



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Massachusetts - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Hull Town of	0.0%	\$0	4,550,000	0.0%	
Sterling Town of	0.0%	\$0	4,503,000	0.0%	
Georgetown City of	0.0%	\$0	4,082,000	0.0%	
Boylston Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,613,000	0.0%	
Ashburnham Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,574,000	0.0%	
Groveland City of	0.0%	\$0	2,489,000	0.0%	
Merrimac Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,231,000	0.0%	
Paxton Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,227,000	0.0%	
Rowley Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,158,000	0.0%	
Princeton Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,331,000	0.0%	
Chester Town of	0.0%	\$0	592,000	0.0%	
Russell City of	0.0%	\$0	395,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Michigan.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Northern States Power Co	0.9%	\$3,358,000	382,564,000	-6.9%	30
Wisconsin Public Service Corp	0.5%	\$2,480,000	479,387,000	-84.7%	45
Lansing City of	0.0%	\$62,000	140,673,000	244.4%	112
Detroit Edison Co	0.0%	\$0	3,619,178,000	-100%	N/A
Consumers Power Co	0.0%	\$0	2,512,792,000	-100%	N/A
Wisconsin Electric Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,412,115,000	-100%	N/A
Indiana Michigan Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,391,917,000	-100%	N/A
Michigan Public Power Agency	0.0%	\$0	100,536,000	0.0%	N/A
Detroit City of	0.0%	\$0	75,608,000	0.0%	
Upper Peninsula Power Co	0.0%	\$0	60,202,000	0.0%	
Holland City of	0.0%	\$0	48,138,000	0.0%	
Top O'Michigan Rural Elec Co	0.0%	\$0	39,805,000	0.0%	
Edison Sault Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	37,482,000	0.0%	
Great Lakes Energy Coop	0.0%	\$0	30,538,000	0.0%	
Michigan South Central Pwr Agy	0.0%	\$0	24,350,000	0.0%	
Fruit Belt Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	22,095,000	0.0%	
Grand Haven City of	0.0%	\$0	21,503,000	0.0%	
Cherryland Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	21,308,000	0.0%	
Wyandotte Municipal Serv Comm	0.0%	\$0	20,463,000	0.0%	
Bay City City of	0.0%	\$0	20,362,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	19,962,000	0.0%	
Presque Isle Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,706,000	0.0%	
Alpena Power Co	0.0%	\$0	18,347,000	0.0%	
Marquette City of	0.0%	\$0	17,082,000	0.0%	
Sturgis City of	0.0%	\$0	14,961,000	0.0%	
Traverse City City of	0.0%	\$0	14,903,000	0.0%	
Coldwater Board of Public Util	0.0%	\$0	13,465,000	0.0%	
Cloverland Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	13,084,000	0.0%	
Zeeland City of	0.0%	\$0	12,668,000	0.0%	
Hillsdale Board of Public Wks	0.0%	\$0	9,673,000	0.0%	
Escanaba City of	0.0%	\$0	9,533,000	0.0%	
Thumb Electric Coop-Michigan	0.0%	\$0	9,214,000	0.0%	
Niles City of	0.0%	\$0	7,711,000	0.0%	
South Haven City of	0.0%	\$0	7,591,000	0.0%	
Marshall City of	0.0%	\$0	7,037,000	0.0%	
Petoskey City of	0.0%	\$0	6,789,000	0.0%	
Western Michigan Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	6,604,000	0.0%	
Bayfield Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,415,000	0.0%	
Alger-Delta Coop Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	4,798,000	0.0%	
Charlevoix City of	0.0%	\$0	4,731,000	0.0%	
Dowagiac City of	0.0%	\$0	3,914,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Michigan - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Chelsea Village of	0.0%	\$0	3,880,000	0.0%	
Eaton Rapids City of	0.0%	\$0	3,648,000	0.0%	
Southeastern Michigan REC Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,606,000	0.0%	
Lowell City of	0.0%	\$0	3,233,000	0.0%	
Paw Paw Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,538,000	0.0%	
Croswell City of	0.0%	\$0	2,494,000	0.0%	
Harbor Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	2,486,000	0.0%	
Sebewaing City of	0.0%	\$0	2,276,000	0.0%	
Ontonagon County R E A	0.0%	\$0	2,257,000	0.0%	
Gladstone City of	0.0%	\$0	2,231,000	0.0%	
Portland City of	0.0%	\$0	2,168,000	0.0%	
St Louis City of	0.0%	\$0	2,031,000	0.0%	
Hart Hydro City of	0.0%	\$0	1,913,000	0.0%	
Norway City of	0.0%	\$0	1,845,000	0.0%	
Clinton Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,704,000	0.0%	
Negaunee City of	0.0%	\$0	1,541,000	0.0%	
Union City City of	0.0%	\$0	1,205,000	0.0%	
Newberry City of	0.0%	\$0	1,157,000	0.0%	
Crystal Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	1,154,000	0.0%	
L'Anse Village of	0.0%	\$0	895,000	0.0%	
Wakefield City of	0.0%	\$0	714,000	0.0%	
Baraga City of	0.0%	\$0	618,000	0.0%	
Stephenson City of	0.0%	\$0	391,000	0.0%	
Daggett Village of	0.0%	\$0	55,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Minnesota.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Minnesota Power & Light Co	1.2%	\$5,816,000	467,274,000	69.2%	21
Northern States Power Co	1.2%	\$24,548,000	2,100,512,000	-1.7%	23
Moorhead City of	1.1%	\$163,000	15,552,000	0.0%	
Otter Tail Power Co	1.0%	\$2,099,000	203,881,000	47.8%	26
United Power Assn	0.7%	\$1,488,000	207,213,000	119.2%	38
Northwestern Wisconsin Elec Co	0.7%	\$70,000	10,114,000	0.0%	
Fairmont Public Utilities Comm	0.7%	\$75,000	11,305,000	0.0%	
Austin City of	0.6%	\$98,000	17,826,000	117.8%	
Thief River Falls City of	0.4%	\$27,000	6,132,000	0.0%	
Coop Power Assn	0.4%	\$662,000	171,817,000	-48.6%	55
Rochester Public Utilities	0.4%	\$273,000	71,273,000	139.5%	
Owatonna City of	0.3%	\$66,000	20,473,000	0.0%	
Peoples Coop Power Assn	0.3%	\$42,000	14,211,000	0.0%	
Shakopee Public Utilities Comm	0.3%	\$24,000	9,339,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop	0.2%	\$36,000	16,208,000	3500%	
Worthington Public Utilities	0.2%	\$18,000	8,669,000	0.0%	
Freeborn-Mower Electric Coop	0.2%	\$17,000	8,390,000	0.0%	
Grand Rapids Public Util Comm	0.1%	\$6,000	7,307,000	0.0%	
Marshall City of	0.0%	\$2,000	17,967,000	-98.4%	
Anoka City of	0.0%	\$2,000	13,567,000	0.0%	
Southern Minnesota Mun P Agny	0.0%	\$0	135,712,000	0.0%	N/A
Anoka Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	89,837,000	0.0%	
Dakota Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	85,196,000	0.0%	
Western Minnesota Mun Pwr Agny	0.0%	\$0	42,285,000	0.0%	
East Central Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	40,869,000	0.0%	
Lake County Power	0.0%	\$0	33,502,000	0.0%	
Wright-Hennepin Coop Elec Assn	0.0%	\$0	32,515,000	0.0%	
Minnesota Mun Pwr Agy	0.0%	\$0	31,009,000	0.0%	
Sioux Valley Empire E A Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,222,000	0.0%	
Crow Wing Coop Power&Light Co	0.0%	\$0	22,464,000	0.0%	
Minnesota Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	21,285,000	0.0%	
Stearns Coop Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	19,618,000	0.0%	
Beltrami Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	19,108,000	0.0%	
Lake Region Coop Elec Assn	0.0%	\$0	18,174,000	0.0%	
Willmar Municipal Utils Comm	0.0%	\$0	14,956,000	0.0%	
Blue Earth-Nicollet-Faribault	0.0%	\$0	13,648,000	0.0%	
Hutchinson Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	12,705,000	0.0%	
Chaska City of	0.0%	\$0	11,446,000	0.0%	
Steele-Waseca Coop Electric	0.0%	\$0	10,895,000	0.0%	
Wild Rice Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,848,000	0.0%	
Runestone Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	10,529,000	-100%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.

The Environmental Working Group is a non-profit environmental research organization based in Washington, D.C.
 Phone: (202) 667-6982 • Fax: (202) 232-2592 • Email: info@ewg.org • Web: http://www.ewg.org



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Minnesota - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
New Ulm Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	10,108,000	0.0%	
Alexandria City of	0.0%	\$0	9,723,000	0.0%	
Mille Lacs Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	8,976,000	0.0%	
Minnesota Valley Coop L&P Assn	0.0%	\$0	8,716,000	0.0%	
Kandiyohi Coop Elec Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	8,518,000	0.0%	
McLeod Coop Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	8,515,000	0.0%	
Brainerd City of	0.0%	\$0	8,401,000	0.0%	
Meeker Coop Light & Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	8,199,000	0.0%	
Hibbing Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	8,098,000	0.0%	
Itasca-Mantrap Coop Elec Assn	0.0%	\$0	7,926,000	0.0%	
Todd-Wadena Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	7,888,000	0.0%	
Agralite Coop	0.0%	\$0	7,816,000	0.0%	
Elk River City of	0.0%	\$0	7,279,000	0.0%	
Roseau Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,262,000	0.0%	
Virginia City of	0.0%	\$0	7,119,000	0.0%	
Red River Valley Coop Pwr Assn	0.0%	\$0	7,055,000	0.0%	
Federated Rural Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	6,546,000	0.0%	
Nobles Coop Electric	0.0%	\$0	6,118,000	0.0%	
North Star Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,986,000	0.0%	
Detroit Lakes City of	0.0%	\$0	5,966,000	0.0%	
Red Lake Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,951,000	0.0%	
Brown County Rural Elec Assn	0.0%	\$0	5,921,000	0.0%	
East Grand Forks City of	0.0%	\$0	5,903,000	0.0%	
South Central Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	5,889,000	0.0%	
Goodhue County Coop Elec Assn	0.0%	\$0	5,729,000	0.0%	
P K M Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,636,000	0.0%	
Lake City City of	0.0%	\$0	5,345,000	0.0%	
Saint Peter Municipal Utils	0.0%	\$0	5,307,000	0.0%	
Lyon-Lincoln Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,888,000	0.0%	
Renville-Sibley Coop Pwr Assn	0.0%	\$0	4,797,000	0.0%	
North St Paul City of	0.0%	\$0	4,753,000	0.0%	
Le Sueur City of	0.0%	\$0	4,714,000	0.0%	
Waseca City of	0.0%	\$0	4,513,000	0.0%	
Buffalo City of	0.0%	\$0	4,454,000	0.0%	
Melrose Public Utilities	0.0%	\$0	4,308,000	0.0%	
Coop L & P Assn of Lake County	0.0%	\$0	4,148,000	0.0%	
H-D Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,042,000	0.0%	
Glencoe Light & Power Comm	0.0%	\$0	4,019,000	0.0%	
Mora City of	0.0%	\$0	3,989,000	0.0%	
Litchfield Public Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	3,790,000	0.0%	
Clearwater-Polk Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,775,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Minnesota - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Redwood Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,758,000	0.0%	
New Prague Mun Utils Comm	0.0%	\$0	3,752,000	0.0%	
Jackson City of	0.0%	\$0	3,725,000	0.0%	
Traverse Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,686,000	0.0%	
Arrowhead Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,648,000	0.0%	
Head of Lakes Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,606,000	0.0%	
Blue Earth City of	0.0%	\$0	3,388,000	0.0%	
Luverne City of	0.0%	\$0	3,292,000	0.0%	
North Itasca Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,201,000	0.0%	
Princeton Public Utils Comm	0.0%	\$0	3,096,000	0.0%	
Redwood Falls Public Util Comm	0.0%	\$0	3,083,000	0.0%	
Winnebago Rural Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	2,830,000	0.0%	
Wadena City of	0.0%	\$0	2,817,000	0.0%	
St James City of	0.0%	\$0	2,755,000	0.0%	
Windom City of	0.0%	\$0	2,438,000	0.0%	
Sauk Centre City of	0.0%	\$0	2,180,000	0.0%	
Sleepy Eye Public Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	2,034,000	0.0%	
Aitkin Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	2,022,000	0.0%	
Roseau City of	0.0%	\$0	1,966,000	0.0%	
Madelia City of	0.0%	\$0	1,933,000	0.0%	
Warroad City of	0.0%	\$0	1,907,000	0.0%	
Delano City of	0.0%	\$0	1,905,000	0.0%	
Ely City of	0.0%	\$0	1,890,000	0.0%	
Breckenridge City of	0.0%	\$0	1,865,000	0.0%	
Benson City of	0.0%	\$0	1,800,000	0.0%	
Two Harbors City of	0.0%	\$0	1,743,000	0.0%	
Granite Falls Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,689,000	0.0%	
Wells City of	0.0%	\$0	1,632,000	0.0%	
St Charles City of	0.0%	\$0	1,577,000	0.0%	
Ortonville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,534,000	0.0%	
Moose Lake Water & Light Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,530,000	0.0%	
Fosston City of	0.0%	\$0	1,503,000	0.0%	
Kasson City of	0.0%	\$0	1,496,000	0.0%	
Grand Marais City of	0.0%	\$0	1,432,000	0.0%	
North Branch Water&Light Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,427,000	0.0%	
Spring Valley Pub Utils Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,415,000	0.0%	
Olivia City of	0.0%	\$0	1,410,000	0.0%	
Blooming Prairie City of	0.0%	\$0	1,401,000	0.0%	
Staples City of	0.0%	\$0	1,336,000	0.0%	
Proctor Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,335,000	0.0%	
Springfield Public Utils Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,245,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Minnesota - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Preston Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,151,000	0.0%	
Caledonia City of	0.0%	\$0	1,136,000	0.0%	
Warren City of	0.0%	\$0	1,109,000	0.0%	
Arlington City of	0.0%	\$0	1,088,000	0.0%	
Baudette City of	0.0%	\$0	1,078,000	0.0%	
Bagley Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,057,000	0.0%	
Ada City of	0.0%	\$0	1,048,000	0.0%	
Barnesville City of	0.0%	\$0	999,000	0.0%	
Mountain Lake City of	0.0%	\$0	997,000	0.0%	
Madison City of	0.0%	\$0	990,000	0.0%	
Hawley Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	977,000	0.0%	
Mountain Iron City of	0.0%	\$0	941,000	0.0%	
Kenyon Municipal Utilities	0.0%	\$0	920,000	0.0%	
Truman Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	876,000	0.0%	
Central Minnesota MPA	0.0%	\$0	860,000	0.0%	
Winthrop City of	0.0%	\$0	857,000	0.0%	
Spring Grove City of	0.0%	\$0	834,000	0.0%	
Lake Crystal City of	0.0%	\$0	833,000	0.0%	
Elbow Lake City of	0.0%	\$0	827,000	0.0%	
Rushford City of	0.0%	\$0	800,000	0.0%	
Adrian Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	716,000	0.0%	
Lakefield City of	0.0%	\$0	680,000	0.0%	
Tyler City of	0.0%	\$0	672,000	0.0%	
Janesville City of	0.0%	\$0	654,000	0.0%	
Gilbert City of	0.0%	\$0	615,000	0.0%	
Round Lake City of	0.0%	\$0	576,000	0.0%	
Halstad City of	0.0%	\$0	560,000	0.0%	
Stephen City of	0.0%	\$0	536,000	0.0%	
Fairfax City of	0.0%	\$0	531,000	0.0%	
Pierz City of	0.0%	\$0	531,000	0.0%	
Grove City City of	0.0%	\$0	501,000	0.0%	
Harmony City of	0.0%	\$0	485,000	0.0%	
Biwabik City of	0.0%	\$0	467,000	0.0%	
Henning City of	0.0%	\$0	434,000	0.0%	
Westbrook City of	0.0%	\$0	433,000	0.0%	
Lanesboro Public Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	391,000	0.0%	
Lake Park City of	0.0%	\$0	382,000	0.0%	
Nashwauk City of	0.0%	\$0	353,000	0.0%	
Keewatin Public Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	345,000	0.0%	
Brownton City of	0.0%	\$0	343,000	0.0%	
Mabel City of	0.0%	\$0	303,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Minnesota - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Randall City of	0.0%	\$0	271,000	0.0%	
Buhl City of	0.0%	\$0	256,000	0.0%	
Alvarado City of	0.0%	\$0	234,000	0.0%	
Brewster City of	0.0%	\$0	229,000	0.0%	
Newfolden City of	0.0%	\$0	206,000	0.0%	
Kasota City of	0.0%	\$0	199,000	0.0%	
Kandiyohi City of	0.0%	\$0	182,000	0.0%	
Rushmore City of	0.0%	\$0	143,000	0.0%	
Eitzen City of	0.0%	\$0	141,000	0.0%	
Ceylon City of	0.0%	\$0	126,000	0.0%	
Darwin Village of	0.0%	\$0	123,000	0.0%	
Bigelow City of	0.0%	\$0	122,000	0.0%	
Shelly City of	0.0%	\$0	119,000	0.0%	
Peterson City of	0.0%	\$0	94,000	0.0%	
Dunnell Village of	0.0%	\$0	78,000	0.0%	
Alpha City of	0.0%	\$0	73,000	0.0%	
Nielsville City of	0.0%	\$0	40,000	0.0%	
