

praised the plan widely. "The plan is a good first step," stated Thomas Kuhn, president of the Edison Electric Institute, the trade organization for major utilities. The utilities, he observed, are "committing to work with administrative representatives to see what kind of programs companies can undertake to limit overall emissions." The Global Climate Coalition, a major trade association representing business groups, similarly endorsed the plan for its "reliance on business/government partnerships and voluntary initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions." Environmental and advocacy groups were less enthusiastic, criticizing the plan for its heavy reliance on the goodwill of the private sector. "This tells the international community that they don't have to use tough measures to fight global warming," said Steve Kretzman of Greenpeace. "It tells them that voluntary measures are enough and that's the wrong signal." Dan Becker of the Sierra Club agreed, declaring that "what we need is tougher measures to achieve real reductions." Even the Environmental Defense Fund, with a reputation for taking moderate positions and favoring market-based approaches to pollution control, responded skeptically, noting that the plan did not contain backup measures if voluntary efforts proved inadequate. Other analysts, however, were more equivocal, contending that too many uncertainties still surrounded global warming to be sure that benefits from mandatory measures would outweigh the costs. "Until we know more about the science," stated Doug Bohi of Resources for the Future, a Washington think-tank, "it might be better to have a purely voluntary program."<sup>265</sup>

## ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLES

The Department of Energy's program offices were responsible for implementation of a significant portion of the administration's energy/environmental policies.<sup>266</sup> This was certainly true for the emissions reduction plan. The Department was accountable for three-fourths of the plan's budget requirements,



*Secretary O'Leary briefing the media following the release of the Climate Change Action Plan at the White House on October 19, 1993.* Source: U.S. Department of Energy

and new energy efficiency and conservation initiatives formed the bulk of this. These new initiatives included cost-shared demonstrations of new technologies, "Golden Carrot" partnerships with non-profit organizations, utilities, and environmental groups to accelerate the commercialization of advanced energy efficient appliances, and the "Motor Challenge"—a collaborative program to test and verify the cost-saving potential of industrial motor systems. In addition, negotiations with the electric utilities bore fruit with a program dubbed "Climate Challenges." Utilities voluntarily agreed to either return greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels (or below) or limit emissions under strict performance measures. By October, the Department had reached tentative agreements with fifty-seven utilities representing 60 percent of the Nation's electricity generation. On the energy supply side, the emissions reduction plan directed the Department to initiate collaborative efforts with private industry to accelerate market acceptance of renewable technologies. The administration earmarked \$432 million for this program through the year 2000.<sup>267</sup>

Emphasis on energy efficiency, conservation, and renewables, as well as natural gas, formed the core of the Clinton Administration's energy strategy. The fiscal year 1994 budget request of \$789 million for energy efficiency activities