

## Department of Energy

Office of Scientific and Technical Information Post Office Box 62 Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

August 10, 2016

Re: OSTI-2016-01064-F

Dear Mr. Ravnitzky:

This is in final response to the request for information you sent to the Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI) under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. 552 on June 22, 2016.

You requested a "copy of records, electronic, or otherwise, of each letter TO and FROM universities, companies, and organizations, from the OSTI 'cold fusion' documents collection." On July 11, 2016, you were emailed an interim response letter informing you of the need for OSTI to obtain release authorization from the Department of Energy. OSTI received notification to release the letters to you in their entirety on August 8, 2016. As a result, OSTI is releasing 72 cold fusion letters in this mailing on a CD-ROM because of the volume and file size of the PDFs.

In addition, there are approximately 13 letters that are currently being reviewed by the DOE's General Counsel Office (GC) for release or redaction. Upon receipt of guidance from GC, OSTI will release in whole or in part.

This decision, as well as the adequacy of the search, may be appealed within 90 calendar days from your 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 to OHA.filings@hq.doe.gov, including the phrase "Freedom of Information Appeal" in the subject line. The appeal must contain all of 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.

You may contact OSTI's FOIA Public Liaison, Charlene Luther, Office of Preservation and Technology at 865.576.1138 or by mail at the Department of Energy, Office of Scientific and Technical Information, 1 Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge, TN 37830 for any further assistance and to discuss any aspect of your request. Additionally, you may contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA mediation services they offer.

The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS, College Park, Maryland 20740-6001, e-mail at ogis@nara.gov; telephone at 202-741-5770; toll free at 1-877-684-6448; or facsimile at 202-741-5769.

If you have any questions about the processing of the request or about this letter, please contact Madelyn M. Wilson at

Sincerely,

Madelyn M. Wilson

FOIA Officer

DOE OSTI

1 Science.gov Way

Oak Ridge, TN 37830



## The Secretary of Energy Washington, DC 20585

May 17, 1989

Professor Harold Lewis Professor of Physics Physics Department University of California Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dear Professor Lewis:

Thank you for your letter of May 10, 1989, in which you provided us with your thoughts on cold fusion. We understand your concern and we also want to bring the scientific debate to an early conclusion.

For that reason, we have asked the Energy Research Advisory Board (ERAB) to set up a panel to review the overall issue of cold fusion. That panel will be chaired by Professor Norman Ramsey and Professor John Huizenga, and they will hold their first meeting during the Santa Fe Workshop, May 23-25, 1989. Also towards that end, I have asked the Department of Energy laboratories to help unravel the technical issues. In this way we will quickly move to a position where we can make a decision based on the broadest perspective of cold fusion. As you know, muon catalyzed fusion is a form of cold fusion and is recognized as a real phenomenon. We are looking to the ERAB panel to provide us with an overall perspective on this subject.

I appreciate your interest and comments and invite you to provide your thoughts directly to the ERAB panel we have established. Please contact Dr. Robert O. Hunter, Jr., should you desire to appear before the panel or submit any written comments.

Sincerely,

ames D. Watkins

Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired)

## DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

# memorandum

DATE: MAY 1 5 1989

REPLY TO

ATTN OF: ER-1 (Louis Ianniello/586-9776)

SUBJECT: Letter to Professor Harold Lewis on Cold Fusion

To The Secretary -

2: bred 1

ISSUE/ACTION STATEMENT

o Professor Lewis, University of California, has written to you on the subject of cold fusion

## DISCUSSION

O Professor Lewis' letter expresses displeasure at the Department's continued support for activities related to cold fusion. The attached letter simply acknowledges that the Department also wants to conclude the debate, but is looking at a broader set of issues and has enlisted the laboratories and ERAB to provide assistance.

## CONCERNS/SENSITIVITIES

 Professor Lewis is a member of the Advisory Committee of Nuclear Facility Safety.

#### RECOMMENDATION

o Sign the attached letter which, in addition, invites Professor Lewis to provide the ERAB panel with his thoughts on the subject of cold fusion. We have informed ERAB and will make the arrangements if Professor Lewis accepts.

Robert Huten.

Robert O. Hunter, Jr. Director Office of Energy Research

Attachment: Letter to Professor Lewis

## United States Government

## memorandum

MAY 1 1 1989

REPLY TO ATTN OF: ER-1

SUBJECT: Cold Fusion

The Secretary

I received the attached letter from Dr. H. D. Lewis today for your consideration. I am preparing a reply which will include a discussion of the review committee which, in the course of examining the various results, should consider Dr. Lewis' comments.

Robert O. Hunter, Jr. Director

Office of Energy Research

Attachment

cc w/att: Steve May Gary Gibbs

## Advisory Committee on Nuclear Facility Safety

United States Department of Energy 1000 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, DC 20585

May 10, 1989

NOTE TO: Robert O. Hunter, ER-1

FROM: W

Wallace R. Kornack

New Finero

SUBJECT: E-Mail Message from Dr. Hal Lewis

Professor Hal Lewis, University of California, transmitted today the attached E-Mail letter for Admiral Watkins. He wanted the letter passed on to the Admiral through you.