Whalan City of	0.0%	\$0	29,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Mississippi.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Singing River Elec Power Assn	0.1%	\$64,000	66,275,000	-12.3%	
South Mississippi El Pwr Assn	0.0%	\$102,000	302,835,000	21.4%	114
Entergy Mississippi, Inc	0.0%	\$0	937,395,000	0.0%	N/A
Mississippi Power Co	0.0%	\$13,000	543,588,000	-87.7%	121
Southern Pine Elec Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	90,852,000	0.0%	
Coast Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	67,005,000	0.0%	
Tombigbee Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	55,260,000	0.0%	
4-County Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	51,643,000	0.0%	
Pearl River Valley El Pwr Assn	0.0%	\$0	40,146,000	0.0%	
Central Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	39,016,000	0.0%	
Dixie Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	37,458,000	0.0%	
East Mississippi Elec Pwr Assn	0.0%	\$0	36,884,000	0.0%	
Tupelo City of	0.0%	\$0	36,270,000	0.0%	
Northcentral Mississippi E P A	0.0%	\$0	35,089,000	0.0%	
Alcorn County Elec Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	34,626,000	0.0%	
Tallahatchie Valley E P A	0.0%	\$0	34,132,000	0.0%	
Delta Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	30,232,000	0.0%	
Magnolia Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	29,721,000	0.0%	
Columbus City of	0.0%	\$0	28,237,000	0.0%	
Municipal Energy Agency of MS	0.0%	\$0	27,829,000	0.0%	
Southwest Mississippi E P A	0.0%	\$0	24,333,000	0.0%	
North East Mississippi E P A	0.0%	\$0	22,343,000	0.0%	
Pontotoc Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	21,412,000	0.0%	
Natchez Trace Elec Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	19,895,000	0.0%	
Starkville City of	0.0%	\$0	19,447,000	0.0%	
Twin County Electric Pwr Assn	0.0%	\$0	18,468,000	0.0%	
Prentiss County Elec Pwr Assn	0.0%	\$0	18,056,000	0.0%	
Tippah Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	17,908,000	0.0%	
Greenwood Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	16,574,000	0.0%	
Yazoo Valley Elec Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	16,301,000	0.0%	
New Albany City of	0.0%	\$0	15,146,000	0.0%	
Tishomingo County E P A	0.0%	\$0	14,650,000	0.0%	
Holly Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	13,407,000	0.0%	
Clarksdale City of	0.0%	\$0	12,099,000	0.0%	
Monroe County Elec Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	10,733,000	0.0%	
West Point City of	0.0%	\$0	10,697,000	0.0%	
Oxford City of	0.0%	\$0	9,919,000	0.0%	
Aberdeen City of	0.0%	\$0	9,906,000	0.0%	
Louisville City of	0.0%	\$0	9,541,000	0.0%	
Public Serv Comm of Yazoo City	0.0%	\$0	7,724,000	0.0%	
Philadelphia City of	0.0%	\$0	7,644,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Mississippi - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Coahoma Electric Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	7,442,000	0.0%	
Amory City of	0.0%	\$0	7,323,000	0.0%	
Canton City of	0.0%	\$0	6,343,000	0.0%	
Okalona City of	0.0%	\$0	5,889,000	0.0%	
Kosciusko City of	0.0%	\$0	5,182,000	0.0%	
Water Valley City of	0.0%	\$0	4,504,000	0.0%	
Leland City of	0.0%	\$0	2,626,000	0.0%	
Collins City of	0.0%	\$0	2,031,000	0.0%	
Macon City of	0.0%	\$0	1,940,000	0.0%	
Durant City of	0.0%	\$0	1,661,000	0.0%	
Itta Bena City of	0.0%	\$0	1,208,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Missouri.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
North Central MO Elec Coop Inc	2.0%	\$174,000	8,605,000	0.0%	
Columbia City of	1.1%	\$592,000	56,095,000	393.3%	
Independence City of	0.2%	\$106,000	62,222,000	1.0%	
Union Electric Co	0.1%	\$2,248,000	2,188,571,000	0.0%	92
Boone Electric Coop	0.0%	\$5,000	24,244,000	0.0%	
St Joseph Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$9,000	86,730,000	0.0%	
Kansas City Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	895,943,000	0.0%	N/A
UtiliCorp United Inc	0.0%	\$0	557,307,000	0.0%	N/A
Associated Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	543,892,000	0.0%	N/A
Springfield City of	0.0%	\$0	115,891,000	0.0%	N/A
Sho-Me Power Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	100,381,000	0.0%	N/A
Carroll Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	59,767,000	0.0%	
Missouri Basin Mun Power Agny	0.0%	\$0	58,664,000	0.0%	
Sikeston City of	0.0%	\$0	57,715,000	0.0%	
Cuivre River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	40,015,000	-100%	
Citizens Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	39,026,000	0.0%	
White River Valley El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	36,601,000	0.0%	
Northeast Missouri El Pwr Coop	0.0%	\$0	34,406,000	0.0%	
Upper Missouri G&T El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	33,737,000	0.0%	
Ozark Border Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	29,206,000	0.0%	
Laclede Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	28,999,000	0.0%	
Southwest Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	27,868,000	0.0%	
Intercounty Electric Coop Assn.	0.0%	\$0	27,677,000	0.0%	
Ozark Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,590,000	-100%	
Platte-Clay Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	22,089,000	0.0%	
Black River Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	21,507,000	0.0%	
CO-MO Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	19,956,000	0.0%	
Howell-Oregon Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,567,000	0.0%	
Three Rivers Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	17,864,000	0.0%	
New-Mac Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,229,000	0.0%	
Scott-New Madrid-MS Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	15,306,000	0.0%	
Crawford Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,830,000	0.0%	
Webster Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	14,619,000	0.0%	
Osage Valley Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	14,051,000	0.0%	
Poplar Bluff City of	0.0%	\$0	13,645,000	0.0%	
Rolla City of	0.0%	\$0	13,102,000	0.0%	
Farmers Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,656,000	0.0%	
Clay County Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	12,490,000	0.0%	
West Central Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,441,000	0.0%	
Central Missouri Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,219,000	0.0%	
Hannibal City of	0.0%	\$0	12,170,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Missouri - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Kirkwood City of	0.0%	\$0	11,893,000	0.0%	
Macon Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	11,124,000	0.0%	
Lebanon City of	0.0%	\$0	11,120,000	0.0%	
Carthage City of	0.0%	\$0	11,025,000	0.0%	
Marshall City of	0.0%	\$0	10,967,000	0.0%	
Missouri Rural Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	10,766,000	0.0%	
Callaway Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	10,488,000	0.0%	
United Electric Coop, Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,969,000	0.0%	
Consolidated Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	9,942,000	0.0%	
Monett City of	0.0%	\$0	9,214,000	0.0%	
West Plains City of	0.0%	\$0	9,174,000	0.0%	
Farmington City of	0.0%	\$0	9,123,000	0.0%	
Barry Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	8,838,000	0.0%	
Fulton City of	0.0%	\$0	8,348,000	0.0%	
Grundy Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,969,000	0.0%	
Sac-Osage Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,488,000	0.0%	
Jackson City of	0.0%	\$0	7,268,000	0.0%	
Gascoage Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	6,911,000	0.0%	
Barton County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,761,000	0.0%	
Pemiscot-Dunklin Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,649,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	6,311,000	0.0%	
Chillicothe Municipal Utils	0.0%	\$0	6,167,000	0.0%	
Kennett City of	0.0%	\$0	6,125,000	0.0%	
Sullivan City of	0.0%	\$0	5,694,000	0.0%	
Lewis County Rural E C A	0.0%	\$0	5,584,000	0.0%	
Ralls County Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	5,408,000	0.0%	
Macon City of	0.0%	\$0	4,859,000	0.0%	
Trenton City of	0.0%	\$0	4,762,000	0.0%	
SE-MA-NO Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	4,532,000	0.0%	
Harrisonville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,332,000	0.0%	
Cameron City of	0.0%	\$0	3,890,000	0.0%	
Nixa City of	0.0%	\$0	3,800,000	0.0%	
Butler City of	0.0%	\$0	3,698,000	0.0%	
Atchison-Holt Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,628,000	0.0%	
Lamar City of	0.0%	\$0	3,331,000	0.0%	
Cuba City of	0.0%	\$0	3,272,000	0.0%	
Malden City of	0.0%	\$0	3,040,000	0.0%	
Higginsville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,902,000	0.0%	
Salem City of	0.0%	\$0	2,884,000	0.0%	
Howard Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	2,758,000	0.0%	
Odessa City of	0.0%	\$0	2,750,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Missouri - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Monroe City City of	0.0%	\$0	2,700,000	0.0%	
Mount Vernon City of	0.0%	\$0	2,645,000	0.0%	
Hermann City of	0.0%	\$0	2,569,000	0.0%	
Palmyra City of	0.0%	\$0	2,450,000	0.0%	
Fredericktown City of	0.0%	\$0	2,366,000	0.0%	
New Madrid City of	0.0%	\$0	2,290,000	0.0%	
St James City of	0.0%	\$0	2,253,000	0.0%	
El Dorado Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	2,231,000	0.0%	
Shelbina City of	0.0%	\$0	2,156,000	0.0%	
California City of	0.0%	\$0	2,070,000	0.0%	
Carrollton Board of Public Wks	0.0%	\$0	2,062,000	0.0%	
Houston City of	0.0%	\$0	2,055,000	0.0%	
Bethany City of	0.0%	\$0	2,031,000	0.0%	
Marceline City of	0.0%	\$0	1,973,000	0.0%	
Mountain View City of	0.0%	\$0	1,829,000	0.0%	
St Robert City of	0.0%	\$0	1,799,000	0.0%	
Waynesville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,778,000	0.0%	
Cabool City of	0.0%	\$0	1,670,000	0.0%	
Ava City of	0.0%	\$0	1,624,000	0.0%	
Willow Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	1,619,000	0.0%	
Centralia City of	0.0%	\$0	1,581,000	0.0%	
Fayette City of	0.0%	\$0	1,565,000	0.0%	
La Plata City of	0.0%	\$0	1,542,000	0.0%	
Owensville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,527,000	0.0%	
Mansfield City of	0.0%	\$0	1,493,000	0.0%	
Milan City of	0.0%	\$0	1,435,000	0.0%	
Vandalia City of	0.0%	\$0	1,247,000	0.0%	
Thayer City of	0.0%	\$0	1,243,000	0.0%	
Seymour City of	0.0%	\$0	1,230,000	0.0%	
Memphis City of	0.0%	\$0	1,219,000	0.0%	
Kahoka City of	0.0%	\$0	1,155,000	0.0%	
Slater City of	0.0%	\$0	1,110,000	0.0%	
Campbell City of	0.0%	\$0	1,097,000	0.0%	
Salisbury City of	0.0%	\$0	1,043,000	0.0%	
Richland City of	0.0%	\$0	1,023,000	0.0%	
Steelville City of	0.0%	\$0	973,000	0.0%	
Gallatin City of	0.0%	\$0	959,000	0.0%	
Unionville City of	0.0%	\$0	951,000	0.0%	
Rockport City of	0.0%	\$0	886,000	0.0%	
Albany City of	0.0%	\$0	841,000	0.0%	
Crane City of	0.0%	\$0	732,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Missouri - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Rich Hill City of	0.0%	\$0	693,000	0.0%	
Winona City of	0.0%	\$0	629,000	0.0%	
Stanberry City of	0.0%	\$0	613,000	0.0%	
Paris City of	0.0%	\$0	606,000	0.0%	
Lockwood Water & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	517,000	0.0%	
Perry City of	0.0%	\$0	412,000	0.0%	
Osceola City City of	0.0%	\$0	411,000	0.0%	
Liberal City of	0.0%	\$0	378,000	0.0%	
Newburg City of	0.0%	\$0	254,000	0.0%	
Gilman City City of	0.0%	\$0	224,000	0.0%	
Meadville City of	0.0%	\$0	209,000	0.0%	
Galt City of	0.0%	\$0	177,000	0.0%	
Mindenmines City of	0.0%	\$0	160,000	0.0%	
Linneus City of	0.0%	\$0	155,000	0.0%	
Easton City of	0.0%	\$0	99,000	0.0%	
Pattonsburg City of	0.0%	\$0	90,000	0.0%	
Hunnewell City of	0.0%	\$0	75,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Montana.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Montana Power Co	0.6%	\$2,923,000	508,407,000	-58.5%	42
MDU Resources Group, Inc	0.0%	\$0	141,590,000	0.0%	N/A
Black Hills Corp	0.0%	\$0	126,496,000	-100%	N/A
Flathead Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	38,713,000	0.0%	
Central Montana E P C Inc	0.0%	\$0	24,067,000	0.0%	
USBIA-Mission Valley Power	0.0%	\$0	16,871,000	0.0%	
McKenzie Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,435,000	0.0%	
Northern Lights Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,391,000	0.0%	
Fall River Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,299,000	0.0%	
Yellowstone Vllly Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,829,000	0.0%	
Missoula Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,819,000	0.0%	
Glacier Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,371,000	0.0%	
Ravalli County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,802,000	0.0%	
Vigilante Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,423,000	0.0%	
Grand Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,329,000	0.0%	
Fergus Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,034,000	0.0%	
Big Horn Rural Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	5,968,000	0.0%	
Lower Yellowstone R E A Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,877,000	0.0%	
Sun River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,552,000	0.0%	
Tongue River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,334,000	0.0%	
Lincoln Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,286,000	0.0%	
Sheridan Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,239,000	0.0%	
Hill County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,812,000	0.0%	
McCone Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,616,000	0.0%	
Park Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,170,000	0.0%	
Marias River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,050,000	0.0%	
Big Horn County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,782,000	0.0%	
Beartooth Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,535,000	0.0%	
Big Flat Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,124,000	0.0%	
Northern Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,065,000	0.0%	
Valley Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,740,000	0.0%	
Mid-Yellowstone Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,733,000	0.0%	
Southeast Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,710,000	0.0%	
Goldenwest Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,210,000	0.0%	
Troy City of	0.0%	\$0	776,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Nebraska.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
South Sioux City City of	0.1%	\$8,000	6,880,000	0.0%	
Lincoln Electric System	0.1%	\$80,000	135,073,000	17.7%	106
Nebraska Public Power District	0.0%	\$0	588,282,000	0.0%	N/A
Omaha Public Power District	0.0%	\$7,000	483,953,000	-98.5%	120
Nebraska Electric G&T Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	93,838,000	0.0%	
Loup River Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	48,652,000	0.0%	
Grand Island City of	0.0%	\$0	28,383,000	0.0%	
Southern Nebraska Rural P P D	0.0%	\$0	25,978,000	0.0%	
Norris Public Power District	0.0%	\$0	23,981,000	0.0%	
Y-W Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,686,000	0.0%	
Hastings City of	0.0%	\$0	20,604,000	0.0%	
Highline Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	19,994,000	0.0%	
Dawson County Public Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	18,045,000	0.0%	
Fremont City of	0.0%	\$0	16,459,000	0.0%	
Central Nebraska Pub P&I Dist	0.0%	\$0	15,222,000	0.0%	
Cornhusker Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	12,376,000	0.0%	
North Platte City of	0.0%	\$0	11,927,000	0.0%	
