

Summary of the
Testimony of W. Jackson Coleman
Before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power
U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce
Concerning H.R. ___, the Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012
March 28, 2012

Key Points

1. The proposed bill is an appropriate response to any drawdown of the SPR.
2. I recommend that an implementation deadline be added.
3. The United States will rely upon fossil fuels for the majority of its energy for at least the next 50 years.
4. The United States has larger recoverable fossil fuel resources than any other nation.
5. A large part of those fossil fuel resources are located on Federally-controlled lands.
6. Leasing and production of oil and natural gas from Federally-controlled lands has been in a decline.
7. There are significant structural and operational problems with the way the Federal government manages the oil and gas programs.
8. Production of Federally-controlled oil and natural gas can payoff the entire national debt without use of taxes other than those directly derived from that production.
9. Production of Federally-controlled oil and natural gas will provide a host of other important benefits to the nation.
10. The Set America Free Act of 2005 established the national policy that Canada, Mexico and the United States could and should become energy self-sufficient as a group by 2025.
11. The American people strongly support producing the nation's oil and natural gas resources and they do not believe that the Federal government is doing all that it can to develop our own oil and natural gas resources.
12. Congress needs to enact policy facilitating oil and natural gas production from Federally-controlled lands.

Testimony of W. Jackson Coleman

before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power

of the

United States House of Representatives Committee on

Energy and Commerce

Concerning H.R. _____, the Strategic Energy Production Act of
2012

March 28, 2012

Chairman Whitfield, Ranking Member Rush and Members of the Subcommittee, my name is Jack Coleman and I am Managing Partner and General Counsel of EnergyNorthAmerica, LLC, a energy consulting firm. My testimony today reflects my personal views and should not be attributed to any organization. I appreciate the Subcommittee's invitation to present my views at this hearing on the proposed "Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012."

Early in 2009 I retired after a career of almost 27 years in the Federal government – the last six of which were spent working in the House of Representatives first as energy and minerals counsel and then Republican General Counsel of the House Committee on Natural Resources. While working in the House, I drafted many bills, including the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act passed by the House in 2006, and significant parts of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

My work in the House followed my previous fourteen years as a senior attorney at the Department of the Interior. For eleven years the Minerals Management Service (MMS) was my primary client, and prior to that, for more than three years I was Senior Attorney for

Environmental Protection and legal advisor to the Department's Office of Environmental Affairs. My first work on offshore oil and gas issues began during the period from March 1982 until August 1985 when I was Special Assistant in the Office of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This year marks my 30th year working on energy and natural resources issues.

I. Provisions of the proposed "Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012."

The bill directs the Secretary of Energy, not later than 180 after the first drawdown of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) after enactment, to develop a plan to increase the percentage of onshore and offshore Federal lands leased for oil and natural gas production. It provides that the total percentage of Federal lands leased for oil and gas production will increase by the same percentage of petroleum in the SPR that was drawn down, but it caps the percentage at 10%. Lands managed under the National Park System or the National Wilderness Preservation System are excluded from this calculation and leasing plan. All Federal agencies are required to comply with the plan developed by the Secretary of Energy.

II. Analysis of bill provisions.

The policy of the bill addresses current suggestions to drawdown the SPR. Because the SPR was designed to help manage severe oil supply disruptions, it is logical that any drawdown would be tied to a measure designed to increase domestic supplies of liquid fossil fuels. In my view, the bill's provisions are adequate to their purposes, however, I recommend that a mandate be added to the bill, requiring full implementation of the plan by a date certain. Otherwise, the country would be trading an immediate loss of strategic oil reserves for a leasing plan that might

never be implemented. I commend Congressman Gardner for his introduction of the foundation bill.

III. Policy Review.

When I first came to work for the House Committee on Resources almost 9 years ago, the nation was in the midst of a natural gas supply crisis. Inadequate volumes of gas were in the marketplace and the long-term future US production capability of this vital resource seemed inadequate for expected demand. This caused prices to be substantially higher than today. One of my first assignments was to work on the Speaker's Task Force on Affordable Natural Gas. Because of the "shale gas revolution" made possible by abundant shale gas resources, hydraulic fracturing, horizontal drilling, private minerals, and primarily state regulation, our country no longer fears a shortage of American natural gas. Through their outstanding efforts, the private oil and gas exploration and production industry has discovered and proved up more than 200 years of natural gas reserves for this country. Please note that I refer to private minerals and primarily state regulation. The shale gas revolution could never have happened on Federal lands under the current state of Federal regulation, and the country would not be reaping the huge economic benefits of abundant, inexpensive natural gas. These huge reserves of natural gas will be major drivers for in the revival of manufacturing in the United States.

