

Revision II

An Analysis of Federal Incentives Used to Stimulate Energy Production

February 1980 Executive Summary



Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract EY-76-C-06-1830

Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Operated for the U.S. Department of Energy
by Battelle Memorial Institute



NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

The views, opinions and conclusions contained in this report are those of the contractor and do not necessarily represent those of the United States Government or the United States Department of Energy.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST LABORATORY
operated by
BATTELLE
for the
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Under Contract EY-76-C-06-1830

Printed in the United States of America
Available from
National Technical Information Service
United States Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22151

Price: Printed Copy \$____*; Microfiche \$3.00

*Pages	NTIS Selling Price
001-025	\$4.00
026-050	\$4.50
051-075	\$5.25
076-100	\$6.00
101-125	\$6.50
126-150	\$7.25
151-175	\$8.00
176-200	\$9.00
201-225	\$9.25
226-250	\$9.50
251-275	\$10.75
276-300	\$11.00

REVISION II

AN ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL INCENTIVES
USED TO STIMULATE ENERGY PRODUCTION

An Executive Summary

B. W. Cone, D. L. Brenchley, V. L. Brix,
M. L. Brown, K. E. Cochran, P. D. Cohn, R. J. Cole,
M. G. Curry, R. Davidson, J. Easterling, J. C. Emery,
A. G. Fassbender, J. S. Fattorini, Jr., B. Gordon,
H. Harty, D. Lernerz, A. R. Maurizi, R. Mazzucchi,
C. McClain, D. D. Moore, J. H. Maxwell, W. J. Sheppard
S. Solomon, P. Sommers

February 1980

Prepared for
Division of Conservation
of Solar Applications
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20545
under Contract EY-76-C-06 1830

Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Richland, Washington 99352

CONTENTS

AN ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL INCENTIVES USED TO STIMULATE ENERGY PRODUCTION	▪	•	•	▪	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1
GENERIC INCENTIVES	▪	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	2
NUCLEAR INCENTIVES	▪	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	3
HYDRO INCENTIVES	▪	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	3
COAL INCENTIVES	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	4
OIL INCENTIVES	▪	•	•	•	•	•	▪	•	•	•	•	4
NATURAL GAS INCENTIVES	▪	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	5
ELECTRICITY INCENTIVES	▪	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	5
CONCLUSIONS	▪	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	▪	•	•	6

AN ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL INCENTIVES
USED TO SIMULATE ENERGY PRODUCTION

An Executive Summary

The amount of solar energy that reaches the earth's surface every two weeks is equivalent to all of the known reserves of coal, gas, and oil. Yet, the use of this energy source to generate electricity and heat and cool buildings is negligible.

Debate over solar energy's role has caused policy makers to speculate on the reasons for the large difference between present and potential uses of solar energy. These reasons appear to be buried in complex technical, economic, legal, institutional, and political interrelationships. An improved understanding of forces that have shaped the existing energy budget may provide insights for the future.

The purpose of this research was to analyze past and present Federal incentives to production of various energy sources and thereby assist the Division of Conservation and Solar Applications, Department of Energy, in the study and recommendation of Federal incentives for the development of solar energy. The research was divided into five parts: a survey of current thought about incentives for solar energy production; the theoretical approach to analyzing and characterizing incentives; a generic view of the energy incentive creating landscape for 1978; analysis of the major energy sources (nuclear, hydro, coal, electricity, oil, and gas) along their trajectories from exploration to waste management, including their costs in 1978 dollars; and insights into potential incentives for solar policy.

Economic, political, organizational, and legal viewpoints were considered in formulating the typology of incentives. The following eight types of Incentives were identified:

- 1) Creation or prohibition of organizations that carry out actions,
- 2) Taxation exemption, or reduction of existing taxes,

- 3) Collection of fees for delivery of a governmental service or good,
- 4) Disbursements in which the Federal Government distributes money without requiring anything in return,
- 5) Requirements made by the government backed by criminal or civil sanctions,
- 6) Traditional government services provided through a nongovernmental entity without direct charge (*i.e.*, regulating interstate and foreign commerce and providing inland waterways),
- 7) Nontraditional government services such as exploration, research, development and demonstration of new technology,
- 8) Market activity under conditions similar to those faced by nongovernmental producers or consumers.

GENERIC INCENTIVES

Using this typology of Federal actions, incentives provided during FY-1978 were identified on a generic basis. Forty-five organizational components spent an estimated \$13.7 billion conducting energy-related activities. Expenditures of individual organizations ranged from \$4.89 billion, spent by the Department of Energy (DOE) to negligible amounts. The DOE, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Army Corps of Engineers accounted for 76% of the incentives expended. Twenty-eight departmental agencies administered \$9.25 billion in energy programs. Eleven Senate committees had jurisdiction over energy-related organizations, the largest of which, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, had jurisdiction over 14 organizations with a total outlay of \$10.24 billion. Fourteen House committees had jurisdiction over energy-related organizations; these included the Government Operations Committee, which had jurisdiction over 21 organizations with a total outlay of \$12.63 billion.

Organizations emphasizing market activity spent 52% of all funds. Exploration, research, development, and demonstration accounted for 38.5%. Organizations whose primary action involved requirements backed by criminal and civil sanctions spent 5.5%. Only one organization was involved in altering the tax structure.

Twenty-nine percent of the \$13.7 billion was directly related to incentives involving electricity, mostly for market activities. Of the remaining 71%, \$5.59 billion was expended for incentives to the nuclear industry. The oil industry received \$1.65 billion. Coal received \$1.63 billion and gas received less than \$300 million. The solar energy industry received \$371 million of the incentives directed specifically toward energy-producing industries.

NUCLEAR INCENTIVES

Incentives for nuclear power are estimated to have cost the Federal Government \$21.0 billion over the past 30 years. This was about 8.3% of total Federal incentives to stimulate energy production. The Civilian Reactor Development Program (CRDP) used approximately 81% of the research and development dollars allocated to commercial nuclear power by DOE. The Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) program has received \$4.4 billion through the CRDP. The costs of regulating civilian reactors (\$1.65 billion) and the investment in enrichment plants (\$2.1 billion) were included in the total costs.

The total costs of incentives to the nuclear industry do not take into account several nonquantifiable incentives, namely the cost of the Price-Anderson Act (a legislative action which removed the liability insurance roadblock) and Federal uranium policies. No way was found to quantify them.

HYDRO INCENTIVES

The estimated cost of incentives to hydroelectric power was \$16.9 billion. This is 6.7% of the total Federal incentives to stimulate energy production. In the development of hydropower, the government has acted primarily as a market entity in each step of the production-consumption cycle. Most of the incentives used to stimulate hydro energy production would, therefore, be categorized as market activity. Two procedures were used to quantify the incentives. For the first, return on investment from power revenues and costs of construction, operation, maintenance, management, and regulation of dams

(that could be allocated to power development) were calculated. For the second, subsidies provided by the low interest rates on Federal loans were calculated. The total incentive costs based on either procedure include regulation cost and the incentives from tax exempt power revenues. Using the first procedure, it was estimated that the costs of incentives were \$16.9 billion for hydroelectric generation. With the second, the costs were \$8.9 billion.

COAL INCENTIVES

The depletion allowance has been the single largest incentive to increased coal production. It amounted to \$4.7 billion between 1950 to 1978. Traditional services, which include facilities to aid the water-borne movement of coal, amounted to \$2.6 billion between 1950 and 1978. The nontraditional services of research, exploration, development, and safety accounted for \$3.6 billion of incentives. An estimated \$11.7 billion has been expended for incentives to the coal industry, or 4.6% of the total cost of incentives.

OIL INCENTIVES

Incentives to oil production were considered as two categories: 1) exploration and production and 2) refining and distribution. Exploration and production was defined to include the search for and recovery of both crude oil and natural gas, so that incentives to the exploration and production of one of these energy sources acted as an incentive to the other. However, refining and distribution was limited to petroleum conversion.

An estimated \$123.6 billion has been expended for incentives to the oil industry. This was 49% of the total Federal incentives to stimulate energy production. A large incentive to the petroleum industry was the reduction of existing taxes through intangible drilling expensing and the percentage depletion allowance. This incentive amounted to \$55.5 billion. Requirements, including stripper well price incentives, incentives for new oil, subsidies for pipelines and the Federal Energy Administration (now the ERA), had an estimated value from 1921 to 1978 of \$57.5 billion. Traditional services,

such as the maintenance of ports and waterways to handle oil tankers, accounted for \$6.9 billion. Research and development and data collection by the Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines accounted for \$1.9 billion of incentives. Disbursements (\$1.3 billion) and market activity (\$0.5 billion) accounted for a small percentage of the total cost of incentives to oil.