Rural Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	11,218,000	0.0%	
Beatrice City of	0.0%	\$0	10,141,000	0.0%	
Midwest Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	10,002,000	0.0%	
Custer Public Power District	0.0%	\$0	9,505,000	0.0%	
Wheat Belt Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	9,354,000	0.0%	
Southwest Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	9,019,000	0.0%	
Elkhorn Rural Public Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	8,823,000	0.0%	
York County Rural Pub Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	8,180,000	0.0%	
McCook Public Power District	0.0%	\$0	7,252,000	0.0%	
Wyrulec Co	0.0%	\$0	6,750,000	0.0%	
Nebraska City City of	0.0%	\$0	6,650,000	0.0%	
Panhandle Rural El Member Assn	0.0%	\$0	6,649,000	0.0%	
Lexington City of	0.0%	\$0	6,457,000	0.0%	
Niobrara Valley El Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	5,945,000	0.0%	
Cedar-Knox Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	5,863,000	0.0%	
LaCreek Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,616,000	0.0%	
Alliance City of	0.0%	\$0	5,598,000	0.0%	
South Central Public Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	5,572,000	0.0%	
Cherry-Todd Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,448,000	0.0%	
Burt County Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	5,060,000	0.0%	
Holdrege City of	0.0%	\$0	4,893,000	0.0%	
Butler County Rural P P D	0.0%	\$0	4,748,000	0.0%	
Crete City of	0.0%	\$0	4,572,000	0.0%	
Schuyler City of	0.0%	\$0	4,540,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Nebraska - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Twin Valleys Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	4,372,000	0.0%	
Northwest Rural Pub Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	4,365,000	0.0%	
Cuming County Public Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	4,250,000	0.0%	
North Central Public Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	4,184,000	0.0%	
Northeast Nebraska Rural P P D	0.0%	\$0	4,079,000	0.0%	
Howard Greeley Rural P P D	0.0%	\$0	3,821,000	0.0%	
Gering City of	0.0%	\$0	3,736,000	0.0%	
Seward County Rrl Pub Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	3,704,000	0.0%	
Wayne County Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	3,554,000	0.0%	
Loup Valleys Rural P P D	0.0%	\$0	3,517,000	0.0%	
Fairbury City of	0.0%	\$0	3,424,000	0.0%	
Cozad City of	0.0%	\$0	3,394,000	0.0%	
Wayne City of	0.0%	\$0	3,377,000	0.0%	
KBR Rural Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	3,288,000	0.0%	
Seward City of	0.0%	\$0	3,251,000	0.0%	
Auburn City of	0.0%	\$0	3,239,000	0.0%	
Polk County Rural Pub Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	3,225,000	0.0%	
Stanton County Public Pwr Dist	0.0%	\$0	3,172,000	0.0%	
Chimney Rock Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	2,933,000	0.0%	
Niobrara Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,792,000	0.0%	
Sidney City of	0.0%	\$0	2,766,000	0.0%	
Roosevelt Public Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	2,753,000	0.0%	
Madison City of	0.0%	\$0	2,548,000	0.0%	
Gothenburg City of	0.0%	\$0	2,382,000	0.0%	
Broken Bow City of	0.0%	\$0	2,278,000	0.0%	
Falls City City of	0.0%	\$0	2,272,000	0.0%	
West Point City of	0.0%	\$0	2,162,000	0.0%	
David City City of	0.0%	\$0	2,133,000	0.0%	
Valentine City of	0.0%	\$0	1,969,000	0.0%	
Central City City of	0.0%	\$0	1,796,000	0.0%	
Wahoo City of	0.0%	\$0	1,724,000	0.0%	
Ord City of	0.0%	\$0	1,577,000	0.0%	
Minden City of	0.0%	\$0	1,569,000	0.0%	
Imperial City of	0.0%	\$0	1,545,000	0.0%	
Superior City of	0.0%	\$0	1,538,000	0.0%	
Tecumseh City of	0.0%	\$0	1,495,000	0.0%	
St Paul City of	0.0%	\$0	1,294,000	0.0%	
Kimball City of	0.0%	\$0	1,253,000	0.0%	
Wakefield City of	0.0%	\$0	1,233,000	0.0%	
Hebron City of	0.0%	\$0	1,153,000	0.0%	
Neligh Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,097,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Nebraska - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Pierce City of	0.0%	\$0	1,025,000	0.0%	
De Witt Village of	0.0%	\$0	964,000	0.0%	
Syracuse City of	0.0%	\$0	942,000	0.0%	
Grant City of	0.0%	\$0	894,000	0.0%	
Sutton City of	0.0%	\$0	850,000	0.0%	
Morrill Village of	0.0%	\$0	824,000	0.0%	
Wilber City of	0.0%	\$0	812,000	0.0%	
Mitchell City of	0.0%	\$0	809,000	0.0%	
Curtis City of	0.0%	\$0	800,000	0.0%	
Bridgeport City of	0.0%	\$0	788,000	0.0%	
Burwell City of	0.0%	\$0	787,000	0.0%	
City of Scribner	0.0%	\$0	741,000	0.0%	
Wymore City of	0.0%	\$0	739,000	0.0%	
Arapahoe City of	0.0%	\$0	719,000	0.0%	
Wisner City of	0.0%	\$0	704,000	0.0%	
Red Cloud City of	0.0%	\$0	698,000	0.0%	
Franklin City of	0.0%	\$0	672,000	0.0%	
Stromsburg City of	0.0%	\$0	671,000	0.0%	
Wood River City of	0.0%	\$0	659,000	0.0%	
Plainview City of	0.0%	\$0	630,000	0.0%	
Bayard City of	0.0%	\$0	615,000	0.0%	
Pender City of	0.0%	\$0	614,000	0.0%	
Lyons City of	0.0%	\$0	611,000	0.0%	
Friend City of	0.0%	\$0	609,000	0.0%	
Chappell City of	0.0%	\$0	600,000	0.0%	
Benkelman City of	0.0%	\$0	593,000	0.0%	
Battle Creek City of	0.0%	\$0	584,000	0.0%	
Cambridge City of	0.0%	\$0	571,000	0.0%	
Randolph City of	0.0%	\$0	545,000	0.0%	
Oxford Village of	0.0%	\$0	525,000	0.0%	
Hemingford Village of	0.0%	\$0	505,000	0.0%	
Wauneta Village of	0.0%	\$0	482,000	0.0%	
Laurel City of	0.0%	\$0	472,000	0.0%	
Arnold Village of	0.0%	\$0	455,000	0.0%	
Beaver City City of	0.0%	\$0	446,000	0.0%	
Clarkson City of	0.0%	\$0	436,000	0.0%	
Hickman City of	0.0%	\$0	425,000	0.0%	
Blue Hill City of	0.0%	\$0	415,000	0.0%	
Snyder City of	0.0%	\$0	410,000	0.0%	
Stuart City of	0.0%	\$0	387,000	0.0%	
Decatur Village of	0.0%	\$0	383,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Nebraska - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Deshler City of	0.0%	\$0	381,000	0.0%	
Edgar City of	0.0%	\$0	373,000	0.0%	
Lyman Village of	0.0%	\$0	362,000	0.0%	
Spencer City of	0.0%	\$0	361,000	0.0%	
Trenton City of	0.0%	\$0	358,000	0.0%	
Emerson City of	0.0%	\$0	356,000	0.0%	
Walthill Village of	0.0%	\$0	344,000	0.0%	
Sargent City of	0.0%	\$0	335,000	0.0%	
Fairmont City of	0.0%	\$0	327,000	0.0%	
Callaway Village of	0.0%	\$0	322,000	0.0%	
Hampton Village of	0.0%	\$0	290,000	0.0%	
Indianola City of	0.0%	\$0	289,000	0.0%	
Leigh Village of	0.0%	\$0	287,000	0.0%	
Nelson City of	0.0%	\$0	283,000	0.0%	
Greenwood City of	0.0%	\$0	277,000	0.0%	
Spalding Village of	0.0%	\$0	276,000	0.0%	
Dorchester Village of	0.0%	\$0	271,000	0.0%	
Giltner City of	0.0%	\$0	262,000	0.0%	
Brainard Village of	0.0%	\$0	251,000	0.0%	
Ansley City of	0.0%	\$0	238,000	0.0%	
Mullen Village of	0.0%	\$0	232,000	0.0%	
Stratton City of	0.0%	\$0	228,000	0.0%	
Bradshaw Village of	0.0%	\$0	217,000	0.0%	
Polk Village of	0.0%	\$0	209,000	0.0%	
Shickley Village of	0.0%	\$0	208,000	0.0%	
Campbell Village of	0.0%	\$0	200,000	0.0%	
Davenport Village of	0.0%	\$0	182,000	0.0%	
Chester Village of	0.0%	\$0	175,000	0.0%	
Prague Village of	0.0%	\$0	171,000	0.0%	
Bartley Village of	0.0%	\$0	167,000	0.0%	
Lodgepole City of	0.0%	\$0	164,000	0.0%	
Wilcox Village of	0.0%	\$0	158,000	0.0%	
Winside Village of	0.0%	\$0	158,000	0.0%	
Village of Hotbrook	0.0%	\$0	154,000	0.0%	
Talmage Village of	0.0%	\$0	150,000	0.0%	
Hildreth Village of	0.0%	\$0	146,000	0.0%	
Panama Village of	0.0%	\$0	84,000	0.0%	
Elk Creek Village of	0.0%	\$0	54,000	0.0%	
Hubbell City of	0.0%	\$0	52,000	0.0%	
Reynolds Village of	0.0%	\$0	45,000	0.0%	
Endicott Village of	0.0%	\$0	37,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Nevada.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Boulder City City of	1.5%	\$86,000	5,943,000	0.0%	
Nevada Power Co	0.1%	\$728,000	799,081,000	-69.9%	95
Sierra Pacific Power Co	0.0%	\$0	540,586,000	-100%	N/A
Wells Rural Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	26,852,000	0.0%	
Colorado River Comm of Nevada	0.0%	\$0	25,719,000	0.0%	
Mt Wheeler Power Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,486,000	0.0%	
Valley Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	21,546,000	0.0%	
Overton Power District No 5	0.0%	\$0	14,050,000	-100%	
Plumas-Sierra Rural Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	9,636,000	0.0%	
Harney Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,569,000	0.0%	
Fallon City of	0.0%	\$0	5,692,000	0.0%	
Nevada Irrigation District	0.0%	\$0	4,474,000	0.0%	
Lincoln County Power Dist No 1	0.0%	\$0	2,844,000	0.0%	
Caliente City of	0.0%	\$0	849,000	0.0%	
Alamo Power District No 3	0.0%	\$0	560,000	0.0%	
Panaca Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	372,000	0.0%	
Pioche City of	0.0%	\$0	291,000	0.0%	
Farmers Mutual Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	56,000	0.0%	
Penoyer Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	31,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in New Hampshire.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Granite State Electric Co	3.5%	\$2,418,000	68,780,000	38.5%	
Central Maine Power Co	1.3%	\$12,494,000	944,390,000	-1.6%	19
Exeter & Hampton Electric Co	0.8%	\$414,000	53,818,000	11.3%	
Concord Electric Co	0.8%	\$382,000	49,801,000	4.4%	
New Hampshire Elec Coop Inc	0.6%	\$617,000	96,285,000	68.6%	
Connecticut Valley Elec Co Inc	0.6%	\$116,000	19,635,000	-57.5%	
Public Service Co of NH	0.1%	\$845,000	1,108,459,000	127.8%	99
Littleton City of	0.0%	\$0	5,256,000	0.0%	
Wolfeboro Town of	0.0%	\$0	5,042,000	0.0%	
Ashland Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,476,000	0.0%	
Woodsville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,516,000	0.0%	
New Hampton Village Precinct	0.0%	\$0	268,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in New Jersey.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Public Service Electric&Gas Co	0.9%	\$38,808,000	4,166,643,000	439.0%	28
Jersey Central Power&Light Co	0.4%	\$8,073,000	2,093,972,000	34.8%	54
Atlantic City Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	970,484,000	-100%	N/A
Rockland Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	136,203,000	0.0%	N/A
Vineland City of	0.0%	\$0	39,523,000	0.0%	
Sussex Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,494,000	0.0%	
Madison City of	0.0%	\$0	11,340,000	0.0%	
Butler Borough of	0.0%	\$0	10,145,000	0.0%	
South River Borough of	0.0%	\$0	5,666,000	0.0%	
Park Ridge Borough of	0.0%	\$0	4,225,000	0.0%	
Milltown Borough of	0.0%	\$0	3,138,000	0.0%	
Seaside Heights City of	0.0%	\$0	2,873,000	0.0%	
Lavallette City of	0.0%	\$0	1,425,000	0.0%	
Pemberton Borough of	0.0%	\$0	680,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in New Mexico.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Navopache Electric Coop Inc	1.1%	\$300,000	28,458,000	9900%	
Southwestern Public Service Co	0.4%	\$3,563,000	960,682,000	281.1%	58
El Paso Electric Co	0.1%	\$551,000	594,038,000	-26.2%	97
Socorro Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$3,000	12,991,000	0.0%	
Public Service Co of NM	0.0%	\$0	722,438,000	0.0%	N/A
Texas-New Mexico Power Co	0.0%	\$0	580,691,000	-100%	N/A
Duncan Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	64,122,000	0.0%	
Farmington City of	0.0%	\$0	52,644,000	0.0%	
La Plata Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	43,426,000	0.0%	
Lea County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	41,880,000	0.0%	
Navajo Tribal Utility Auth	0.0%	\$0	39,068,000	0.0%	
Los Alamos County	0.0%	\$0	28,567,000	0.0%	
Central Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	24,575,000	0.0%	
Jemez Mountains Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,916,000	0.0%	
Continental Divide El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,785,000	0.0%	
Kit Carson Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	22,907,000	0.0%	
Columbus Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,454,000	0.0%	
Southwestern Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,286,000	0.0%	
Gallup City of	0.0%	\$0	14,325,000	0.0%	
Central New Mexico El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,954,000	0.0%	
Farmers Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,935,000	0.0%	
Rio Grande Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,651,000	0.0%	
Otero County Electric Coop Inc.	0.0%	\$0	12,305,000	0.0%	
Roosevelt County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,676,000	0.0%	
Mora-San Miguel Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,744,000	0.0%	
Springer Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,236,000	0.0%	
Raton Public Service Co	0.0%	\$0	3,850,000	0.0%	
Sierra Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,591,000	0.0%	
Truth or Consequences City of	0.0%	\$0	3,427,000	0.0%	
Northern Rio Arriba E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,979,000	0.0%	
Aztec City of	0.0%	\$0	2,333,000	0.0%	
Springer Town of	0.0%	\$0	555,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in New York.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Fairport Village of	3.2%	\$378,000	11,835,000	0.0%	
Power Authority of State of NY	2.3%	\$34,030,000	1,480,803,000	258.8%	6
Orange & Rockland Utils Inc	0.6%	\$2,613,000	412,434,000	-83.8%	40
Massena Town of	0.5%	\$30,000	6,413,000	200.0%	
Consolidated Edison Co-NY Inc	0.5%	\$25,656,000	5,646,917,000	-74.4%	50
Long Island Lighting Co	0.3%	\$6,396,000	2,480,747,000	-74.4%	67
New York State Elec & Gas Corp	0.1%	\$2,448,000	1,792,164,000	-94.4%	85
Central Hudson Gas & Elec Corp	0.1%	\$413,000	416,429,000	-88.8%	94
Pennsylvania Electric Co	0.1%	\$498,000	1,052,935,000	-85.3%	110
Niagara Mohawk Power Corp	0.0%	\$635,000	3,307,601,000	-97.5%	116
Jamestown City of	0.0%	\$2,000	25,198,000	-98.3%	
Rochester Gas & Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	700,330,000	-100%	N/A
Freeport Village of Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,794,000	0.0%	
Rockville Centre Village of	0.0%	\$0	12,616,000	0.0%	
Plattsburgh City of	0.0%	\$0	11,508,000	0.0%	
Solvay Village of	0.0%	\$0	5,683,000	0.0%	
Steuben Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,197,000	0.0%	
Lake Placid Village Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,989,000	0.0%	
Arcade Village of	0.0%	\$0	4,027,000	0.0%	
Delaware County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,426,000	0.0%	
Otsego Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,249,000	0.0%	
Rouses Point Village of	0.0%	\$0	3,128,000	0.0%	
Bath Electric Gas & Water Sys	0.0%	\$0	2,823,000	0.0%	
Tupper Lake Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,748,000	0.0%	
Sherburne Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,215,000	0.0%	
Ilion Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,180,000	0.0%	
Boonville Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,126,000	0.0%	
Westfield Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,123,000	0.0%	
Springville Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,116,000	0.0%	
Penn Yan Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,097,000	0.0%	
Sherrill City of	0.0%	\$0	2,008,000	0.0%	
Greenport Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,996,000	0.0%	
Salamanca City of	0.0%	\$0	1,958,000	0.0%	
Spencerport Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,847,000	0.0%	
Hamilton Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,835,000	0.0%	
Wellsville Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,828,000	0.0%	
Endicott Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,797,000	0.0%	
Akron Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,587,000	0.0%	
Watkins Glen Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,456,000	0.0%	