Our oil and gas producers have been severely hampered in their exploration and production efforts on Federal lands because the Federal government has become so difficult to deal with. Permitting a well with state regulators might take a month, or at the most two months. The same well on Federal lands may take a year or longer. Further, Federal laws give environmental groups the opportunity to litigate an oil and gas prospect at multiple points along the way toward

production. I could write a litany of actions by the Department of the Interior that have unreasonably, and frequently unlawfully, restricted energy leasing, exploration and production on Federal lands, both onshore and offshore. But I will list only a few:

1. Removal of the Atlantic Ocean, Pacific Ocean, Eastern Gulf of Mexico, and Alaska Beaufort Sea from consideration for oil and gas leasing until 2017 at the earliest.
2. A decision to send commercial oil shale regulations back through the rulemaking process despite the fact that these regulations were finalized after months of extensive and open public comment, including the reports and recommendations of an 11-member task force made up of state and local officials.
3. Repeated delays for the 2012-2017 offshore oil and gas leasing plan, leaving serious doubt as to whether a program will be in place on July 1, 2012, when the current program ends.
4. A failure to complete work on the environmental analysis that would allow companies to move forward with crucial seismic surveys in the Atlantic. Applications to perform seismic work in the Atlantic have been pending for several years.
5. A failure to move forward with energy projects in Alaska, both onshore and offshore, that exposes the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System to risk of shutdown.
6. A failure to issue onshore leases within the required 60-day timeline, thereby imposing a significant cost to successful bidders.
7. Placing of severely restrictive and expensive conditions of approval on permits – long after the lessee has made major investments in the lease.

8. Failure to properly and expeditiously implement many of the energy law reforms enacted by Congress as part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, including the NEPA categorical exclusions provision and the oil shale and tar sands commercial leasing program.
9. Implementation of the lengthy and unnecessary offshore oil and gas drilling moratoria post-Macondo in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore Alaska, contrary to law and with major negative impacts for national oil and gas production.
10. Continued failure to comply with statutory permitting requirements for exploration plans in the outer Continental Shelf.
11. Reducing by 15% since November, 2008, the total acreage of Federally-controlled onshore and offshore lands leased for oil and gas production. This dropped from about 92 million acres to less than 78 million acres – or to only about 3.1% of the total of Federally-controlled minerals. The number of onshore oil and gas leases has decreased by more than 10% in the past three years, and the number of offshore oil and gas leases has decreased by almost 19% during that three years.
12. While state and private lands have enjoyed a significant increase in oil and natural gas production over the past three years, according to the EIA oil production from Federal lands declined from 2010 to 2011 by almost 12.6% and natural gas production declined by almost 10.3%. Finally, annual average onshore acreage leased for oil and gas over the past three years has decreased almost 57% from the annual average onshore acreage leased for oil and gas over the previous three years.

A recent Congressional Research Service report (R40872, November 30, 2010) documented the fact that the United States has the largest endowment of recoverable hydrocarbon resources

in the world. No other country has more recoverable oil and natural gas than we do. Yet, with current national policies, a large portion if not a majority of those resources will never be produced. We have failed to do our part to produce oil resources so that world supply and demand will stay in balance. We have known for decades that undeveloped countries were growing much faster than we are and that great pressure would be placed on oil supplies. But our national policy actions have not responded adequately to that knowledge.

I think of our national energy resources located on Federal onshore and offshore lands as being locked up in a deep freezer, with many padlocks on it. Each new unnecessary regulatory restraint is a new padlock on that freezer – keeping those resources from being available to meet the economic and energy security needs of this country. The role of the Federal government is to establish strong safety and environmental performance standards, and then inspect and enforce to ensure that these standards are met. But instead of that vision, we have a Federal government that micromanages and must approve almost everything that an energy producer does. The emphasis on a prescriptive regulatory regime is contrary to the most enlightened oil and gas regulatory regimes in the world that rely on performance-based regulation with compliance inspections. The red tape that has been heaped upon the process is almost unbelievable. Our Federal energy production management programs are good examples of how to do things the hard way instead of the smart way.