NATURAL GAS INCENTIVES

An estimated \$14.6 billion was expended for incentives to the natural gas industry between 1950 and 1978. This was 5.8% of total incentives to energy production. Most of the incentives were in the form of exemptions or reductions of existing taxes. Intangible drilling expensing and the percentage depletion allowance accounted for \$14.9 billion. Requirements in the form of wellhead price controls were disincentives to the natural gas industry of \$0.8 billion. Nontraditional services (which included data from the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey) and market activity accounted for \$0.45 billion.

ELECTRICITY INCENTIVES

The total cost of incentives for electricity generation and transmission were \$64.5 billion or 25.6% of the total energy incentives provided by the Federal Government to the six major energy sources.

To estimate the value of incentives, the analysis distinguished between the investor-owned private utilities and the government sponsored utilities. Emphasis was placed on public utilities since the distribution of electricity has traditionally been the principle concern of public utilities.

The same two alternative procedures used to estimate hydro incentives were applied to the calculation of electricity incentives. Using the first procedure (Federal investment money outstanding), it was estimated that the costs of incentives were \$64.5 billion. With the second (interest rate incentive), the costs of incentives were estimated at \$51.4 billion. Most of these incentives to electricity generation and transmission constitute market activity and taxation actions by the Federal Government.

CONCLUSIONS

In the years since 1918 the Federal Government has expended \$252 billion for incentives to stimulate energy production. A precedent therefore exists for the Federal Government to spend or forego large sums to increase energy production.

Considering the sums of the columns of Table 1, it can be seen that oil received the largest share of incentive funds. Possible reasons are 1) a large percentage of the population enters the oil market, at the gasoline pumps, each week; 2) oil has been commonly assumed to be difficult to find and in relatively limited supply; and 3) oil is perceived by the average citizen as necessary for a desirable lifestyle. The great value placed on oil by the public makes legislators sensitive to an assured supply.

The second largest share of Federal incentives went to the promotion of electricity generation and transmission. Reasons for this expenditure may have been the 'desirability of an inexpensive and readily available source of power for the public, The Rural Electrification Administration was created to provide the financing necessary to develop an electrical distribution system for all areas of the country.

Coal received the smallest percentage of incentives. The reasons may be: 1) coal has supplied energy over the longest period of time; 2) it is thought to be available in abundant quantities; and 3) coal is perceived as an inconvenient and dirty fuel. It therefore commands less political popularity.

Incentives for gas, nuclear, and hydro power have received intermediate amounts of funding. Production of gas is strongly related to the production of oil and the creation of incentives to increase oil production is correlated to that for gas. Incentives to the nuclear industry could result from 1) a strong puritan ethic which valued the making of something useful out of an investment conceived for destruction, and 2) a recognized need for new power sources. This was manifested as a dream of the future and articulated by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The driving forces behind Federal expenditures for hydro power were largely social, as part of the taming of a raw land with flood control, irrigation, and recreational facilities.

TABLE 1. An Estimate of the Cost Incentives Used to Stimulate Energy Production (in Billions of 1978 Dollars)

	<u>Nuclear</u>	<u>Hydro</u>	<u>Coal</u>	<u>Oil</u>	<u>Gas</u>	<u>Electricity</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent of Total Incentives</u>
Taxation		2.0	4.74	55.48	14.92	38.83	115.97	46.0
Disbursements			-	1.30	.		1.30	0.5
Requirements	1.7	0.04	0.80	57.49	-0.80		59.23	23.5
Traditional Services			2.57	6.92	-	0.52	10.01	4.0
Nontraditional Services	17.2		3.55	1.88	0.30		22.93	9.1
Market Activity	<u>2.1</u>	<u>14.86</u> ^(a)		<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.50</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>25.17</u> ^(a)	<u>42.80</u>
	<u>17.0</u>							
Totals	21.0	16.90	11.68	123.57	14.57	64.52	252.24	100
Percent of Total Incentives	8.3	6.7	4.6	49.0	5.8	25.6	100	

(a) This value based on incentive definition 1 (Federal money outstanding).

Considering the sum of the rows of Table 1, it can be seen that 46% of the total cost of incentives could be categorized as the action of levying a tax or the exemption or reduction of an existing one. Taxation is relatively easy to administer, has an immediate financial impact on those affected, is flexible, and is expedient. Approximately 0.5% of the cost of incentives was in the form of disbursements for which the Federal Government received no direct or indirect good or service in return. Requirements, such as price controls, accounted for 23.5% of the incentives. The Federal Government allocated 9.1% of the money expended to create incentives for energy production through nontraditional services such as exploration, research, development, and demonstration. Though popular in promise, nontraditional services are not as flexible as taxation and requirements. One reason for this is the limited size of the research community, which cannot be readily expanded. Seventeen percent of the total expenditure for incentives to increase energy production involved government market activity such as TVA. Traditional government services accounted for 4% of the total. These, too, are inflexible.

Creation or prohibition of organizations, and collection of fees, have not been emphasized as incentives to increase energy production. Such incentives are often unpopular. When they are potentially feasible, as in the case of creating the TVA, they must be acted upon quickly.

The analysis indicates two apparent rationales for incentives: 1) promotion of a new technology during its early stages and 2) payment of the difference between the value of an activity to the private sector and its value to the public sector. The support of nuclear energy represents an example of the first justification. Examples of the second are rural electrification (REA), economic development (TVA), flood control (dams), and price controls (oil, gas, and coal). If solar policy were developed according to these rationales, two-thirds of the action would focus on taxation and requirements. It would appear that these incentives should affect the technical elements of solar energy production for which consumers most often enter the marketplace.

During the course of the analysis, incentives were identified which did not have a quantifiable cost to the American taxpayer. Examples of these are

the Price-Anderson liability identification for nuclear power, the Connally Hot Oil Act, the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, and the Natural Gas Act of 1938. An analysis of the results of such incentives in which the Federal Government assumes responsibility and risk could lend considerable insight to the formulation of a strategy for solar development.

In conclusion, a precedent exists for utilizing Federal incentives to increase energy production. Design of national energy policy which considers the results of Federal investment in incentives to increase energy production could be an efficient basis upon which to integrate current and impending technology, existing energy stocks, and consumer requirements and preferences. The conclusion of micro-economic solar energy feasibility studies could be inconsequential without a comprehensive understanding of the costs and results of incentives to increase energy production. This is so because of the disparity in rationale between the Federal Government and the private sector. The Federal Government need not predicate national policy on short-term micro-economic analysis. As confirmed by this study, Federal justification is predicated on long-term goals met with the aid of new technology and supported by social values of the nation. **If it** is socially desirable and technologically feasible to increase solar energy's share in the national energy budget, the paramount policy question is one of selecting an incentive strategy and determining the government's level of investment in **it**.

DISTRIBUTION

<u>No. of Copies</u>		<u>No. of Copies</u>
	<u>OFFSITE</u>	
25	Roger Bezdek Chief Division of Conservation and Solar Applications Department of Energy 20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20545	Bruce Macphee Economist Tennessee Valley Authority 1340 Commerce Union Bank Bldg. Chattanooga, TN 37401
	Robert Spongberg Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401	Raymond Anderson Deputy Director Office of Energy Management and Conservation Washington State Energy Office 1000 South Cherry St. Olympia, WA 98504
	Wilson Clark Assistant to the Governor for Issues and Planning California State Governor's Office 1400 10th st. Sacramento, CA 95814	Michael Yoke11 Senior Economist Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401
	Penny Plamann Kansas Energy Office 503 Kansas Ave. Topeka, KS 66603	Gerald Savitsky, Editor Energy User News Fairchild Publications 7 E 12th St. New York, NY 10003
	George Hinman, Director, Environmental Research Center Washington State University Pullman, WA 99164	Frederick Koomanoff, Chief Environmental and Resource Studies Branch Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545
	John Mitchner Mail Stop 4723 Sandia Laboratories P. O. Box 5800 Albuquerque, NM 87185	Thomas Sparrow Purdue University West Lafayette, IN 41906
	Jeff Hammarlund 7983 Maurer Rd. Cross Plains, WI 53528	Jon Veigel Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401

No. of
Copies

Charles R. Hauer
Consultant
Planning Research Corp.
7600 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, VA 22101

Jack Benveniste
Senior Staff Scientist
The Aerospace Corporation
P.O. Box 92957
Los Angeles, CA 90009

John Nassikas
Attorney
Cox, Langford & Brown
21 Dupont Circle, NW.
Washington, DC 20035

Barry Hyman
Program in Social Management of
Technology
University of Washington, FS-15
Seattle, WA 98195

Richard Watson
Research Asst. Professor
SMT Program
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

Al Williams
State Senator-District 32
4801 Fremont, N.
Seattle, WA 98103

James Easterling
Division of Conservation and
Solar Applications
Department of Energy
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW.
Washington, DC 20545

Stephan Lanes
House Science Committee
B-374 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515

No. of
Copies

Douglas R. Boleyn, P.E.
Energy Management Consultant
17610 Springhill Place
Gladstone, OR 97027

Rocky Wilson
Co-Editor
The Times Journal
Box 746
Condon, OR 97823

Chandler Thompson
Technical Writer
New Mexico Solar Energy Institute
Box 3 SOL
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Leon Lindberg
Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Wisconsin-Madison
North Hall
1050 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706

Ronald Doctor, Commissioner
California Energy Resources
Development Commission
1111 Howe Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825

Wm H Babcock
Director of Policy and Economic
Analysis for PRC Energy Analysis Co.
7600 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, VA 22101

A. A. Churm
DOE Patent Division
9800 S. Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439

Andrew Krantz
Division of Solar Energy
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20545

No. of
Copies

No. of
Copies

Paul Maycock Division of Solar Energy Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	George A. Tsongas Engineering & Appl. Sciences Portland State University Portland, Or 97207
George Kaplan Solar-Central Receiver Branch Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	Mary Lawrence 4015 S. W. Canyon Road Portland, OR 97221
Martin Gutsten Solar-Thermal Systems R&D Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	Wendell E. Newson Department of Atmospheric Sciences Oregon State University Corvallis, OR 97330
G. W. Brown Solar Thermal Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	Elliott Katz Aerospace Corporation P.O. Box 92957 Los Angeles, CA 90009
Bob Stewart Department of Energy Richland Office Richland, WA 99352	Herbert Costner Division of Social Sciences National Science Foundation 1800 G Street, NW Washington, DC 20006
314 DOE Technical Information Center	Esther Cassidy Office of Congressional Affairs 12th and Pennsylvania, NW Washington, DC 20461
William D. Beverly 17778-41st Avenue, South Seattle, WA 98124	Joey Skaff Department of Energy Library Room 1223 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20545
John S. Reynolds Department of Agriculture University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403	Howard Bucknell, III P.O. Box 1508 East Hampton, NY 11937
David E. McDaniels Physics Department University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403	Orval Bruton North Pacific Division US Army Corps of Engineers P.O. Box 2870 Portland, OR 97208
Loren Johnson 2270 N. W. Irving Street Portland, OR 97210	
George W. Wyes 7617 S. W. 24th Avenue Portland, OR 97219	

No. of
Copies

Richard L. Mittelstadt
North Pacific Division
US Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2870
Portland, OR 97208

Leon Joroulman
US Department of Interior
Bonneville Power Administration
919 NE 19th Avenue
Portland, OR 97208

Jerry Dinan
US Department of Interior
Bonneville Power Administration
919 NE 19th Avenue
Portland, OR 97208

O. P. Pitts
Tennessee Valley Authority
815 Power Building
Chattanooga, TN 37401

John Lopez
Tennessee Valley Authority
815 Power Building
Chattanooga, TN 37401

Kathleen Berry
US Department of Interior
Alaska Power Administration
P.O. Box 50
Juneau, AK 99802

Lenore Melin
US Department of Interior
Alaska Power Administration
P.O. Box 50
Juneau, AL 99802

Gordon Hallum
US Department of Interior
Alaska Power Administration
P.O. Box 50
Juneau, AK 99802

No. of
Copies

Edward E. Riggin
US Department of Interior
Southwestern Power Administration
Page Belcher Federal Building
Tulsa, OK 74101

Lee C. Sheppard
Tennessee Valley Authority
Knoxville, TN 37902

Jesse C. Mills
Tennessee Valley Authority
Knoxville, TN 37902

Wade Rose
Governor's Office
1400 10th St.
Room 108
Sacramento, CA 95814

Commissioner of Reclamation
Room 7654
Department of the Interior
Washington, DC 20240

Mary George Bond
US Department of Interior
Southeastern Power Administration
Elberton, GA 30635

H. Wright
US Department of Interior
Southeastern Power Administration
Elberton, GA 30635

John E. Bigger
Solar Energy Program
EPRI
3412 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94303

George P. Branch
Program Manager
Hexcel
11711 Dublin Boulevard
Dublin, CA 94566

No. of
Copies

Peter H. Rose
Mathematical Sciences NW, Inc.
P.O. Box 1887
Bellvue, WA 98009

John M. Musser
Weyerhaeuser Company
First National Bank Building
St. Paul, MN 55101

Myron B. Katz
Northwest Energy Policy Project
Pacific Northwest Regional
Commission
1097 Lloyd Building
700 NE Multnomah Street
Portland, OR 97232

McLaren Stinchfield
The Times-Journal
P.O. Box 746
Condon, Or 97823

Carol S. Harlow
Office of Environmental Affairs
Seattle City
1015 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

John Hogan
City Energy Office
914 Arctic Building
Seattle, WA 98104

Alan Matthews
R. W. Beck and Associates
16009 NE 57th Street
Redmond, WA 98055

Kenneth D. Smith
Ecotope Group
2332 East Madison
Seattle, WA 98112

George Textor
Seattle Trust and Savings Bank
Fourth & Union Branch
Seattle, WA 98101

No. of
Copies

Richard H. Watson
Social management of Technology
University of Washington FS-15
Seattle, WA 98195

William D. Schulze
Department of Economics
New Mexico University
Albuquerque, NM

Douglas R. Bolste
17610 Springhill Place
Gladstone, OR 97027

Gary D. Somon
California Energy Commission
1111 Howe Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825

Craig Chase
Department of Energy
1992 Federal Bldg.
915 2nd Avenue
Seattle, WA 98174

Ken Bostock
Washington Energy Office
1000 South Cherry St.
Olympia, WA 98504

Ron Quist
Senior Research Analyst
Second Floor
House Office Building
Olympia, WA 98504

Vincent DiCara
Office of Energy Resources
55 Capitol St.
August, ME 04330

Joseph Honick
Group Mangement Associates
Suite 715
Encina, CA 91436

No. of
Copies

Robert Scot
CEBS
Campus Box 1126
Washington University
St. Louis, MO 63130

Michael W. Graine, Esq.
Special Assistant to the Director
Department of Energy
State of Oregon
Salem, OR 97310

A. Verrips
American Public Gas Assn.
Suite 115
2600 Virginia Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Bruce Chapman
Secretary of State
Legislative Building
Olympia, WA 98504

R. Schedigar
NM Solar Energy Institute
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Edward W. Ware III
American Gas Association
1515 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209

Michael Totten
National Taxpayers Union
325 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Thomas Scanlon
Project Office
Rural Electrification Administration,
Department of Agriculture
14th Street and Independence Ave.,
Washington, DC 20250

Bill Weigle
1620 North Park Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85719

No. of
Copies

Mike McCabe
Environmental Study Conference
3334 House Annex 2
US Congress
Washington, DC 20515

Susannah Lawrence
Non-Congressional Coordinator
of Solar
317 Penn. Ave. SE
Washington, DC 20003

Daniel Drayfus
Committee on Energy and National
Resources
US Senate
Dirson Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dick D'Amato
US Congress
429 Cannon Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Terry Johnson
Senator Hart's Office
254 Russell Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Tom Smith
University of Wisconsin Extension
Department of Engineering
432 N. Lake St.
Madison, WI 53706

Meg Schachter
National Center for Economic
Alternatives
2000 P Street, NW
Suite 515
Washington, DC 20510

Paul Rothberg
RS-SPR
Library of Congress
1st and Independence Ave. SE
Washington, DC 20540