F	Ç	*	3	2	5	1	2
. 4	1	×		M	h		

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RRESPONDENCE CONTROL FORM OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

	1		
	1	D.	
Commercial	w	w.	
T			

11:18 ACTIVITY ADD DO NOT DETACH FROM ORIGINAL CORRESPONDENCE SOURCE CODE PM PUBLIC MAIL DATE CHTRL: 05/19/89 DATE DIE: 05 DATE DUE: 05/24/89 CORR: 05/10/89 DATE RECD: 05/17/89 TO: SECY: X DEP SEC: UN SEC: OTHER: LETTER: X MEMO: TWX: OTHER: REMARKS: DOCUMENT CONTROLLED AFTER THE CA D FROMLEWIS, HAROLD FACT. SUBJ: POLICY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS FOR USE BY ACTION OFFICE ONLY COLD FUSION **ACTION REFERRED TO** DATE **RETURN TO** 1 2 3 TYPE ACTION: Prepare final reply ACTION TO: ER SIG OF: S CONCURRENCE: INFORMATION: CONTROL ANALYST: Richard Rosser . 5075 FILE CODE:PMLEWIS-ES89007346

ALL DOCUMENTS FOR THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
MUST BE FORWARDED TO THE OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT FOR FINAL PROCESSING

(Retyped E-Mail Message from Dr. Hal Lewis, 5/10/89)

#### Dear Admiral Watkins:

While I do serve on one of your advisory committees, I write this as an individual scientist. No support from others is implied, though I have little doubt that it is there.

It was clear from the very beginning that the Utah chemists' claims of limitless free energy from cold fusion were scientifically wrong---simply error in the laboratory, coupled with inexcusable unwillingness to either admit it or to help others search for the truth---and what little support there was from a few scattered reports of partial confirmation has long since vanished. At the May 1 meeting of the American Physical Society in Baltimore, all of the sources of error were dredged out in embarrassing detail, and I do not know of any reputable scientists---none---who give any residual credence to the claims. It was never the responsibility of the scientific community to find the errors in the Pons/Fleischman experiments, but theirs to convince others that they were right, yet the special circumstances of publicity and politics led to the reversal of roles in this case. Be that as it may, the scientific debate, such as it was, is now over, and there is not, and never was, cold fusion.

Given that, does it no seem improper for the Department to be continuing in throwing good money after bad. Among other things, it is sponsoring a large meeting at Los Alamos in two weeks, devoted to these phoney claims, and adding perhaps several millions of dollars to the large sums already wasted on the subject. It is not too late to simply call off all further waste of Department money. That the Department should have an open mind to scientific advances is of course clear, as is its obligation to separate fact from fancy in the pursuit of those advances. That is not a matter of choice---it is a duty. The Utah people have long since forfeited their right to the benefit of the doubt by their intransigence in refusing others access to the details of their purported experiments. Their behavior is certainly far from the accepted scientific norm, and now verges on fraud, which the Department should not condone.

I urge you to reconsider the Department's continued sponsorship of what has clearly become pseudo-science, both for the good of the Department and for the good of the country. Pseudo-science dilutes the environment in which we must all work, and is a form of intellectual pollution which keeps people from doing their real jobs. Intellectual pollution may be less tangible than other forms for which the Department has sad but acknowledged historic responsibility, but it is no less real, and is no less malodorous.

Sincerely, H. W. Lewis ER-1 (Louis Ianniello/586-9776)

Letter to Professor Harold Lewis on Cold Fusion

The Secretary

### ISSUE/ACTION STATEMENT

 Professor Lewis, University of California, has written to you on the subject of cold fusion.

## DISCUSSION

o Professor Lewis' letter expresses displeasure at the Department's continued support for activities related to cold fusion. The attached letter simply acknowledges that the Department also wants to conclude the debate, but is looking at a broader set of issues and has enlisted the laboratories and ERAB to provide assistance.

## CONCERNS/SENSITIVITIES

 Professor Lewis is a member of the Advisory Committee of Nuclear Facility Safety.

### RECOMMENDATION

o Sign the attached letter which, in addition, invites Professor Lewis to provide the ERAB panel with his thoughts on the subject of cold fusion. We have informed ERAB and will make the arrangements if Professor Lewis accepts. ER)60 Undler 5//2/89

Robert O. Hunter, Jr. Director Office of Energy Research Decker

Attachment: Letter to Professor Lewis

bcc: ES(4) ER-1(3) ER-60(1) ER-11(file) RMarley(ER-1)

ER-11:LIammiello:dm:5/12/89:enable/C:HLEWIS

Professor Harold Lewis Professor of Physics Physics Department University of California Santa Barbara, CA 93106

## Dear Professor Lewis:

Thank you for your letter of May 10, 1989, in which you provided us with your thoughts on cold fusion. We understand your concern and we also want to bring the scientific debate to an early conclusion.

For that reason, we have asked the Energy Research Advisory Board (ERAB) to set up a panel to review the overall issue of cold fusion. That panel will be chaired by Professor Norman Ramsey and Professor John Huizenga, and they will hold their first meeting during the Santa Fe Workshop, May 23-25, 1989. Also towards that end, I have asked the Department of Energy laboratories to help unravel the technical issues. In this way we will quickly move to a position where we can make a decision based on the broadest perspective of cold fusion. As you know, muon catalyzed fusion is a form of cold fusion and is recognized as a real phenomenon. We are looking to the ERAB panel to provide us with an overall perspective on this subject.

I appreciate your interest and comments and invite you to provide your thoughts directly to the ERAB panel we have established. Please contact Dr. Robert O. Hunter, Jr., should you desire to appear before the panel or submit any written comments.

Sincerely,

James D. Watkins Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired)