

Fisher Sheehan & Colton

- Home
- Feedback
- Contact Us

Who We Are What We Do **Our Work** News FSC Library

TOPICS

- Home Energy Affordability Gap
- Labor Economics
- Housing Economics
- Energy Regulation
- Consumer Economics
- Natural Resource & Environmental Economics
- Utility Restructuring


Home Energy Affordability Gap

In an effort to quantify the gap between "affordable" home energy bills and "actual" home energy bills, Fisher, Sheehan & Colton (FSC) has developed a model that estimates the "home energy affordability gap" on a county-by-county basis for the entire country. FSC found that the annual "affordability gap" for 2002 reached roughly \$18.2 billion and that federal fuel assistance provided through the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) covered just a fraction of that gap.

Based on this county-specific data, FSC has prepared state-by-state Home Energy Affordability Gap Fact Sheets. The Fact Sheets available through this Affordability Gap analysis will provide you with the following state-level information:

- Home energy burdens broken down by Poverty Level;
- Number of households broken down by Poverty Level;
- Home Energy Affordability Gap given winter 2002 heating prices (and normal weather), broken down by Poverty Level;
- Projected Home Energy Affordability Gap given estimated 2003 heating prices (and normal weather), broken down by Poverty Level;
- Low-income home energy bills, broken down by end use (heating, cooling, hot water, electricity);
- Average per-household Home Energy Affordability Gap for households below 185% of Poverty (state ranking amongst 50 states plus D.C.);
- Average total home energy burden for households below 50% of Poverty (state ranking amongst 50 states plus D.C.);
- Percentage of individuals below 100% of Poverty Level (state ranking amongst 50 states plus D.C.); and
- Combined heating/cooling affordability gap covered by federal energy assistance (state ranking amongst 50 states plus D.C.).

Simply click on the state for which you wish information.



The problems arising from the unaffordability of home energy in the United States are substantial. A June 2001 report by the National Fuel Funds Network, and other national organizations, found that at the end of the 2000/2001 winter heating season, at least 4.3 million low-income households were at risk of having their utility service cut off because of an inability to pay their winter home energy bills. While natural gas prices moderated after the 2001/2002 winter heating season, recent increases in natural gas and fuel oil prices are again creating crisis situations for utility customers. These households are disproportionately low-income households.

That payment-troubled customers are disproportionately low wage households is commonly accepted. National data reported by the U.S. Census Bureau indicates that the proportion of households in arrears at any given point in time is substantially higher for the low-income population than for the population as a whole. One 1995 Census study reported that while 9.8% of non-poor families could not pay their utility bills in full, 32.4% of poor families could not do so. According to the Census Bureau, while 1.8% of non-poor families had their electric and/or natural gas service disconnected for nonpayment, 8.5% of poor families suffered this same deprivation.

It is not merely the nonpayment of bills that is of concern, however. One impact, but only one impact, of the unaffordability of home energy service is the nonpayment of bills. Previous research by the Iowa Department of Human Rights (DHR) found that bill nonpayment is perhaps not even the most significant of the adverse impacts of unaffordable home energy bills. A DHR study of Iowa LIHEAP recipients found that:

- Over 12 percent of Iowa LIHEAP recipients went without food to pay their home heating bill.
- More than one-in-five went without medical care to pay for heating bills. This included not

seeking medical assistance when it was needed, not filling prescriptions for medicine when a doctor had prescribed it, and/or not taking prescription medicines in the dosage ordered by the doctor.

- Almost 30 percent reported that they did not pay other bills, but did not elaborate as to which bills were not paid.
- In addition to not paying other bills, many low-income households incurred debt in order to pay both their home heating bills and other basic necessities. They borrowed from friends and/or neighbors, used credit cards to pay for food and other necessities, or did not pay the heating bill.

A summary presentation of the FSC Home Energy Affordability Gap, made to the June 2003 National Fuel Funds Network (NFFN) annual conference, can be obtained by clicking on this link:

- [NFFN Home Energy Affordability Gap presentation](#)

A summary presentation of the uses to which FSC's Home Energy Affordability Gap can be put can be obtained by clicking on this link:

- [NFFN Home Energy Affordability Gap - Uses of Data](#)

Contact us for county-specific information (available on a fee-for-service basis).


[Who We Are](#) | [What We Do](#) | [Our Work](#) | [News](#) | [FSC Library](#) | [Home](#) | [Registration](#) | [Contact Us](#)

ON THE BRINK

The Home Energy Affordability Gap in MISSOURI

APRIL 2003


Finding #1



Home energy is a crippling financial burden for low-income Missouri households. Missouri households with incomes of below 50% of the Federal Poverty Level pay 38% or more of their annual income simply for their home energy bills.

Home energy unaffordability, however, is not simply the province of the very poor. Bills for households between 50% and 100% of Poverty take up 13% of income. Even Missouri households with incomes between 150% and 185% of the Federal Poverty Level often have energy bills above the percentage of income generally considered to be affordable.

Finding #2




The number of households facing these energy burdens is staggering. More than 115,000 Missouri households live with income at or below 50% of the Federal Poverty Level and thus face a home energy burden of 38% of income or more.

70,000 additional Missouri households live with incomes between 50% and 74% of Poverty (home energy burden of 15%).

80,000 *more* Missouri households live with incomes between 75% and 99% of the Federal Poverty Level (home energy burden of 11%).


Finding #3



Existing sources of energy assistance do not adequately address the energy affordability gap in Missouri. Actual low-income energy bills exceeded affordable energy bills in Missouri by nearly \$273 million at 2001/2002 winter heating fuel prices.

In contrast, Missouri received a gross allotment of federal energy assistance funds of \$38.7 million for Fiscal Year 2003. Some of those funds will be used for administrative costs, weatherization, and other non-cash assistance.

Finding #4




Increases in the prices of natural gas, propane and fuel oil during the 2002/2003 winter heating season drive the unaffordability gap up to more than \$321 million.

While the gap for the lowest income households (0-50% of Poverty) increases by nearly 9% (from \$121 million to \$131 million), the gap for the highest income households (150-185% of Poverty) increases by more than 1700% (from \$0.3 million to \$6.4 million).

Finding #5

Low-Income Energy Bills in Missouri by End Use (2001/2002 Winter Heating Prices)



The energy affordability gap in Missouri is not created exclusively, or even primarily, by home heating and cooling bills.

At 2001/2002 winter heating prices, while home heating bills were \$354 of a \$1,273 bill (27.8%), electric bills (other than cooling) were \$543 (42.7%). Annual cooling bills represented \$117 in expenditures (9.2% of the total bill), while domestic hot water represented \$258 in expenditures (20.2%).

Finding #6

The unaffordability of home energy bills frequently causes low-income households to take drastic actions that are detrimental to their health, safety and welfare. A survey of energy assistance recipients by the Iowa Department of Human Rights found that:

- Over 12 percent of the surveyed energy assistance recipients went without food to pay their home heating bill.
- More than one-in-five went without medical care to pay for heating bills, including not seeking medical assistance when it was needed, not filling prescriptions for medicine when a doctor has prescribed it, and/or not taking prescription medicines in the dosage ordered by the doctor.
- Almost 30 percent reported that they did not pay other bills, but did not elaborate as to which bills were not paid.
- In addition to not paying other bills, many low-income households incurred debt in order to pay both their home heating bills and other basic necessities: borrowed from friends and/or neighbors; used credit cards to pay for food and other necessities, or did not pay the heating bill.

MISSOURI Energy Gap Rankings
(scale of 1 – 51)

<p>AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT BY WHICH ACTUAL HOME ENERGY BILLS EXCEEDED AFFORDABLE HOME ENERGY BILLS FOR HOUSEHOLDS BELOW 185% OF POVERTY LEVEL.</p> <p>\$453 per household</p> <p>RANK: #7</p>	<p>AVERAGE TOTAL HOME ENERGY BURDEN FOR HOUSEHOLDS BELOW 50% OF POVERTY LEVEL.</p> <p>38.0% of household income</p> <p>RANK: #8</p>
<p>PERCENT OF INDIVIDUALS BELOW 100% OF POVERTY LEVEL.</p> <p>11.7% of all individuals</p> <p>RANK: #28</p>	<p>COMBINED HEATING/COOLING AFFORDABILITY GAP COVERED BY FEDERAL HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE.</p> <p>33.0% of gap is covered</p> <p>RANK: #13</p>

DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Each state (along with the District of Columbia) has been ranked (from 1 to 51) in terms of four separate measures of the extent of the energy affordability gap facing its low-income customers:

- (1) The percent of individuals with annual incomes at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level. This data is obtained directly from the 2000 U.S. Census.
- (2) The average total home energy burden for households with income at or below 50% of the Federal Poverty Level shows the percentage of income which households with these incomes spend on home energy. "Total home energy" includes all energy usage, not merely heating and cooling. A home energy bill is calculated on a county-by-county basis. The statewide average is a population-weighted average of county-by-county data.
- (3) The average affordability gap (in dollars per household) for all households with income at or below 185% of Poverty is the dollar difference between actual total home energy bills and bills that are set equal to an affordable percentage of income. Affordability for total home energy bills is set at 6% of household income.
- (4) The extent to which federal energy assistance covers the combined heating/cooling affordability gap for each state. The combined heating/cooling affordability gap is the difference between actual heating/cooling bills and bills that are set equal to an affordable percentage of income. Affordability for combined heating/cooling bills is set at 2% of income. This measure thus examines the proportion of the heating/cooling gap that is covered by the gross federal Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) allocation to the state assuming that the entire LIHEAP allocation is used for cash benefits.

In the state's rankings, a higher ranking indicates better conditions while a lower ranking indicates worse conditions relative to other states. Thus, for example:

- (1) The state with the rank of #1 has the lowest percentage of individuals living in households with income at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level while the state with the rank of #51 has the highest percentage.
- (2) The state with the rank of #1 has the lowest average home energy burden for households with income below 50% of the Federal Poverty Level while the state with the rank of #51 has the highest average home energy burden.
- (3) The state with the rank of #1 has the lowest average affordability gap (dollars per household) while the state with the rank of #51 has the highest dollar gap.
- (4) The state with the rank of #1 has the highest percentage of its heating/cooling affordability gap covered by federal energy assistance while the state with the rank of #51 has the lowest percentage of its heating/cooling gap covered.

All references to "states" include the District of Columbia as a "state." Low-income home energy bills are calculated using average residential revenues per unit of energy. State financial resources and utility-specific discounts are not considered.



ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

Top Issues:

- Farm Subsidies
- Pesticides
- Drinking Water
- Enforcement
- Air Pollution

Other EWG Sites:

- Farm Subsidy Database
- Chemical Industry Archives
- California
- Dirty Money Tracker
- FoodNews.org
- BanDursban.org

Archives

Contact EWG

About EWG

Search EWG:

Go



EWG Supports:

- Our Stolen Future
- Earth Day Network
- Coming Clean
- PBS' Trade Secrets

*Our thoughts are with
the families of
Monday's airplane
disaster*



Utility Deregulation a Bust For Energy Efficiency Programs

Consumers Pay \$ Billions More for Power,
Breathe Dirtier Air,
Finds New Report of Industry Data from 1992-1997

Download PDF of Unplugged (215K)

Download PDF of Unplugged State Reports (780K)

For Immediate Release

Thursday, October 1, 1998

WASHINGTON--By cutting energy efficiency programs almost in half, electric utilities are sticking consumers with bigger electric bills and dirty air, concludes *Unplugged*, a new study by the Environmental Working Group and World Wildlife Fund.

To raise profits in a deregulated energy market, utilities are eliminating or drastically cutting these programs which save consumers money and reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, consumers paid an extra \$1 billion each year for the next decade due to cuts in energy efficiency investments, concludes the report.

The report ranked the nation's largest utilities on their commitment to energy efficiency programs and found a wide variation between power companies and regions of the country. For example, the City of Eugene, OR, whose utility serves some 73,000 customers, invested more in energy efficiency than the combined outlay of Southern Company, Entergy, Commonwealth Edison, and American Electric Power, which serve more than 12 million customers. Forty-two of the largest electric utilities completely eliminated their investments in energy efficiency.

"Utilities are putting profits ahead of their customers' interests," said John Coequyt of EWG, author of the report, "and to keep up with soaring demand, utilities have turned to antiquated, dirty power plants. Competition among electric utilities should not come at the cost of higher bills for consumers and dirty air."

Schedule - 6

Unplugged is based on documents utilities must file with the U.S. Department of Energy and finds that cuts in energy efficiency programs totaled \$736 million between 1993 and 1997. The cuts have also meant dirtier air across the U.S. According to the study, if energy efficiency programs had been fully funded in 1997 utilities would have avoided emitting 11 million tons of global warming gases and 79,000 tons of soot and smog-forming pollutants.

"Consumers are getting more than they bargained for from their utility companies -- more pollution, and more greenhouse gases," said Adam Markham, director of WWF's Climate Change Campaign. "Consumers want more energy efficiency and cleaner air, but our utilities, which should be on the front lines of America's effort to halt global warming, are letting us down."


The utilities have eliminated a range of energy efficiency programs including home energy efficiency audits and rebates for new energy efficient appliances, such as water heaters, light bulbs, showerheads, and refrigerators. These strategies are proven to cut energy usage and pollution. For example, compact fluorescent light bulbs use one-quarter the electricity of incandescent bulbs. Replacing just one incandescent light bulb will save a consumer \$50 and reduce carbon emissions by 1,000 pounds over the life of the bulb.

The report recommends all states create a public benefits fund in which a small percentage of consumers' bills is set aside for energy efficiency programs.

Although the most immediate consumer benefit of energy efficiency programs is economic, "far more than electric bills are at stake," noted Markham. "Global warming is a pervasive and ever growing threat to all life on Earth and the ecosystems that support it. Utility companies can and must play a role in reducing that threat," he said.

Environmental Working Group, a project of the Tides Center, is a non-profit research organization with offices in Washington, DC, and San Francisco. Known around the globe by its panda logo, World Wildlife Fund is the world's largest conservation organization; it leads international efforts to protect endangered species and their habitats through its Living Planet Campaign.

--30--



UNPLUGGED

HOW POWER COMPANIES HAVE ABANDONED
ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS



Acknowledgments

The principal authors of *Unplugged* were John Coequyt and Richard Wiles of Environmental Working Group. Adam Markham and Jennifer Morgan of the World Wildlife Fund contributed to the report. Molly Evans designed and produced the report. Chris Campbell assisted in the data analysis. Ken Cook, Bill Walker and Ed Hopkins of EWG also provided editorial assistance and advice.

We wish to thank Felice Stadler, Steve Bernow, Michael Ross, Susan Hedman, Jimmy Seidita and Amy Hennen for their review of *Unplugged* in draft form. We would also like to thank the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, especially Martin Kushler, Steve Nadel and Howard Geller for their help with the report. Any errors of fact or interpretation are the sole responsibility of the Environmental Working Group.

Thanks to Felice Stadler and Gina Porreco of The Clean Air Network for their support in releasing the report. We also wish to thank all the groups that are working in their state to disseminate the report.

The Joyce Foundation and the SBF Fund of the Tides Foundation supported the report's development. The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the financial supporters. Environmental Working Group is responsible for any errors of fact or interpretation contained in this report.

Copyright © October 1998 by the Environmental Working Group/The Tides Center. All rights reserved. Manufactured in the United States of America. Printed on recycled paper.

Environmental Working Group

The Environmental Working Group is a nonprofit environmental research organization based in Washington, D.C. The Environmental Working Group is a project of the Tides Center, a California Public Benefit Corporation based in San Francisco that provides administrative and program support services to nonprofit programs and projects.

