

Revised

PNL-2410 REV. *ES*

UC-59

An Analysis of Federal Incentives Used to Stimulate Energy Production

December 1978 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



PNL-2410 REV.

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 my 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

3 3679 00051 7815

PNL-2410 REV
UC 59
Executive Summary

REVISED

**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. Easter1ing, J. C. Emery,
A. G. Fassbender, J. S. Fattorini, Jr.,
B. Gordon, H. Harty, R. Mazzucchi, C. McClain, D. D. Morre,
E. J. Sheppard, S. Solomon

December, 1978

Prepared for
Division of Conservation
and Solar Applications
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20545
under Contract EY-76-C-06-1330

Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Richland, Washington 99352

CONTENTS

AN ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL INCENTIVES USED TO STIMULATE ENERGY PRODUCT	1
GENERIC INCENTIVES	2
NUCLEAR INCENTIVES	3
HYDRO INCENTIVES	3
COAL INCENTIVES	4
OIL INCENTIVES	4
NATURAL GAS INCENTIVES	5
ELECTRICITY INCENTIVES	5
CONCLUSION	6

AN ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL INCENTIVES
USED TO STIMULATE 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 1977; 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 1977 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 of consumers.

GENERIC, INCENTIVES

Using this typology of federal actions, incentives provided during FY-1977 were identified on a generic basis. Fifty-six organizational components spent an estimated \$9.8 billion conducting energy-related activities. Expenditures of individual organizations ranged from \$2.75 billion, spent by the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA), to negligible amounts. The ERDA, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Army Corps of Engineers accounted for 57% of the incentives expended. Thirty-four departmental agencies administered \$4.47 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 17 organizations with a total outlay of \$5.95 billion. Fourteen House committees had jurisdiction over energy-related organizations; these included the Government Operations Committee, which had jurisdiction over 28 organizations with a total outlay of \$8.08 billion.

Organizations emphasizing market activity spent 46% of all funds. Exploration, research, development, and demonstration accounted for 34%. Organizations whose primary action involved requirements backed by criminal and civil sanctions spent 6.5%. Only one organization was involved in altering the tax structure.

Thirty-eight percent of the \$9.8 billion was directly related to incentives involving electricity, mostly for market activities. Of the remaining 62%, \$2.75 billion was expended for incentives to the nuclear industry. The oil industry received \$2.26 billion. Coal and gas received less than one-half billion each. The solar energy industry received just over \$100 million of the incentives directed specifically toward energy-producing industries.

NUCLEAR INCENTIVES

Incentives for nuclear power are estimated to have cost the Federal Government \$18.0 billion over the past 30 years. This was about 8.3% of total federal incentives to stimulate energy production. The Civilian Reactor Development Program (CDRP) used approximately 62% of the research and development dollars. The Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) program has received \$3.1 billion through the CDRP. The costs of regulating civilian reactors (\$1.1 billion) and the investment in enrichment plants (\$1.8 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 road-block) and federal uranium policies. No way was found to quantify them.

HYDRO INCENTIVES

The estimated cost of incentives to hydroelectric power was \$15.3 billion. This is 7.0% of the total federal incentives to stimulate energy production. In the development of hydropower, the government has acted as a market entity at each step of the production-consumption cycle. All 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 \$15.3 billion for hydroelectric generation. With the second, the costs were \$8.0 billion.

COAL INCENTIVES

The depletion allowance has been the single largest incentive to increased coal production. It amounted to \$4 billion between 1950 and 1977. Traditional services, which include facilities to aid the water-borne movement of coal, amounted to \$2.3 billion between 1950 and 1977. The nontraditional services of research, exploration, development, and safety accounted for \$2.7 billion of incentives. An estimated \$9.71 billion has been expended for incentives to the coal industry, or 4.5% 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 \$101.3 billion has been expended for incentives to the oil industry. This was almost 47% of the total federal incentives to stimulate energy production. The largest incentive to the petroleum industry was the reduction of existing taxes through intangible drilling expensing and the percentage depletion allowance. This incentive amounted to \$50.4 billion. The second largest category, requirements, included stripper well price incentives, incentives for new oil, subsidies for pipelines and the Federal Energy Administration. The estimated value of requirements from 1921 to 1977 was \$41.9 billion. Traditional services, such as the maintenance of ports and waterways to handle oil tankers, accounted for \$6.0 billion. Research and development and data collection by the Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines

accounted for \$1.5 billion of incentives. Disbursements and market activity accounted for an insignificant percentage of the total cost of incentives to oil.

NATURAL GAS INCENTIVES

An estimated \$16.5 billion was expended for incentives to the natural gas industry between 1950 and 1977. This was 7.6% 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 \$16 billion. Requirements in the form of wellhead price controls were an incentive to the natural gas industry of \$0.06 billion. Nontraditional services (which included data from the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey) and market activity accounted for \$0.4 billion.

ELECTRICITY INCENTIVES

The total costs of incentives for electricity generation and transmission were \$56.6 billion or 26% 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 \$56.6 billion. With the second (interest rate incentive), the costs of incentives were estimated at \$43.9 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 \$217.4 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 1977 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		1.8	4.03	50.4	16.04	31.37	103.64	47.7%
Disbursements				1.1			1.10	0.5%
Requirements	1.1	0.03	0.67	41.9	0.06		43.76	20.1%
Traditional Services				2.31	6.0	0.48	8.79	4.0%
Nontraditional Services	15.1			2.68	1.5	0.3	19.58	9.0%
Market Activity	1.8	13.5 ^(a)	0.02	0.4	0.1	24.73 ^(a)	40.55	18.7%
Totals	18.0	15.33	9.71	101.3	16.50	56.58	217.42	100%
Percent of Total Incentives	8.3%	7.0%	4.5%	46.6%	7.6%	26.0%	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 47.7% 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 20.1% of the incentives. The Federal Government allocated 9.0% 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. Almost 19% of the total expenditure for incentives to increase energy production involved government market activities such as TVA. These, too, are inflexible.

Creation or prohibition of organizations, collection of fees, and traditional services 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 market-place.

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 indemnification 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 conclusions 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 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, NW. Washington, DC 20545
	Robert Spongberg Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401
	Wilson Clark Assistant to the Governor for Issues and Planning California State Governor's Office 1400 10th St. Sacramento, CA 95814
	Penny Plamann Kansas Energy Office 503 Kansas Ave. Topeka, KA 66603
	George Hinman Director, Environmental Research Center Washington State University Pullman, WA 99164
	John Mitchner Mail Stop 4723 Sandia Laboratories P.O. Box 5800 Albuquerque, NM 87185
	Barry L. Human Social Management of Technology University of Washington FS-15 Seattle, WA 98195
	Jeff Hammarlund 7983 Maurer Rd. Cross Plains, WI 53528
	Bruce Macphee Economist Tennessee Valley Authority 1340 Commerce Union Bank Bldg. Chattanooga, TN 37401
	John Vigol ERCDC California Department of Energy Sacramento, CA 95825
	Raymond Anderson Deputy Director Office of Energy Management and Conservation Washington State Energy Office 1000 South Cherry St. Olympia, WA 98504
	Michael Yokel Senior Economist Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401
	Gerald Savitsky, Editor Energy User News Fairchild Publications 7 E 12th St. New York, NY 10003
	Frederick Koomanoff, Chief Environmental and Resource Studies Branch Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545
	Thomas Sparrow Purdue University West Lafayette, IN 41906