President Obama stated in a speech on June 15, 2010, that the energy debate has been marked by “a lack of political courage and candor.” In my view, candor would mean telling the American people that, according to the most recent Annual Energy Outlook by the non-partisan U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), oil, coal, and natural gas (fossil fuels) currently supply about 83% of America’s energy. Candor would inform that the EIA projects that between

now and 2035 the total volumes of fossil fuels used in the United States will increase, not decrease, and that 77% of America's energy will come from fossil fuels in 2035.

Over the next 25 years, the U.S. population is projected to increase from just over 300 million to just under 400 million people. The number of motor vehicles is projected to increase from about 230 million to almost 300 million. The American economy is projected to almost double in size. Energy efficiencies in appliances; smarter use and more efficient transmission of electric power; more energy-efficient buildings; and many other efficiency and conservation measures are very important and will play a significant role in minimizing the increase in fossil fuels that will be needed to power a growing American economy. Further, wind, solar, and biomass renewable sources of energy are expected to provide 12.5% of America's energy supply in 2035, up from 5.4% in 2010.

It is very clear that for at least the next 50 years, and probably much longer, a majority of America's energy supply will come from fossil fuels. As the EIA projections show, an energy agenda focused primarily on renewable energy sources will fail to meet the energy needs of the American people.

For a host of reasons from national security to creating excellent jobs here in America, it is vital that the United States become energy self-sufficient. In fact, EIA projects that the net import share of total U.S. energy consumption will decrease from 29% in 2007 to 13% in 2035. Further, the net import share of U.S. liquid fuels consumption (primarily for transportation) is projected to decrease from 60% in 2006 to 37% in 2035, even though total liquid fuels consumption will increase. A large part of these reduced import shares is projected to result from significant increases in production of U.S. fossil fuels. For example, EIA projects that

annual production of oil in the U.S. will increase by 15.66% by 2035, natural gas will increase by 22.2%, and coal will increase by 17.8%.

In 2005, Congress in its wisdom enacted the Set America Free Act, Sections 1421-1424 of the Energy Policy Act, which established the national policy that the three mainland countries of North America – Canada, Mexico, and the United States – can and should become energy self-sufficient by 2025 for a host of economic and national security reasons. The House made clear that this would be achieved through an “all of the above” approach. In its findings, the House of Representatives was extremely prescient:

“(6) EIA projects that, without a change in governmental policy, the three contiguous North American countries contain 492.7 Bbbls of oil resources (16.8 percent of total world oil resources) (not including unconventional oil resources such as United States oil shale or the overwhelming majority of Canadian oil sands) at the base case oil price, which represents sufficient oil to fully supply the needs of the three contiguous North American countries for 57.4 years based on 2001 oil consumption and 39.1 years based on projected 2025 oil consumption, resulting in an average of approximately 48 years of full supply.

...

(10) According to published scientific, technical, and economic reports, the three contiguous North American countries have the resource base and technical ability to increase production of oil by at least 15 Mmbbl/d by 2025 and 20 Mmbbl/d by 2030 even before increases in coal liquifaction, biofuels, gas-to-liquids, and other methods of creating liquid substitutes for crude oil and crude oil products.

(11) This increase in North American oil production would be derived from a variety of resources including, among others—

(A) the United States oil shale resource base (2 trillion barrels of oil in place out of 2.6 trillion in the world) believed to be capable of eventually producing 10 Mmbbl/d for more than 100 years;

(B) the Canadian Alberta oil sands resource base (1.7 trillion barrels of oil in place), also believed to be capable of eventually producing 10 Mmbbl/d for more than 100 years;

(C) the United States heavy oil resource base (80 billion barrels of oil in place);

(D) the remaining 400 billion barrels of conventional oil in place in the United States of which 60 billion barrels are potentially producible with advanced CO₂ enhanced oil recovery technology;

(E) the United States oil sands resource base of 54 billion barrels of oil in place;

(F) the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Coastal Plain area (ANWR) with a mean technically recoverable resource of more than 10 billion barrels of oil;

(G) the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPR-A) with a mean technically recoverable resource of 9.3 billion barrels of oil;

(H) the 12–18 billion barrels of oil likely to be producible in the Canadian Atlantic offshore;

(I) the extensive resources of the Canadian Arctic onshore and offshore;

(J) the extensive resources in the Alaskan Arctic offshore and the outer Continental Shelf offshore the lower-48 United States;

(K) other extensive oil resources in Canada and the United States; and

(L) the extensive oil resources of Mexico.

...

(13) Growth in world oil consumption has been outstripping growth in world production of conventional oil resources for several primary reasons, including that conventional oil production in most oil producing countries has peaked and is now declining, and developing nations such as China and India are greatly accelerating their consumption of crude oil.

...

(16) Because the price of crude oil is set on a world market basis, the excess of world demand over supply will continue to drive up oil prices to levels potentially several times those of today unless all nations capable of producing significant quantities of incremental oil respond by ensuring such production is developed and available for consumption on an expedited basis.

...

(27) Economists have found that while OPEC is an important source of oil price increases, the United States government is also partly to blame because overly burdensome government regulations on domestic energy exploration, production, and sales have supported OPEC's monopoly power and restricted competition from American energy companies, in addition to making expansive highly prospective areas off-limits to leasing and production.

(28) In addition to jeopardizing our national and energy security, importing the majority of our oil also injures our economic security. The United States imported approximately 4.7 billion barrels of oil in 2004, of which 1.4 billion barrels were from Canada and Mexico. Imported energy creates very few jobs in the United States and makes only a very minor contribution to our Gross Domestic Product (GDP). If we substitute North American production for the remaining 3.3 billion barrels of imports per year, at \$40 per barrel the new production would sell for \$132 billion. A widely used commercial economics model projects that GDP would increase

by \$336 billion, creating 1,667,160 jobs, each with an average total annual compensation of \$50,356. Further, such activity is projected to generate approximately \$22 billion in indirect business taxes, including sales, excise, and severance taxes. At a one-eighth royalty, total royalty payments to mineral rights owners would approximate \$16.5 billion per year. Further, our imported energy represents more than 25 percent of our international trade deficit. American production could eliminate two-thirds of the 25 percent, strengthening our economy.”

IV. What oil and natural gas resources does the U.S. have?

As detailed in the previously referenced Congressional Research Service Report (R40872), dated November 30, 2010, entitled “U.S. Fossil Fuel Resources: Terminology, Reporting, and Summary”, the United States has more producible fossil fuels resources (on a barrel of oil equivalent basis) than any other country in the world. More than Russia, twice as much as China, three times more than Saudi Arabia, and twenty-three times more than Brazil. The United States is also the world’s leader in technically recoverable undiscovered oil and natural gas, with 50% more than Saudi Arabia, more than four times that of Brazil, and twelve times that of China.

The CRS finding is supported by a December 2011 report by the Institute for Energy Research, “North American Energy Inventory.” That report concludes, based on U.S. Government reports, that the United States contains 1.442 trillion barrels of recoverable oil, 2.744 quadrillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas, and 486 billion short tons of recoverable coal. Clearly, the United States is a energy giant and has the resource base to be fully self-sufficient.

As an example of what can happen if the private sector is allowed to produce our bountiful natural resources, just a few short years ago the Bakken formation in North Dakota and Montana, which covers 15,000 square miles, was just an “idea”. With breakthroughs in technology, we are now producing more than 500,000 barrels of oil per day and climbing – this from the largest U.S. oil discovery in more than 40 years.

As of the time of the last Department of the Interior Offshore Oil and Gas National Assessment of offshore oil and gas resources in 2006, just over 14 billion barrels of oil had been produced from the federal offshore and more than 15 billion barrels of already discovered oil reserves were available to be produced. Further, the National Assessment estimated that exploration and production activities in the federal offshore would, in the mean case, eventually produce an additional 86 billion barrels of currently undiscovered oil – assuming the offshore lands containing this oil are reasonably made available for leasing and production. These two amounts combine to an expected future production from the federal offshore of 101 billion barrels – sufficient to eliminate all oil imports by the United States, at current levels, for almost 25 years.

Similarly, the National Assessment estimated that just over 153 trillion cubic feet of natural gas have been produced from the federal offshore and that more than 60 trillion cubic feet of already discovered natural gas is available to be produced. Further, the National Assessment estimated that exploration and production activities in the federal offshore would, in the mean case, eventually produce an additional 420 trillion cubic feet of currently undiscovered natural gas – assuming the offshore lands containing the natural gas are reasonably made available for leasing and production. These two amounts combine to an expected future production from the

federal offshore of 480 trillion cubic feet of conventional natural gas – sufficient to totally provide for the United States’ current annual consumption of natural gas for more than 20 years.

As the great Oscar Hammerstein II once said, “a bell is no bell till you ring it,” similarly, oil and gas resources are not reserves that can be produced for the benefit of our country until they are leased, drilled for and discovered.

According to the *Washington Post*, President Obama stated last week in a speech in Boulder City, Nevada, on March 21, “America used 20 percent of the world’s oil, and we’ve got 2 percent of the world’s oil reserves. I wasn’t a math major, but if you’re using 20, you’ve only got 2, that means you got to bring in the rest from someplace else.” He has made numerous similar statements since he became President. First on March 14, and more strenuously on March 22, the *Washington Post* has criticized the President for his “dubious combination of two true statistics” – what the *Post* called “non sequitur facts” – “two bits of information that actually bear little relationship to each other.” As the *Post* stated, “using ‘oil reserves’ as a key metric gives an incomplete picture of U.S. oil resources.” The *Post* then cited to the 2010 analysis by the Congressional Research Service, which pointed out that “‘Proven reserves’ whether for oil, natural gas or coal, has a very strict definition, in part because reserves are considered actual assets owned by companies. The oil must have been discovered, confirmed and economically recoverable, with at least 90 percent certainty. The level of reserves, in fact, may vary depending on the price of oil, since a higher price may suddenly make some finds economically viable.” The *Post* pointed out that EIA data on oil reserves “shows that proven U.S. reserves hit a peak of nearly 40 billion barrels in 1970 – after the Prudhoe Bay oil field was found in Alaska – and now stand at about 22 billion barrels. But here’s the strange thing: the United States also had proven oil reserves of 22 billion barrels through much of the 1940’s. How is that possible? New

sources of oil kept getting found, more-difficult-to-obtain oil suddenly became more viable, new oil-extraction techniques gained favor, and so forth. This brings us to our next category of oil: undiscovered technically recoverable resources. Oil companies cannot consider this oil an asset. Whether that oil will be recovered depends in part on technology and/or the price of oil.” The *Post* pointed out that U.S. technically recoverable oil resources are at least a multiple of 8 times proven reserves, and that even that number is low because it does not include things such as the 800 billion in technically recoverable oil shale, as determined by the Rand Corporation, and other oil resources. After pointing out the oil consumption of other major nations, and their relative lack of oil reserves, the *Post* further stated, “measuring the U.S. consumption against its proven oil reserves makes little sense . . . In fact, in the relative scheme of things, the United States is relatively blessed with proven oil reserves – and, given the U.S. technological advantage, also with potentially large resources of oil yet to be tapped.” As the *Post* concluded on March 14th, “This is a strange case because the facts are technically correct but are used in service of fuzzy thinking. . . . He is especially on shaky ground when he says ‘no matter what we do, it’s not going to get much above 3 percent.’ The estimate of proven oil reserves may change at any moment depending on technological innovations and the price of oil.” The *Post* therefore labeled the President’s statement as “True but False.” On March 21, after more speeches by the President making similar statements, the *Washington Post* revisited the issue and stated, “That’s just simply wrong. The United States has the same number of barrels of proven oil reserves – 22 billion – today as it did in the 1940s. That’s because new sources of oil kept getting found, more-difficult-to-obtain oil suddenly became more economically viable, new oil-extraction techniques gained favor, and so forth. . . . We hope he finally drops this specious logic from his talking points.”

V. What do our oil and gas resources potentially mean to the U.S.?

It is clear that our nation benefits from developing oil and gas resources here at home. Existing domestic oil and gas development reduces our reliance on imported oil, directly supports over 9 million jobs, creates billions in new wealth every year, and generates over \$13 billion for the Federal Treasury on an annual basis, not counting corporate and personal income taxes.

One might ask, “What is the value of these reserves and resources to the American people?” This can be measured in many ways. In addition to creating millions of new, high paying jobs, one important way to value these resources in these difficult economic times is that achieving American energy self-sufficiency will generate enough revenue for the Treasury from production of Federally-owned oil and natural gas resources, in royalties and corporate income taxes on that production, to more than pay off the entire national debt without use of any other tax revenues. However, these vast resources will never pay off any of the national debt if they are not made available for leasing, drilling and production.