Oneida-Madison Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,383,000	0.0%	
Greene Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,350,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in New York - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency investment*
Little Valley Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,290,000	0.0%	
Bergen Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,184,000	0.0%	
Fishers Island Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	1,104,000	0.0%	
Skaneateles Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,060,000	0.0%	
Frankfort Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,014,000	0.0%	
Groton Village of	0.0%	\$0	859,000	0.0%	
Churchville Village of	0.0%	\$0	828,000	0.0%	
Mayville Village of	0.0%	\$0	819,000	0.0%	
Green Island City of	0.0%	\$0	776,000	0.0%	
Mohawk Municipal Comm	0.0%	\$0	746,000	0.0%	
Richmondville Village of	0.0%	\$0	639,000	0.0%	
Marathon Village of	0.0%	\$0	617,000	0.0%	
Holley Village of	0.0%	\$0	569,000	0.0%	
Moreau Manufacturing Corp	0.0%	\$0	555,000	0.0%	
Brocton City of	0.0%	\$0	427,000	0.0%	
Philadelphia Village of	0.0%	\$0	424,000	0.0%	
Angelica Village of	0.0%	\$0	375,000	0.0%	
Andover Village of	0.0%	\$0	295,000	0.0%	
Castile Village of	0.0%	\$0	293,000	0.0%	
Theresa City of	0.0%	\$0	281,000	0.0%	
Silver Springs Village of	0.0%	\$0	190,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in North Carolina.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Carolina Power & Light Co	0.8%	\$25,120,000	3,024,088,000	63.1%	33
Jones-Onslow Elec Member Corp	0.2%	\$125,000	57,078,000	0.0%	
Virginia Electric & Power Co	0.1%	\$2,996,000	4,797,946,000	-65.4%	104
Greenville Utilities Comm	0.1%	\$66,000	104,380,000	10.0%	108
Albemarle City of	0.1%	\$10,000	20,917,000	0.0%	
Fayetteville Public Works Comm	0.0%	\$10,000	126,456,000	-60.0%	119
Wilson City of	0.0%	\$10,000	88,969,000	0.0%	
Duke Power Co	0.0%	\$0	4,296,181,000	-100%	N/A
North Carolina El Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	629,700,000	0.0%	N/A
Kinston City of	0.0%	\$0	507,251,000	0.0%	N/A
North Carolina Eastern M P A	0.0%	\$0	495,063,000	0.0%	N/A
North Carolina Mun Power Agny	0.0%	\$0	417,331,000	0.0%	N/A
Louisburg Town of	0.0%	\$0	165,644,000	0.0%	N/A
Blue Ridge Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	70,869,000	0.0%	
Rutherford Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	69,099,000	0.0%	
High Point Town of	0.0%	\$0	68,030,000	0.0%	
Crescent Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	67,573,000	0.0%	
Brunswick Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	66,462,000	-100%	
Nantahala Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	64,922,000	0.0%	
Rocky Mount City of	0.0%	\$0	57,052,000	0.0%	
Lumbee River Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	52,720,000	0.0%	
Gastonia City of	0.0%	\$0	50,568,000	0.0%	
South River Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	46,282,000	0.0%	
Union Electric Membership Corp	0.0%	\$0	45,617,000	0.0%	
Four County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	43,210,000	-100%	
Davidson Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	42,645,000	0.0%	
New Bern City of	0.0%	\$0	36,323,000	0.0%	
Randolph Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	36,224,000	0.0%	
Carteret-Craven El Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	33,616,000	0.0%	
Lexington City of	0.0%	\$0	33,472,000	0.0%	
French Broad Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	33,294,000	0.0%	
Concord City of	0.0%	\$0	31,748,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	31,112,000	0.0%	
Mountain Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	30,851,000	0.0%	
Monroe City of	0.0%	\$0	30,845,000	0.0%	
Piedmont Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	30,173,000	-100%	
Blue Ridge Mountain E M C	0.0%	\$0	27,970,000	0.0%	
Wake Electric Membership Corp	0.0%	\$0	27,577,000	-100%	
Statesville City of	0.0%	\$0	27,322,000	0.0%	
Tideland Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	23,911,000	0.0%	
Surry-Yadkin Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	23,765,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in North Carolina - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Washington City of	0.0%	\$0	23,121,000	0.0%	
Pee Dee Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	22,994,000	0.0%	
Elizabeth City City of	0.0%	\$0	22,094,000	0.0%	
Lumberton City of	0.0%	\$0	21,861,000	0.0%	
Broad River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,715,000	0.0%	
Morganton City of	0.0%	\$0	20,491,000	0.0%	
Tarboro Town of	0.0%	\$0	20,472,000	0.0%	
Central Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	18,933,000	-100%	
Haywood Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	17,926,000	-100%	
Roanoke Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	16,126,000	-100%	
Edgecombe-Martin County E M C	0.0%	\$0	14,830,000	0.0%	
Tri-State Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	14,378,000	0.0%	
Shelby City of	0.0%	\$0	12,911,000	0.0%	
Pitt & Greene Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	12,181,000	0.0%	
New River Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	12,164,000	0.0%	
Laurinburg City of	0.0%	\$0	12,130,000	0.0%	
Smithfield Town of	0.0%	\$0	11,606,000	0.0%	
Halifax Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	11,316,000	0.0%	
Albemarle Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	9,361,000	0.0%	
Forest City Town of	0.0%	\$0	8,907,000	0.0%	
Cape Hatteras Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	8,747,000	0.0%	
Edenton Town of	0.0%	\$0	8,033,000	0.0%	
Ayden Town of	0.0%	\$0	7,630,000	0.0%	
Murphy City of	0.0%	\$0	7,591,000	0.0%	
Kings Mountain City of	0.0%	\$0	7,257,000	0.0%	
Pineville Town of	0.0%	\$0	7,256,000	0.0%	
Wake Forest Town of	0.0%	\$0	6,980,000	0.0%	
Newton City of	0.0%	\$0	6,549,000	0.0%	
Apex Town of	0.0%	\$0	6,521,000	0.0%	
Clayton City of	0.0%	\$0	6,510,000	0.0%	
Selma Town of	0.0%	\$0	5,064,000	0.0%	
Farmville Town of	0.0%	\$0	5,000,000	0.0%	
Cherryville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,945,000	0.0%	
Waynesville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,886,000	0.0%	
Maiden Town of	0.0%	\$0	4,801,000	0.0%	
Lincolnton City of	0.0%	\$0	4,725,000	0.0%	
Granite Falls Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,998,000	0.0%	
Red Springs Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,964,000	0.0%	
Benson Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,382,000	0.0%	
Dallas Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,364,000	0.0%	
Southport City of	0.0%	\$0	3,127,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in North Carolina - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Landis Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,070,000	0.0%	
Winterville City of	0.0%	\$0	3,019,000	0.0%	
Scotland Neck Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,995,000	0.0%	
Windsor Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,864,000	0.0%	
Huntersville Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,583,000	0.0%	
Enfield Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,542,000	0.0%	
Highlands City of	0.0%	\$0	2,355,000	0.0%	
La Grange Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,339,000	0.0%	
Sharpsburg City of	0.0%	\$0	2,325,000	0.0%	
Hertford City of	0.0%	\$0	2,286,000	0.0%	
Cornelius City of	0.0%	\$0	2,200,000	0.0%	
Belhaven Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,191,000	0.0%	
Robersonville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,167,000	0.0%	
Stantonsburg Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,754,000	0.0%	
Drexel Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,631,000	0.0%	
Lucama Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,506,000	0.0%	
Pinetops Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,336,000	0.0%	
Harkers Island EI Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	1,222,000	0.0%	
Fremont Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,216,000	0.0%	
Black Creek Town of	0.0%	\$0	926,000	0.0%	
Pikeville Town of	0.0%	\$0	759,000	0.0%	
Hookerton Town of	0.0%	\$0	630,000	0.0%	
Hobgood Town of	0.0%	\$0	446,000	0.0%	
Fountain Town of	0.0%	\$0	426,000	0.0%	
MacClesfield Town of	0.0%	\$0	410,000	0.0%	
Hamilton Town of	0.0%	\$0	395,000	0.0%	
Oak City Town of	0.0%	\$0	254,000	0.0%	
Bostic Town of	0.0%	\$0	207,000	0.0%	
Walstonburg Town of	0.0%	\$0	178,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in North Dakota.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Northern States Power Co	1.2%	\$24,548,000	2,100,512,000	-1.7%	23
Otter Tail Power Co	1.0%	\$2,099,000	203,881,000	47.8%	26
Cass County Electric Coop Inc	0.1%	\$15,000	25,644,000	25.0%	
Verendrye Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$5,000	15,784,000	0.0%	
MDU Resources Group, Inc	0.0%	\$0	141,590,000	0.0%	N/A
Minnkota Power Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	112,390,000	0.0%	N/A
Nodak Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	26,922,000	0.0%	
Northern Plains Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	18,115,000	0.0%	
McKenzie Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,435,000	0.0%	
West Plains Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,675,000	0.0%	
R S R Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,400,000	0.0%	
Oliver-Mercer Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,220,000	0.0%	
North Central Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,130,000	0.0%	
Williams Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,015,000	-100%	
Capital Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,969,000	0.0%	
Mor-Gran-Sou Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,812,000	0.0%	
Lower Yellowstone R E A Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,877,000	0.0%	
James Valley Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,313,000	0.0%	
Sheridan Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,239,000	0.0%	
Slope Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,643,000	0.0%	
Sheyenne Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,599,000	0.0%	
KEM Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,164,000	0.0%	
McLean Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,983,000	0.0%	
Valley City City of	0.0%	\$0	3,846,000	0.0%	
Burke-Divide Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,697,000	0.0%	
Grafton City of	0.0%	\$0	2,825,000	0.0%	
Cavalier Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,241,000	0.0%	
Goldenwest Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,210,000	0.0%	
Park River City of	0.0%	\$0	1,071,000	0.0%	
Cavalier City of	0.0%	\$0	899,000	0.0%	
Hillsboro City of	0.0%	\$0	895,000	0.0%	
Northwood City of	0.0%	\$0	790,000	0.0%	
Lakota City of	0.0%	\$0	487,000	0.0%	
Maddock City of	0.0%	\$0	452,000	0.0%	
Hope City of	0.0%	\$0	244,000	0.0%	
Stanton City of	0.0%	\$0	197,000	0.0%	
Riverdale, City of	0.0%	\$0	78,000	0.0%	
Sharon City of	0.0%	\$0	63,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Ohio.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Dayton Power & Light Co	0.5%	\$4,783,000	1,014,977,000	-80.0%	48
Ohio Edison Co	0.2%	\$4,268,000	2,168,775,000	59.9%	81
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co	0.1%	\$2,114,000	1,908,132,000	-29.2%	91
South Central Power Co	0.1%	\$111,000	97,098,000	23.3%	
Columbus Southern Power Co	0.0%	\$500,000	1,139,604,000	-57.8%	113
Ohio Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,975,291,000	-100%	N/A
Cleveland Electric Illum Co	0.0%	\$0	1,784,728,000	-100%	N/A
Toledo Edison Co	0.0%	\$0	895,365,000	-100%	N/A
Monongahela Power Co	0.0%	\$0	666,362,000	-100%	N/A
Ohio Valley Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	301,460,000	0.0%	N/A
AEP Generating Co	0.0%	\$0	227,868,000	0.0%	N/A
Buckeye Power Inc	0.0%	\$0	206,066,000	0.0%	N/A
American Mun Power-Ohio Inc	0.0%	\$0	184,411,000	-100%	N/A
Cleveland City of	0.0%	\$0	110,191,000	0.0%	N/A
Hamilton City of	0.0%	\$0	43,904,000	0.0%	
Columbus City of	0.0%	\$0	42,530,000	0.0%	
Pioneer Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	24,888,000	0.0%	
Cuyahoga Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	24,017,000	0.0%	
Union Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,012,000	0.0%	
Bowling Green City of	0.0%	\$0	19,813,000	0.0%	
Licking Rural Electricatn Inc	0.0%	\$0	19,513,000	0.0%	
Westerville City of	0.0%	\$0	19,231,000	0.0%	
Buckeye Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,388,000	0.0%	
Niles City of	0.0%	\$0	18,083,000	0.0%	
Hancock-Wood Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,906,000	0.0%	
Orrville City of	0.0%	\$0	16,277,000	0.0%	
Piqua City of	0.0%	\$0	15,507,000	0.0%	
Consolidated Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,377,000	0.0%	
Delaware Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,890,000	0.0%	
Painesville City of	0.0%	\$0	14,801,000	0.0%	
Lorain-Medina R E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,563,000	0.0%	
Holmes-Wayne Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,255,000	0.0%	
Wadsworth City of	0.0%	\$0	14,204,000	0.0%	
Butler Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,607,000	0.0%	
Paulding-Putman Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,587,000	0.0%	
Bryan City of	0.0%	\$0	13,121,000	0.0%	
North Central Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,719,000	0.0%	
Guernsey-Muskingum El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,680,000	0.0%	
Midwest Electric Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,546,000	0.0%	
Hudson City of	0.0%	\$0	10,966,000	0.0%	
Dover City of	0.0%	\$0	10,901,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Ohio - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Toledo Bend Project Joint Oper	0.0%	\$0	10,504,000	0.0%	
Napoleon City of	0.0%	\$0	9,283,000	0.0%	
Carroll Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,089,000	0.0%	
Firelands Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,719,000	0.0%	
Celina City of	0.0%	\$0	8,210,000	0.0%	
Jackson City of	0.0%	\$0	7,834,000	0.0%	
Wapakoneta City of	0.0%	\$0	7,696,000	0.0%	
St Marys City of	0.0%	\$0	7,520,000	0.0%	
Lebanon City of	0.0%	\$0	7,271,000	0.0%	
Oberlin City of	0.0%	\$0	7,064,000	0.0%	
Washington Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,025,000	0.0%	
Galion City of	0.0%	\$0	6,792,000	0.0%	
Adams Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,746,000	0.0%	
Frontier Power Co	0.0%	\$0	6,654,000	0.0%	
Clyde Light & Power	0.0%	\$0	6,393,000	0.0%	
Darke Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,124,000	0.0%	
North Western Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,077,000	0.0%	
Logan Cnty Coop P&L Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,674,000	0.0%	
Shelby City of	0.0%	\$0	5,542,000	0.0%	
Tipp City City of	0.0%	\$0	5,329,000	0.0%	
Wellington City of	0.0%	\$0	4,483,000	0.0%	
Amherst City of	0.0%	\$0	4,221,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,090,000	0.0%	
Minster Village of	0.0%	\$0	3,893,000	0.0%	
United Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,884,000	0.0%	
Marion Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,849,000	0.0%	
Montpelier City of	0.0%	\$0	3,841,000	0.0%	
Southeastern Michigan REC Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,606,000	0.0%	
Hubbard City of	0.0%	\$0	3,565,000	0.0%	