Kenneth A. Cook, President
Richard Wiles, Vice President for Research
Edward Hopkins, Vice President for Programs

To order a copy

Copies of this report may be ordered for \$5.00 each (plus 6% sales tax or \$.30 for Washington, D.C. residents) and \$3.00 for postage and handling. Payment must accompany all orders. Please make checks payable to:

Environmental Working Group
1718 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 667-6982 (phone)
(202) 232-2592 (fax)
info@ewg.org (e-mail)

www.ewg.org

This report and many other EWG publications are available on the World Wide Web at www.ewg.org

Unplugged

Hot Enough For You?

The summer of 1998 was the hottest on record, and that's saying something. After all, the seven warmest years since scientists began keeping records in 1853 have all occurred in the past ten years, and 1997 was the warmest ever. So far, every month of 1998 has broken the temperature record for that month, and July 1998 was the single hottest month on record (NOAA 1998). To put it another way, we've probably just lived through the hottest seven-month period in 600 years.

Among scientists, there is an overwhelming consensus that this warming trend is at least partly the result of human activities such as electricity production, which annually spews billions of tons of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide and other pollutants into the atmosphere.

In the face of these growing problems utilities should be working overtime to increase energy efficiency. But between 1993 and 1997, U.S. utilities cut their combined investment in energy-saving programs by 45


percent, or \$736 million, largely in response to industry deregulation (Figure 1). After promising in the early 1990s to fund and even expand energy conservation programs for their customers, most utilities have done just the opposite (Table 1).

If utilities had funded energy efficiency programs in 1997 at the levels they promised five years earlier:

- **The air would be cleaner.**
Utilities would have avoided emitting 11 million

Between 1993 and 1997, U.S. utilities cut their combined investment in energy-saving programs by 45 percent, or \$736 million, largely in response to industry deregulation.

Figure 1. Utilities have drastically cut their investments in energy efficiency programs.



Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1992-1997.

Table 1. Without deregulation, utilities would have spent much more on energy efficiency in 1997.

Rank	Utility	State	Energy Efficiency Expenditures		Difference (\$ in thousands)
			1992 Projected Spending for 1997 (\$ in thousands)	Actual Spending (\$ in thousands)	
1	PacifiCorp	OR/WA	160,226	4,982	155,244
2	Pacific Gas & Electric Co	CA	185,000	81,123	103,877
3	Public Service Electric&Gas Co	NJ	140,000	38,808	101,192
4	Consolidated Edison Co-NY Inc	NY	119,278	25,656	93,622
5	Southern California Edison Co	CA	131,361	53,574	77,787
6	Consumers Power Co	MI	63,195	-	63,195
7	Massachusetts Electric Co	MA	102,800	45,620	57,180
8	Puget Sound Power & Light Co	WA	58,749	4,174	54,575
9	Duke Power Co	NC/SC	45,053	-	45,053
10	Los Angeles City of	CA	41,862	-	41,862
11	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co	MD	68,489	27,791	40,698
12	Northern States Power Co	MN/ND	64,890	24,548	40,342
13	Georgia Power Co	GA	34,996	-	34,996
14	Potomac Electric Power Co	DC/MD	63,424	29,562	33,862
15	New York State Elec & Gas Corp	NY	35,618	2,448	33,170
16	Pennsylvania Electric Co	PA/NY	30,200	498	29,702
17	Wisconsin Electric Power Co	WI/MI	29,497	-	29,497
18	Dayton Power & Light Co	OH	34,000	4,783	29,217
19	Sacramento Municipal Util Dist	CA	41,450	17,379	24,071
20	Boston Edison Co	MA	37,185	13,542	23,643
21	Niagara Mohawk Power Corp	NY	21,882	635	21,247
22	Jersey Central Power&Light Co	NJ	28,704	8,073	20,631
23	San Diego Gas & Electric Co	CA	43,537	24,330	19,207
24	Connecticut Light & Power Co	CT	51,461	32,691	18,770
25	PSI Energy Inc	IN	21,928	4,742	17,186
26	Appalachian Power Co	WV/VA	15,869	-	15,869
27	Montana Power Co	MT/WY	17,972	2,923	15,049
28	Hawaiian Electric Co Inc	HI	21,056	6,515	14,541
29	Orange & Rockland Utils Inc	NY	16,745	2,613	14,132
30	Detroit Edison Co	MI	13,950	-	13,950
31	Narragansett Electric Co	RI	22,240	8,493	13,747
32	Wisconsin Public Service Corp	WI/MI	16,000	2,480	13,520
33	United Illuminating Co	CT	15,950	2,742	13,208
34	Ohio Power Co	OH	13,106	-	13,106
35	Rochester Gas & Electric Corp	NY	12,137	-	12,137
36	Central Maine Power Co	ME	24,549	12,494	12,055
37	Long Island Lighting Co	NY	18,198	6,396	11,802
38	Portland General Electric Co	OR	22,328	10,923	11,405
39	Montaup Electric Co	MA	11,376	-	11,376
40	Columbus Southern Power Co	OH	10,555	500	10,055
41	Southern Indiana Gas & Elec Co	IN	9,590	131	9,459
42	Indiana Michigan Power Co	IN/MI	9,445	-	9,445
43	Florida Power Corp	FL	15,020	5,638	9,382
44	Puerto Rico Electric Pwr Auth	PR	9,460	89	9,371
45	Seattle City of	WA	23,300	13,938	9,362
46	Central Hudson Gas & Elec Corp	NY	9,718	413	9,305
47	Washington Water Power Co	WA/ID	12,524	3,225	9,299
48	Philadelphia Electric Co	PA	8,417	-	8,417
49	PUD No 1 of Snohomish County	WA	8,061	-	8,061
50	Public Service Co of Colorado	CO	11,000	2,972	8,028

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1992-1997.

tons of global warming gases and 79,000 tons of air pollution in 1997 alone. Thanks largely to deregulation, utilities are increasingly turning to cheap power from older coal-burning power plants in the Midwest to meet peak electricity demand. These huge power stations are mostly exempt from contemporary clean air standards, and they generate enormous amounts of air pollution including millions of tons of nitrous oxides, sulfur dioxide, and global warming gases. According to a recent analysis, the air quality was the worst when power shortages were the most prevalent (CAN/U.S. PIRG 1998). On June 25, 1998, the day many Midwestern utilities asked customers to cut their power usage, there were 110 violations of the new ozone air quality standard in 27 states and the District of Columbia.

- **Consumers would save money.** Americans would have saved \$1 billion on electric bills in 1997. These savings would have continued every year for the next 10 to 15 years, a total of at least \$10 billion

in consumer savings lost due to cuts in energy efficiency programs by utilities, inspired largely by utility deregulation.

- **Power would be available when people need it.** With well-funded energy efficiency programs in place, utilities would very likely not have had to ask customers to turn down their air conditioners in the peak of the summer heat wave in June. This past summer, two utilities that slashed their energy efficiency spending, Commonwealth Edison of Chicago and American Electric Power¹ asked their customers to cut daytime power use during the peak of the summer heat wave in June. In Denver, Public Service of Colorado instituted a "rolling blackout" plan, and thousands of families were forced to endure the heat without any power at all.

Cuts in Energy Efficiency Programs are Big, and they Hurt Consumers

Since the October 1992 passage of the Energy Policy Act, the federal law that paved the way for the industry deregulation, utilities have cut investments in

¹American Electric Power (AEP) is an electric holding company that operates in 7 states. AEP's principal operating companies are Appalachia Power Company which serves Virginia and West Virginia, Columbus Southern Power Company in Ohio, Indiana Michigan Power Company, Kentucky Power Company, and Ohio Power Company.

Table 2. Cuts in energy efficiency programs cost consumers money.

Rank	Utility Name	State	Projected Savings in 1992 for 1997 (Mwh)	Actual Savings in 1997 (Mwh)	Cost to Customers
1	PacifiCorp	OR/WY	2,880,000	89,562	\$131 million
2	Consumers Power Co	MI	1,349,000	-	\$93 million
3	Consolidated Edison Co-NY Inc	NY	638,000	137,270	\$70 million
4	Southern California Edison Co	CA	1,170,000	477,028	\$70 million
5	Los Angeles City of	CA	710,000	-	\$67 million
6	New York State Elec & Gas Corp	NY	608,000	41,758	\$66 million
7	Public Service Electric&Gas Co	NJ	832,000	230,595	\$60 million
8	Niagara Mohawk Power Corp	NY	648,000	18,792	\$59 million
9	Pacific Gas & Electric Co	CA	941,000	412,593	\$52 million
10	Pennsylvania Electric Co	PA/NY	569,000	9,388	\$41 million
11	Wisconsin Electric Power Co	WI/MI	666,000	-	\$35 million
12	Appalachian Power Co	WV/VA	421,000	-	\$20 million
13	Massachusetts Electric Co	MA	358,000	159,001	\$20 million
14	Hawaiian Electric Co Inc	HI	233,000	72,224	\$18 million
15	Northern States Power Co	MN/ND	472,000	178,416	\$17 million
16	Jersey Central Power&Light Co	NJ	205,000	57,578	\$17 million
17	Dayton Power & Light Co	OH	294,000	41,403	\$17 million
18	Indiana Michigan Power Co	IN	294,000	-	\$16 million
19	Wisconsin Public Service Corp	WI/MI	381,000	59,051	\$15 million
20	Puget Sound Power & Light Co	WA	235,000	16,723	\$12 million
21	Sierra Pacific Power Co	CA	150,000	-	\$10 million
22	United Illuminating Co	CT	98,000	16,905	\$9 million
23	Duke Power Co	NC/SC	159,000	-	\$9 million
24	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co	MD/DC	196,000	79,613	\$8 million
25	Long Island Lighting Co	NY	80,000	28,124	\$8 million
26	Detroit Edison Co	MI	100,000	-	\$8 million
27	Potomac Electric Power Co	DC	193,000	90,087	\$7 million
28	Ohio Power Co	OH	162,000	-	\$7 million
29	Montana Power Co	MT/WY	149,000	24,254	\$7 million
30	Public Service Co of Colorado	CO	135,000	36,391	\$6 million
31	Rochester Gas & Electric Corp	NY	59,000	-	\$6 million
32	Arizona Public Service Co	AZ	63,000	-	\$5 million
33	Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co	OH	106,000	22,630	\$5 million
34	Narragansett Electric Co	RI	77,000	29,439	\$5 million
35	Sacramento Municipal Util Dist	CA	112,000	46,828	\$5 million
36	Cleveland Electric Illum Co	OH	57,000	-	\$5 million
37	Florida Power Corp	FL	109,000	40,737	\$5 million
38	PUD No 2 of Grant County	WA	236,000	26,150	\$5 million
39	Connecticut Light & Power Co	CT	125,000	79,626	\$5 million
40	Columbus Southern Power Co	OH	72,000	3,406	\$4 million
41	Georgia Power Co	GA	71,000	-	\$4 million
42	Portland General Electric Co	OR	152,000	74,423	\$4 million
43	South Carolina Electric&Gas Co	SC	56,000	-	\$3 million
44	Central Maine Power Co	ME	68,000	34,644	\$3 million
45	Central Vermont Pub Serv Corp	VT	38,000	10,553	\$3 million
46	Omaha Public Power District	NE	50,000	335	\$3 million
47	Washington Water Power Co	WA/ID	75,000	19,270	\$3 million
48	Tallahassee City of	FL	48,000	13,334	\$3 million
49	PSI Energy Inc	IN	68,000	14,676	\$3 million
50	Green Mountain Power Corp	VT	38,000	9,727	\$3 million

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1992-1997. Projected savings estimated from actual costs of energy efficiency programs for each utility, and 1992 projections of investment in energy efficiency programs for 1997. Cost to customer based on each utility's average electric rate.

energy efficiency programs by 45 percent. In 1992, in disclosures required by the Department of Energy, utilities projected investing \$2.4 billion on conservation in 1997. In fact, they spent only \$894 million.

This means that actual spending on energy efficiency in 1997 was well less than half of one percent of the \$276 billion in revenues reported by the utilities. Although the cost to the utilities of providing these energy-saving programs would have been minuscule compared to their revenues, fully funded efficiency programs would have saved customers \$1 billion in 1997 (Table 2), and those investments would have continued to save customers money for the next 10 to 15 years.

Both American Electric Power (AEP) and Commonwealth Edison, utilities that asked customers to turn off their air conditioners to avoid blackouts this summer, cut their investments in energy efficiency in 1997. Commonwealth Edison cut its program entirely, as did every AEP operating company except Columbus Southern. In fact, AEP paid its president and CEO, Linn Draper, four times more in 1997 (\$2 million) than its ten operating companies combined spent on energy efficiency in the same year (\$500,000) (AEP 1997).

The efficiency programs that utilities cut range from home energy efficiency audits and other forms of consumer educa-

tion to rebates (or low-interest loans) for the purchase of new products such as efficient water heaters, lights, shower heads, air conditioners, and heat pumps. Many of these programs save customers substantial amounts of money.

Simple efforts like replacing ordinary incandescent light bulbs with compact fluorescent bulbs that use one-quarter the energy can save customers \$50 per bulb over the life of the bulb. If every household in America replaced just one ordinary bulb in this way, carbon dioxide emissions could be reduced by nearly 5 million tons a year. Replacing old refrigerators can also provide easy savings. The Chicago Housing Authority replaced old refrigerators with new, more efficient units, and will save more than \$500,000 on its electric bill in 1998. Home weatherization programs often produce savings in excess of 25 percent. For example, the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program saves customers an average of \$193 per dwelling annually and returns \$1.80 per dollar invested.

Cutting energy efficiency keeps electric bills unnecessarily high and forces utilities to generate more power to serve inefficient homes and businesses. Inefficient use of power also means that less power is available when people really need it, during summertime heat waves. As the global warming trend continues, we need to invest

Spending on energy efficiency in 1997 was well less than half of one percent of the \$276 billion in revenues reported by the utilities.

American Electric Power paid its president and CEO, Linn Draper, four times more in 1997 (\$2 million) than its ten operating companies combined spent on energy efficiency in the same year (\$500,000).

Movement toward the deregulation of the retail power market has led to cuts in energy efficiency programs.

more in energy efficiency, not less. Global warming will not only change the weather and damage agriculture and natural habitats, but may also exacerbate the health effects of air pollution. Hotter summers may result in increased smog formation and more build-up of pollutants in urban air masses during heat waves. No one benefits from energy efficiency cuts.

Deregulation Has Driven Cuts in Energy Efficiency Programs

Few people realize that the power that utilities *buy* from each other is already deregulated. This is known in the industry as "wholesale" deregulation. Congress and the states, meanwhile, are struggling to deregulate the decades-old system by which power utilities *sell* electricity to their customers — the "retail" end of the electricity industry. While it is highly unlikely that any legislation will pass Congress this year, 13 states have already passed laws and four states have issued commission orders that deregulate their electric industries.

This movement toward the deregulation of the retail power market has led to cuts in energy efficiency programs. Some utilities have explicitly stated in their filings with the Department of Energy that they have cut their energy efficiency programs to prepare for the deregulation of the electricity market. For example, two of Allegheny Power System's four operating compa-

nies, Monongahela Power, which serves Ohio and West Virginia, and West Penn Power, stated in their DOE filing that they were canceling their energy efficiency programs because of increased competition in the industry. American Electric Power said it was trimming its demand-side management programs in anticipation of the emerging competitive market. Other utilities, like Georgia Power, claim that they are cutting these programs because they have determined that they are not cost-effective in a deregulated market.

In the past, through a combination of market forces and progressive regulation, some utilities had an incentive to promote energy efficiency. Because most state regulators allowed utilities to purchase power only in special circumstances and not as a day-to-day method of supplying their customers, the cost of energy efficiency was balanced against the high cost of building new power plants. Energy efficiency programs helped utilities avoid the costs of new construction, and many utilities were refunded with interest for their investment in energy efficiency programs just as they would have been for a new power plant. In the process, consumers saved money and reduced pollution.

