

October 31, 1993

Mr. Brian O'Neill, President
Insurance Institute for Highway Safety
1005 N. Glebe RD.
Arlington, VA 22201

Dear Mr. O'Neill,

Thank you for your April 16, 1993 response to my letter of March 16, 1991. Sorry for the delay in responding to your letter.

I recently purchased *AUTOMOTIVE FUEL ECONOMY, How Far Should We Go?* (ISBN 0-309-04530-4). I believe "...the expert panel recently convened.", referred to in your letter, wrote the report. As I interpret this report, it is primarily concerned with the political and economic considerations of increasing fuel economy. The Table, ES-1, on page 4, addresses the "Technically Achievable" Fuel Economy of MY 2006 Vehicles", and essentially agrees with your statement concerning the 40 MPG CAFE. The paragraphs below the table explain how the estimates were obtained. Only technologies of vehicles currently in mass production were considered in preparing the estimates. To me, this means that if we have never built high MPG automobiles, then we will never be able to build them. This sentence, the disclaimer I believe, is at the end of paragraph a/ "The term "technically achievable" should not be taken to mean the technological limit of what is possible with the current state of the art; nor should the committee's estimates of what is technically achievable be taken as its recommendations as to what future fuel economy levels should be.". Nowhere in this report did I find any reference to the Shell Oil Book *Fuel Economy Of The Gasoline Engine* (ISBN 0-470-99132-1). Could it be that the 376.59 MPG achievement of Shell Oil might have clouded the politically correct message in the report? Could the panel refute the 1929 prediction by the President of General Motors of 80 MPG by 1939? The 95 pages of energy information enclosed with my 1991 letter included photocopies of four pages from the Shell Oil book.

Your letter states that your engineers, and the Academy experts, don't believe the existence of viable technology to produce 376 MPG and devices that allow an engine to burn water. This lack of belief, I believe, is due to filtering of the facts by politically correct glasses. Do you know of a rational explanation for ignoring the achievements of Shell Oil Co., and so many others that have achieved more than 100 MPG. What better proof that automobile can burn water for fuel than the hydrogen fueled Cadillac Seville in President Carter's inaugural parade, the many patents for powering engines by water fuel or the hydrogen fueled car that MAZDA will put on American highways by 1995 (Pages 9 to 58 of the previously mailed energy information and Popular Science, October 93, page 40).

Just in case you missed it, attached is a September 93 article concerning President Clinton's plan to triple the current 28 MPG average automobile fuel economy. If you wonder where the idea for achievable higher MPG could have come from, also attached is a letter from then candidate Clinton to me.

Sincerely,

Byron S. Wine III
P.O. Box 1956
Manassas, VA 22110

Attachments: Washington Post 9/93; Clinton letter February 17, 1992.

cc: Gerald L. Maatman (No response from O'Neill or Maatman.)