The payoff of the national debt is only part of the U.S. federal taxpayers’ share from the production of America’s Federally-owned oil and natural gas resources. Much more wealth will redound to our citizens through high paying jobs, economic development, state and local taxes, and the economic benefit of the turnover of trillions of dollars that would have been sent to foreign countries.

VI. Closing

We continue to hear the old dogma that this nation cannot drill its way to energy self-sufficiency. The facts show that we could do just that, given adequate time to develop the

resources, if we had the national will to do it, but I don't know of anyone proposing that this nation rely solely on our hydrocarbon resources. But, as the Energy Information Administration recently reiterated, the United States and the world will rely on oil, natural gas, and coal for the vast majority of its energy resources for as far into the distance as EIA projects.

Yet, the American people have not seen a results-oriented national energy program determined to achieve North American energy self-sufficiency. Is it any wonder that the American people are unhappy and hurting? They want action. (A February 27, 2012, Rasmussen Poll found that 63% of American adults agree that reducing America's dependence on foreign oil is more important than reducing the price of gasoline.) They understand that the United States has abundant oil, gas and coal resources – in fact the largest in the world. They do not believe that their government is doing all that it can to produce the energy necessary to run this great country and provide for its energy, economic, and national security. (A March 23, 2012, Rasmussen Poll found that 70% of likely U.S. voters believe that the United States is not doing enough to develop its own oil and natural gas resources.)(A Pew Research Center for the People & the Press poll of American adults released on March 19, 2012, found that 65% support more offshore oil and gas drilling – even higher than before the Macondo blowout. 50% of Democrats, 64% of Independents and 89% of Republicans support more offshore oil and natural gas drilling.)

I congratulate the House of Representatives for passing major energy production legislation focused on the outer Continental Shelf, ANWR, and oil shale. I hope that the Senate will pass those bills, and I hope the Congress will go beyond that legislation and enact the Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012 and further act broadly and boldly to unlock the bountiful natural hydrocarbon and renewable energy resources that this nation has been blessed with. Permit

reform, opening the entire outer Continental Shelf to leasing, policy changes to make greater use of CO2 enhanced oil recovery, commercial lease sales for American oil shale and oil sands, use of commonsense NEPA categorical exclusions, gas and coal-to-liquids technology implementation, eliminating frivolous litigation, and other actions must be taken to achieve the nation's energy independence.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify and I would be pleased to answer any questions.



ENERGY NORTH AMERICA, LLC

W. Jackson (Jack) Coleman is Managing Partner and General Counsel of EnergyNorthAmerica, LLC, an energy consulting firm. EnergyNorthAmerica, LLC provides a wide array of services, including government relations, energy regulatory consulting, and project assistance. See www.energy-northamerica.com for further details.

Prior to joining EnergyNorthAmerica, LLC, Jack was the Republican General Counsel for the House Committee on Natural Resources from February 2007 until March 2009, and prior to that from May 2003 Jack was the Energy and Minerals Counsel for the Committee. Jack was the primary drafter and negotiator for many provisions included in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, including the BLM permitting offices provisions, the Section 390 NEPA statutory categorical exclusions, and the Oil Shale, Tar Sands and Other Unconventional Fuels Act. Further, among other legislation, Jack drafted and developed the strategy for the House to pass the Deep Ocean Energy Resources (DOER) Act of 2006 - the first comprehensive bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to pass either House of Congress since 1978.

From October 1992 until May 2003, Jack was the Senior Attorney for Royalties and Offshore Minerals at the Department of the Interior Office of the Solicitor. In that position, Jack was responsible to advise the Minerals Management Service on the implementation of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and many other statutes. Further, Jack was lead attorney for the Department on many cases litigating the implementation of these statutes, including the landmark decision in *Mobil v. US* by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2000.

Prior to that, from January 1989 until October 1992, Jack was the Senior Attorney for Environmental Protection for the Department of the Interior with responsibilities as the legal advisor to the Department's Office of Environmental Policy and the senior environmental law attorney in the Department. Among other duties, Jack participated in the executive branch legal team activities in response to the Exxon Valdez oil spill, including analysis of the large number of statutes touching on various aspects of oil spills and participated in executive branch activities related to legislation which became the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

Jack is a member of the Mississippi Bar. A native of Rosedale, Mississippi, Jack received a B.B.A. in Accountancy and a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Mississippi. Contact Jack at 571-228-3225 and jack.coleman@energy-northamerica.com.