No. of
Copies

David Gushee
Congressional Research Service
Library of Congress
Washington, DC 20540

Robert L. Vines
Bituminous Coal Operators
Assn., Inc.
World Center Building
Washington, DC 20036

Thomas E. Biery
Director Policy Analysis
Independent Petroleum Assn.
of American
1101 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Alan Starr
Economics Regulatory
Administration
Office of Utilities Systems
US Department of Energy
20 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20545

Allen Hirshberg
Booze-Allen-Hamilton Mgmt.
Consultants
1025 Connecticut Ave., NW
Bethesda, MD 20014

Dr. David Bushnell
9620 Hawick Lane
Kensington, ME 20795

Kay McSweeney
PATRIOT-LEDGER
13 Temple St.
Quincy, MA 02169

Jet Propulsion Laboratory/CALTECH
ATTN: Library Tech. Operations
#1680
4800 Oak Grove Drive
Pasadena, CA 91103

Attn: Lois M. Baird

No. of
Copies

Randi Lornell
Solar Energy Research Institute
1536 Cole Blvd.
Golden, CO 80401

Jack Cadogan
Department of Energy (ETS)
600 E. St., NW
Washington, DC 20545

John Davidson, CEQ
722 Jackson Place
Washington, DC 20006

Tom Friery
Office of Sacramento
City Treasurer
800-10th St.
Sacramento, CA 95814

Robert T. Jaske
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of State Programs
Washington, DC 20555

Roger W. Bryenton
956 East 16th Avenue
Vancouver, BC
V5T 2V9, CANADA

Allan Brosz
Science and Public Policy Program
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK 73019

W. R. McCuney
Program Director
Florida Solar Energy Center
300 State Road 401
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

John Fattorini
House Republican Caucus
Legislative Building
Olympia, WA 98504

No. of
Copies

Charles McClain
House Republican Caucus
Legislative Building
Olympia, WA 98504

Iraida B. Rickling
Librarian
Florida Solar Energy Center
300 State Road 401
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

Dr. Haskell P. Wald
Chief Economist
Federal Power Commission
Washington, DC 20426

Thomas D. Duchesneau
University of Maine at Orono
Orono, ME 04473

Reed Moyer
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48823

John L. Siegfried
Assistant Professor Economics
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37240

Edwin Mansfield
Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19174

Thomas F. Hogarty
Dept. of Econ.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State U
Blacksburg, VA 24060

Dr. Thomas Gale Moore
Dept. of Econ.
Michigan State U
East Lansing, MI 48823

John H. Lichtblau
Pet. Industry Research Foundation
122 E. 42 St.
New York, NY 10017

No. of
Copies

George Patton
American Petroleum Institute
21st and L St.
Washington, DC 20006

Connie Holmes
National Coal Assn.
1130 17th, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Lester M. Salamon
Asst. Prof. of Political Science
Duke University
Durham, NC 27706

Professor Gerard M. Brannonall
Georgetown University
1400 37th, NW
Washington, DC 20057

Robert Kalisch
American Gas Assn.
1515 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209

Sheldon Butt
Solar Energy Industry Assn.
Suite 800
1001 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

Robert Perry
Director, Systems Acquisition
Management
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90406

Dr. Meir Carraso, Mgr.
Energy Systems Integration
California Energy Resources
Conservation and Development
Commission
111 Howe Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825

No. of
Copies

Kenny Cousins
c/o Senator Paul Tsongas
Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20515

Chris Byal
Public Interest Economics
1095 Market St.
Suite 604
San Francisco, CA 94103

Bruce Hannon
Associate Professor
Director - Energy Research Group
University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign
Center for Advanced Computation
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Paul Rappaport, Director
Solar Energy Research Institute
1536 Cole Blvd.
Golden, CO 80401

Dr. Barbara C. Farhar
Solar Energy Research Institute
1536 Cole Blvd.
Golden, CO 80401

Silvio J. Flaim, Ph.D.
Solar Energy Research Institute
1536 Cole Blvd.
Golden, CO 80401

Dennis R. Costello
Solar Energy Research Institute
1536 Cole Blvd.
Golden, CO 80401

Duane Chapman
Energy & Resource Program
Room 100, Building T-4
Berkeley, Ca 94720