Newton Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	3,238,000	0.0%	
Columbiana Village of	0.0%	\$0	3,193,000	0.0%	
Versailles City of	0.0%	\$0	2,933,000	0.0%	
New Bremen Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,923,000	0.0%	
Blanchester Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,602,000	0.0%	
Georgetown Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,400,000	0.0%	
St Clairsville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,370,000	0.0%	
Yellow Springs Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,322,000	0.0%	
Carey Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,196,000	0.0%	
Monroeville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,126,000	0.0%	
Brewster Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,053,000	0.0%	
Lodi City of	0.0%	\$0	2,051,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Ohio - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Seville Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,956,000	0.0%	
Bethel City of	0.0%	\$0	1,876,000	0.0%	
Pioneer City of	0.0%	\$0	1,627,000	0.0%	
Oak Harbor Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,580,000	0.0%	
Grafton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,500,000	0.0%	
Edgerton Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,428,000	0.0%	
Arcanum City of	0.0%	\$0	1,364,000	0.0%	
Deshler City of	0.0%	\$0	1,358,000	0.0%	
Woodsfield City of	0.0%	\$0	1,249,000	0.0%	
Ripley City of	0.0%	\$0	1,146,000	0.0%	
Pemberville Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,064,000	0.0%	
Genoa Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,020,000	0.0%	
Elmore Village of	0.0%	\$0	963,000	0.0%	
Jackson Center Village of	0.0%	\$0	872,000	0.0%	
Woodville Village of	0.0%	\$0	748,000	0.0%	
Sycamore City of	0.0%	\$0	744,000	0.0%	
Beach City City of	0.0%	\$0	729,000	0.0%	
Greenwich Village of	0.0%	\$0	723,000	0.0%	
Milan Village of	0.0%	\$0	717,000	0.0%	
Lakeview Village of	0.0%	\$0	666,000	0.0%	
Plymouth Village of	0.0%	\$0	630,000	0.0%	
Glouster Village of	0.0%	\$0	596,000	0.0%	
Bradner Village of	0.0%	\$0	588,000	0.0%	
Prospect Corp	0.0%	\$0	587,000	0.0%	
New Knoxville Village of	0.0%	\$0	511,000	0.0%	
Marshallville Village of	0.0%	\$0	421,000	0.0%	
Ohio City Village of	0.0%	\$0	421,000	0.0%	
Waynesfield Village of	0.0%	\$0	353,000	0.0%	
Lucas Village of	0.0%	\$0	332,000	0.0%	
Bloomdale Village of	0.0%	\$0	313,000	0.0%	
South Vienna Corporation	0.0%	\$0	297,000	0.0%	
Mendon City of	0.0%	\$0	290,000	0.0%	
Hamersville Village of	0.0%	\$0	289,000	0.0%	
Shiloh Village of	0.0%	\$0	270,000	0.0%	
Arcadia City of	0.0%	\$0	250,000	0.0%	
Eldorado City of	0.0%	\$0	250,000	0.0%	
Haskins Village of	0.0%	\$0	232,000	0.0%	
Wharton Village of	0.0%	\$0	202,000	0.0%	
Tontogany Village of	0.0%	\$0	199,000	0.0%	
Republic City of	0.0%	\$0	190,000	0.0%	
Cygnets Village of	0.0%	\$0	171,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Ohio - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Custar City of	0.0%	\$0	134,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Oklahoma.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Duncan City of	0.1%	\$11,000	8,631,000	-26.7%	
Red River Valley Rrl Elec Assn	0.1%	\$9,000	13,813,000	-89.0%	
Caddo Electric Coop Inc	0.1%	\$8,000	16,146,000	0.0%	
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	1,191,690,000	-100%	N/A
Public Service Co of Oklahoma	0.0%	\$0	712,690,000	0.0%	N/A
Empire District Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	214,306,000	0.0%	N/A
Grand River Dam Authority	0.0%	\$0	177,584,000	0.0%	N/A
Oklahoma Municipal Power Auth	0.0%	\$0	92,345,000	0.0%	
Ozarks Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	47,264,000	0.0%	
Arkansas Valley Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	44,997,000	0.0%	
Oklahoma Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	39,871,000	0.0%	
Edmond City of	0.0%	\$0	32,794,000	0.0%	
Northeast Oklahoma El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	30,685,000	0.0%	
East Central Okla El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	27,418,000	0.0%	
Verdigris Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	26,963,000	0.0%	
Cotton Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	25,472,000	0.0%	
Stillwater Utilities Authority	0.0%	\$0	23,632,000	0.0%	
Indian Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	21,053,000	0.0%	
Canadian Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,668,000	0.0%	
Peoples Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,542,000	0.0%	
Ponca City City of	0.0%	\$0	20,187,000	0.0%	
Central Rural Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	19,263,000	0.0%	
Lake Region Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	19,166,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,250,000	0.0%	
Kiamichi Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,879,000	0.0%	
Choctaw Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,369,000	0.0%	
Cookson Hills Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,116,000	0.0%	
Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,986,000	0.0%	
Claremore City of	0.0%	\$0	13,997,000	0.0%	
Cimarron Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	13,116,000	0.0%	
Northwestern Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,229,000	0.0%	
Southeastern Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,901,000	0.0%	
Alfalfa Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,732,000	0.0%	
Altus City of	0.0%	\$0	9,700,000	0.0%	
Kay Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	8,125,000	0.0%	
Miami City of	0.0%	\$0	8,094,000	0.0%	
Tahlequah Public Works Auth	0.0%	\$0	8,087,000	0.0%	
Southwest Rural Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,262,000	0.0%	
Rich Mountain Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,066,000	0.0%	
Blackwell City of	0.0%	\$0	6,448,000	0.0%	
Sallisaw City of	0.0%	\$0	5,637,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Oklahoma - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Cushing City of	0.0%	\$0	5,447,000	0.0%	
Northfork Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,311,000	0.0%	
Kiwash Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,026,000	0.0%	
Wagoner Public Works Authority	0.0%	\$0	4,740,000	0.0%	
Pryor City of	0.0%	\$0	4,643,000	0.0%	
Perry City of	0.0%	\$0	4,386,000	0.0%	
Anadarko Public Works Auth	0.0%	\$0	4,364,000	0.0%	
Marlow City of	0.0%	\$0	3,636,000	0.0%	
Frederick City of	0.0%	\$0	3,436,000	0.0%	
Stilwell City of	0.0%	\$0	3,350,000	0.0%	
Harmon Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,197,000	0.0%	
Purcell City of	0.0%	\$0	2,961,000	0.0%	
Kingfisher City of	0.0%	\$0	2,876,000	0.0%	
Skiatook Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,396,000	0.0%	
Pawhuska City of	0.0%	\$0	2,203,000	0.0%	
Stroud City of	0.0%	\$0	2,147,000	0.0%	
Tonkawa City of	0.0%	\$0	2,021,000	0.0%	
Collinsville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,955,000	0.0%	
Tecumseh Utility Authority	0.0%	\$0	1,955,000	0.0%	
Watonga City of	0.0%	\$0	1,865,000	0.0%	
Pawnee City of	0.0%	\$0	1,832,000	0.0%	
Fairview City of	0.0%	\$0	1,779,000	0.0%	
Mangum City of	0.0%	\$0	1,739,000	0.0%	
Lindsay City of	0.0%	\$0	1,699,000	0.0%	
Cordell City of	0.0%	\$0	1,558,000	0.0%	
Mannford Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,539,000	0.0%	
Newkirk City of	0.0%	\$0	1,514,000	0.0%	
Hominy City of	0.0%	\$0	1,362,000	0.0%	
Wynnewood City of	0.0%	\$0	1,336,000	0.0%	
Walters Public Works Authority	0.0%	\$0	1,245,000	0.0%	
Prague Public Works Authority	0.0%	\$0	1,191,000	0.0%	
Okeene Public Works Authority	0.0%	\$0	911,000	0.0%	
Comanche City of	0.0%	\$0	907,000	0.0%	
Spiro City of	0.0%	\$0	886,000	0.0%	
Wetumka City of	0.0%	\$0	709,000	0.0%	
Lexington Town of	0.0%	\$0	707,000	0.0%	
Waynoka City of	0.0%	\$0	702,000	0.0%	
Laverne Town of	0.0%	\$0	689,000	0.0%	
Pond Creek City of	0.0%	\$0	674,000	0.0%	
Yale City of	0.0%	\$0	665,000	0.0%	
Geary City of	0.0%	\$0	582,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Oklahoma - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
South Coffeyville City of	0.0%	\$0	459,000	0.0%	
Ryan Town of	0.0%	\$0	418,000	0.0%	
Granite City of	0.0%	\$0	411,000	0.0%	
Mooreland City of	0.0%	\$0	398,000	0.0%	
Copan Public Works Authority	0.0%	\$0	262,000	0.0%	
Eldorado City of	0.0%	\$0	256,000	0.0%	
Olustee City of	0.0%	\$0	232,000	0.0%	
Fort Supply Town of	0.0%	\$0	178,000	0.0%	
Braman Town of	0.0%	\$0	164,000	0.0%	
Goltry Public Works Authority	0.0%	\$0	142,000	0.0%	
Burlington City of	0.0%	\$0	122,000	0.0%	
Manitou City of	0.0%	\$0	112,000	0.0%	
Orlando City of	0.0%	\$0	101,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Oregon.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Forest Grove City of	8.1%	\$661,000	8,187,000	210.3%	
Eugene City of	5.3%	\$5,500,000	103,029,000	64.2%	1
Emerald Peoples Utility Dist	4.5%	\$1,018,000	22,772,000	0.0%	
Springfield City of	3.6%	\$1,192,000	33,084,000	-10.8%	
Columbia River Peoples Ut Dist	2.6%	\$323,000	12,427,000	-14.8%	
Bonneville Power Admin	1.7%	\$38,419,000	2,311,678,000	-62.5%	9
Tillamook Peoples Utility Dist	1.0%	\$191,000	18,904,000	0.0%	
Salem Electric Coop	0.9%	\$157,000	18,202,000	101.3%	
Portland General Electric Co	0.8%	\$10,923,000	1,418,552,000	-35.2%	35
Idaho Power Co	0.3%	\$2,336,000	748,503,000	-72.8%	64
Canby City of	0.3%	\$19,000	6,291,000	0.0%	
Oregon Trail El Cons Coop Inc	0.3%	\$100,000	36,751,000	-0.0%	
PacifiCorp	0.1%	\$4,982,000	3,683,923,000	-87.9%	84
Central Lincoln Peoples Utl Dt	0.0%	\$0	55,886,000	0.0%	
Umatilla Electric Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	25,826,000	0.0%	
Central Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	25,327,000	0.0%	
McMinnville City of	0.0%	\$0	24,771,000	0.0%	
Clatskanie Peoples Util Dist	0.0%	\$0	24,379,000	0.0%	
Consumers Power Inc	0.0%	\$0	21,687,000	0.0%	
Coos-Curry Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,722,000	0.0%	
Midstate Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,397,000	0.0%	
Northern Wasco County P U D	0.0%	\$0	12,868,000	0.0%	
Lane Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,315,000	0.0%	
Columbia Rural Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,083,000	0.0%	
Douglas Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,678,000	0.0%	
Ashland City of	0.0%	\$0	8,308,000	-100%	
Blachly-Lane Cnty Coop El Assn	0.0%	\$0	6,675,000	0.0%	
Harney Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,569,000	0.0%	
Surprise Valley Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	6,135,000	0.0%	
Milton-Freewater City of	0.0%	\$0	6,029,000	0.0%	
West Oregon Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,712,000	0.0%	
Columbia Basin Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,564,000	0.0%	
Wasco Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,608,000	0.0%	
Hood River Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	4,179,000	0.0%	
Bandon City of	0.0%	\$0	3,051,000	0.0%	
Monmouth City of	0.0%	\$0	2,943,000	0.0%	
Columbia Power Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,756,000	0.0%	
Drain City of	0.0%	\$0	1,265,000	0.0%	
Cascade Locks City of	0.0%	\$0	1,040,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Pennsylvania.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Pennsylvania Power Co	0.1%	\$218,000	323,266,000	-29.9%	101
Metropolitan Edison Co	0.1%	\$543,000	942,986,000	-80.6%	105
Pennsylvania Electric Co	0.1%	\$498,000	1,052,935,000	-85.3%	110
UGI Utilities Inc	0.0%	\$14,000	72,400,000	-75.0%	
Philadelphia Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	4,166,069,000	-100%	N/A
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	3,047,659,000	0.0%	N/A
West Penn Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,151,242,000	-100%	N/A
Duquesne Light Co	0.0%	\$0	1,147,233,000	0.0%	N/A
Allegheny Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	140,437,000	0.0%	N/A
Allegheny Generating Co	0.0%	\$0	76,458,000	0.0%	
Adams Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	33,671,000	-100%	
Susquehanna Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	26,137,000	0.0%	
Southwest Central R E C Corp	0.0%	\$0	25,140,000	0.0%	
Central Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	21,798,000	0.0%	
Valley Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	21,054,000	-100%	
Northwestern Rural E C A Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,607,000	0.0%	
Claverack Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	17,943,000	0.0%	
United Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,202,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,123,000	0.0%	
Chambersburg Borough of	0.0%	\$0	15,400,000	0.0%	
Somerset Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,114,000	0.0%	
Lansdale Borough of	0.0%	\$0	11,789,000	0.0%	
Bedford Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,324,000	0.0%	
Ephrata Borough of	0.0%	\$0	9,449,000	0.0%	
Citizens Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	9,248,000	0.0%	
Quakertown Borough of	0.0%	\$0	7,376,000	0.0%	
Wellsborough Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	6,186,000	0.0%	
Warren Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,645,000	0.0%	
Pike County Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	5,306,000	0.0%	
Perkasie Borough of	0.0%	\$0	4,833,000	0.0%	
Sullivan County R E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,688,000	0.0%	
Kutztown Borough of	0.0%	\$0	4,163,000	0.0%	
Ellwood City Borough of	0.0%	\$0	4,129,000	0.0%	
Blakely Borough of	0.0%	\$0	3,862,000	0.0%	
Grove City Borough of	0.0%	\$0	3,806,000	0.0%	
Lehighon Borough of	0.0%	\$0	3,798,000	0.0%	
New Enterprise R E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,732,000	0.0%	
Schuylkill Haven Borough of	0.0%	\$0	3,510,000	0.0%	
Mifflinburg Borough of	0.0%	\$0	3,352,000	0.0%	
Middletown Borough of	0.0%	\$0	3,204,000	0.0%	
Girard Borough of	0.0%	\$0	2,991,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Pennsylvania - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Zelienople Borough of	0.0%	\$0	2,358,000	0.0%	
Olyphant Borough of	0.0%	\$0	2,155,000	0.0%	
New Wilmington Borough of	0.0%	\$0	1,539,000	0.0%	
Weatherly Borough of	0.0%	\$0	1,535,000	0.0%	
Pitcairn Borough of	0.0%	\$0	1,518,000	0.0%	
St Clair Borough of	0.0%	\$0	1,380,000	0.0%	
Hatfield Borough of	0.0%	\$0	1,361,000	0.0%	
Berlin Borough of	0.0%	\$0	1,216,000	0.0%	
Watsonstown Borough of	0.0%	\$0	1,210,000	0.0%	
Catawissa Borough of	0.0%	\$0	1,001,000	0.0%	
Smethport Borough of	0.0%	\$0	990,000	0.0%	
Duncannon Borough of	0.0%	\$0	614,000	0.0%	
Mont Alto Borough of	0.0%	\$0	584,000	0.0%	
Goldsboro Borough of	0.0%	\$0	405,000	0.0%	
East Conemaugh Borough of	0.0%	\$0	393,000	0.0%	
Royalton Borough of	0.0%	\$0	292,000	0.0%	
Hooversville Boro Elec Lgt Co	0.0%	\$0	283,000	0.0%	
Wampum Borough of	0.0%	\$0	255,000	0.0%	
Summerhill Borough of	0.0%	\$0	216,000	0.0%	
Lewisberry Borough of	0.0%	\$0	148,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Rhode Island.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Narragansett Electric Co	1.6%	\$8,493,000	520,038,000	-15.0%	10
Newport Electric Corp	1.4%	\$893,000	63,504,000	-24.0%	
Blackstone Valley Electric Co	1.2%	\$1,699,000	140,565,000	-27.2%	22
Pascoag Fire District	0.0%	\$0	3,986,000	0.0%	
Block Island Power Co	0.0%	\$0	2,175,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in South Carolina.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Carolina Power & Light Co	0.8%	\$25,120,000	3,024,088,000	63.1%	33