Now, due to wholesale power deregulation, utilities no longer compare energy efficiency programs to the costs of

Table 3. Fifty-two utilities with revenues over \$1 billion spent less than half of one percent of their total revenues on energy efficiency programs in 1997.

Utility	State	Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)	Percent spending on efficiency
Commonwealth Edison Co	IL	7,073,086	0.00%
Texas Utilities Electric Co	TX	6,135,417	0.24%
Tennessee Valley Authority	TN	5,753,883	0.22%
Consolidated Edison Co-NY Inc	NY	5,646,917	0.45%
Virginia Electric & Power Co	VA/NC	4,797,946	0.06%
Georgia Power Co	GA	4,383,320	0.00%
Duke Power Co	NC/SC	4,296,181	0.00%
Houston Lighting & Power Co	TX	4,251,243	0.06%
Philadelphia Electric Co	PA	4,166,069	0.00%
PacifiCorp	OR/WA	3,683,923	0.14%
Detroit Edison Co	MI	3,619,178	0.00%
Niagara Mohawk Power Corp	NY	3,307,601	0.02%
Alabama Power Co	AL	3,149,110	0.00%
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	PA	3,047,659	0.00%
Consumers Power Co	MI	2,512,792	0.00%
Long Island Lighting Co	NY	2,480,747	0.26%
Florida Power Corp	FL	2,448,436	0.23%
Los Angeles City of	CA	2,332,904	0.00%
Union Electric Co	MO/IL	2,188,571	0.10%
Ohio Edison Co	OH	2,168,775	0.20%
Jersey Central Power&Light Co	NJ	2,093,972	0.39%
Gulf States Utilities Co	TX/LA	2,067,485	0.00%
Ohio Power Co	OH	1,975,291	0.00%
PSI Energy Inc	IN	1,958,469	0.24%
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co	OH	1,908,132	0.11%
Louisiana Power & Light Co	LA	1,803,272	0.00%
New York State Elec & Gas Corp	NY	1,792,164	0.14%
Arizona Public Service Co	AZ	1,790,276	0.00%
Cleveland Electric Illum Co	OH	1,784,728	0.00%
Puerto Rico Electric Pwr Auth	PR	1,734,976	0.01%
Appalachian Power Co	WV/VA	1,720,010	0.00%
Arkansas Power & Light Co	AR/TN	1,715,714	0.00%
New England Power Co	MA/VT	1,677,903	0.00%
Salt River Proj Ag I & P Dist	AZ	1,558,798	0.12%
Public Service Co of Colorado	CO	1,454,717	0.20%
Illinois Power Co	IL	1,419,941	0.00%
Wisconsin Electric Power Co	WI/MI	1,412,115	0.00%
Indiana Michigan Power Co	IN/MI	1,391,917	0.00%
Central Power & Light Co	TX	1,376,283	0.13%
Puget Sound Power & Light Co	WA	1,231,424	0.34%
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	OK/AR	1,191,690	0.00%
West Penn Power Co	PA	1,151,242	0.00%
Duquesne Light Co	PA	1,147,233	0.00%
Columbus Southern Power Co	OH	1,139,604	0.04%
MidAmerican Energy Co	IA/SD	1,126,300	0.25%
Public Service Co of NH	NH	1,108,459	0.08%
South Carolina Electric&Gas Co	SC	1,103,091	0.00%
Delmarva Power & Light Co	DE/MD	1,093,883	0.21%
Pennsylvania Electric Co	PA/NY	1,052,935	0.05%
Oglethorpe Power Corp	GA	1,047,784	0.00%
Northern Indiana Pub Serv Co	IN	1,017,083	0.00%
Dayton Power & Light Co	OH	1,014,977	0.47%

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1992-1997.

Cuts in energy efficiency compound the need for more power.

new plants. In looking for the cheapest way to meet peaks in demand for power, utilities now compare the cost of energy efficiency programs to the cost of wholesale power. In effect, where they once "paid" customers to use less power, now they can just buy power on the wholesale market.

In this new cost equation, energy efficiency programs are typically the losers. And in the electricity "price wars" that are expected as fully deregulated utilities compete for customers, energy conservation services and the mechanisms that fund them are even more likely to be eliminated. The ultimate loser is the customer, who loses both the savings and the environmental benefits of energy efficiency.

Utilities often use heavily polluting coal-fired power plants to meet this demand, and in some cases even re-open polluting old facilities that had been mothballed.

Since 1993, energy efficiency investments at 52 electric utilities with revenues over \$1 billion shrank to less than half of one percent of their total revenues (Table 3). Thirty-eight other large utilities have cut their investment by over 50 percent (Table 4), and 42 have eliminated investments in energy efficiency programs altogether (Table 5).

Even some of the top investors in energy efficiency have cut their energy efficiency programs significantly. In California, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, which spent 2.4 percent of its revenue on energy efficiency in 1997, cut its funding from \$38 million in 1995 to \$17 million in

1997. San Francisco-based Pacific Gas & Electric, which invested more than any utility on energy efficiency in 1997, cut its funding from nearly \$125 million in 1994 to \$81 million in 1997 (Table 6).

Deregulation and Cuts in Energy Efficiency Increase Incentives to use Cheap Polluting Power

Deregulation produces price competition, which has two main effects on utilities. First, it puts pressure on utilities to cut programs like energy efficiency that are no longer seen as profitable in the short term. Cuts in energy efficiency compound the need for more power. Second, as utilities search for more power, deregulation drives them to produce or buy the cheapest power available. Utilities often use heavily-polluting coal-fired power plants to meet this demand, and in some cases even re-open polluting old facilities that had been mothballed (see Sidebar). Many of these huge, coal-fired plants are exempt from the Clean Air Act's most stringent requirements.

Environmental Working Group estimated the reduction in electric usage that would have resulted if utilities had invested \$2.4 billion in energy efficiency programs, as promised, in 1997. By applying the utilities' historical return from their energy efficiency investments to their projected spending for that year, we found that energy savings would have been over 4 times greater if the programs had been funded at the projected levels.

Table 4. Many large utilities cut their investments in energy efficiency programs by more than 50 percent as a result of wholesale power deregulation.

Rank	Utility	State	Spending 1993 (\$ in thousands)	Spending 1997 (\$ in thousands)	Percent Reduction
1	Omaha Public Power District	NE	459	7	98%
2	Niagara Mohawk Power Corp	NY	24,944	635	97%
3	New York State Elec & Gas Corp	NY	43,653	2,448	94%
4	Puget Sound Power & Light Co	WA	57,173	4,174	93%
5	Southern Indiana Gas & Elec Co	IN	1,695	131	92%
6	Turlock Irrigation District	CA	805	80	90%
7	Central Hudson Gas & Elec Corp	NY	3,688	413	89%
8	PacifiCorp	OR/WA	41,000	4,982	88%
9	Mississippi Power Co	MS	106	13	88%
10	Cambridge Electric Light Co	MA	2,391	311	87%
11	Washington Water Power Co	WA/ID	22,805	3,225	86%
12	Pennsylvania Electric Co	PA/NY	3,376	498	85%
13	Wisconsin Public Service Corp	WI/MI	16,200	2,480	85%
14	Orange & Rockland Utils Inc	NY	16,078	2,613	84%
15	PSI Energy Inc	IN	25,696	4,742	82%
16	Metropolitan Edison Co	PA	2,803	543	81%
17	Dayton Power & Light Co	OH	23,941	4,783	80%
18	United Illuminating Co	CT	12,414	2,742	78%
19	Consolidated Edison Co-NY Inc	NY	100,162	25,656	74%
20	Long Island Lighting Co	NY	24,932	6,396	74%
21	Kentucky Utilities Co	KY/TN	612	159	74%
22	Anaheim City of	CA	506	135	73%
23	Central Vermont Pub Serv Corp	VT	5,908	1,587	73%
24	Idaho Power Co	OR/ID	8,575	2,336	73%
25	Houston Lighting & Power Co	TX	9,021	2,554	72%
26	Nevada Power Co	NV	2,421	728	70%
27	Arizona Electric Pwr Coop Inc	AZ	400	122	70%
28	Boston Edison Co	MA	44,070	13,542	69%
29	Virginia Electric & Power Co	VA/NC	8,654	2,996	65%
30	Green Mountain Power Corp	VT	4,289	1,567	63%
31	Bonneville Power Admin	MT/OR	102,400	38,419	62%
32	Madison Gas & Electric Co	WI	4,283	1,673	61%
33	Fayetteville Public Works Comm	NC	25	10	60%
34	Montana Power Co	MT/WY	7,049	2,923	59%
35	Public Service Co of Colorado	CO	7,088	2,972	58%
36	Columbus Southern Power Co	OH	1,184	500	58%
37	Florida Power Corp	FL	11,874	5,638	53%
38	Commonwealth Electric Co	MA	3,498	1,748	50%

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1992-1997.

Table 5. Many large utilities eliminated energy efficiency programs as a result of wholesale power deregulation.

Rank	Utility	State	Spending 1993 (\$ in thousands)	Spending 1997 (\$)
1	Commonwealth Edison Co	IL	600	0
2	Georgia Power Co	GA	37,958	0
3	Duke Power Co	NC/SC	9,423	0
4	Philadelphia Electric Co	PA	7,255	0
5	Detroit Edison Co	MI	3,371	0
6	Alabama Power Co	AL	4,473	0
7	Consumers Power Co	MI	46,951	0
8	Los Angeles City of	CA	15,348	0
9	Gulf States Utilities Co	TX/LA	2,500	0
10	Ohio Power Co	OH	638	0
11	Cleveland Electric Illum Co	OH	2,603	0
12	Arizona Public Service Co	AZ	3,720	0
13	Appalachian Power Co	WV/VA	1,383	0
14	Wisconsin Electric Power Co	WI/MI	33,962	0
15	Illinois Power Co	IL	497	0
16	Indiana Michigan Power Co	IN/MI	744	0
17	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	OK/AR	1,064	0
18	West Penn Power Co	PA	1,689	0
19	South Carolina Electric & Gas Co	SC	7,477	0
20	Atlantic City Electric Co	NJ	5,546	0
21	Toledo Edison Co	OH	1,077	0
22	Rochester Gas & Electric Corp	NY	9,109	0
23	Monongahela Power Co	OH/WV	301	0
24	Sierra Pacific Power Co	CA/NV	3,278	0
25	Texas-New Mexico Power Co	NM/TX	480	0
26	Lower Colorado River Authority	TX	2,506	0
27	Orlando Utilities Comm	FL	578	0
28	PUD No 1 of Snohomish County	WA	10,488	0
29	Montaup Electric Co	MA	9,276	0
30	Kentucky Power Co	KY	16	0
31	Savannah Electric & Power Co	GA	2,503	0
32	Withlacoochee River Elec Coop	FL	53	0
33	Jackson Electric Member Corp	GA	129	0
34	American Mun Power-Ohio Inc	OH	25	0
35	PUD No 1 of Chelan County	WA	652	0
36	Northern Virginia Elec Coop	VA	170	0
37	Hawaii Electric Light Co Inc	HI	183	0
38	Black Hills Corp	MT/SD	42	0
39	Wisconsin Public Power Inc Sys	WI	923	0
40	Walton Electric Member Corp	GA	101	0
41	Pasadena City of	CA	259	0
42	Kingsport Power Co	TN	210	0

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1992-1997.

Table 6. Even utilities that invest more than one percent of total revenues on energy efficiency programs have cut spending in response to deregulation.

Rank	Utility	State	Percent of Revenue	Spending on Energy Efficiency Programs		
				1995 (\$ in thousands)	1996 (\$ in thousands)	1997 (\$ in thousands)
1	Eugene City of	OR	5.34%	3,800	5,700	5,500
2	Seattle City of	WA	3.81%	15,527	9,712	13,938
3	Granite State Electric Co	NH	3.52%	1,642	1,694	2,418
4	Tacoma City of	WA	3.43%	4,949	N/A	7,483
5	Massachusetts Electric Co	MA	2.81%	47,924	42,989	45,620
6	Sacramento Municipal Util Dist	CA	2.41%	38,069	19,910	17,379
7	Power Authority of State of NY	NY	2.30%	8,209	8,309	34,030
8	IES Utilities Inc	IA	2.11%	12,212	8,548	12,754
9	Western Massachusetts Elec Co	MA	2.10%	9,516	10,320	8,941
10	Bonneville Power Admin	MT/OR	1.66%	82,157	64,075	38,419
11	Narragansett Electric Co	RI	1.63%	7,771	8,550	8,493
12	Potomac Electric Power Co	DC/MD	1.59%	99,631	45,251	29,562
13	Southern Maryland El Coop Inc	MD	1.58%	2,435	3,555	3,109
14	Interstate Power Co	IA/IL	1.49%	2,831	3,536	4,138
15	Wisconsin Power & Light Co	WI	1.49%	12,021	6,730	9,401
16	Austin City of	TX	1.45%	11,489	10,256	9,008
17	Eastern Edison Co	MA	1.44%	-	1,987	4,000
18	San Diego Gas & Electric Co	CA	1.37%	39,910	46,172	24,330
19	Connecticut Light & Power Co	CT	1.33%	33,065	27,017	32,691
20	Central Maine Power Co	ME	1.32%	11,912	15,705	12,494
21	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co	MD	1.27%	35,896	28,752	27,791
22	Minnesota Power & Light Co	MN	1.24%	14,260	15,597	5,816
23	Blackstone Valley Electric Co	RI	1.21%	-	1,162	1,699
24	Northern States Power Co	MN/ND	1.17%	44,350	34,471	24,548
25	Florida Power & Light Co	FL	1.05%	62,078	75,762	64,488
26	Pacific Gas & Electric Co	CA	1.04%	98,900	77,474	81,123
27	Otter Tail Power Co	MN/ND	1.03%	2,106	2,084	2,099
28	Madison Gas & Electric Co	WI	1.02%	2,191	1,448	1,673

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1992-1997; and NRDC 1998 Benchmarking Report.

DEREGULATION ENCOURAGES UTILITIES TO REOPEN OLD POWER PLANTS

Some utilities are attempting to deal with the problem of inefficient power use by reopening mothballed, dirty power plants that do not meet modern pollution control standards. Detroit Edison, which eliminated its energy efficiency programs in 1997, is trying to open the Conners Creek power plant in Detroit. Detroit Edison lost the first round of regulatory battles to open Conners Creek without installing modern pollution control equipment, but is appealing the decision. Similarly, Illinois Power, which eliminated its spending on energy efficiency programs in 1994, recently announced plans to open five oil-burning units at its Havana plant which have been closed since 1996.

Table 7. Cuts in energy efficiency programs increase pollution.

Rank	Utility Name	State	Projected Savings in 1992 for 1997 (Mwh)	Actual Savings in 1997 (Mwh)	Increased CO2 (tons)	Increased SO2 (tons)	Increased NOx (tons)
1	PacifiCorp	OR/WA	2,880,000	89,562	3,131,000	7,900	6,800
2	Consumers Power Co	MI	1,349,000	-	1,077,000	5,900	3,000
3	Wisconsin Electric Power Co	WI/MI	666,000	-	610,000	2,900	1,300
4	New York State Elec & Gas Corp	NY	608,000	41,758	572,000	3,900	1,300
5	Pennsylvania Electric Co	PA/NY	569,000	9,388	540,000	6,200	1,300
6	Los Angeles City of	CA	710,000	-	500,000	1,700	800
7	Appalachian Power Co	WV/VA	421,000	-	420,000	2,500	1,600
8	Wisconsin Public Service Corp	WI/MI	381,000	59,051	329,000	1,100	700
9	Consolidated Edison Co-NY Inc	NY	638,000	137,270	324,000	200	300
10	Public Service Electric&Gas Co	NJ	832,000	230,595	299,000	1,500	700
11	Dayton Power & Light Co	OH	294,000	41,403	291,000	1,700	900
12	Niagara Mohawk Power Corp	NY	648,000	18,792	289,000	3,600	600
13	Southern California Edison Co	CA	1,170,000	477,028	289,000	500	500
14	Northern States Power Co	MN/ND	472,000	178,416	213,000	500	600
15	Puget Sound Power & Light Co	WA	235,000	16,723	182,000	400	300
16	Ohio Power Co	OH	162,000	-	171,000	1,700	800
17	Sierra Pacific Power Co	CA	150,000	-	118,000	100	200
18	Public Service Co of Colorado	CO	135,000	36,391	111,000	300	300
19	Potomac Electric Power Co	DC/MD	193,000	90,087	108,000	900	400
20	Indiana Michigan Power Co	IN/MI	294,000	-	104,000	1,000	500
21	Detroit Edison Co	MI	100,000	-	98,000	500	200
22	Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co	OH	106,000	22,630	93,000	600	300
23	Duke Power Co	NC/SC	159,000	-	92,000	600	300
24	Pacific Gas & Electric Co	CA	941,000	412,593	81,000	-	100
25	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co	MD	196,000	79,613	79,000	500	200
26	Montana Power Co	MT	149,000	24,254	78,000	100	100
27	Columbus Southern Power Co	OH	72,000	3,406	77,000	800	200
28	PSI Energy Inc	IN	68,000	14,676	72,000	600	100
29	Florida Power Corp	FL	109,000	40,737	65,000	500	200
30	United Illuminating Co	CT	98,000	16,905	60,000	300	100
31	Georgia Power Co	GA	71,000	-	58,000	400	100
32	Jersey Central Power&Light Co	NJ	205,000	57,578	52,000	500	100
33	Nevada Power Co	NV	32,000	5,440	50,000	100	100
34	Cleveland Electric Illum Co	OH	57,000	-	42,000	600	100
35	Omaha Public Power District	NE	50,000	335	42,000	200	100
36	Arizona Public Service Co	AZ	63,000	-	39,000	100	100
37	Portland General Electric Co	OR	152,000	74,423	39,000	100	100
38	Kentucky Power Co	KY	34,000	-	38,000	200	100
39	South Carolina Electric&Gas Co	SC	56,000	-	37,000	300	100
40	Coop Power Assn	MN	42,000	14,820	36,000	200	100
41	Long Island Lighting Co	NY	80,000	28,124	33,000	100	-
42	Wisconsin Power & Light Co	WI	103,000	70,010	33,000	100	100
43	Indianapolis Power & Light Co	IN	30,000	4,150	30,000	200	100
44	Connecticut Light & Power Co	CT	125,000	79,626	29,000	100	-
45	Houston Lighting & Power Co	TX	54,000	18,474	28,000	100	100
46	Montaup Electric Co	MT	35,000	-	28,000	100	-
47	Orange & Rockland Utils Inc	NY	29,000	4,549	25,000	100	-
48	Madison Gas & Electric Co	WI	59,000	32,058	25,000	100	100
49	Southern Indiana Gas & Elec Co	IN	16,000	223	24,000	200	100
50	West Penn Power Co	PA	23,000	-	24,000	200	100

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration Data Form 861, 1992-1997. Projected savings estimated from actual costs of energy efficiency programs for each utility, and 1992 projections of investment in energy efficiency programs for 1997. Increased pollution based on each utility's average emissions per unit of electricity generated.

At the same time, if the 50 utilities that cut back the most from their projected energy efficiency spending had invested at the rates that they promised, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions would have been significantly reduced. In 1997 alone, energy efficiency programs at these 50 utilities would have reduced carbon dioxide emissions by over 11 million tons, and ozone and particulate-forming sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides by over 53,000 and 26,000 tons respectively (Table 7). These savings would have continued to benefit customers for the next 10 to 15 years, or for the entire useful life of the installed measures.

Some States Have Already Enacted Legislation

As a part of larger retail deregulation bills, a few states have already enacted legislation that provides funding for energy efficiency programs. In addition some states are considering legislation that would provide funding for energy efficiency programs in the absence of retail deregulation legislation.

The most common mechanism for funding energy efficiency programs in a deregulated market is a public benefits fund. Public benefits funds charge all consumers a percentage or rate based upon their energy usage. The funds are then used for energy efficiency and other environmental and consumer programs. They also provide a fi-

nancial backstop for low-income customers who cannot pay their electric bill.

Currently eleven states, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island have implemented or are proceeding to implement public benefits funds that support energy efficiency programs (Kushler 1998). Several other states are considering public benefits funds as a part of their larger state deregulation proposal. Wisconsin is considering a similar program even though the state is not planning to deregulate the retail market.

The actual funding levels for these efforts vary tremendously. Massachusetts's public benefits funding is nearly \$160 million in 1998, or 3 percent of revenues, while similar legislation in Illinois only appropriates \$3 million, or less than one-tenth of one percent of revenues, sixty times less than in Massachusetts. Of the remaining states, four have reasonably well-funded programs (California, \$218 million or 1.4 percent; Connecticut, \$85 million or 2.6 percent; Montana, \$15 million or 2.4 percent, and Rhode Island \$15 million or 2.1 percent). Three states (Maine, \$9 million or .9 percent; New York, \$56 million or .5 percent; and Pennsylvania, \$10 million or .1 percent) are poorly funded. New Hampshire and Arizona have yet to set their funding levels (Kushler 1998).

Currently eleven states have public benefits funds that support energy efficiency programs.

As the electricity industry opens up for competition, so should the market for energy efficiency services.

The Clinton Administration's Comprehensive Electricity Competition Plan calls for the creation of a public benefits fund of up to \$3 billion. The fund would provide matching funds for state energy efficiency, low-income assistance, renewable energy, and public-interest energy research and development programs.

States have also used revolving loan funds to promote energy efficiency. Revolving loan funds provide interest-free capital to banks to subsidize loans on pre-approved products and can easily be incorporated into public benefits funds. These programs are designed to increase the demand for energy efficient products by involving lenders and contractors in the process. Nebraska currently uses a \$19 million revolving loan fund to support energy efficiency.

Since electric utilities now increasingly profit from the sale of electricity and not from a state-guaranteed return to their investments, retail conservation programs are no longer in their short-term economic interest. To mitigate this problem, energy efficiency programs should be designed to include providers other than utilities. As the electricity industry opens up for competition, so should the market for energy efficiency services. Opening the energy efficiency market to electric service companies, who sell products and information, rather than electricity, will substantially increase long-term

support for energy efficiency products and programs.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Energy efficiency reduces air pollution and the carbon pollution that causes global warming, and it saves consumers money. In spite of these clear benefits, energy efficiency programs have suffered huge cuts in funding under deregulation, primarily because they are not in the short-term financial interest of the utilities.

In light of the United States' international commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, promoting energy efficiency and reducing pollution should be priorities of national energy policy. The United States currently has no such national energy policy; in fact, carbon dioxide emissions are 11 percent above the target (1990) levels agreed to in the Protocol. For too long, the nation has relied on a patchwork of individual utility and state regulatory initiatives. As state regulation decreases, and prices alone govern utility investment decisions, utilities are dramatically cutting their energy efficiency investments.

The deregulation of the retail end of the electric utility business will only increase the incentives for further cuts in energy efficiency programs and other consumer services, unless

utilities are required by law to invest in energy efficiency programs. Without some way to reintroduce efficiency into energy policy, the public and the environment will lose.

To reverse this trend and restore the nation's investment in energy efficiency the federal government and the states must insure that future funding is available for energy efficiency programs — with or without retail deregulation. This can best be achieved through the use of a public benefits fund. Public benefits funds charge customers a small amount — gener-

ally 2 to 5 percent — to fund energy efficiency and other consumer and environmental programs.

These changes would complement other initiatives, such as strengthened appliance efficiency standards, power generation performance standards and minimum renewable energy portfolio standards. Together, these policies and tools could reverse the downward trend in energy efficiency investments, save consumers money, and ultimately result in significant reductions in air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

The deregulation of the retail end of the electric utility business will only increase the incentives for further cuts in energy efficiency programs and other consumer services, unless utilities are required by law to invest in energy efficiency programs.



References

American Electric Power. 1997. American Electric Power, 1997 Annual Report.

Clean Air Network, U.S. Public Interest Research Group Education Fund. 1998. Danger in the Air: A Midpoint Assessment of the 1998 Ozone Season. Published July 30, 1998.

Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. 1992 - 1997. Annual Electric Utility Reports, Forms 861.

Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. 1996. Electric Sales and Revenue.

Kushler, M. 1998. An Updated Status Report of Public Benefit Programs in an Evolving Electric Utility Industry. American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy. Published July, 1998.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1998. Climate of 1998 January - August in Perspective. <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/ol/climate/research/1998/aug/aug98.html>

Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Service Electric and Gas Company. 1998. Benchmarking Air Emissions of Electric Utility Generators in the United States: 1996 Emissions and Generation Data. Published June, 1998.



Investment in energy efficiency programs by utilities operating in Alabama.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Alabama Electric Coop Inc	0.2%	\$589,000	252,090,000	51.0%	75
Tennessee Valley Authority	0.2%	\$12,600,000	5,753,883,000	130.1%	76
Alabama Power Co	0.0%	\$0	3,149,110,000	-100%	N/A
Huntsville City of	0.0%	\$0	213,383,000	0.0%	N/A
Alabama Municipal Elec Auth	0.0%	\$0	100,178,000	0.0%	N/A
Florence City of	0.0%	\$0	66,634,000	0.0%	
Decatur City of	0.0%	\$0	61,208,000	0.0%	
Joe Wheeler Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	59,155,000	0.0%	
Dothan City of	0.0%	\$0	52,937,000	0.0%	
Cullman Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	49,830,000	0.0%	
Baldwin County EI Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	49,454,000	0.0%	
Athens City of	0.0%	\$0	43,530,000	0.0%	
Southern Pine Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	41,202,000	0.0%	
Foley City of (Riviera Utils)	0.0%	\$0	40,752,000	0.0%	
Sand Mountain Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	33,907,000	0.0%	
Central Alabama Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	29,522,000	0.0%	
Troup County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	28,866,000	0.0%	
Sheffield City of	0.0%	\$0	26,965,000	0.0%	
Cherokee Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	25,054,000	0.0%	
Marshall-De Kalb Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	24,278,000	0.0%	
North Alabama Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	23,806,000	0.0%	
Covington Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,567,000	0.0%	
Albertville City of	0.0%	\$0	21,840,000	0.0%	
Black Warrior Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	20,827,000	0.0%	
Tallapoosa River Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,023,000	0.0%	
Fort Payne Improvement Auth	0.0%	\$0	19,867,000	0.0%	
Opelika City of	0.0%	\$0	19,198,000	0.0%	
Scottsboro City of	0.0%	\$0	19,169,000	0.0%	
Bessemer City of	0.0%	\$0	18,350,000	0.0%	
Arab Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,070,000	0.0%	
Dixie Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	18,007,000	0.0%	
Clarke-Washington E M C	0.0%	\$0	17,875,000	0.0%	
Pea River Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	17,865,000	0.0%	
Cullman City of	0.0%	\$0	17,864,000	0.0%	
Wiregrass Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	17,478,000	0.0%	
South Alabama Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	15,352,000	0.0%	
Andalusia City of	0.0%	\$0	15,178,000	0.0%	
Troy City of	0.0%	\$0	14,910,000	0.0%	
Franklin Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	13,975,000	0.0%	
Coosa Valley Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,771,000	0.0%	
Pioneer Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,596,000	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 Alabama - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Guntersville City of	0.0%	\$0	13,073,000	0.0%	
Muscle Shoals City of	0.0%	\$0	12,663,000	0.0%	
Sylacauga City of	0.0%	\$0	11,316,000	0.0%	
Tuskegee City of	0.0%	\$0	8,760,000	0.0%	
Fairhope City of	0.0%	\$0	8,707,000	0.0%	
Hartselle City of	0.0%	\$0	8,143,000	0.0%	
Russellville City of	0.0%	\$0	7,828,000	0.0%	
Alexander City City of	0.0%	\$0	7,802,000	0.0%	
Tombigbee Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,750,000	0.0%	
Tarrant City City of	0.0%	\$0	5,867,000	0.0%	
Tuscumbia City of	0.0%	\$0	5,334,000	0.0%	
Opp City of	0.0%	\$0	5,115,000	0.0%	
Piedmont City of	0.0%	\$0	4,515,000	0.0%	
Lafayette City of	0.0%	\$0	4,113,000	0.0%	
Lanett City of	0.0%	\$0	3,711,000	0.0%	
Elba City of	0.0%	\$0	3,520,000	0.0%	
Evergreen City of	0.0%	\$0	3,242,000	0.0%	
Robertsdale City of	0.0%	\$0	2,942,000	0.0%	
Brundidge City of	0.0%	\$0	2,133,000	0.0%	
Luverne City of	0.0%	\$0	2,129,000	0.0%	
Hartford City of	0.0%	\$0	1,600,000	0.0%	
Courtland City of	0.0%	\$0	1,189,000	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 Alaska.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Golden Valley Elec Assn Inc	0.3%	\$219,000	69,126,000	75.2%	N/A
Alaska Electric Light&Power Co	0.1%	\$12,000	24,752,000	0.0%	
Chugach Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	146,461,000	0.0%	
Anchorage City of	0.0%	\$0	86,793,000	0.0%	
Matanuska Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	46,873,000	0.0%	
Alaska Electric G & T Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	38,973,000	0.0%	
Homer Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	38,556,000	0.0%	
Alaska Energy Authority	0.0%	\$0	21,016,000	0.0%	
Alaska Village Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,624,000	0.0%	
Kodiak Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	17,305,000	0.0%	
Ketchikan City of	0.0%	\$0	12,759,000	0.0%	
Copper Valley Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,183,000	0.0%	
Alaska Power Administration	0.0%	\$0	9,233,000	0.0%	
Sitka City of & Borough of	0.0%	\$0	7,988,000	0.0%	
Alaska Power & Telephone Co	0.0%	\$0	7,355,000	0.0%	
Bethel Utilities Corporation	0.0%	\$0	7,031,000	0.0%	
Seward City of	0.0%	\$0	5,991,000	0.0%	
Tlingit & Haida Region El Auth	0.0%	\$0	4,957,000	0.0%	
Nome Joint Utility Systems	0.0%	\$0	4,774,000	0.0%	
Cordova Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,569,000	0.0%	
Unalaska City of	0.0%	\$0	4,475,000	0.0%	
North Slope Borough of	0.0%	\$0	4,439,000	0.0%	
Arctic Utilities Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,231,000	0.0%	
Kotzebue Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,078,000	0.0%	
Naknek Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,626,000	0.0%	
Nushagak Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,469,000	0.0%	
Barrow Utils & Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,371,000	0.0%	
Petersburg City of	0.0%	\$0	3,140,000	0.0%	
Metlakatla Power & Light	0.0%	\$0	2,134,000	0.0%	
Wrangell City of	0.0%	\$0	2,100,000	0.0%	
Haines Light & Power Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,014,000	0.0%	
Galena City of	0.0%	\$0	1,811,000	0.0%	
Yakutat Power Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,438,000	0.0%	
St Paul City of	0.0%	\$0	1,397,000	0.0%	
G & K Incorporated	0.0%	\$0	1,175,000	0.0%	
McGrath Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,079,000	0.0%	
Aniak Light & Power Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,007,000	0.0%	
Unalakleet Valley Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	967,000	0.0%	
I-N-N Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	958,000	0.0%	
Gwitchyaa Zhee Utility Co	0.0%	\$0	778,000	0.0%	
Gustavus Electric Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	747,000	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 Alaska - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Thorne Bay City of	0.0%	\$0	582,000	0.0%	
King Cove City of	0.0%	\$0	570,000	0.0%	
Tanana Power Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	517,000	0.0%	
Middle Kuskokwim Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	513,000	0.0%	
Northway Power & Light Inc	0.0%	\$0	480,000	0.0%	
Teller Power Co	0.0%	\$0	473,000	0.0%	
Bettles Light & Power Inc	0.0%	\$0	374,000	0.0%	
Pelican Utility Co	0.0%	\$0	365,000	0.0%	
City of White Mountain	0.0%	\$0	354,000	0.0%	
Kotlik City of	0.0%	\$0	341,000	0.0%	
Egegik Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	334,000	0.0%	
Coffman Cove Utilities	0.0%	\$0	319,000	0.0%	
Akiachak Native Community Elec	0.0%	\$0	307,000	0.0%	
Kuiggluum Kallugvia	0.0%	\$0	305,000	0.0%	
Manokotak City of	0.0%	\$0	285,000	0.0%	
Napakiak Ircinaq Power Co	0.0%	\$0	253,000	0.0%	
Far North Utilities	0.0%	\$0	221,000	0.0%	
Manley Utility Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	218,000	0.0%	
Kwig Power Co	0.0%	\$0	206,000	0.0%	
Ouzinkie City of	0.0%	\$0	201,000	0.0%	
Chignik City of	0.0%	\$0	198,000	0.0%	
Atmautluak City of	0.0%	\$0	196,000	0.0%	
Ipnatchiaq Electric Company	0.0%	\$0	191,000	0.0%	
Tuntutuliak Comm Svc Assn	0.0%	\$0	188,000	0.0%	
Larsen Bay City of	0.0%	\$0	187,000	0.0%	
Tatitlek Electric Utility	0.0%	\$0	165,000	0.0%	
Nightmute Power Plant	0.0%	\$0	159,000	0.0%	
Chefornak City of	0.0%	\$0	152,000	0.0%	
Kokhanok Village Council	0.0%	\$0	150,000	0.0%	
Nelson Lagoon Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	139,000	0.0%	
Andranof Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	122,000	0.0%	
Tenakee Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	120,000	0.0%	
Native Village of Perryville	0.0%	\$0	110,000	0.0%	
Pedro Bay Village Council	0.0%	\$0	87,000	0.0%	
Chitina Electric Inc	0.0%	\$0	86,000	0.0%	
Igiugig Electric Company	0.0%	\$0	80,000	0.0%	
Hughes Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	70,000	0.0%	
Birch Creek Village Elec Util	0.0%	\$0	64,000	0.0%	
Elfin Cove Utility Commission	0.0%	\$0	60,000	0.0%	
Akutan City of	0.0%	\$0	35,000	0.0%	
Paxson Lodge Inc	0.0%	\$0	30,000	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 Arizona.

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%	
Citizens Utilities Co	0.5%	\$913,000	196,034,000	0.0%	49
Tucson Electric Power Co	0.2%	\$1,786,000	730,033,000	-37.1%	71
Salt River Proj Ag I & P Dist	0.1%	\$1,884,000	1,558,798,000	8.9%	88
Arizona Electric Pwr Coop Inc	0.1%	\$122,000	174,881,000	-69.5%	103
Mohave Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$4,000	42,611,000	100.0%	
Arizona Public Service Co	0.0%	\$0	1,790,276,000	-100%	N/A
Western Area Power Admin	0.0%	\$0	793,226,000	0.0%	N/A
Duncan Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	64,122,000	0.0%	
Sulphur Springs Valley E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	45,371,000	-100%	
Navajo Tribal Utility Auth	0.0%	\$0	39,068,000	0.0%	
Trico Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	28,764,000	0.0%	
Mesa City of	0.0%	\$0	28,573,000	0.0%	
Continental Divide El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,785,000	0.0%	
Arizona Power Authority	0.0%	\$0	23,765,000	0.0%	
U S Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0%	\$0	21,589,000	0.0%	
Columbus Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,454,000	0.0%	
Electrical Dist No2 Pinal Cnty	0.0%	\$0	8,940,000	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%	
Graham County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,164,000	0.0%	
Page City of	0.0%	\$0	6,588,000	0.0%	
Colorado River Indian Irr Proj	0.0%	\$0	5,805,000	0.0%	
Tohono O'Odham Utility Auth	0.0%	\$0	5,593,000	0.0%	
Safford City of	0.0%	\$0	4,535,000	0.0%	
Wellton-Mohawk Irr&Drain Dist	0.0%	\$0	4,258,000	0.0%	
Electrical Dist No8 of Maricop	0.0%	\$0	3,770,000	0.0%	
Morenci Water & Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	2,554,000	0.0%	
Electrical Dist No7 Maricopa	0.0%	\$0	2,340,000	0.0%	
Electrical Dist No3 Pinal Cnty	0.0%	\$0	2,129,000	0.0%	
Wickenburg Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,883,000	0.0%	
Electrical Dist No4 Pinal Cnty	0.0%	\$0	1,707,000	0.0%	
Maricopa County M W C Dist #1	0.0%	\$0	1,369,000	0.0%	
McMullen Valley Water C&D Dist	0.0%	\$0	1,343,000	0.0%	
Roosevelt Irrigation District	0.0%	\$0	1,126,000	0.0%	
Electrical Dist No5 Pinal Cnty	0.0%	\$0	1,120,000	0.0%	
Thatcher City of	0.0%	\$0	1,048,000	0.0%	
Aquilla Irrigation District	0.0%	\$0	862,000	0.0%	
Electrical Dist No6 Pinal Cnty	0.0%	\$0	826,000	0.0%	
Electrical Dist No1 Pinal Cnty	0.0%	\$0	773,000	0.0%	
Harquahala Valley Pwr District	0.0%	\$0	714,000	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 Arizona - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
City of Fredonia	0.0%	\$0	677,000	0.0%	
Ajo Improvement Co	0.0%	\$0	628,000	0.0%	
Tonopah Irrigation District	0.0%	\$0	364,000	0.0%	
Ak-Chin Electric Utility Auth	0.0%	\$0	138,000	0.0%	
Buckeye Irr Dist	0.0%	\$0	113,000	0.0%	
Hohokam Irrigation&Drainage Dt	0.0%	\$0	72,000	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 Arkansas.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Southwestern Electric Power Co	0.1%	\$1,144,000	939,869,000	117.1%	87
Entergy Arkansas, Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,715,714,000	0.0%	N/A
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	1,191,690,000	-100%	N/A
Arkansas Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	345,105,000	0.0%	N/A
Empire District Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	214,306,000	0.0%	N/A
Mississippi Cnty Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	77,309,000	0.0%	
First Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	72,601,000	0.0%	
North Little Rock City of	0.0%	\$0	66,611,000	0.0%	
Jonesboro City of	0.0%	\$0	66,459,000	0.0%	
Carroll Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	59,767,000	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%	
Conway Corp	0.0%	\$0	33,093,000	0.0%	
North Arkansas Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	-\$0	31,811,000	0.0%	
Southwest Arkansas E C C	0.0%	\$0	30,481,000	0.0%	
Craighead Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	23,912,000	0.0%	
Woodruff Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	22,674,000	0.0%	
West Memphis City of	0.0%	\$0	20,104,000	0.0%	
C & L Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	19,732,000	0.0%	
Benton City of	0.0%	\$0	16,954,000	0.0%	
Paragould Light & Water Comm	0.0%	\$0	15,896,000	0.0%	
Petit Jean Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	14,795,000	0.0%	
Hope City of	0.0%	\$0	14,214,000	0.0%	
Ouachita Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	13,608,000	0.0%	
Clay County Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	12,490,000	0.0%	
Siloam Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	11,964,000	0.0%	
Bentonville City of	0.0%	\$0	11,209,000	0.0%	
Arkansas River Power Authority	0.0%	\$0	11,165,000	0.0%	
South Central Ark El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,160,000	0.0%	
Clarksville Light & Water Co	0.0%	\$0	10,032,000	0.0%	
Osceola City of	0.0%	\$0	9,670,000	0.0%	
Rich Mountain Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,066,000	0.0%	
Prescott City of	0.0%	\$0	6,328,000	0.0%	
Farmers Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	5,517,000	0.0%	
Ashley Chicot Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,431,000	0.0%	
Piggott City of	0.0%	\$0	2,184,000	0.0%	
Paris City of	0.0%	\$0	2,118,000	0.0%	
Augusta City of	0.0%	\$0	1,425,000	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 California.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Sacramento Municipal Util Dist	2.4%	\$17,379,000	719,790,000	-48.8%	5
San Diego Gas & Electric Co	1.4%	\$24,330,000	1,776,256,000	-7.3%	17
Pacific Gas & Electric Co	1.0%	\$81,123,000	7,776,757,000	-23.4%	25
Southern California Edison Co	0.7%	\$53,574,000	7,933,449,000	-46.5%	39
Roseville City of	0.5%	\$340,000	65,284,000	94.3%	
Palo Alto City of	0.3%	\$200,000	70,171,000	-70.2%	
Modesto Irrigation District	0.3%	\$395,000	139,820,000	-49.1%	65
PacifiCorp	0.1%	\$4,982,000	3,683,923,000	-87.9%	84
Alameda City of	0.1%	\$50,000	38,078,000	-77.6%	
Imperial Irrigation District	0.1%	\$245,000	204,433,000	-31.8%	90
Riverside City of	0.1%	\$134,000	165,515,000	-34.0%	98
Turlock Irrigation District	0.1%	\$80,000	106,713,000	-90.1%	100
Anaheim City of	0.1%	\$135,000	252,786,000	-73.3%	111
Los Angeles City of	0.0%	\$0	2,332,904,000	-100%	N/A
Western Area Power Admin	0.0%	\$0	793,226,000	0.0%	N/A
Sierra Pacific Power Co	0.0%	\$0	540,586,000	-100%	N/A
Southern California P P A	0.0%	\$0	268,575,000	0.0%	N/A
Santa Clara City of	0.0%	\$0	220,470,000	0.0%	N/A
Northern California Power Agny	0.0%	\$0	194,685,000	0.0%	N/A
California Dept-Wtr Resources	0.0%	\$0	140,942,000	0.0%	N/A
Pasadena City of	0.0%	\$0	123,603,000	-100%	N/A
Glendale City of	0.0%	\$0	121,303,000	0.0%	N/A
Burbank City of	0.0%	\$0	104,515,000	0.0%	N/A
Redding City of	0.0%	\$0	96,391,000	-100%	
San Francisco City & County of	0.0%	\$0	75,041,000	0.0%	
Vernon City of	0.0%	\$0	53,737,000	0.0%	
Lodi City of	0.0%	\$0	35,538,000	0.0%	
Colton City of	0.0%	\$0	24,279,000	0.0%	
Azusa City of	0.0%	\$0	23,343,000	0.0%	
Valley Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	21,546,000	0.0%	
Banning City of	0.0%	\$0	13,257,000	0.0%	
Southern California Water Co	0.0%	\$0	13,010,000	0.0%	
Ukiah City of	0.0%	\$0	12,726,000	0.0%	
Lassen Municipal Utility Dist	0.0%	\$0	12,603,000	0.0%	
Lompoc City of	0.0%	\$0	12,455,000	0.0%	
Yuba County Water Agency	0.0%	\$0	12,429,000	0.0%	
Plumas-Sierra Rural Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	9,636,000	0.0%	
Oakdale & South San Joaquin	0.0%	\$0	9,400,000	0.0%	
Truckee Donner Pub Util Dist	0.0%	\$0	9,026,000	0.0%	
Healdsburg City of	0.0%	\$0	6,760,000	0.0%	
Merced Irrigation District	0.0%	\$0	6,305,000	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 California - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Trinity County Pub Util Dist	0.0%	\$0	6,225,000	0.0%	
Surprise Valley Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	6,135,000	0.0%	
Shasta Dam Area Pub Util Dist	0.0%	\$0	5,617,000	0.0%	
Needles City of	0.0%	\$0	5,263,000	0.0%	
Anza Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,038,000	0.0%	
Gridley City of	0.0%	\$0	2,483,000	0.0%	
Tuolumne County Pub Power Agny	0.0%	\$0	1,290,000	0.0%	
Biggs City of	0.0%	\$0	841,000	0.0%	
Escondido City of	0.0%	\$0	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 Colorado.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Colorado Springs City of	0.8%	\$1,569,000	199,581,000	0.0%	34
Public Service Co of Colorado	0.2%	\$2,972,000	1,454,717,000	-58.1%	80
Loveland City of	0.1%	\$25,000	23,727,000	-64.3%	
Poudre Valley R E A Inc	0.1%	\$32,000	32,839,000	0.0%	
San Miguel Power Assn Inc	0.1%	\$10,000	11,342,000	0.0%	
United Power, Inc	0.1%	\$30,000	36,384,000	0.0%	
Longmont City of	0.1%	\$15,000	26,715,000	-76.2%	
Intermountain Rural Elec Assn	0.0%	\$0	81,808,000	0.0%	
Fort Collins City of	0.0%	\$0	57,669,000	0.0%	
Holy Cross Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	51,298,000	0.0%	
Wheatland Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	48,890,000	0.0%	
La Plata Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	43,426,000	0.0%	
Moon Lake Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	38,423,000	0.0%	
Delta Montrose Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	29,924,000	0.0%	
Yampa Valley Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	29,108,000	0.0%	
Mountain View Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	28,911,000	0.0%	
Empire Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,938,000	0.0%	
Y-W Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	20,686,000	0.0%	
Highline Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	19,994,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	18,250,000	0.0%	
San Isabel Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,992,000	0.0%	
San Luis Valley R E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,299,000	0.0%	
Mountain Parks Electric Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,550,000	0.0%	
Morgan County Rural Elec Assn	0.0%	\$0	11,961,000	0.0%	
Southeast Colorado Power Assn	0.0%	\$0	11,608,000	0.0%	
Rural Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	11,218,000	0.0%	
K C Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	10,020,000	0.0%	
Grand Valley Rrl Pwr Line Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,766,000	0.0%	
Fountain City of	0.0%	\$0	8,913,000	0.0%	
Fort Morgan City of	0.0%	\$0	8,192,000	0.0%	
Gunnison County Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,341,000	0.0%	
Estes Park Town of	0.0%	\$0	6,977,000	0.0%	
Glenwood Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	6,752,000	0.0%	
White River Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,655,000	0.0%	
Sangre De Cristo Elec Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,642,000	0.0%	
Lamar City of	0.0%	\$0	6,370,000	0.0%	
La Junta City of	0.0%	\$0	5,569,000	0.0%	
Aspen City of	0.0%	\$0	4,168,000	0.0%	
Trinidad City of	0.0%	\$0	3,165,000	0.0%	
Delta City of	0.0%	\$0	2,980,000	0.0%	
Gunnison City of	0.0%	\$0	2,794,000	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 Colorado - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Burlington City of	0.0%	\$0	2,039,000	0.0%	
Las Animas City of	0.0%	\$0	1,749,000	0.0%	
Yuma City of	0.0%	\$0	1,527,000	0.0%	
Wray City of	0.0%	\$0	1,472,000	0.0%	
Frederick Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,045,000	0.0%	
Center City of	0.0%	\$0	1,040,000	0.0%	
Holyoke City of	0.0%	\$0	862,000	0.0%	
Julesburg City of	0.0%	\$0	768,000	0.0%	
Springfield City of	0.0%	\$0	736,000	0.0%	
Lyons Town of	0.0%	\$0	561,000	0.0%	
Holly City of	0.0%	\$0	538,000	0.0%	
Haxtun Town of	0.0%	\$0	433,000	0.0%	
Oak Creek Town of	0.0%	\$0	357,000	0.0%	
Granada Town of	0.0%	\$0	221,000	0.0%	
Fleming City of	0.0%	\$0	141,000	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 Connecticut.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Connecticut Light & Power Co	1.3%	\$32,691,000	2,465,587,000	-12.9%	18
United Illuminating Co	0.4%	\$2,742,000	710,267,000	-77.9%	53
Connecticut Yankee Atom Pwr Co	0.0%	\$0	120,213,000	0.0%	N/A
Connecticut Mun Elec Engy Coop	0.0%	\$0	114,523,000	0.0%	N/A
Groton City of	0.0%	\$0	43,749,000	0.0%	
Wallingford Town of	0.0%	\$0	42,291,000	0.0%	
Norwich City of	0.0%	\$0	30,071,000	0.0%	
South Norwalk City of	0.0%	\$0	9,264,000	0.0%	
Bozrah Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	8,317,000	0.0%	
Norwalk Third Taxing District	0.0%	\$0	5,648,000	0.0%	
Jewett City City of	0.0%	\$0	2,219,000	0.0%	
Farmington River Power Co	0.0%	\$0	457,000	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 Delaware.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Delmarva Power & Light Co	0.2%	\$2,349,000	1,093,883,000	35.9%	78
Delaware Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	59,291,000	0.0%	
Dover City of	0.0%	\$0	44,908,000	0.0%	
Lewes City of	0.0%	\$0	26,787,000	0.0%	
Newark City of	0.0%	\$0	21,888,000	0.0%	
Milford City of	0.0%	\$0	11,269,000	0.0%	
Seaford City of	0.0%	\$0	7,725,000	0.0%	
Smyrna Town of	0.0%	\$0	4,089,000	0.0%	
Middletown Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,619,000	0.0%	
New Castle City of	0.0%	\$0	3,293,000	0.0%	
Clayton Town of	0.0%	\$0	623,000	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 District Of Columbia.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Potomac Electric Power Co	1.6%	\$29,562,000	1,863,510,000	-43.9%	11