No. of
Copies

James Hardcastle
Energy Research Digest
Dulles Intern'l Airport
P.O. Box 17162
Washington, DC 20041

The Wall Street Journal
1701 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Carol Anderson
National Resources Defense
Council
917 15th St., NW
Washington, DC 20005

Jerry Duane
Building and Community Systems
Division
20 Massachusetts NW,
Room 2248
Washington, DC 20545

Max Goldman
Texaco Inc.
Suite 500
1050 17th St. NW
Washington, DC 20036

Jane Gravelle
Economic Division
Congressional Research Service
Library of Congress
Main Building
1st Floor - West Side, Room 103
Washington, DC 20540

H. Richard Chew,
Attorney at Law
Suite 312 Radio Bldg.
2030 N. 16th Street
Arlington, VA 22201

Ronald W. Szwajkowski
Mayer, Brown and Platt
231 South La Salle Street
Chicago, IL 60604

No. of
Copies

H Dana Moran
Solar Energy Research Institute
1536 Cole Blvd.
Golden, CO 80401

Harvey A Harris
Attorney at Law
Stolar, Heitzmann & Eder
515 Olive Street
Room 1700
St. Louis, MO 63101

Daniel L. Skoler
Program Development Counsel
American Bar Assoc.
1800 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20036

Harold P. Green
Professor of Law
The National Law Center
The George Washington University
720 20th Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

Katherine McG. Sullivan
Assistant Director
Public Service Activities Div.
American Bar Assoc.
1800 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20036

Jan G. Laitos
Ass't Professor of Law
University of Denver College
of Law
200 W. 14th Ave.
Denver, CO 80204

Bob Lindsey
706 Federal Bldg.
Department of Energy
Richland Office
Richland, VA 99352

No. of
Copies

Earl Finbar Murphy
Ohio State University College
of Law
1659 N. High St.
Columbus, OH 43210

William A. Thomas
American Bar Foundation
1155 E. 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637

George R. Perrine
Legal Consultant
Tenneco Inc.
Suite 4300-1100 Milan Bldg.
P.O. Box 2511
Houston, TX 77001

Prof. Gary Widman
Hastings College of Law
198 McAllister St.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Patrick Donnelly
Office of Public Affairs
Department of Energy
12th and Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20461

Michael Silverstein, President
Energy Marketing Associates
c/o Energy User News
7 E. 12th Street
New York, NY 10003

William Fenzel
U.S. General Accounting Office
Room A2-2200
Century 21 Building
c/o Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20545

James Eberhardt
Division of Conservation and
Solar Applications
Department of Energy
20 Massachusetts Avenue N. W.
Washington, DC 20545

No. of
Copies

Richard N. Bergstrom
Partner -- Sargent & Lundy
55 East Monroe
Chicago, IL 60603

E. Sturt Kirkpatrick
P.O. Box 236
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411

J. George Thon
465 Barbara Way
Hillsborough, CA 94010

Harry E. Bovay
Bovay Engineers, Inc.
5009 Caroline
Houston, TX 77004

Richard S. McGinnis
Northern States Power co.
414 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Franklin D. Meyers
Inter-County Highway Commission
of SE Michigan
24719 Van Dyke
Center Line, MI 48105

Don P. Reynolds
ASCE, 345 East 47th Street
New York, NY 10017

Louis L. Meier, Jr.
ASCE, 1625 Eye St., NW
Washington, DC 20006

No. of
Copies

133 Pacific Northwest Laboratory

D. Brenchley
10 R. Cole (HARC)
W. Coleman

50 B. Cone
D. Deonigi

5 K. Drumheller
5 J. Emery

10 A. Fassbender
J. Fox
J. Goodnight (HARC)
R. Gurwall

10 H. Harty
F. Hungate
E. Kleckner
D. Lenerz (Columbus)
J. Litchfield

5 J. Maxwell (HARC)
R. Mazzucchi
J. Ramsdell

10 W. Sheppard (Columbus)
P. Sommers (HARC),
G. Stacy (Columbus)
P. Walkup
R. Watts
O. Williams

3 Economics Library
5 Technical Information
2 Publishing Coordination

ONSITE

DOE Richland Operations Office

Programs Division

H. E. Ranson