Palmetto Electric Coop Inc	0.8%	\$499,000	60,332,000	1412%	
South Carolina Pub Serv Auth	0.5%	\$3,839,000	724,211,000	37.8%	44
Pee Dee Electric Coop Inc	0.1%	\$49,000	44,624,000	0.0%	
Black River Electric Coop Inc	0.1%	\$30,000	32,991,000	-21.1%	
Laurens Electric Coop Inc	0.1%	\$36,000	49,644,000	33.3%	
York Electric Coop Inc	0.1%	\$18,000	37,340,000	0.0%	
Berkeley Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$30,000	72,776,000	0.0%	
Duke Power Co	0.0%	\$0	4,296,181,000	-100%	N/A
South Carolina Electric&Gas Co	0.0%	\$0	1,103,091,000	-100%	N/A
South Carolina Genertg Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	99,772,000	0.0%	
Blue Ridge Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	58,235,000	0.0%	
Santee Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	51,997,000	0.0%	
Mid-Carolina Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	46,385,000	-100%	
Aiken Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	45,733,000	0.0%	
Rock Hill City of	0.0%	\$0	43,377,000	0.0%	
Orangeburg City of	0.0%	\$0	41,775,000	0.0%	
Horry Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	40,688,000	0.0%	
Fairfield Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	27,505,000	-100%	
Marlboro Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	24,855,000	0.0%	
Broad River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,715,000	0.0%	
Lynches River Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,717,000	-100%	
Edisto Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,424,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	17,304,000	0.0%	
Easley City of	0.0%	\$0	16,232,000	0.0%	
Lockhart Power Co	0.0%	\$0	16,171,000	0.0%	
Gaffney City of	0.0%	\$0	15,008,000	0.0%	
Greenwood City of	0.0%	\$0	13,819,000	0.0%	
Greer City of	0.0%	\$0	12,472,000	0.0%	
Little River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,115,000	0.0%	
Newberry Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,024,000	0.0%	
Camden City of	0.0%	\$0	11,700,000	0.0%	
Newberry City of	0.0%	\$0	10,862,000	0.0%	
Coastal Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,626,000	0.0%	
Union City of	0.0%	\$0	9,959,000	0.0%	
Seneca City of	0.0%	\$0	9,572,000	0.0%	
Georgetown City of	0.0%	\$0	8,527,000	0.0%	
Clinton Combined Utility Sys	0.0%	\$0	8,158,000	0.0%	
Laurens City of	0.0%	\$0	6,806,000	0.0%	
Bennettsville City of	0.0%	\$0	6,789,000	0.0%	
Winnsboro Town of	0.0%	\$0	5,421,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in South Carolina - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Abbeville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,448,000	0.0%	
Bamberg City of	0.0%	\$0	2,587,000	0.0%	
Westminster City of	0.0%	\$0	1,964,000	0.0%	
McCormick Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,615,000	0.0%	
Due West City of	0.0%	\$0	703,000	0.0%	
Prosperity Town of	0.0%	\$0	570,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in South Dakota.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
MidAmerican Energy Co	0.3%	\$2,767,000	1,126,300,000	0.0%	69
Pierre City of	0.1%	\$8,000	7,335,000	-46.7%	
Nebraska Public Power District	0.0%	\$0	588,282,000	0.0%	N/A
Black Hills Corp	0.0%	\$0	126,496,000	-100%	N/A
Northwestern Public Service Co	0.0%	\$0	76,726,000	0.0%	
Sioux Valley Empire E A Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,222,000	0.0%	
Heartland Consumers Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	15,457,000	0.0%	
West River Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,189,000	0.0%	
Watertown City of	0.0%	\$0	10,503,000	0.0%	
Brookings City of	0.0%	\$0	9,046,000	0.0%	
Northern Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,176,000	0.0%	
West Central Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,828,000	0.0%	
Grand Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,329,000	0.0%	
Black Hills Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,280,000	0.0%	
Lincoln-Union Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	5,814,000	0.0%	
Moreau-Grand Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,666,000	0.0%	
LaCreek Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,616,000	0.0%	
Turner-Hutchinson El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,449,000	0.0%	
Cherry-Todd Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,448,000	0.0%	
Butte Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,794,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,777,000	0.0%	
Dakota Energy Coop	0.0%	\$0	4,744,000	0.0%	
Intercounty Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,637,000	0.0%	
Bon Homme Yankton El Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,600,000	0.0%	
Codington-Clark Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,547,000	0.0%	
Lake Region Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,402,000	0.0%	
Sioux Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	4,314,000	0.0%	
Rosebud Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,074,000	0.0%	
H-D Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,042,000	0.0%	
Clay-Union Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	3,997,000	0.0%	
Whetstone Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,959,000	0.0%	
Traverse Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,686,000	0.0%	
Madison City of	0.0%	\$0	3,544,000	0.0%	
Oahe Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,435,000	0.0%	
Cam Wal Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,166,000	0.0%	
Charles Mix Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,082,000	0.0%	
FEM Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,058,000	0.0%	
Vermillion City of	0.0%	\$0	2,946,000	0.0%	
McCook Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,104,000	0.0%	
Winner City of	0.0%	\$0	1,861,000	0.0%	
Southeast Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,710,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in South Dakota - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Volga City of	0.0%	\$0	1,595,000	0.0%	
Union County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,546,000	0.0%	
Kingsbury Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,435,000	0.0%	
Douglas Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,287,000	0.0%	
Beresford City of	0.0%	\$0	1,144,000	0.0%	
Flandreau City of	0.0%	\$0	1,038,000	0.0%	
Elk Point City of	0.0%	\$0	997,000	0.0%	
Miller City of	0.0%	\$0	951,000	0.0%	
Fort Pierre City of	0.0%	\$0	783,000	0.0%	
Big Stone City of	0.0%	\$0	608,000	0.0%	
Groton City of	0.0%	\$0	608,000	0.0%	
Tyndall City of	0.0%	\$0	593,000	0.0%	
Arlington City of	0.0%	\$0	581,000	0.0%	
Howard City of	0.0%	\$0	562,000	0.0%	
Parker City of	0.0%	\$0	520,000	0.0%	
Wessington Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	508,000	0.0%	
Onida City of	0.0%	\$0	435,000	0.0%	
Colman City of	0.0%	\$0	425,000	0.0%	
Plankinton City of	0.0%	\$0	410,000	0.0%	
Estelline City of	0.0%	\$0	378,000	0.0%	
McLaughlin City of	0.0%	\$0	377,000	0.0%	
Burke City of	0.0%	\$0	349,000	0.0%	
Faith City of	0.0%	\$0	330,000	0.0%	
Aurora City of	0.0%	\$0	199,000	0.0%	
White City of	0.0%	\$0	198,000	0.0%	
Hecla City of	0.0%	\$0	174,000	0.0%	
Bryant City of	0.0%	\$0	173,000	0.0%	
Langford Town of	0.0%	\$0	133,000	0.0%	
Badger City of	0.0%	\$0	49,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Tennessee.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Tennessee Valley Authority	0.2%	\$12,600,000	5,753,883,000	130.1%	76
Kentucky Utilities Co	0.0%	\$159,000	716,437,000	-74.0%	117
Entergy Arkansas, Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,715,714,000	0.0%	N/A
Memphis City of	0.0%	\$0	721,741,000	0.0%	N/A
Nashville City of	0.0%	\$0	602,872,000	0.0%	N/A
Chattanooga City of	0.0%	\$0	307,882,000	0.0%	N/A
Knoxville City of	0.0%	\$0	281,659,000	0.0%	N/A
Middle Tennessee E M C	0.0%	\$0	166,361,000	0.0%	N/A
Volunteer Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	100,747,000	0.0%	N/A
Cumberland Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	98,077,000	0.0%	
Johnson City City of	0.0%	\$0	95,447,000	0.0%	
Kingsport Power Co	0.0%	\$0	79,922,000	-100%	
Duck River Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	74,836,000	0.0%	
Jackson City of	0.0%	\$0	73,353,000	0.0%	
Lenoir City City of	0.0%	\$0	68,533,000	0.0%	
Sevier County	0.0%	\$0	61,466,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	58,293,000	0.0%	
Murfreesboro City of	0.0%	\$0	55,303,000	0.0%	
Clarksville City of	0.0%	\$0	54,380,000	0.0%	
Southwest Tennessee E M C	0.0%	\$0	52,712,000	0.0%	
Greenville City of	0.0%	\$0	51,173,000	0.0%	
Upper Cumberland E M C	0.0%	\$0	50,737,000	0.0%	
Cleveland City of	0.0%	\$0	50,295,000	0.0%	
Bristol City of	0.0%	\$0	45,280,000	0.0%	
Appalachian Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	45,200,000	0.0%	
South Kentucky Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	45,049,000	0.0%	
Gibson County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	43,054,000	0.0%	
Meriwether Lewis Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	42,552,000	0.0%	
Sequachee Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	41,528,000	0.0%	
Dickson City of	0.0%	\$0	40,894,000	0.0%	
Clinton City of	0.0%	\$0	40,019,000	0.0%	
Morristown City of	0.0%	\$0	39,926,000	0.0%	
Holston Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	36,892,000	0.0%	
French Broad Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	33,294,000	0.0%	
Dyersburg City of	0.0%	\$0	32,580,000	0.0%	
Caney Fork Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	32,287,000	0.0%	
Elizabethton City of	0.0%	\$0	31,753,000	0.0%	
Maryville City of	0.0%	\$0	31,184,000	0.0%	
Mountain Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	30,851,000	0.0%	
Columbia City of	0.0%	\$0	30,352,000	0.0%	
Cookeville City of	0.0%	\$0	29,193,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Tennessee - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Powell Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	28,670,000	0.0%	
Athens City of	0.0%	\$0	28,599,000	0.0%	
Lawrenceburg City of	0.0%	\$0	28,593,000	0.0%	
Weakley Municipal Utility Sys	0.0%	\$0	28,315,000	0.0%	
Oak Ridge City of	0.0%	\$0	28,171,000	0.0%	
Alcoa Utilities Board	0.0%	\$0	27,841,000	0.0%	
Fort Loudoun Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	27,623,000	0.0%	
Newport City of	0.0%	\$0	27,177,000	0.0%	
Gallatin City of	0.0%	\$0	25,769,000	0.0%	
Lexington City of	0.0%	\$0	25,688,000	0.0%	
Paris City of	0.0%	\$0	25,189,000	0.0%	
Fayetteville City of	0.0%	\$0	24,250,000	0.0%	
LaFollette City of	0.0%	\$0	24,090,000	0.0%	
Pulaski City of	0.0%	\$0	23,089,000	0.0%	
Pickwick Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	23,085,000	0.0%	
Carroll County	0.0%	\$0	22,919,000	0.0%	
Cumberland Valley Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	21,096,000	0.0%	
Tennessee Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	20,946,000	0.0%	
Lebanon City of	0.0%	\$0	20,012,000	0.0%	
Shelbyville City of	0.0%	\$0	19,835,000	0.0%	
Loudon City of	0.0%	\$0	19,554,000	0.0%	
Plateau Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	18,726,000	0.0%	
Rockwood City of	0.0%	\$0	18,559,000	0.0%	
Union City City of	0.0%	\$0	17,366,000	0.0%	
Chickasaw Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,450,000	0.0%	
Tullahoma City of	0.0%	\$0	15,880,000	0.0%	
Lewisburg City of	0.0%	\$0	15,296,000	0.0%	
Ripley City of	0.0%	\$0	15,041,000	0.0%	
Bolivar City of	0.0%	\$0	14,782,000	0.0%	
Harriman City of	0.0%	\$0	14,435,000	0.0%	
Tri-State Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	14,378,000	0.0%	
Milan City of	0.0%	\$0	14,210,000	0.0%	
McMinnville City of	0.0%	\$0	13,823,000	0.0%	
Covington City of	0.0%	\$0	13,604,000	0.0%	
Springfield City of	0.0%	\$0	13,110,000	0.0%	
Benton County of	0.0%	\$0	12,827,000	0.0%	
Erwin City of	0.0%	\$0	12,412,000	0.0%	
Humboldt City of	0.0%	\$0	12,091,000	0.0%	
Dayton City of	0.0%	\$0	11,923,000	0.0%	
Sweetwater City of	0.0%	\$0	11,509,000	0.0%	
Forked Deer Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,199,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Tennessee - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Brownsville City of	0.0%	\$0	10,424,000	0.0%	
Winchester City of	0.0%	\$0	8,869,000	0.0%	
Etowah City of	0.0%	\$0	7,469,000	0.0%	
Mt Pleasant City of	0.0%	\$0	5,695,000	0.0%	
Smithville City of	0.0%	\$0	5,478,000	0.0%	
Sparta City of	0.0%	\$0	5,473,000	0.0%	
Newbern City of	0.0%	\$0	5,466,000	0.0%	
Jellico City of	0.0%	\$0	5,408,000	0.0%	
Trenton City of	0.0%	\$0	5,208,000	0.0%	
Tipton City of	0.0%	\$0	4,790,000	0.0%	
Somerville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,103,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Texas.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
South Plains Electric Coop Inc	1.5%	\$475,000	31,746,000	161.0%	
Austin City of	1.5%	\$9,008,000	621,491,000	31.4%	15
Brazos Electric Power Coop Inc	0.4%	\$1,167,000	278,606,000	250.5%	52
San Bernard Electric Coop Inc	0.4%	\$86,000	24,658,000	561.5%	
Bryan City of	0.3%	\$235,000	69,794,000	-6.0%	
Texas Utilities Electric Co	0.2%	\$14,805,000	6,135,417,000	-2.7%	70
West Texas Utilities Co	0.2%	\$681,000	397,780,000	-30.2%	82
Magic Valley Electric Coop Inc	0.2%	\$93,000	58,117,000	5.7%	
College Station City of	0.2%	\$54,000	33,317,000	0.0%	
Central Power & Light Co	0.1%	\$1,816,000	1,376,283,000	-10.1%	86
Southwestern Electric Power Co	0.1%	\$1,144,000	939,869,000	117.1%	87
El Paso Electric Co	0.1%	\$551,000	594,038,000	-26.2%	97
Houston Lighting & Power Co	0.1%	\$2,554,000	4,251,243,000	-71.7%	107
Entergy Gulf States, Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,067,485,000	-100%	N/A
San Antonio City of	0.0%	\$0	844,848,000	0.0%	N/A
Texas-New Mexico Power Co	0.0%	\$0	580,691,000	-100%	N/A
Lower Colorado River Authority	0.0%	\$0	476,200,000	-100%	N/A
Pedernales Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	167,982,000	0.0%	N/A
Garland City of	0.0%	\$0	148,739,000	0.0%	N/A
Texas Municipal Power Agency	0.0%	\$0	133,430,000	0.0%	N/A
Northeast Texas Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	75,633,000	0.0%	
Southwestern Electric Serv Co	0.0%	\$0	74,812,000	0.0%	
Bluebonnett Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	69,312,000	0.0%	
Denton County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	68,906,000	0.0%	
Sam Houston Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	68,131,000	0.0%	
Denton City of	0.0%	\$0	67,131,000	-100%	
Guadalupe Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	60,829,000	0.0%	
Lubbock City of	0.0%	\$0	60,100,000	0.0%	
South Texas Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	57,897,000	0.0%	
Trinity Valley Elec Coop, Inc	0.0%	\$0	57,792,000	0.0%	
Brownsville Public Utils Board	0.0%	\$0	55,671,000	0.0%	
East Texas Electric Coop, Inc	0.0%	\$0	54,767,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	54,247,000	-100%	
Johnson County Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	51,688,000	-100%	
Cap Rock Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	51,572,000	0.0%	
Tex-La Electric Coop-Texas Inc	0.0%	\$0	51,144,000	0.0%	
New Braunfels City of	0.0%	\$0	43,705,000	0.0%	
Lea County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	41,880,000	0.0%	
Deep East Texas Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	40,442,000	0.0%	
Farmers Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	34,729,000	0.0%	
Upshur Rural Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	33,897,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.