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Jon Veigel Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401	Stephan Lanes House Science Committee B-374 Rayburn Building Washington, DC 20515
Charles R. Hauer Consultant Planning Research Corp. 7600 Old Springhouse Road McLean, VA 22101	Douglas R. Boleyn, P.E. Energy Management Consultant 17610 Springhill Place Gladstone, OR 97027
Jack Benveniste Senior Staff Scientist The Aerospace Corporation P.O. Box 92957 Los Angeles, CA 90009	Rocky Wilson Co-Editor The Times Journal Box 746 Condon, OR 97823
John Nassikas Attorney Cox, Langford & Brown 21 Dupont Circle, NW Washington, DC 20035	Chandler Thompson Technical Writer New Mexico Solar Energy Institute Box 3 SOL Las Cruces, NM 88003
Barry Hyman Program in Social Management of Technology University of Washington, FS-15 Seattle, WA 98195	Leon Lindberg Professor Department of Political Science University of Wisconsin-Madison North Hall 1050 Bascom Mall Madison, WI 53706
Richard Watson Research Asst. Professor SMT Program University of Washington Seattle, WA 98195	Ronald Doctor, Commissioner California Energy Resources Development Commission 1111 Howe Avenue Sacramento, CA 95825
A1 Williams State Senator-District 32 4801 Fremont, N. Seattle, WA 98103	Wm. H. Babcock Director of Policy and Economic Analysis for PRC Energy Analysis Co. 7600 Old Springhouse Road McLean, VA 22101
James Easterling Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401	A. A. Churm DOE Patent Division 9800 S. Cass Avenue Argonne, IL 60439

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Andrew Krantz Division of Solar Energy Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	Loren Johnson 2270 N. W. Irving Street Portland, OR 97210
Paul Maycock Division of Solar Energy Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	George W. Wyes 7617 S. W. 24th Avenue Portland, OR 97219
George Kaplan Solar-Central Receiver Branch Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	George A. Tsongas Engineering & App. Sciences Portland State University Portland, OR 97207
Martin Gutsten Solar-Thermal Systems R&D Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	Mary Lawrence 4015 S. W. Canyon Road Portland, OR 97221
G. W. Brown Solar Thermal Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545	Wendell E. Newson Department of Atmospheric Sciences Oregon State University Corvallis, OR 97330
Bob Stewart Department of Energy Richland Office Richland, WA 99352	Elliott Katz Aerospace Corporation P.O. Box 92957 Los Angeles, CA 90009
304 DOE TECHNICAL Information Center	Herbert Costner Division of Social Sciences National Science Foundation 1800 G Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006
William D. Beverly 17778-41st Avenue, South Seattle, WA 98124	Esther Cassidy Office of Congressional Affairs 12th and Pennsylvania, NW Washington, DC 20461
John S. Reynolds Department of Agriculture University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403	Joey Skaff Department of Energy Library Room 1223 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20545
Robert H. Murray 2735 S. E. 28th Avenue Portland, OR 97210	Howard Bucknell, III P.O. Box 1508 East Hampton, NY 11937
David E. McDaniels Physics Department University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403	

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Orval Bruton North Pacific Division US Army Corps of Engineers 210 Custom House Portland, OR 97209	Gordon Hallum US Department of Interior Alaska Power Administration P.O. Box 50 Juneau, AK 99802
Richard L. Mittelstadt North Pacific Division US Army Corps of Engineers 210 Custom House Portland, OR 97209	Edward E. Riggin US Department of Interior Southwestern Power Adniistration Page Belcher Federal Building Tulsa, OK 74101
Leon Jorouiman US Department of Interior Bonneville Power Administration 919 NE 19th Avenue Portland, OR 97208	Lee C. Sheppeward Tennessee Valley Authority Knoxville, TN 37902
Jerry Dinan US Department of Interior Bonneville Power Administration 919 NE 19th Avenue Portland, OR 97208	Jesse C. Mills Tennessee Valley Authroity Knoxville, TN 37902
O. P. Pitts Tennessee Valley Authority 815 Power Building Chattanooga, TN 37401	Wade Rose Governor's Office 1400 10th St. Room 108 Sacramento, CA 95814
John Lopez Tennesse Valley Authority 815 Power Building Chattanooga, TN 37401	Commissioner of Reclamation Room 7654 Department of the Interior Washington, DC 20240
Kathleen Berry US Department of Interior Alaska Power Administration P.O. Box 50 Juneau, AK 99802	Mary George Bond US Department of Interior Southeastern Power Administration Elberton, GA 30635
Lenore Melin US Department of Interior Alaska Power Administration P.O. Box 50 Juneau, AL 99802	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
	Calvin C. Silverstein Westinghouse Electric Corporation P.O. Box 10864 Pittsburgh, PA 15236

