice.com](http://OilPrice.com) – 7/25/11**

By Andrew Smolski

Alternative energy (or renewable energy) is a new manufacturing industry paradigm that is in its infancy. However, the discussion is not new, and it looks as if the United States has positioned itself to be behind history on what can be a very promising industry for a stumbling economy. After the oil shortages in the 70's, government officials began discussing energy policy as a matter of national security, but this misses the point of a globally competitive economic world. It was too early then to begin thinking that China could out-invest the United States in order to produce an alternative energy manufacturing industry. Yet, now we must come to terms that the free market ideology is disallowing America from utilizing tried and true techniques of infant industry construction as laid out by Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. This article will attempt to show that what is needed now and what will aid in rebuilding the economy, is a change in paradigm that constructs energy companies under regulatory principles so that America will remain competitive in a rapidly changing economic climate.

Let us begin with the thought process of Alexander Hamilton in order to frame the argument of building a new industry within the United States correctly in order to compete on the global market. The gist of the argument is that in order for new industries to start up losses have to be guaranteed by the government in order for industry, and at the time the merchant class, to take the risk of investing to be competitive. Governments are not businesses and have properties more like non-profit organizations. They have the ability to hold and maintain debt even above yearly revenue or GDP in order to stimulate economic activity. Hamilton called this the infant industry argument, and it was due to the fact that if America wanted to compete it had to be able to safeguard the industries it thought would be best positioned against other countries who were enacting similar policies. The free trade argument against this is to an extent quite ridiculous, because what person would not want their initial investments guaranteed. And also this does not mean supporting bail-outs of large banking institutions who are not a new industry, bu

only for infant industries. Nor does it mean remaining with centralized power plants that lose 6.5-7.5% of energy due to long distance transmission. Those things would be fallacious to the argument. What it means is that the government has a duty to utilize tax revenue in order to secure American economic competitiveness and not, to use the words of Ha-Joon Chang, “kicking away the ladder”, at such a critical economic moment in American history.

So, in America at the moment according to the Renewable Energy Status Report, in 2010 10.9% of domestic primary energy production was renewable with a 5.6% increase from 2009, which shows growth and also a demand in the market. As well, pointed out by Michael Heiman and Barry Solomon, “renewable energy is typically more labor-intensive per dollar invested in the construction phase and cheaper to operate.” Further along they also show that there exists a difference between saying and doing, where 40 percent say they would pay more for Green Energy and only 1 percent actually do. This brings us back to the argument of being willing to take a loss at the outset, having a cheaper price in order to produce clients until the price can come down because of the aggregate demand. The problem has been in states who have enacted market reform instead of infant industry creation policies to produce this change, such as New Jersey, did not move towards renewable energy and the market reform only raised the rates on clients. So, obviously business is not willing to take the risk and therefore government regulation, investment, and policy is needed in order to make these risky jumps onto new frontiers.

This had led to something quite astounding and should be ridiculous to every American, that China now leads the world in installation of wind turbines and solar thermal systems. With a \$211 billion investment in 2010 for renewable energy, it is on the rise and should not be discounted to have conversations about drilling in the Gulf of Mexico or whether or not the EPA should remain. There is a reason T Boone Pickens is investing heavily in wind farms, and another reason why they aren't going to Texas, poor State and Federal Government policy. Companies do not do externalities or infrastructure, and when they do it is with government support and money, so without the transmission lines, Pickens sent his turbines to Canada. The overemphasis on tax cuts as the only way to spur private business has become a mantra that is corrosive and harming American capabilities to deal properly with the economic crisis and get people back to work. As stated before, renewable energy is labor intensive and we have an employment rate at 16-17% if we include discourage and part time workers. That's talking jobs.

To end this out, what we have in America is a political discourse and ideology that disallows proper economic domestic policy. Alternative energy is a boom industry that needs government stimulus in order to cover the initial losses that would be incurred by private industry. All the ingredients exist to utilize this industry to bring back manufacturing to America, a sector that has been rapidly losing jobs. In

2007 prior to the recession 217,000 manufacturing jobs were lost, a trend that is continued with more outsourcing every year. This isn't because labor was priced out of the market, it is because high-technology has no domestic economic policy to support large-scale investment and construction. The argument is against both sides of the aisle in congress and the executive who have lacked the political will against the onslaught of propaganda. Alternative energy will not kill the petroleum industry, as long you have heard of something called plastic, nor will it be some socialist evil over-centralizing, but it will allow America to rebuild an economy that hangs on the edge of a cliff.

By. Andrew Smolski

Andrew Smolski is a Graduate Student and Teaching Assistant at Illinois State University studying in the Applied Community Economic Development Sociology Sequence Program at the Stevenson Center. As well as this sequence, Andrew is currently studying for his Master of Arts in Sociology and is working on his Peace Corps placement for the summer of 2012. He graduated from the University of Houston Summa Cum Laude with a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology and Sociology May 2011. His focuses are Sociology of Politics/Economics and Theory, as well as Cultural/Physical Anthropology. He is trained in qualitative research methods and currently studying quantitative research methods. He is a native English speaker, but is able to communicate, read, and understand Spanish enabling better research on Central and South America. Questions should be directed to [da.smolski@gmail.com](mailto:da.smolski@gmail.com)

### **Soros Making More Cash With Congress – [BigGovernment.com](http://BigGovernment.com) – 7/25/11**

By Capitol Confidential

As the Administration's push for alternative fuels grows stronger, Congress is set to consider H.R. 1380, which would create very generous tax credits to manufacturers who retrofit existing work vehicles to run on natural gas rather than on that terrifying global menace known as oil, and very generous subsidies to natural gas vehicle consumers: \$7500 per car and a whopping \$64,000 for heavy-duty trucks and 18-wheelers. It's common knowledge in DC that Texas hedge-fund operator and natural gas-magnate T. Boone Pickens is the force behind this bi-partisan, pork-laden legislation, possibly because his natural gas empire would greatly profit from the sudden influx of billions of taxpayer dollars in the form of subsidies listed in the bill.

But hidden behind the scenes is another multi-billionaire, one with a much more sinister motive than mere profit. A man who's vast fortune of nearly \$7 billion is being used to subvert nearly every American

institution to conform with his dream of a worldwide socialist utopia.

George Soros.

According to the website GuruFocus, which tracks the investment habits and portfolio trends of some of the world's richest people, George Soros has made some intriguing investments into alternative fuel companies of late, specifically those at the forefront of natural gas. This would not be so troubling except that, as GuruFocus points out, Soros has accurately predicted both economic bubbles and quickly growing industries. As a result, Soros's funds have turned out a 30% return on investments since their inception.

One of the stocks Soros invested in recently is Westport Innovations (WPST), a global supplier of "solutions" that allow vehicles to operate on clean-burning fuels, such as natural gas. In fact, they are the world's leading engineer of natural gas engines. Westport is currently working with Caterpillar to develop a natural-gas powered engine that would work in a number of utility vehicles, all of which would be eligible for the subsidies Congress is now considering. Soros's investment funds have pumped about \$122 million into WPST, and he's added to his control as recently as December and March, when he picked up over a million shares, bringing his total to 5.5 million shares.

No other major investor shares his rosy outlook for natural gas engines, and the stock has barely crept up during the time Soros has held it, leading many to suspect Soros knows of a major future development. Could that development be Congress's NAT GAS act? It seems likely.

Many Republican legislators who once supported the bill have pulled their names and yes votes from the NAT GAS act, and we'd encourage still more. Not only is the bill a dramatic waste of taxpayer dollars for Chevy Volt-style technology, but it is a manipulation of the free market designed to help a billionaire who needs the public to accept his technology. It could cost Americans thousands of jobs as the resulting artificially high price of natural gas destroys the manufacturing industry and crushes consumer confidence. And, there is a high possibility that Congress's masochistic desire to prop up flagging alternative energy sources could end up funding one of today's greatest threats to American democracy.

Very little other convincing should be needed to drop the NAT GAS act like a hot engine.

Follow us on [Facebook](#)! Or Twitter @pickensplan