The Environmental Working Group is a non-profit environmental research organization based in Washington, D.C.
 Phone: (202) 667-6982 • Fax: (202) 232-2592 • Email: info@ewg.org • Web: http://www.ewg.org



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Texas - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Bowie-Cass Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	33,364,000	0.0%	
Lyntegar Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	31,994,000	0.0%	
Greenville City of	0.0%	\$0	31,047,000	0.0%	
Southwest Arkansas E C C	0.0%	\$0	30,481,000	0.0%	
Wood County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	28,912,000	0.0%	
Medina Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	27,965,000	0.0%	
Jasper-Newton Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	25,780,000	0.0%	
Dickens Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	24,799,000	0.0%	
Kerrville Public Utility Board	0.0%	\$0	24,762,000	0.0%	
Central Texas Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,545,000	0.0%	
Bandera Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,268,000	0.0%	
Grayson-Collin Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,077,000	0.0%	
Deaf Smith Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,016,000	0.0%	
San Marcos City of	0.0%	\$0	22,348,000	-100%	
Mid-South Electric Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	22,259,000	0.0%	
Erath County El Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	21,600,000	0.0%	
Rusk County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,654,000	0.0%	
Hill County Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	20,180,000	0.0%	
Cherokee County Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	19,954,000	0.0%	
Navasota Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	19,474,000	0.0%	
Houston County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	19,407,000	0.0%	
Southwestern Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,286,000	0.0%	
Victoria County Elec Coop Co	0.0%	\$0	17,530,000	0.0%	
Cooke County Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	16,262,000	0.0%	
Weatherford Mun Utility System	0.0%	\$0	15,887,000	0.0%	
Wise Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,729,000	0.0%	
Lamb County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,078,000	0.0%	
Seguin City of	0.0%	\$0	14,933,000	0.0%	
Georgetown City of	0.0%	\$0	14,814,000	0.0%	
Navarro County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,552,000	0.0%	
Brenham City of	0.0%	\$0	14,292,000	0.0%	
Nueces Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,787,000	0.0%	
Taylor Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,559,000	0.0%	
Panola-Harrison Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,554,000	0.0%	
Lighthouse Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,159,000	0.0%	
Concho Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,104,000	0.0%	
Karnes Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,101,000	0.0%	
McLennan County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,908,000	0.0%	
Comanche County Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	12,791,000	0.0%	
Rio Grande Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,651,000	0.0%	
Fayette Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,634,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Texas - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Bailey County Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	12,373,000	0.0%	
Floresville City of	0.0%	\$0	12,347,000	0.0%	
Jackson Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,839,000	0.0%	
San Patricio Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,101,000	0.0%	
Swisher Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,938,000	0.0%	
Jasper City of	0.0%	\$0	10,909,000	0.0%	
Lamar County Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	10,702,000	0.0%	
Hamilton County Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	10,505,000	0.0%	
Southwest Texas Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,986,000	0.0%	
Midwest Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,905,000	0.0%	
North Plains Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,677,000	0.0%	
Wharton County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,438,000	0.0%	
Rita Blanca Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,305,000	0.0%	
Liberty City of	0.0%	\$0	9,159,000	0.0%	
Bartlett Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,015,000	0.0%	
Fannin County Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	7,701,000	0.0%	
Livingston City of	0.0%	\$0	7,675,000	0.0%	
Coleman County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,592,000	0.0%	
Southwest Rural Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,262,000	0.0%	
Robstown City of	0.0%	\$0	7,205,000	0.0%	
Fort Belknap Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,511,000	0.0%	
Dewitt County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,267,000	0.0%	
Fredericksburg City of	0.0%	\$0	6,055,000	0.0%	
J-A-C Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,995,000	0.0%	
Lockhart City of	0.0%	\$0	5,495,000	0.0%	
Lampasas City of	0.0%	\$0	5,449,000	0.0%	
McCulloch Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,227,000	0.0%	
Stamford Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,201,000	0.0%	
Gonzales City of	0.0%	\$0	5,198,000	0.0%	
B-K Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,119,000	0.0%	
Cuero City of	0.0%	\$0	5,087,000	0.0%	
Hondo City of	0.0%	\$0	4,855,000	0.0%	
Belfalls Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,801,000	0.0%	
Boerne City of	0.0%	\$0	4,641,000	0.0%	
Granbury City of	0.0%	\$0	4,440,000	0.0%	
Yoakum City of	0.0%	\$0	4,422,000	0.0%	
Brownfield City of	0.0%	\$0	4,320,000	0.0%	
Kimble Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,164,000	0.0%	
Caldwell City of	0.0%	\$0	3,955,000	0.0%	
Brady City of	0.0%	\$0	3,788,000	0.0%	
Greenbelt Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,684,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Texas - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Bridgeport City of	0.0%	\$0	3,639,000	0.0%	
Burnet City of	0.0%	\$0	3,612,000	0.0%	
La Grange City of	0.0%	\$0	3,303,000	0.0%	
Bowie City of	0.0%	\$0	3,298,000	0.0%	
Harmon Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,197,000	0.0%	
Hearne City of	0.0%	\$0	3,151,000	0.0%	
Bastrop City of	0.0%	\$0	3,115,000	0.0%	
Coleman City of	0.0%	\$0	3,058,000	0.0%	
Giddings City of	0.0%	\$0	3,003,000	0.0%	
Hallettsville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,794,000	0.0%	
Bellville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,767,000	0.0%	
Gate City Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,757,000	0.0%	
Mason City of	0.0%	\$0	2,728,000	0.0%	
Smithville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,608,000	0.0%	
Sanger City of	0.0%	\$0	2,605,000	0.0%	
Luling City of	0.0%	\$0	2,602,000	0.0%	
Hempstead City of	0.0%	\$0	2,561,000	0.0%	
Llano City of	0.0%	\$0	2,481,000	0.0%	
Schulenburg City of	0.0%	\$0	2,425,000	0.0%	
Shiner City of	0.0%	\$0	2,396,000	0.0%	
Whitesboro City of	0.0%	\$0	2,366,000	0.0%	
Seymour City of	0.0%	\$0	2,208,000	0.0%	
San Saba City of	0.0%	\$0	2,183,000	0.0%	
Weimar City of	0.0%	\$0	1,975,000	0.0%	
Tulia City of	0.0%	\$0	1,908,000	0.0%	
Electra City of	0.0%	\$0	1,808,000	0.0%	
San Augustine City of	0.0%	\$0	1,794,000	0.0%	
Castroville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,672,000	0.0%	
Farmersville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,643,000	0.0%	
Flatonia City of	0.0%	\$0	1,593,000	0.0%	
Newton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,563,000	0.0%	
Kirbyville Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,430,000	0.0%	
Hemphill City of	0.0%	\$0	1,198,000	0.0%	
Goldthwaite City of	0.0%	\$0	1,172,000	0.0%	
Floydada City of	0.0%	\$0	1,091,000	0.0%	
Bartlett City of	0.0%	\$0	874,000	0.0%	
City of Timpson	0.0%	\$0	837,000	0.0%	
Moulton City of	0.0%	\$0	765,000	0.0%	
Waelder City of	0.0%	\$0	710,000	0.0%	
Lexington City of	0.0%	\$0	654,000	0.0%	
Garrison City of	0.0%	\$0	607,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Texas - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Plains City of	0.0%	\$0	415,000	0.0%	
City of Goldsmith	0.0%	\$0	218,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Utah.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Utah Municipal Power Agency	1.5%	\$480,000	32,019,000	0.0%	
PacifiCorp	0.1%	\$4,982,000	3,683,923,000	-87.9%	84
Bountiful City City of	0.0%	\$2,000	12,912,000	-90.0%	
Deseret Generation & Tran Coop	0.0%	\$0	123,209,000	0.0%	N/A
Utah Associated Mun Power Sys	0.0%	\$0	75,772,000	0.0%	
Provo City Corp	0.0%	\$0	39,716,000	0.0%	
Moon Lake Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	38,423,000	0.0%	
Wells Rural Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	26,852,000	0.0%	
St George City of	0.0%	\$0	24,404,000	0.0%	
Mt Wheeler Power Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,486,000	0.0%	
Empire Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,938,000	0.0%	
Murray City of	0.0%	\$0	20,134,000	0.0%	
Logan City of	0.0%	\$0	17,922,000	0.0%	
Springville City of	0.0%	\$0	10,691,000	0.0%	
Garkane Power Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,735,000	0.0%	
Dixie Escalante R E A Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,444,000	0.0%	
Spanish Fork City Corp	0.0%	\$0	7,697,000	0.0%	
Brigham City Corp	0.0%	\$0	7,676,000	0.0%	
Raft River Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,016,000	0.0%	
Bridger Valley Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,643,000	0.0%	
Kaysville City Corp	0.0%	\$0	6,578,000	0.0%	
Heber Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	4,284,000	0.0%	
Price Municipal Corp	0.0%	\$0	4,112,000	0.0%	
Payson City Corp	0.0%	\$0	3,848,000	0.0%	
Lehi City City of	0.0%	\$0	3,495,000	0.0%	
Strawberry Electric Serv Dist	0.0%	\$0	3,290,000	0.0%	
Hyrum City Corp	0.0%	\$0	2,787,000	0.0%	
Hurricane Power Committee	0.0%	\$0	2,597,000	0.0%	
City of Washington	0.0%	\$0	2,448,000	0.0%	
Nephi City Corp	0.0%	\$0	2,160,000	0.0%	
Kanab City Corporation	0.0%	\$0	1,681,000	0.0%	
Ephraim City of	0.0%	\$0	1,577,000	0.0%	
Helper City of	0.0%	\$0	1,527,000	0.0%	
Beaver City Corp	0.0%	\$0	1,478,000	0.0%	
Fillmore City Corp	0.0%	\$0	1,384,000	0.0%	
Blanding City of	0.0%	\$0	1,347,000	0.0%	
City of Santa Clara	0.0%	\$0	1,228,000	0.0%	
Flowell Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,106,000	0.0%	
Mt Pleasant City of	0.0%	\$0	1,099,000	0.0%	
Salem City Corp	0.0%	\$0	1,029,000	0.0%	
Manti City of	0.0%	\$0	899,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Utah - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Parowan City Corp	0.0%	\$0	855,000	0.0%	
Morgan City Corp	0.0%	\$0	722,000	0.0%	
Monroe City City of	0.0%	\$0	574,000	0.0%	
Fairview City Corp	0.0%	\$0	500,000	0.0%	
Enterprise City of	0.0%	\$0	465,000	0.0%	
Spring City Corp	0.0%	\$0	246,000	0.0%	
Oak City Town of	0.0%	\$0	174,000	0.0%	
Levan Town Corp	0.0%	\$0	159,000	0.0%	
Kanosh Town of	0.0%	\$0	138,000	0.0%	
Holden Town of	0.0%	\$0	119,000	0.0%	
Paragonah Town of	0.0%	\$0	119,000	0.0%	
Meadow Town Corp	0.0%	\$0	94,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Vermont.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Vermont Electric Coop Inc	2.3%	\$357,000	15,320,000	0.0%	
Barton Village Inc	1.3%	\$19,000	1,487,000	0.0%	
Green Mountain Power Corp	0.9%	\$1,567,000	179,323,000	-63.5%	31
Burlington City of	0.7%	\$270,000	38,152,000	-71.7%	
Central Vermont Pub Serv Corp	0.5%	\$1,587,000	295,912,000	-73.1%	43
Citizens Utilities Co	0.5%	\$913,000	196,034,000	0.0%	49
Orleans Village of	0.2%	\$3,000	1,456,000	0.0%	
Vermont Marble Pwr Div of OMYA	0.0%	\$1,000	12,235,000	-99.1%	
New England Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,677,903,000	0.0%	N/A
Vermont Yankee Nucl Pwr Corp	0.0%	\$0	173,106,000	0.0%	N/A
Vermont Electric Power Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	51,147,000	0.0%	
Vermont Public Pwr Supply Auth	0.0%	\$0	12,908,000	0.0%	
Washington Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,247,000	0.0%	
Lyndonville Village of	0.0%	\$0	6,137,000	0.0%	
Town of Stowe	0.0%	\$0	6,078,000	0.0%	
Swanton Village of	0.0%	\$0	5,866,000	0.0%	
Vermont Electric Trans Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,522,000	0.0%	
Morrisville Village of	0.0%	\$0	4,613,000	0.0%	
Ludlow Village of	0.0%	\$0	3,958,000	0.0%	
Hardwick Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,243,000	0.0%	
Northfield Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,395,000	0.0%	
Enosburg Falls Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,875,000	0.0%	
Johnson Village of Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,354,000	0.0%	
Hyde Park Village of Inc	0.0%	\$0	930,000	0.0%	
Rochester Electric Lgt&Pwr Co	0.0%	\$0	670,000	0.0%	
Jacksonville Village of	0.0%	\$0	606,000	0.0%	
Readsboro Town of	0.0%	\$0	211,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Virginia.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Franklin City of	0.1%	\$11,000	9,171,000	0.0%	
Potomac Edison Co	0.1%	\$773,000	760,973,000	-31.8%	93
Virginia Electric & Power Co	0.1%	\$2,996,000	4,797,946,000	-65.4%	104
Appalachian Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,720,010,000	-100%	N/A
Northern Virginia Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	154,081,000	-100%	N/A
Rappahannock Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	120,808,000	0.0%	N/A
Southside Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	50,855,000	0.0%	
Danville City of	0.0%	\$0	49,353,000	0.0%	
Virginia Municipal Elec	0.0%	\$0	48,676,000	0.0%	
Shenandoah Valley Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	40,634,000	0.0%	
Mecklenburg Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	34,201,000	0.0%	
Harrisonburg City of	0.0%	\$0	34,020,000	-100%	
Central Virginia Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	29,731,000	0.0%	
Powell Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	28,670,000	0.0%	
Bristol Utilities Board	0.0%	\$0	27,370,000	0.0%	
Manassas City of	0.0%	\$0	18,906,000	-100%	
Salem City of	0.0%	\$0	18,196,000	0.0%	
Radford City of	0.0%	\$0	16,025,000	0.0%	
Northern Neck Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,003,000	0.0%	
A & N Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	13,126,000	0.0%	
Virginia Tech Electric Service	0.0%	\$0	12,725,000	0.0%	
Prince George Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	12,481,000	0.0%	
BARC Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,186,000	0.0%	
Bedford City of	0.0%	\$0	11,627,000	0.0%	
Community Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	11,619,000	0.0%	
Martinsville City of	0.0%	\$0	10,421,000	0.0%	
Front Royal Town of	0.0%	\$0	7,657,000	0.0%	
Craig-Botetourt Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	5,799,000	0.0%	
Culpeper Town of	0.0%	\$0	4,006,000	0.0%	
Richlands Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,364,000	0.0%	
Blackstone Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,964,000	0.0%	
Elkton Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,043,000	0.0%	
Wakefield Town of	0.0%	\$0	651,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Washington.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Ellensburg City of	4.3%	\$329,000	7,616,000	0.0%	
Seattle City of	3.8%	\$13,938,000	366,138,000	-28.8%	2
Tacoma City of	3.4%	\$7,483,000	218,298,000	13.5%	3
Richland City of	3.1%	\$850,000	27,110,000	0.0%	
Bonneville Power Admin	1.7%	\$38,419,000	2,311,678,000	-62.5%	9
PUD No 1 of Pend Oreille Cnty	0.8%	\$164,000	20,631,000	0.0%	
PUD No 2 of Grant County	0.8%	\$855,000	113,426,000	-22.4%	37
PUD No 1 of Clark County	0.6%	\$991,000	165,240,000	0.0%	41
Washington Water Power Co	0.4%	\$3,225,000	725,883,000	-85.9%	51
Puget Sound Power & Light Co	0.3%	\$4,174,000	1,231,424,000	-92.7%	63
PacifiCorp	0.1%	\$4,982,000	3,683,923,000	-87.9%	84
Washington Pub Pwr Supply Sys	0.0%	\$0	434,226,000	0.0%	N/A
PUD No 1 of Snohomish County	0.0%	\$0	384,032,000	-100%	N/A
PUD No 1 of Chelan County	0.0%	\$0	188,643,000	-100%	N/A
PUD No 1 of Cowlitz County	0.0%	\$0	102,911,000	0.0%	N/A
PUD No 1 of Benton County	0.0%	\$0	63,472,000	-100%	
PUD No 1 of Grays Harbor Cnty	0.0%	\$0	49,753,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Douglas County	0.0%	\$0	43,259,000	0.0%	
Inland Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	31,887,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Lewis County	0.0%	\$0	29,328,000	-100%	
PUD No 1 of Franklin County	0.0%	\$0	28,295,000	0.0%	
PUD No 3 of Mason County	0.0%	\$0	28,281,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Clallam County	0.0%	\$0	25,763,000	0.0%	
Peninsula Light Co	0.0%	\$0	24,240,000	0.0%	
Benton Rural Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	19,659,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Okanogan County	0.0%	\$0	19,153,000	0.0%	
Port Angeles City of	0.0%	\$0	16,738,000	-100%	
Big Bend Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,703,000	0.0%	
PUD No 2 of Pacific County	0.0%	\$0	14,655,000	0.0%	
Kootenai Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,218,000	-100%	
PUD No 1 of Klickitat County	0.0%	\$0	13,517,000	0.0%	
Orcas Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	10,814,000	0.0%	
Clearwater Power Co	0.0%	\$0	10,447,000	0.0%	
Elmhurst Mutual Power&Light Co	0.0%	\$0	10,006,000	0.0%	
Lakeview Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	9,855,000	0.0%	
Centralia City of	0.0%	\$0	9,424,000	0.0%	
Modern Electric Water Co	0.0%	\$0	9,088,000	0.0%	
Columbia Rural Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,083,000	0.0%	
Vera Irrigation District #15	0.0%	\$0	8,157,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Skamania County	0.0%	\$0	5,437,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Ferry County	0.0%	\$0	5,425,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Washington - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Cheney City of	0.0%	\$0	4,883,000	0.0%	
Parkland Light & Water Co	0.0%	\$0	4,517,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Mason County	0.0%	\$0	3,784,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Whatcom County	0.0%	\$0	3,644,000	0.0%	
Blaine City of	0.0%	\$0	3,297,000	0.0%	
Ohop Mutual Light Co	0.0%	\$0	3,194,000	0.0%	
Tanner Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	2,915,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Kittitas County	0.0%	\$0	2,809,000	0.0%	
Steilacoom Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,432,000	0.0%	
Okanogan County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,253,000	0.0%	
Milton City of	0.0%	\$0	2,128,000	0.0%	
Fircrest Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,102,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Wahkiakum County	0.0%	\$0	2,008,000	0.0%	
Nespelem Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,999,000	0.0%	
McCleary City of	0.0%	\$0	1,655,000	0.0%	
Cashmere City of	0.0%	\$0	1,458,000	0.0%	
Chewelah City of	0.0%	\$0	1,293,000	0.0%	
Eatonville Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,051,000	0.0%	
Sumas City of	0.0%	\$0	887,000	0.0%	
West Bend City of	0.0%	\$0	850,000	0.0%	
Coulee Dam City of	0.0%	\$0	750,000	0.0%	
Waterville Town of	0.0%	\$0	342,000	0.0%	
Ruston City of	0.0%	\$0	264,000	0.0%	
Alder Mutual Light Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	162,000	0.0%	
PUD No 1 of Asotin County	0.0%	\$0	11,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in West Virginia.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Appalachian Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,720,010,000	-100%	N/A
Monongahela Power Co	0.0%	\$0	666,362,000	-100%	N/A
UtiliCorp United Inc	0.0%	\$0	557,307,000	0.0%	N/A
Wheeling Power Co	0.0%	\$0	85,297,000	-100%	
Shenandoah Valley Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	40,634,000	0.0%	
Craig-Botetourt Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	5,799,000	0.0%	
Harrison Rural Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,511,000	0.0%	
Philippi City of	0.0%	\$0	1,945,000	0.0%	
New Martinsville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,898,000	0.0%	
United Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,328,000	0.0%	
Elk Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,265,000	0.0%	
Black Diamond Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,111,000	0.0%	
Union Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,040,000	0.0%	
War Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	899,000	0.0%	
Kimball Light & Water Co	0.0%	\$0	306,000	0.0%	
Elkhorn Public Service Co	0.0%	\$0	164,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Wisconsin.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Oakdale Electric Coop	2.3%	\$278,000	11,914,000	0.0%	
Taylor County Electric Coop	1.7%	\$73,000	4,237,000	0.0%	
Polk-Burnett Electric Coop	1.6%	\$200,000	12,723,000	-40.5%	
Wisconsin Power & Light Co	1.5%	\$9,401,000	632,483,000	-21.6%	13
Vernon Electric Coop	1.5%	\$137,000	9,344,000	878.6%	
Madison Gas & Electric Co	1.0%	\$1,673,000	163,470,000	-60.9%	27
Trempealeau Electric Coop	1.0%	\$99,000	9,914,000	0.0%	
Rice Lake City of	0.9%	\$62,000	6,748,000	0.0%	
Northern States Power Co	0.9%	\$3,358,000	382,564,000	-6.9%	30
Northwestern Wisconsin Elec Co	0.7%	\$70,000	10,114,000	0.0%	
Superior Water Light&Power Co	0.6%	\$146,000	24,080,000	-22.3%	
Wisconsin Public Service Corp	0.5%	\$2,480,000	479,387,000	-84.7%	45
Marshfield City of	0.5%	\$76,000	14,724,000	-21.7%	
Stoughton City of	0.5%	\$31,000	6,580,000	0.0%	
Manitowoc City of	0.5%	\$117,000	25,676,000	-58.1%	
Eau Claire Electric Coop	0.4%	\$37,000	9,515,000	0.0%	
Plymouth City of	0.1%	\$10,000	8,328,000	0.0%	
Grant Electric Coop	0.1%	\$7,000	10,262,000	40.0%	
Dunn County Electric Coop	0.1%	\$4,000	8,166,000	0.0%	
Wisconsin Electric Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,412,115,000	-100%	N/A
Wisconsin Public Power Inc Sys	0.0%	\$0	125,064,000	-100%	N/A
Consolidated Water Power Co	0.0%	\$0	37,128,000	0.0%	
Kaukauna City of	0.0%	\$0	26,650,000	0.0%	
Adams-Columbia Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	23,864,000	0.0%	
Menasha City of	0.0%	\$0	23,459,000	0.0%	
Barron Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	16,291,000	-100%	
Wisconsin Rapids W W & L Comm	0.0%	\$0	10,661,000	0.0%	
Shawano Municipal Utilities	0.0%	\$0	9,756,000	0.0%	
Clark Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	9,102,000	0.0%	
Oconomowoc City of	0.0%	\$0	8,840,000	0.0%	
Hartford City of	0.0%	\$0	8,810,000	0.0%	
Reedsburg Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	8,447,000	0.0%	
Sun Prairie Water & Light Comm	0.0%	\$0	8,336,000	0.0%	
St Croix County Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	8,290,000	0.0%	
Sheboygan Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	8,109,000	0.0%	
New London City of	0.0%	\$0	7,960,000	0.0%	
Sturgeon Bay Combined Utils	0.0%	\$0	7,541,000	0.0%	
Jefferson City of	0.0%	\$0	7,121,000	0.0%	
Jackson Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,008,000	0.0%	
Pierce-Pepin Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	6,686,000	0.0%	
Jump River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,429,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 266 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Wisconsin - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Oconto Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	6,372,000	0.0%	
Cedarburg Light & Water Comm	0.0%	\$0	6,267,000	0.0%	
River Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	5,996,000	0.0%	
Chippewa Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	5,976,000	0.0%	
Dahlberg Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	5,673,000	0.0%	
Central Wisconsin Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	5,570,000	0.0%	
Bayfield Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,415,000	0.0%	
Medford City of	0.0%	\$0	5,320,000	0.0%	
Wisconsin River Power Co	0.0%	\$0	5,144,000	0.0%	
Rock County Electric Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	5,123,000	0.0%	
Elkhorn Light & Water Comm	0.0%	\$0	5,081,000	0.0%	
Price Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,044,000	0.0%	
Buffalo Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	4,901,000	0.0%	
Two Rivers City of	0.0%	\$0	4,743,000	0.0%	
Waupun Public Utilities	0.0%	\$0	4,269,000	0.0%	
Clintonville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,161,000	0.0%	
Waunakee Village of	0.0%	\$0	4,020,000	-100%	
Richland Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,829,000	0.0%	
Lake Mills City of	0.0%	\$0	3,677,000	0.0%	
Head of Lakes Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,606,000	0.0%	
New Richmond City of	0.0%	\$0	3,468,000	0.0%	
Evansville City of	0.0%	\$0	3,433,000	0.0%	
New Holstein City of	0.0%	\$0	3,430,000	0.0%	
Richland Center City of	0.0%	\$0	3,251,000	0.0%	
Crawford Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,094,000	0.0%	
Waterloo Light & Water Comm	0.0%	\$0	3,036,000	0.0%	
Columbus City of	0.0%	\$0	2,946,000	0.0%	
Black River Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	2,785,000	0.0%	
Arcadia City of	0.0%	\$0	2,707,000	0.0%	
Kiel City of	0.0%	\$0	2,540,000	0.0%	
Wisconsin Dells Electric Util	0.0%	\$0	2,461,000	0.0%	
Algoma Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	2,280,000	0.0%	
Bloomer Electric & Water Co	0.0%	\$0	2,236,000	0.0%	
Mt Horeb Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,191,000	0.0%	
North Central Power Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,109,000	0.0%	
Barron City of	0.0%	\$0	1,960,000	0.0%	
Cumberland City of	0.0%	\$0	1,944,000	0.0%	
Bangor City of	0.0%	\$0	1,935,000	0.0%	
Brodhead Water & Lighting Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,848,000	0.0%	
Sauk City City of	0.0%	\$0	1,799,000	0.0%	
Slinger Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,741,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Wisconsin - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Boscobel City of	0.0%	\$0	1,697,000	0.0%	
Prairie Du Sac Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,663,000	0.0%	
Juneau Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,624,000	0.0%	
Eagle River City of	0.0%	\$0	1,537,000	0.0%	
Spooner City of	0.0%	\$0	1,516,000	0.0%	
Whitehall City of	0.0%	\$0	1,511,000	0.0%	
Pioneer Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	1,508,000	0.0%	
Muscoda City of	0.0%	\$0	1,432,000	0.0%	
Fennimore City of	0.0%	\$0	1,427,000	0.0%	
Lodi City of	0.0%	\$0	1,288,000	0.0%	
Oconto Falls Water&Light Comm	0.0%	\$0	1,251,000	0.0%	
Hustisford City of	0.0%	\$0	1,139,000	0.0%	
New Glarus City of	0.0%	\$0	1,098,000	0.0%	
Pardeeville Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,059,000	0.0%	
Westby City of	0.0%	\$0	1,021,000	0.0%	
Florence Utility Commission	0.0%	\$0	916,000	0.0%	
Black Earth Village of	0.0%	\$0	897,000	0.0%	
Gresham Village of	0.0%	\$0	868,000	0.0%	
Elroy City of	0.0%	\$0	866,000	0.0%	
Cuba City City of	0.0%	\$0	784,000	0.0%	
Washington Island El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	775,000	0.0%	
Westfield Milling & El Lgt Co	0.0%	\$0	768,000	0.0%	
Cadott City of	0.0%	\$0	746,000	0.0%	
Village of Mazomanie	0.0%	\$0	738,000	0.0%	
New Lisbon City of	0.0%	\$0	728,000	0.0%	
Cornell City of	0.0%	\$0	694,000	0.0%	
Stratford Village of	0.0%	\$0	647,000	0.0%	
Princeton City of	0.0%	\$0	624,000	0.0%	
Trempealeau Village of	0.0%	\$0	561,000	0.0%	
Shullsburg City of	0.0%	\$0	513,000	0.0%	
Belmont Village of	0.0%	\$0	415,000	0.0%	
Argyle City of	0.0%	\$0	405,000	0.0%	
Hazel Green Village of	0.0%	\$0	403,000	0.0%	
Cashton Village of	0.0%	\$0	355,000	0.0%	
La Farge Municipal Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	355,000	0.0%	
Wonewoc Village of	0.0%	\$0	322,000	0.0%	
Benton Village of	0.0%	\$0	302,000	0.0%	
Centuria Village of	0.0%	\$0	286,000	0.0%	
Viola City of	0.0%	\$0	251,000	0.0%	
Merrillan City of	0.0%	\$0	162,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Wyoming.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Montana Power Co	0.6%	\$2,923,000	508,407,000	-58.5%	42
PacifiCorp	0.1%	\$4,982,000	3,683,923,000	-87.9%	84
Powder River Energy Corp	0.0%	\$0	61,305,000	0.0%	
Cheyenne Light Fuel & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	36,873,000	0.0%	
Yampa Valley Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	29,108,000	0.0%	
Lower Valley Power & Light Inc	0.0%	\$0	26,371,000	0.0%	
Hot Springs Rural El Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,781,000	0.0%	
Gillette City of	0.0%	\$0	11,694,000	0.0%	
Riverton Valley Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,879,000	0.0%	
Wyrulec Co	0.0%	\$0	6,750,000	0.0%	
Bridger Valley Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,643,000	0.0%	
Big Horn Rural Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	5,968,000	0.0%	
Carbon Power & Light Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,848,000	0.0%	
Wheatland Rural Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,837,000	0.0%	
Wyoming Municipal Power Agency	0.0%	\$0	5,783,000	0.0%	
Cody City of	0.0%	\$0	3,958,000	0.0%	
Torrington City of	0.0%	\$0	3,915,000	0.0%	
Big Horn County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,782,000	0.0%	
Niobrara Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,792,000	0.0%	
Powell City of	0.0%	\$0	2,577,000	0.0%	
Wheatland Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,540,000	0.0%	
Garland Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,289,000	0.0%	
Lusk Town of	0.0%	\$0	761,000	0.0%	
Guernsey Town of	0.0%	\$0	662,000	0.0%	
Basin Town of	0.0%	\$0	584,000	0.0%	
Pine Bluffs City of	0.0%	\$0	546,000	0.0%	
Lingle Town of	0.0%	\$0	240,000	0.0%	
Fort Laramie Town of	0.0%	\$0	84,000	0.0%	
Deaver City of	0.0%	\$0	45,000	0.0%	
Willwood Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	43,000	0.0%	
Midvale Irrigation District	0.0%	\$0	2,000	0.0%	

* Rankings are for utilities with revenues over \$100 million in 1997. There are 268 utilities included in the ranking. N/A appears for utilities with revenues above \$100 million that could not be ranked because they did not invest in energy efficiency programs.

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1993-1997.