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
George P. Branch Program Manager Hexcel 11711 Dublin Boulevard Dublin, CA 94566	George Textor Seattle Trust and Savings Bank Fourth & Union Branch Seattle, WA 98101
Peter H. Rose Mathematical Sciences NW, Inc. P.O. Box 1887 Bellevue, WA 98009	Richard H. Watson Social Management of Technology University of Washington FS-15 Seattle, WA 98195
John M. Musser Weyerhauser Company First National Bank Building St. Paul, MN 55101	William D. Schulze Department of Economics New Mexico University Albuquerque, NM
Myron B. Katz Northwest Energy Policy Project Pacific Northwest Regional Commission 1097 Lloyd Building 700 NE Multnomah Street Portland, OR 97232	Douglas R. Bolste 17610 Springhill Place Gladstone, OR 97027
McLaren Stinchfield The Times-Journal P.O. Box 746 Condon, OR 97823	Gary D. Somon California Energy Commission 1111 Howe Avenue Sacramento, CA 95825
Carol S. Harlow Office of Environmental Affairs Seattle City 1015 Third Avenue Seattle, WA 98104	Craig Chase Department of Energy 1992 Federal Bldg. 915 2nd Avenue Seattle, WA 98174
John Hogan City Energy Office 914 Arctic Building Seattle, WA 98104	Ken Bostock Washington Energy Office 1000 South Cherry St. Olympia, WA 98504
Alan Matthews R. W. Beck and Associates 16009 NE 57th Street Redmond, WA 98055	Ron Quist Senior Research Analyst Second Floor House Office Building Olympia, WA 98504
Kenneth D. Smith Ecotope Group 2332 East Madison Seattle, WA 98112	Vincent DiCara Office of Energy Resources 55 Capitol St. August, Maine 04330
	Joseph Honick Group Management Associates Suite 715 Encina, CA 91436

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Robert Scot CBNS Campus Box 1126 Washington University St. Louis, MO 63130	Mike McCabe Environmental Study Conference 3334 House Annex 2 US Congress Washington, DC 20515
Michael W. Grainen, Esq. Special Assistant to the Director Department of Energy State of Oregon Salem, OR 97310	Susannah Lawrence Non Congressional Coordinator of Solar 317 Penn. Ave. SE Washington, DC 20003
A. Verrips American Public Gas Assn. Suite 115 2600 Virginia Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20037	Daniel Drayfus Committee on Energy and National Resources US Senate Dirksen Office Building Washington, DC 20510
Bruce Chapman Secretary of State Legislative Building Olympia, WA 98504	Dick D'Amato US Congress 429 Cannon Office Building Washington, DC 20515
R. Scheidigar NM Solar Energy Institute Las Cruces, NM 88003	Terry Johnson Senator Hart's Office 254 Russell Office Building Washington, DC 20510
Edward W. Ware III American Gas Association 1515 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209	Tom Smith University of Wisconsin Extension Department of Engineering 432 N. Lake St. (Madison, WI 53706)
Michael Totten National Taxpayers Union 325 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE Washington, DC 20003	Meg Schachter National Center for Economic Alternatives 2000 P Street, NW Suite 515 Washington, DC 20510
Thomas Scanlon Project Office Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture 14th Street and Independence Ave., SW Washington, DC 20250	Paul Rothberg CRS-SPR Library of Congress 1st and Independence Ave. SE Washington, DC 20540
Bill Weigle 1620 North Park Avenue Tucson, AZ 85719	

