



Department of Energy  
Washington, DC 20585

February 29, 2016

Mr. Steven Krivit  
Publisher and Senior Editor  
New Energy Times

Re: HQ-2016-00390-F

Dear Mr. Krivit:

This is the final response to the request for information that you sent to the Department of Energy (DOE) under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552. You requested a copy of a letter sent by Peter Hagelstein to the DOE requesting that it conduct a review of low energy nuclear reaction research.

Your request was assigned to the Office of Science (SC) to conduct a search of its files. SC conducted its search on January 20, 2016, which is the cut-off date for responsive documents. SC has completed its search and identified one (1) document responsive to your request. The document is being released to you in its entirety as described in the accompanying index.

The adequacy of the search may be appealed within 30 calendar days from receipt of this letter pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 1004.8. Appeals should be addressed to Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, HG-1, L'Enfant Plaza, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585-1615. The written appeal, including the envelope, must clearly indicate that a FOIA appeal is being made. You may also submit your appeal by e-mail to [OHA.filings@hq.doe.gov](mailto:OHA.filings@hq.doe.gov), including the phrase "Freedom of Information Appeal" in the subject line. The appeal must contain all the elements required by 10 C.F.R. § 1004.8, including a copy of the determination letter. Thereafter, judicial review will be available to you in the Federal District Court either (1) in the district where you reside, (2) where you have your principal place of business, (3) where DOE's records are situated, or (4) in the District of Columbia.

The FOIA provides for the assessment of fees for the processing of requests. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(i); *see also* 10 C.F.R. § 1004.9(a). Your request was placed in the "news media" category for fee purposes. Requesters in this category are charged fees for duplication only and are provided 100 pages at no cost. DOE's processing costs did not exceed \$15.00, the minimum amount at which DOE assesses fees. Thus, no fees will be charged for processing your request.



If you have any questions about the processing of the request or this letter, you may contact Ms. Melissa Darr at:

MA-90/ Forrestal Building  
1000 Independence Avenue, S. W.  
Washington, DC 20585  
(202) 287-6745

I appreciate the opportunity to assist you with this matter.

Sincerely,



Alexander C. Morris  
FOIA Officer  
Office of Information Resources

Enclosure

New Energy

## INDEX

Request#: HQ-2016-00390-F

**Final response for request from Steven Krivit for the following:**

**A copy of a letter sent by Peter Hagelstein to the DOE requesting that it conduct a review of low energy nuclear reaction research.**

The Office of Science (SC) conducted a search of its files and identified one (1) document responsive to your request.

- One (1) document is being released in its entirety.

New Energy Times



RESEARCH LABORATORY *of* ELECTRONICS  
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
77 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02139-4307

September 12, 2003

Spencer Abraham  
Secretary of Energy  
United States Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave., SW  
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham,

I noticed with interest a recent column in the Wall Street Journal by Sharon Begley last Friday (September 5, 2003). She wrote this column after attending the 10th International Conference on Cold Fusion which was held recently in Cambridge at the end of August. Her argument in this column was that perhaps most problematic about the conference was not what was presented and discussed at the conference, but the lack of interest on the part of the scientific community.

I write this brief letter to you wearing three hats. First, as a member of the DoE community, having won the 1984 Lawrence Prize for National Defense. Second, as a faculty member at MIT. And third, as Chair of the conference under discussion.

The conference was technically very strong, and has been considered by many to be the best of the ICCF series to date. The evidence for nuclear emissions from metal deuterides in a variety of experiments presented at this conference, and at previous conferences, is very strong. The experimental evidence in support of an excess heat effect that has accumulated over the years is very compelling, certainly strong enough that it should be of interest to DoE and the scientific community in general.

As you know, DoE assembled a panel to review results in this area in 1989. This group, the ERAB panel, was composed of distinguished scientists from different disciplines who were tasked to provide a recommendation to Admiral Watkins about what should be done in the area. Specifically, the ERAB panel was tasked to

(1) review experiments and theory (2) identify what research should be undertaken to determine what processes might be involved (3) provide guidance as to research and development directions might lead to understanding and applications

The ERAB panel was not convinced that there was anything to the claims, based on the information available in 1989. Moreover, the panel noted that the claims would be "contrary to all understanding gained of nuclear reactions in the last half century", and would "require the invention of an entirely new nuclear process".

The panel recommended against any special funding for research in this area, and suggested that the funding system present at that time might be used to provide modest support in the area.

Now, more than a decade later, much progress has been made. The relatively weak evidence available in 1989 is now superseded by much stronger results, which are sufficient to convince distinguished scientists that are otherwise unbiased. The experimental evidence, in my view, is now beginning to provide some indication as to what new physical mechanisms are at work.

I think that it is time to review this area once more. A great many of my colleagues who worked in this area feel the same way. There is a great interest among the public, as indicated by the nearly 200,000 papers on the subject that have been downloaded during the past 11 months from a website devoted to cold fusion.

I propose that you consider the possibility of convening a new review panel to provide an updated recommendation based on the initial tasking provided by Admiral Watkins. I would recommend that new scientists be appointed, as some of the members of the previous panel might be considered to have already made up their minds based on what they have said in public and have published.

I offer you my personal assistance in this matter, and the assistance of many of my colleagues who have studied the new phenomena over the past 14 years.

Sincerely



Peter Hagelstein  
Associate Professor  
Department of Electrical Engineering and  
Computer Science  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Chair, ICCF10  
E-mail: plh@mit.edu