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
David Gushee Congressional Research Service Library of Congress Washington, DC 20540	Randi Lornell Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401
Robert L. Vines Bituminous Coal Operators Assn., Inc. World Center Building Washington, DC 20036	Jack Cadogan Department of Energy (ETS) 600 E. St., NW Washington, DC 20545
Thomas E. Biery Director Policy Analysis Independent Petroleum Assn. of American 1101 16th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036	John Davidson, CEQ 722 Jackson Place Washington, DC 20006
Alan Starr Economics Regulatory Admini- stration Office of Utilities Systems US Department of Energy 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW Washington, DC 20545	Tom Friery Washington Public Power Supply System George Washington Way Richland, WA 99352
Allen Hirshberg Booze-Allen-Hamilton Mgmt. Consultants 1025 Connecticut Ave., NW Bethesda, MD 20014	Robert T. Jaske Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of State Programs Washington, DC 20555
Dr. David Bushnell 9620 Hawick Lane Kensington, MD 20795	Roger W. Bryenton 956 East 16th Avenue Vancouver, BC V5T 2V9, CANADA
Kay McSweeney PATRIOT-LEDGER 13 Temple St. Quincy, MA 02169	Allan Brosz Science and Public Policy Program University of Oklahoma Norman, OK 73019
Jet Propulsion Laboratory/CALTECH ATTN: Library Tech. Operations #1680 4800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, CA 91103	W. R. McCune Program Director Florida Solar Energy Center 300 State Road 401 Cape Canaveral, FL 32920
Attn: Lois M. Baird	John Fattorini House Republican Caucus Legislative Building Olympia, WA 98504

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Charles McClain House Republican Caucus Legislative Building Olympia, WA 98504	George Patton American Petroleum Institute 21st and L St. Washington, DC 20006
Iraida B. Rickling Librarian Florida Solar Energy Center 300 State Road 401 Cape Canaveral, FL 32920	Connie Holmes National Coal Assn. 1130 17th, NW Washington, DC 20036
Dr. Haskell P. Wald Chief Economist Federal Power Commission Washington, DC 20426	Lester M. Salamon Asst. Prof. of Political Science Duke University Durham, NC 27706
Thomas D. Duchesneau University of Maine at Orono Orono, Maine 04473	Professor Gerard M. Brannonall Georgetown University 1400 37th, NW Washington, DC 20057
Reed Moyer Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48823	Robert Kalisch American Gas Assn. 1515 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209
John L. Siegfried Assistant Professor Economics Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN 37240	Sheldon Butt Solar Energy Industry Assn. Suite 800 1001 Connecticut Ave., NW Washington, DC 20036
Edwin Mansfield Wharton School University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA 19174	Robert Perry Director, Systems Acquisition Management 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, CA 90406
Thomas F. Hogarty Dept. of Econ Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State U Blacksburg, VA 24060	Dr. Meir Carrasco, Mgr. Energy Systems Integration California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission 111 Howe Avenue Sacramento, CA 95825
Dr. Thomas Gale Moore Dept. of Econ Michigan State U East Lansing, MI 48823	Kenny Cousins c/o Senator Paul Tsongas Senate Office Bldg. Washington, DC 20515
John H. Lichtblau Pet. Industry Research Foundation 122 E. 42 St. New York, NY 10017	

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Chris Byal Public Interest Economics 1095 Market St. Suite 604 San Francisco, CA 94103	The Wall Street Journal 1701 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304
Bruce Hannon Associate Professor Director - Energy Research Group University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Center for Advanced Computation Urbana, IL 61801	Carol Anderson National Resources Defense Council 917 15th St., NW Washington, DC 20005
Randi Lornell Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401	Jerry Duane Building and Community Systems Division 20 Massachusetts N.W., Room 2248 Washington, DC 20545
Dr. Paul Rappaport, Director Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401	Max Goldman Texaco Inc. Suite 500 1050 17th St. NW Washington, DC 20036
Dr. Earbara C. Farhar Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401	Jane Gravelle Economic Division Congressional Research Service Library of Congress Main Building 1st Floor - West Side, Room 103 Washington, DC 20540
Silvio J. Flaim, Ph.D. Solar Energy Research Insitute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401	H. Richard Chew, Attorney at Law Suite 312 Radio Bldg. 2030 N. 16th Street Arlington, VA 22201
Dennis R. Costello Solar Energy Research Insitute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401	Ronald W. Szwajkowski Mayer, Brown and Platt 231 South La Salle Street Chicago, IL 60604
Duane Chapman Energy & Resource Program Room 100, Building T-4 Berkley, CA 94720	H. Dana Moran Solar Energy Research Institute 1536 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401
James Hardcastle Energy Research Digest Dulles Intern'l Airport P.O. Box 17162 Washington, DC 20041	

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>
Harvey A. Harris Attorney at Law Stolar, Heitzmann & Eder 515 Olive Street Room 1700 St. Louis, MO 63101	William A. Thomas American Bar Foundation 1155 E 60th Street Chicago, IL 60637
Daniel L. Skoler Program Development Counsel American Bar Assoc. 1800 M Street NW Washington, DC 20036	George R. Perrine Legal Consultant Tenneco Inc. Suite 4300-1100 Milan Bldg. P.O. Box 2511 Houston, TX 77001
Harold P. Green Professor of Law The National Law Center The George Washington University 720 20th Street NW Washington, DC 20006	Prof. Gary Widman Hastings College of Law 198 McAllister St. San Francisco, CA 94102
Katherine McG. Sullivan Assistant Director Public Service Activities Div. American Bar Assoc. 1800 M Street NW Washington, DC 20036	Patrick Donnelly Office of Public Affairs Department of Energy 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue Washington, DC 20461
Jan G. Laitos Ass't Professor of Law University of Denver College of Law 200 W. 14th Ave. Denver, CO 80204	Michael Silverstein, President Energy Marketing Associates c/o Energy User News 7 E. 12th Street New York, NY 10003
Bob Lindsey 706 Federal Bldg. Department of Energy Richland Office Richland, WA 99352	William Fenzel U.S. General Accounting Office Room A2-2200 Century 21 Building c/o Department of Energy Washington, DC 20545
Earl Finbar Murphy Ohio State University College of Law 1659 N High St. Columbus, OH 43210	James Eberhardt Division of Conservation and Solar Applications Department of Energy 20 Massachusetts Avenue NW. Washington, DC 20545
	Richard N. Bergstrom Partner -- Sargent & Lundy 55 East Monroe Chicago, IL 60603

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Pacific Northwest Laboratory</u>
E. Sturt Kirkpatrick P.O. Box 236 Berkeley Springs, WV 25411		D. Brenchley N. Carter R. Cole (HARC) W. Coleman B. Cone D. Deonigi K. Drumheller J. Emery A. Fassbender J. Fox J. Goodnight (HARC) R. Gurwall H. Harty F. Hungate E. Kleckner J. Litchfield R. Mazzucchi J. Ramsdell W. Sheppard (Columbus) P. Walkup R. Watts
J. George Thon 465 Barbara Way Hillsborough, CA 94010	10	
Harry E. Bovay Bovay Engineers, Inc. 5009 Caroline Huston, TX 77004	10	
Richard S. McGinnis Northern States Power Co. 414 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis, MN 55401	10	
Franklin D. Meyers Inter-County Highway Commission of SE Michigan 24719 Van Dyke Center Line, MI 48105	5	
Don P. Reynolds ASCE, 345 East 47th Street New York, NY 10017	10	Economics Library (3) Technical Information (5) Publishing Coordination (3)
Louis L. Meier, Jr. ASCE, 1625 Eye St., NW Washington, DC 20006		

ONSITE

DOE Richland Operations Office
Programs Division
H. E. Ranson