* 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 Florida.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Florida Power & Light Co	1.1%	\$64,488,000	6,132,047,000	30.2%	24
Tampa Electric Co	0.5%	\$5,998,000	1,188,984,000	49.4%	46
Gulf Power Co	0.5%	\$3,154,000	625,856,000	61.1%	47
Gainesville Regional Utilities	0.4%	\$471,000	124,417,000	659.7%	57
Fort Pierce Utilities Auth	0.4%	\$167,000	46,549,000	2.5%	
Ocala City of	0.3%	\$226,000	80,946,000	96.5%	
Tallahassee City of	0.3%	\$459,000	172,755,000	39.1%	66
Florida Power Corp	0.2%	\$5,638,000	2,448,436,000	-52.5%	74
Choctawhatche Elec Coop Inc	0.2%	\$68,000	32,293,000	0.0%	
Reedy Creek Improvement Dist	0.1%	\$90,000	69,357,000	125.0%	
Lee County Electric Coop Inc	0.1%	\$221,000	186,674,000	-31.6%	89
Jacksonville Electric Auth	0.1%	\$713,000	758,799,000	-15.6%	96
Kissimmee Utility Authority	0.1%	\$50,000	71,126,000	-56.1%	
Seminole Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	537,936,000	0.0%	N/A
Orlando Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	393,486,000	-100%	N/A
Florida Municipal Power Agency	0.0%	\$0	230,106,000	0.0%	N/A
Withlacoochee River Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	182,045,000	-100%	N/A
Lakeland City of	0.0%	\$0	166,588,000	0.0%	N/A
Clay Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	155,909,000	0.0%	N/A
Sumter Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	109,137,000	0.0%	N/A
Key West City of	0.0%	\$0	60,386,000	0.0%	
Talquin Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	59,688,000	0.0%	
Vero Beach City of	0.0%	\$0	50,349,000	0.0%	
Jacksonville Beach City of	0.0%	\$0	48,030,000	0.0%	
Florida Keys EI Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	44,868,000	0.0%	
Florida Public Utilities Co	0.0%	\$0	38,683,000	0.0%	
Lake Worth City of	0.0%	\$0	34,655,000	0.0%	
Leesburg City of	0.0%	\$0	31,352,000	0.0%	
Okefenoke Rural EI Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	29,898,000	0.0%	
Central Florida Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	27,286,000	0.0%	
Peace River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	26,920,000	0.0%	
St Cloud City of	0.0%	\$0	25,385,000	0.0%	
Bartow City of	0.0%	\$0	24,860,000	0.0%	
West Florida EI Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	24,812,000	0.0%	
New Smyrna Beach Utils Comm	0.0%	\$0	24,692,000	0.0%	
Suwannee Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	23,689,000	0.0%	
Glades Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	22,552,000	0.0%	
Homestead City of	0.0%	\$0	21,787,000	0.0%	
Gulf Coast Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,990,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	16,296,000	0.0%	
Quincy City of	0.0%	\$0	10,772,000	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 Florida - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Escambia River Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,718,000	0.0%	
Green Cove Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	8,297,000	0.0%	
Clewiston City of	0.0%	\$0	7,957,000	0.0%	
Mount Dora City of	0.0%	\$0	5,849,000	0.0%	
Starke City of	0.0%	\$0	5,479,000	0.0%	
Alachua City of	0.0%	\$0	5,125,000	0.0%	
Wauchula City of	0.0%	\$0	4,376,000	0.0%	
Fort Meade City of	0.0%	\$0	3,664,000	0.0%	
Chattahoochee City of	0.0%	\$0	3,224,000	0.0%	
Newberry City of	0.0%	\$0	2,624,000	0.0%	
Blountstown City of	0.0%	\$0	2,475,000	0.0%	
Williston City of	0.0%	\$0	2,394,000	0.0%	
Havana Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	2,052,000	0.0%	
Bushnell City of	0.0%	\$0	1,749,000	0.0%	
Moore Haven City of	0.0%	\$0	1,413,000	0.0%	
Miami Power Corp	0.0%	\$0	27,000	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 Georgia.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Central Georgia El Member Corp	1.1%	\$412,000	36,646,000	8140%	
Ocmulgee Electric Member Corp	0.9%	\$97,000	11,399,000	0.0%	
Hart County Elec Member Corp	0.8%	\$250,000	32,660,000	66.7%	
Tri-County Elec Member Corp	0.7%	\$118,000	17,582,000	0.0%	
Grady County El Member Corp	0.6%	\$110,000	17,671,000	1000%	
Colquitt Electric Members Corp	0.5%	\$328,000	66,171,000	0.0%	
Flint Electric Membership Corp	0.5%	\$360,000	79,063,000	39.5%	
Sawnee Electric Member Corp	0.4%	\$416,000	111,758,000	715.7%	59
GreyStone Power Corp	0.3%	\$262,000	83,241,000	0.0%	
Cobb Electric Membership Corp	0.2%	\$300,000	204,812,000	66.7%	83
Amicalola Electric Member Corp	0.1%	\$22,000	31,852,000	83.3%	
Douglas City of	0.1%	\$8,000	16,122,000	300.0%	
Jefferson Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$12,000	34,429,000	9.1%	
Satilla Rural Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$5,000	48,488,000	66.7%	
Georgia Power Co	0.0%	\$0	4,383,320,000	-100%	N/A
Oglethorpe Power Corp	0.0%	\$0	1,047,784,000	0.0%	N/A
Chattanooga City of	0.0%	\$0	307,882,000	0.0%	N/A
Savannah Electric & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	225,872,000	-100%	N/A
Jackson Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	185,501,000	-100%	N/A
North Georgia Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	117,203,000	0.0%	N/A
Walton Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	110,350,000	-100%	N/A
Georgia Transmission Corp	0.0%	\$0	87,034,000	0.0%	
Marietta City of	0.0%	\$0	77,465,000	0.0%	
Snapping Shoals El Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	68,416,000	-100%	
Coweta-Fayette El Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	64,435,000	-100%	
Albany Water Gas & Light Comm	0.0%	\$0	56,335,000	0.0%	
Carroll Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	44,533,000	0.0%	
Dalton City of	0.0%	\$0	42,326,000	0.0%	
Thomasville City of	0.0%	\$0	30,446,000	0.0%	
Okefenoke Rural El Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	29,898,000	0.0%	
Mitchell Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	29,098,000	0.0%	
Troup County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	28,866,000	0.0%	
Cartersville City of	0.0%	\$0	27,983,000	0.0%	
Blue Ridge Mountain E M C	0.0%	\$0	27,970,000	0.0%	
La Grange City of	0.0%	\$0	27,415,000	0.0%	
Griffin City of	0.0%	\$0	25,573,000	0.0%	
Altamaha Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	24,149,000	-100%	
Habersham Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	24,075,000	0.0%	
Washington Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	22,317,000	0.0%	
Canoochee Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	22,080,000	0.0%	
Calhoun City of	0.0%	\$0	21,822,000	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 Georgia - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
East Point City of	0.0%	\$1,000	21,602,000	0.0%	
Sumter Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	20,007,000	0.0%	
Excelsior Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	19,254,000	0.0%	
Crisp County Power Comm	0.0%	\$0	18,243,000	0.0%	
Haywood Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	17,926,000	-100%	
College Park City of	0.0%	\$0	17,272,000	0.0%	
Covington City of	0.0%	\$0	17,242,000	0.0%	
Sylvania City of	0.0%	\$0	17,118,000	0.0%	
Lamar Electric Membership Corp	0.0%	\$0	16,296,000	0.0%	
Lawrenceville City of	0.0%	\$0	16,049,000	0.0%	
Oconee Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	15,989,000	0.0%	
Rayle Electric Membership Corp	0.0%	\$0	15,757,000	-100%	
Coastal Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	15,372,000	-100%	
Planters Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	14,781,000	0.0%	
Three Notch Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	14,288,000	0.0%	
Fitzgerald Wtr Lgt & Bond Comm	0.0%	\$0	13,436,000	0.0%	
Moultrie City of	0.0%	\$0	13,207,000	0.0%	
Irwin County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	12,055,000	0.0%	
Newnan Wtr Sewer & Light Comm	0.0%	\$0	11,636,000	0.0%	
Little Ocmulgee EI Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	9,880,000	0.0%	
Monroe Water Light & Gas Comm	0.0%	\$0	8,746,000	0.0%	
Cairo City of	0.0%	\$0	8,639,000	0.0%	
Elberton City of	0.0%	\$0	8,265,000	0.0%	
Slash Pine Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	8,189,000	0.0%	
Upson County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	8,029,000	0.0%	
Middle Georgia EI Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	7,968,000	0.0%	
Thomaston City of	0.0%	\$0	7,968,000	0.0%	
Washington City of	0.0%	\$0	7,447,000	0.0%	
Fort Valley Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	7,239,000	0.0%	
La Fayette City of	0.0%	\$0	6,298,000	0.0%	
Adel City of	0.0%	\$0	6,195,000	0.0%	
Camilla City of	0.0%	\$0	5,998,000	0.0%	
Blakely City of	0.0%	\$0	5,664,000	0.0%	
Buford City of	0.0%	\$0	5,621,000	0.0%	
Sylvester City of	0.0%	\$0	5,506,000	0.0%	
Sandersville City of	0.0%	\$0	5,331,000	0.0%	
Norcross City of	0.0%	\$0	5,046,000	0.0%	
Forsyth City of	0.0%	\$0	4,975,000	0.0%	
Pataula Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	4,975,000	0.0%	
Acworth City of	0.0%	\$0	4,332,000	0.0%	
Quitman City of	0.0%	\$0	4,174,000	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 Georgia - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Barnesville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,135,000	0.0%	
Commerce City of	0.0%	\$0	3,718,000	0.0%	
West Point City of	0.0%	\$0	3,200,000	0.0%	
Jackson City of	0.0%	\$0	2,997,000	0.0%	
Fairburn City of	0.0%	\$0	2,704,000	0.0%	
Palmetto City of	0.0%	\$0	1,889,000	0.0%	
Chickamauga City of	0.0%	\$0	1,840,000	0.0%	
Hogansville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,782,000	0.0%	
Monticello City of	0.0%	\$0	1,703,000	0.0%	
Ellaville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,560,000	0.0%	
Oxford City of	0.0%	\$0	1,127,000	0.0%	
Hampton City of	0.0%	\$0	942,000	0.0%	
Doerun City of	0.0%	\$0	560,000	0.0%	
Whigham City of	0.0%	\$0	489,000	0.0%	
Mansfield Town of	0.0%	\$0	400,000	0.0%	
Grantville City of	0.0%	\$0	371,000	0.0%	
Brinson Town of	0.0%	\$0	106,000	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 Hawaii.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Maui Electric Co Ltd	0.9%	\$1,417,000	152,947,000	1303%	29
Hawaiian Electric Co Inc	0.8%	\$6,515,000	784,688,000	573.0%	32
Hawaii Electric Light Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	161,120,000	-100%	N/A

* 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 Idaho.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Washington Water Power Co	0.4%	\$3,225,000	725,883,000	-85.9%	51
Idaho Power Co	0.3%	\$2,336,000	748,503,000	-72.8%	64
PacifiCorp	0.1%	\$4,982,000	3,683,923,000	-87.9%	84
Idaho Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	38,914,000	0.0%	
Inland Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	31,887,000	0.0%	
Lower Valley Power & Light Inc	0.0%	\$0	26,371,000	0.0%	
Northern Lights Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,391,000	0.0%	
Kootenai Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	14,218,000	-100%	
Fall River Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,299,000	0.0%	
Clearwater Power Co	0.0%	\$0	10,447,000	0.0%	
Missoula Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,819,000	0.0%	
Salmon River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,395,000	0.0%	
Raft River Rural Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,016,000	0.0%	
Vigilante Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,423,000	0.0%	
Burley City of	0.0%	\$0	6,087,000	0.0%	
Rural Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	4,169,000	0.0%	
Rupert City of	0.0%	\$0	3,754,000	0.0%	
Heyburn City of	0.0%	\$0	3,448,000	0.0%	
Unity Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	3,222,000	0.0%	
Bonnars Ferry City of	0.0%	\$0	3,219,000	0.0%	
Idaho Cnty L&P Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,079,000	0.0%	
Lost River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,787,000	0.0%	
Weiser City of	0.0%	\$0	1,871,000	0.0%	
South Side Electric Lines Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,603,000	0.0%	
Soda Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	1,458,000	0.0%	
Plummer City of	0.0%	\$0	1,333,000	0.0%	
East End Mutual Elec Co Ltd	0.0%	\$0	744,000	0.0%	
Albion City of	0.0%	\$0	167,000	0.0%	
Farmers Electric Co Ltd	0.0%	\$0	153,000	0.0%	
Declo City of	0.0%	\$0	119,000	0.0%	
Atlanta Power Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	51,000	0.0%	
Minidoka City of	0.0%	\$0	41,000	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 Illinois.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Interstate Power Co	1.5%	\$4,138,000	277,340,000	113.4%	14
Springfield City of	0.2%	\$208,000	105,121,000	5.6%	79
Eastern Illini Electric Coop	0.1%	\$25,000	20,426,000	0.0%	
Union Electric Co	0.1%	\$2,248,000	2,188,571,000	0.0%	92
Grant Electric Coop	0.1%	\$7,000	10,262,000	40.0%	
Central Illinois Light Co	0.0%	\$104,000	338,298,000	13.0%	115
Southeastern IL Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$7,000	35,722,000	0.0%	
Commonwealth Edison Co	0.0%	\$0	7,073,086,000	-100%	N/A
Illinois Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,419,941,000	-100%	N/A
Central Illinois Pub Serv Co	0.0%	\$0	700,517,000	0.0%	N/A
Illinois Municipal Elec Agency	0.0%	\$0	69,828,000	0.0%	
Naperville City of	0.0%	\$0	55,459,000	0.0%	
Southern Illinois Power Coop	0.0%	\$0	49,184,000	0.0%	
Southwestern Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	28,472,000	0.0%	
Corn Belt Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	25,896,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	24,289,000	0.0%	
St Charles City of	0.0%	\$0	22,900,000	0.0%	
Wayne-White Counties Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	22,174,000	0.0%	
Norris Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	18,915,000	0.0%	
Shelby Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	17,005,000	0.0%	
Egyptian Electric Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	16,067,000	0.0%	
Batavia City of	0.0%	\$0	15,939,000	0.0%	
Menard Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	14,029,000	0.0%	
Coles-Moultrie Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	13,824,000	0.0%	
Illinois Rural Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	13,311,000	0.0%	
Southern Illinois Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	13,054,000	0.0%	
Rochelle Municipal Utilities	0.0%	\$0	11,853,000	0.0%	
Geneva City of	0.0%	\$0	10,616,000	0.0%	
Adams Electrical Coop	0.0%	\$0	10,561,000	0.0%	
M J M Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	10,366,000	0.0%	
Winnetka Village of	0.0%	\$0	10,069,000	0.0%	
Rantoul Village of	0.0%	\$0	10,034,000	0.0%	
South Beloit Water Gas&Elec Co	0.0%	\$0	9,636,000	0.0%	
Peru City of	0.0%	\$0	9,348,000	0.0%	
Mt Carmel Public Utility Co	0.0%	\$0	9,227,000	0.0%	
Illinois Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,832,000	0.0%	
Clinton County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,246,000	0.0%	
Rural Electric Conven Coop	0.0%	\$0	8,226,000	0.0%	
Edgar Electric Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	7,965,000	0.0%	
Monroe County Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,439,000	0.0%	
Highland City of	0.0%	\$0	7,173,000	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 Illinois - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Princeton City of	0.0%	\$0	6,974,000	0.0%	
Jo-Carroll Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,292,000	0.0%	
Rock Falls City of	0.0%	\$0	6,230,000	0.0%	
McDonough Power Coop	0.0%	\$0	6,174,000	0.0%	
Flora City of	0.0%	\$0	6,057,000	0.0%	
Spoon River Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,392,000	0.0%	
Rock County Electric Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	5,123,000	0.0%	
Oglesby City of	0.0%	\$0	4,805,000	0.0%	
Cairo Public Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	4,663,000	0.0%	
Marshall City of	0.0%	\$0	4,363,000	0.0%	
Western Illinois Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	4,307,000	0.0%	
Fairfield City of	0.0%	\$0	4,243,000	0.0%	
Metropolis City of	0.0%	\$0	3,893,000	0.0%	
Clay Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,774,000	0.0%	
Geneseo City of	0.0%	\$0	3,612,000	0.0%	
Waterloo City of	0.0%	\$0	3,534,000	0.0%	
Carmi City of	0.0%	\$0	3,398,000	0.0%	
Sullivan City of	0.0%	\$0	3,316,000	0.0%	
Mascoutah City of	0.0%	\$0	2,924,000	0.0%	
Carlyle City of	0.0%	\$0	2,616,000	0.0%	
Casey City of	0.0%	\$0	2,595,000	0.0%	
Chatham Village of	0.0%	\$0	2,449,000	0.0%	
Breese City of	0.0%	\$0	2,226,000	0.0%	
Red Bud City of	0.0%	\$0	2,118,000	0.0%	
Bushnell City of	0.0%	\$0	1,916,000	0.0%	
Freeburg Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,782,000	0.0%	
Farmers Mutual Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	1,754,000	0.0%	
Newton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,662,000	0.0%	
Altamont City of	0.0%	\$0	1,559,000	0.0%	
Riverton Village of	0.0%	\$0	1,535,000	0.0%	
McLeansboro City of	0.0%	\$0	1,477,000	0.0%	
Farmer City City of	0.0%	\$0	1,354,000	0.0%	
Roodhouse City of	0.0%	\$0	956,000	0.0%	
Greenup Village of	0.0%	\$0	851,000	0.0%	
Ladd Village of	0.0%	\$0	752,000	0.0%	
Bethany Village of	0.0%	\$0	563,000	0.0%	
Albany City of	0.0%	\$0	288,000	0.0%	
Allendale City of	0.0%	\$0	215,000	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 Indiana.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
PSI Energy Inc	0.2%	\$4,742,000	1,958,469,000	-81.6%	72
Indianapolis Power & Light Co	0.1%	\$517,000	738,134,000	-30.4%	102
Southern Indiana Gas & Elec Co	0.1%	\$131,000	273,453,000	-92.3%	109
Indiana Michigan Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,391,917,000	-100%	N/A
Northern Indiana Pub Serv Co	0.0%	\$0	1,017,083,000	0.0%	N/A
Hoosier Energy R E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	280,880,000	0.0%	N/A
Indiana Municipal Power Agency	0.0%	\$0	156,978,000	0.0%	N/A
Indiana-Kentucky Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	148,265,000	0.0%	N/A
Alcoa Generating Corp	0.0%	\$0	72,967,000	0.0%	
Lafayette Public Power Auth	0.0%	\$0	42,926,000	0.0%	
Richmond City of	0.0%	\$0	40,631,000	0.0%	
Anderson City of	0.0%	\$0	34,624,000	0.0%	
Mishawaka City of	0.0%	\$0	30,171,000	0.0%	
South Central Indiana REMC	0.0%	\$0	28,295,000	0.0%	
Northeastern Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	25,372,000	0.0%	
Southeastern Indiana R E M C	0.0%	\$0	23,639,000	0.0%	
Jackson County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	23,413,000	0.0%	
Fruit Belt Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	22,095,000	0.0%	
Auburn City of	0.0%	\$0	21,812,000	0.0%	
Harrison County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	21,645,000	0.0%	
Hendricks County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	20,973,000	0.0%	
Western Indiana Energy REMC	0.0%	\$0	20,765,000	0.0%	
United Rural Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	19,932,000	0.0%	
Logansport City of	0.0%	\$0	19,391,000	0.0%	
Crawfordsville Elec Lgt&Pwr Co	0.0%	\$0	19,171,000	-100%	
Tipmont Rural Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	18,652,000	0.0%	
Clark County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	17,608,000	0.0%	
Utilities Dist-Western IN REMC	0.0%	\$0	16,351,000	-100%	
Johnson County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	15,887,000	0.0%	
Frankfort City of	0.0%	\$0	14,698,000	0.0%	
Kosciusko County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	14,435,000	0.0%	
Jasper City of	0.0%	\$0	14,151,000	0.0%	
Bartholomew County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	13,949,000	0.0%	
Paulding-Putman Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,587,000	0.0%	
Kankakee Valley Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	13,464,000	0.0%	
Parke County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	12,298,000	0.0%	
Dubois Rural Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,017,000	0.0%	
Whitewater Valley R E M C	0.0%	\$0	11,831,000	0.0%	
Decatur County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	11,763,000	0.0%	
Noble County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	10,987,000	0.0%	
Boone County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	10,464,000	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 Indiana - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Peru City of	0.0%	\$0	9,892,000	0.0%	
Hancock County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	9,567,000	0.0%	
Greenfield City of	0.0%	\$0	9,430,000	0.0%	
Southern Indiana R E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,423,000	0.0%	
Shelby County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	9,229,000	0.0%	
Daviess Martin County R E M C	0.0%	\$0	9,190,000	0.0%	
Bluffton City of	0.0%	\$0	9,058,000	0.0%	
Henry County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	8,610,000	0.0%	
Carroll County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	8,172,000	0.0%	
Scottsburg City of	0.0%	\$0	8,092,000	0.0%	
Wabash County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	8,058,000	0.0%	
Jasper County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	7,784,000	0.0%	
Lebanon City of	0.0%	\$0	7,751,000	0.0%	
Tell City City of	0.0%	\$0	7,608,000	0.0%	
Washington City of	0.0%	\$0	7,475,000	0.0%	
White County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	7,039,000	0.0%	
Orange County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	6,782,000	0.0%	
Miami-Cass County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	6,586,000	0.0%	
Steuben County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	6,554,000	0.0%	
Jay County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	6,467,000	0.0%	
Lagrange County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	6,339,000	0.0%	
Marshall County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	6,079,000	0.0%	
Bremen Town of	0.0%	\$0	5,860,000	0.0%	
Columbia City City of	0.0%	\$0	5,771,000	0.0%	
Warren County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	5,589,000	0.0%	
Rush County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	5,404,000	0.0%	
Fulton County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	5,269,000	0.0%	
Huntingburg City of	0.0%	\$0	4,574,000	0.0%	
Boonville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,342,000	0.0%	
Edinburg City of	0.0%	\$0	4,308,000	0.0%	
Lawrenceburg City of	0.0%	\$0	4,257,000	0.0%	
Garrett City of	0.0%	\$0	3,894,000	0.0%	
Rensselaer City of	0.0%	\$0	3,834,000	0.0%	
Linton City of	0.0%	\$0	3,813,000	0.0%	
Winamac Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,796,000	0.0%	
Greendale Town of	0.0%	\$0	3,768,000	0.0%	
Gas City City of	0.0%	\$0	2,948,000	0.0%	
Bargersville Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,861,000	0.0%	
Pendleton Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,241,000	0.0%	
Paoli Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,175,000	0.0%	
Walkerton City of	0.0%	\$0	2,173,000	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 Indiana - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Argos Town of	0.0%	\$0	2,116,000	0.0%	
Ferdinand Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,898,000	0.0%	
Rising Sun City of	0.0%	\$0	1,871,000	0.0%	
Rockville Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,754,000	0.0%	
Newton County Rural E M C	0.0%	\$0	1,671,000	0.0%	
Veedersburg Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,668,000	0.0%	
Avilla Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,463,000	0.0%	
Covington City of	0.0%	\$0	1,425,000	0.0%	
Cannelton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,343,000	0.0%	
Hagerstown Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,198,000	0.0%	
Warren Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,144,000	0.0%	
Flora Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,143,000	0.0%	
Knightstown Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,129,000	0.0%	
Centerville Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,070,000	0.0%	
South Whitley Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,007,000	0.0%	
Darlington Light & Power Co	0.0%	\$0	998,000	0.0%	
Middletown Town of	0.0%	\$0	989,000	0.0%	
Williamspport City of	0.0%	\$0	955,000	0.0%	
Frankton Town of	0.0%	\$0	859,000	0.0%	
Thorntown City of	0.0%	\$0	815,000	0.0%	
Brookston Town of	0.0%	\$0	780,000	0.0%	
New Carlisle Town of	0.0%	\$0	759,000	0.0%	
Troy City of	0.0%	\$0	667,000	0.0%	
Montezuma Town of	0.0%	\$0	598,000	0.0%	
Brooklyn Town of	0.0%	\$0	516,000	0.0%	
West Harrison Gas & Elec Co	0.0%	\$0	501,000	0.0%	
Ladoga Town of	0.0%	\$0	478,000	0.0%	
Jamestown City of	0.0%	\$0	448,000	0.0%	
Pittsboro Town of	0.0%	\$0	414,000	0.0%	
Kingsford Heights Town of	0.0%	\$0	409,000	0.0%	
Spiceland Town of	0.0%	\$0	393,000	0.0%	
Etna Green Town of	0.0%	\$0	356,000	0.0%	
Waynetown City of	0.0%	\$0	344,000	0.0%	
Advance Town of	0.0%	\$0	316,000	0.0%	
Bainbridge Town of	0.0%	\$0	281,000	0.0%	
Dublin Town of	0.0%	\$0	251,000	0.0%	
Coatesville Town of	0.0%	\$0	230,000	0.0%	
Chalmers Town of	0.0%	\$0	227,000	0.0%	
New Ross City of	0.0%	\$0	146,000	0.0%	
Lewisville City of	0.0%	\$0	115,000	0.0%	
Dunreith City of	0.0%	\$0	97,000	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 Indiana - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Straughn Town of	0.0%	\$0	87,000	0.0%	
Town of Crane	0.0%	\$0	74,000	0.0%	
Commonwealth Edison Co IN Inc	0.0%	\$0	0	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 Iowa.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Glidden Rural Electric Coop	2.9%	\$82,000	2,864,000	0.0%	
IES Utilities Inc	2.1%	\$12,754,000	604,270,000	380.0%	7
Pella City of	2.0%	\$229,000	11,367,000	81.8%	
Cedar Falls City of	1.9%	\$300,000	16,206,000	43.5%	
Southern Iowa Elec Coop Inc	1.6%	\$92,000	5,711,000	0.0%	
Interstate Power Co	1.5%	\$4,138,000	277,340,000	113.4%	14
Iowa Lakes Electric Coop	1.3%	\$240,000	18,427,000	69.0%	
Spencer City of	0.8%	\$46,000	6,038,000	0.0%	
Atlantic City of	0.8%	\$38,000	5,044,000	0.0%	
Central Iowa Power Coop	0.4%	\$368,000	90,589,000	-39.9%	
Northwest Iowa Power Coop	0.4%	\$117,000	33,683,000	143.8%	
Webster City City of	0.3%	\$28,000	9,111,000	0.0%	
MidAmerican Energy Co	0.3%	\$2,767,000	1,126,300,000	0.0%	69
Tri-County Electric Coop	0.2%	\$36,000	16,208,000	3500%	
Muscatine City of	0.2%	\$100,000	50,335,000	-59.5%	
Midland Power Cooperative	0.1%	\$7,000	14,912,000	-91.1%	
Eastern Iowa Light&Power Coop	0.0%	\$0	32,425,000	0.0%	
Ames City of	0.0%	\$0	25,411,000	-100%	
Maquoketa Valley Rrl Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	16,632,000	0.0%	
Linn County Rural E C A	0.0%	\$0	16,253,000	0.0%	
East-Central Iowa R E C	0.0%	\$0	11,585,000	0.0%	
S E Iowa Coop Electric Assn	0.0%	\$0	10,589,000	0.0%	
United Electric Coop, Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,969,000	0.0%	
Butler County Rural Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	8,606,000	0.0%	
Allamakee-Clayton El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,539,000	0.0%	
Hawkeye Tri-County El Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,376,000	0.0%	
T I P Rural Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	8,215,000	0.0%	
Grundy Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,969,000	0.0%	
Farmers Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,896,000	0.0%	
South Crawford Rural Elec Corp	0.0%	\$0	7,561,000	0.0%	
North West Rural Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	7,077,000	0.0%	
Waverly City of	0.0%	\$0	6,815,000	0.0%	
Nobles Coop Electric	0.0%	\$0	6,118,000	0.0%	
Wright County Rural Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	6,035,000	0.0%	
Marshall County Rrl Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	5,910,000	0.0%	
Nishnabotna Valley R E C	0.0%	\$0	5,696,000	0.0%	
Clarke Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,579,000	0.0%	
Guthrie County Rural E C A	0.0%	\$0	5,564,000	0.0%	
Algona City of	0.0%	\$0	5,240,000	0.0%	
Chariton Valley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,222,000	0.0%	
Denison City of	0.0%	\$0	5,096,000	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 Iowa - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Maquoketa City of	0.0%	\$0	4,937,000	0.0%	
Indianola City of	0.0%	\$0	4,674,000	0.0%	
Amana Society Service Co	0.0%	\$0	4,632,000	0.0%	
Plymouth Electric Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	4,490,000	0.0%	
Mt Pleasant City of	0.0%	\$0	4,263,000	0.0%	
Cedar Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	4,232,000	0.0%	
Woodbury County Rural E C A	0.0%	\$0	4,214,000	0.0%	
Harrison County Rrl Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,885,000	0.0%	
Independence City of	0.0%	\$0	3,853,000	0.0%	
Hancock County Rural Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,706,000	0.0%	
Atchison-Holt Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,628,000	0.0%	
Grundy County Rural Elec Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,582,000	0.0%	
Harlan City of	0.0%	\$0	3,524,000	0.0%	
Rideta Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,407,000	0.0%	
Lyon Rural Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,391,000	0.0%	
Humboldt County R E C	0.0%	\$0	3,387,000	0.0%	
Pella Coop Elec Assn	0.0%	\$0	3,355,000	0.0%	
Forest City City of	0.0%	\$0	3,308,000	0.0%	
Orange City City of	0.0%	\$0	3,294,000	0.0%	
Sioux Center City of	0.0%	\$0	3,292,000	0.0%	
Franklin Rural Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	3,074,000	0.0%	
New Hampton City of	0.0%	\$0	3,001,000	0.0%	
Winterset City of	0.0%	\$0	2,856,000	0.0%	
Winnebago Rural Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	2,830,000	0.0%	
Estherville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,825,000	0.0%	
Lake Mills City of	0.0%	\$0	2,760,000	0.0%	
Ida County Rural Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	2,619,000	0.0%	
Story City City of	0.0%	\$0	2,438,000	0.0%	
Adams County Coop Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	2,399,000	0.0%	
Calhoun County Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	2,381,000	0.0%	
West Liberty City of	0.0%	\$0	2,355,000	0.0%	
Osage City of	0.0%	\$0	2,299,000	0.0%	
Vinton City of	0.0%	\$0	2,285,000	0.0%	
Eldridge City of	0.0%	\$0	2,090,000	0.0%	
Nyman Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,980,000	0.0%	
Bloomfield City of	0.0%	\$0	1,951,000	0.0%	
Tipton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,901,000	0.0%	
Sibley City of	0.0%	\$0	1,793,000	0.0%	
Greenfield City of	0.0%	\$0	1,748,000	0.0%	
Sac County Rural Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	1,681,000	0.0%	
Osceola Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,678,000	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 Iowa - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Grundy Center City of	0.0%	\$0	1,630,000	0.0%	
Manning City of	0.0%	\$0	1,594,000	0.0%	
Hawarden City of	0.0%	\$0	1,566,000	0.0%	
Onawa City of	0.0%	\$0	1,469,000	0.0%	
Laurens City of	0.0%	\$0	1,461,000	0.0%	
Wilton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,433,000	0.0%	
Milford City of	0.0%	\$0	1,364,000	0.0%	
Fredericksburg City of	0.0%	\$0	1,355,000	0.0%	
Sergeant Bluff City of	0.0%	\$0	1,350,000	0.0%	
Bellevue City of	0.0%	\$0	1,334,000	0.0%	
Traer City of	0.0%	\$0	1,310,000	0.0%	
Coon Rapids City of	0.0%	\$0	1,304,000	0.0%	
New London Municipal Utilities	0.0%	\$0	1,303,000	0.0%	
Lamoni City of	0.0%	\$0	1,262,000	0.0%	
Montezuma City of	0.0%	\$0	1,232,000	0.0%	
Carlisle City of	0.0%	\$0	1,164,000	0.0%	
Rock Rapids City of	0.0%	\$0	1,135,000	0.0%	
State Center City of	0.0%	\$0	1,087,000	0.0%	
Guttenberg City of	0.0%	\$0	1,076,000	0.0%	
Pocahontas City of	0.0%	\$0	976,000	0.0%	
Durant City of	0.0%	\$0	935,000	0.0%	
Stuart City of	0.0%	\$0	924,000	0.0%	
Cascade City of	0.0%	\$0	920,000	0.0%	
Lake View City of	0.0%	\$0	917,000	0.0%	
West Point City of	0.0%	\$0	899,000	0.0%	
Hartley City of	0.0%	\$0	888,000	0.0%	
Sumner City of	0.0%	\$0	882,000	0.0%	
Ogden City of	0.0%	\$0	872,000	0.0%	
Keosauqua City of	0.0%	\$0	865,000	0.0%	
Sanborn City of	0.0%	\$0	822,000	0.0%	
La Porte City City of	0.0%	\$0	810,000	0.0%	
Hudson City of	0.0%	\$0	802,000	0.0%	
Panora City of	0.0%	\$0	793,000	0.0%	
Mapleton City of	0.0%	\$0	779,000	0.0%	
Lenox City of	0.0%	\$0	751,000	0.0%	
Brooklyn City of	0.0%	\$0	747,000	0.0%	
Akron City of	0.0%	\$0	712,000	0.0%	
Strawberry Point City of	0.0%	\$0	690,000	0.0%	
Corning City of	0.0%	\$0	684,000	0.0%	
Remsen City of	0.0%	\$0	677,000	0.0%	
Denver City of	0.0%	\$0	671,000	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 Iowa - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Bancroft Municipal Utilities	0.0%	\$0	656,000	0.0%	
Dysart City of	0.0%	\$0	647,000	0.0%	
Alta City of	0.0%	\$0	636,000	0.0%	
Woodbine City of	0.0%	\$0	584,000	0.0%	
Gowrie City of	0.0%	\$0	533,000	0.0%	
Ellsworth City of	0.0%	\$0	529,000	0.0%	
Villisca City of	0.0%	\$0	509,000	0.0%	
Primghar City of	0.0%	\$0	508,000	0.0%	
Preston City of	0.0%	\$0	505,000	0.0%	
Aurelia City of	0.0%	\$0	495,000	0.0%	
Graettinger City of	0.0%	\$0	494,000	0.0%	
Lake Park City of	0.0%	\$0	493,000	0.0%	
Paulina City of	0.0%	\$0	492,000	0.0%	
McGregor City of	0.0%	\$0	479,000	0.0%	
Hopkinton City of	0.0%	\$0	470,000	0.0%	
Anita City of	0.0%	\$0	467,000	0.0%	
Grand Junction City of	0.0%	\$0	457,000	0.0%	
Wall Lake City of	0.0%	\$0	451,000	0.0%	
Fairbank City of	0.0%	\$0	434,000	0.0%	
Alton City of	0.0%	\$0	430,000	0.0%	
Glidden City of	0.0%	\$0	428,000	0.0%	
Afton City of	0.0%	\$0	419,000	0.0%	
Rockford City of	0.0%	\$0	415,000	0.0%	
Dike City of	0.0%	\$0	413,000	0.0%	
Aplington City of	0.0%	\$0	380,000	0.0%	
Stratford City of	0.0%	\$0	379,000	0.0%	
Boone Valley Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	375,000	0.0%	
Manilla Town of	0.0%	\$0	373,000	0.0%	
Hinton City of	0.0%	\$0	366,000	0.0%	
Stanton City of	0.0%	\$0	366,000	0.0%	
Dayton City of	0.0%	\$0	363,000	0.0%	
Danville City of	0.0%	\$0	355,000	0.0%	
Anthon City of	0.0%	\$0	354,000	0.0%	
Coggon City of	0.0%	\$0	346,000	0.0%	
Fonda City of	0.0%	\$0	329,000	0.0%	
Whittemore City of	0.0%	\$0	323,000	0.0%	
Buffalo City of	0.0%	\$0	323,000	0.0%	
Larchwood City of	0.0%	\$0	318,000	0.0%	
Earlville City of	0.0%	\$0	297,000	0.0%	
Fontanelle City of	0.0%	\$0	293,000	0.0%	
Breda City of	0.0%	\$0	275,000	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 Iowa - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Farnhamville City of	0.0%	\$0	268,000	0.0%	
Sabula City of	0.0%	\$0	267,000	0.0%	
Readlyn City of	0.0%	\$0	263,000	0.0%	
Renwick City of	0.0%	\$0	258,000	0.0%	
Burt City of	0.0%	\$0	251,000	0.0%	
Stanhope City of	0.0%	\$0	248,000	0.0%	
Shelby City of	0.0%	\$0	242,000	0.0%	
Neola City of	0.0%	\$0	240,000	0.0%	
Marathon City of	0.0%	\$0	239,000	0.0%	
Livermore City of	0.0%	\$0	228,000	0.0%	
Corwith City of	0.0%	\$0	201,000	0.0%	
Long Grove City of	0.0%	\$0	180,000	0.0%	
Lehigh City of	0.0%	\$0	177,000	0.0%	
Lawler City of	0.0%	\$0	176,000	0.0%	
Callender City of	0.0%	\$0	170,000	0.0%	
Paton City of	0.0%	\$0	165,000	0.0%	
Orient City of	0.0%	\$0	161,000	0.0%	
Woolstock City of	0.0%	\$0	151,000	0.0%	
Kimballton City of	0.0%	\$0	132,000	0.0%	
Auburn City of	0.0%	\$0	126,000	0.0%	
Alta Vista City of	0.0%	\$0	124,000	0.0%	
Bigelow City of	0.0%	\$0	122,000	0.0%	
Grafton City of	0.0%	\$0	113,000	0.0%	
Cass Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	87,000	0.0%	
Westfield Town of	0.0%	\$0	71,000	0.0%	
Tennant City of	0.0%	\$0	36,000	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 Kansas.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Southwestern Public Service Co	0.4%	\$3,563,000	960,682,000	281.1%	58
Kansas City Power & Light Co	0.0%	\$0	895,943,000	0.0%	N/A
Western Resources, Inc	0.0%	\$0	615,218,000	0.0%	N/A
KG&E a Western Resources Co	0.0%	\$0	612,473,000	0.0%	N/A
KAMO Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	162,053,000	0.0%	N/A
Kansas City City of	0.0%	\$0	129,013,000	0.0%	N/A
Kansas Electric Power Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	76,949,000	0.0%	
Midwest Energy Inc	0.0%	\$0	55,070,000	0.0%	
Wheatland Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	48,890,000	0.0%	
Pioneer Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	26,548,000	0.0%	
McPherson City of	0.0%	\$0	24,779,000	0.0%	
Garden City City of	0.0%	\$0	14,030,000	0.0%	
Winfield City of	0.0%	\$0	13,199,000	0.0%	
Coffeyville City of	0.0%	\$0	12,434,000	0.0%	
Prairie Land Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,812,000	0.0%	
Sekan Electric Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	11,315,000	0.0%	
Kansas Municipal Energy Agency	0.0%	\$0	10,705,000	0.0%	
Western Coop Electric Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,786,000	0.0%	
Alfalfa Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,732,000	0.0%	
Chanute City of	0.0%	\$0	9,320,000	0.0%	
Butler Rural El Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	9,079,000	0.0%	
Kaw Valley Elec Coop Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,806,000	0.0%	
Lyon County Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,349,000	0.0%	
D S & O Rural E C A Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,266,000	0.0%	
CMS Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,254,000	0.0%	
Victory Electric Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	8,197,000	0.0%	
Wellington City of	0.0%	\$0	7,976,000	0.0%	
Leavenworth-Jefferson E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,842,000	0.0%	
Ark Valley Elec Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	7,287,000	0.0%	
Ottawa City of	0.0%	\$0	6,922,000	0.0%	
Flint Hills Rural E C A Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,834,000	0.0%	
Sedgwick Cnty El Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,772,000	0.0%	
Sumner-Cowley Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	6,538,000	0.0%	
Lane-Scott Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,758,000	0.0%	
Caney Valley El Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,585,000	0.0%	
Iola City of	0.0%	\$0	5,408,000	0.0%	
Ninnescah Rural E C A Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,275,000	0.0%	
Russell City of	0.0%	\$0	5,010,000	0.0%	
Pratt City of	0.0%	\$0	4,724,000	0.0%	
Jewell-Mitchell Coop Elec Inc	0.0%	\$0	4,333,000	0.0%	
Radiant Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,959,000	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 Kansas - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Augusta City of	0.0%	\$0	3,941,000	0.0%	
P R & W Electric Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,860,000	0.0%	
Brown-Atchison E C A Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,830,000	0.0%	
Gardner City of	0.0%	\$0	3,699,000	0.0%	
Goodland City of	0.0%	\$0	3,688,000	0.0%	
Smoky Hill Elec Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,683,000	0.0%	
C & W Rural Elec Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,508,000	0.0%	
N C K Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,270,000	0.0%	
Larned City of	0.0%	\$0	3,186,000	0.0%	
Clay Center City of	0.0%	\$0	3,180,000	0.0%	
Nemaha-Marshall E C A Inc	0.0%	\$0	3,127,000	0.0%	
Kingman City of	0.0%	\$0	3,068,000	0.0%	
Hugoton City of	0.0%	\$0	3,064,000	0.0%	
Colby City of	0.0%	\$0	3,063,000	0.0%	
Beloit City of	0.0%	\$0	2,915,000	0.0%	
Neodesha City of	0.0%	\$0	2,886,000	0.0%	
Twin Valley Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,738,000	0.0%	
Wamego City of	0.0%	\$0	2,622,000	0.0%	
Girard City of	0.0%	\$0	2,562,000	0.0%	
Sabetha City of	0.0%	\$0	2,560,000	0.0%	
Holton City of	0.0%	\$0	2,434,000	0.0%	
Fredonia City of	0.0%	\$0	2,331,000	0.0%	
Mulvane City of	0.0%	\$0	2,181,000	0.0%	
Osawatomie City of	0.0%	\$0	2,052,000	0.0%	
Eudora City of	0.0%	\$0	2,046,000	0.0%	
Burlington City of	0.0%	\$0	2,022,000	0.0%	
Norton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,996,000	0.0%	
Lindsborg City of	0.0%	\$0	1,876,000	0.0%	
Belleville City of	0.0%	\$0	1,840,000	0.0%	
Baldwin City City of	0.0%	\$0	1,812,000	0.0%	
Anthony City of	0.0%	\$0	1,749,000	0.0%	
Garnett City of	0.0%	\$0	1,646,000	0.0%	
Seneca City of	0.0%	\$0	1,625,000	0.0%	
Hillsboro City of	0.0%	\$0	1,616,000	0.0%	
Lakin City of	0.0%	\$0	1,502,000	0.0%	
Hoisington City of	0.0%	\$0	1,471,000	0.0%	
Herington City of	0.0%	\$0	1,446,000	0.0%	
Sterling City of	0.0%	\$0	1,434,000	0.0%	
Ellinwood City of	0.0%	\$0	1,381,000	0.0%	
Doniphan Elec Coop Assn Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,311,000	0.0%	
Osage City City of	0.0%	\$0	1,307,000	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 Kansas - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Oberlin City of	0.0%	\$0	1,232,000	0.0%	
Hill City City of	0.0%	\$0	1,230,000	0.0%	
Moundridge City of	0.0%	\$0	1,212,000	0.0%	
Oakley City of	0.0%	\$0	1,205,000	0.0%	
Cimarron City of	0.0%	\$0	1,204,000	0.0%	
Marion City of	0.0%	\$0	1,195,000	0.0%	
St Marys City of	0.0%	\$0	1,187,000	0.0%	
Meade City of	0.0%	\$0	1,153,000	0.0%	
Johnson City of	0.0%	\$0	1,118,000	0.0%	
Osborne City of	0.0%	\$0	1,081,000	0.0%	
Dighton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,066,000	0.0%	
St Francis City of	0.0%	\$0	1,028,000	0.0%	
Greensburg City of	0.0%	\$0	1,010,000	0.0%	
Minneapolis City of	0.0%	\$0	1,004,000	0.0%	
Horton City of	0.0%	\$0	1,002,000	0.0%	
Lincoln Center City of	0.0%	\$0	993,000	0.0%	
Stockton City of	0.0%	\$0	972,000	0.0%	
Arma City of	0.0%	\$0	925,000	0.0%	
St John City of	0.0%	\$0	903,000	0.0%	
La Crosse City of	0.0%	\$0	896,000	0.0%	
Kiowa City of	0.0%	\$0	847,000	0.0%	
Washington City of	0.0%	\$0	831,000	0.0%	
Haven City of	0.0%	\$0	794,000	0.0%	
Stafford City of	0.0%	\$0	784,000	0.0%	
Sharon Springs City of	0.0%	\$0	691,000	0.0%	
Ashland City of	0.0%	\$0	683,000	0.0%	
Wathena City of	0.0%	\$0	679,000	0.0%	
Montezuma City of	0.0%	\$0	675,000	0.0%	
Erie City of	0.0%	\$0	672,000	0.0%	
Burlingame City of	0.0%	\$0	671,000	0.0%	
Chapman City of	0.0%	\$0	662,000	0.0%	
Chetopa City of	0.0%	\$0	607,000	0.0%	
Oxford City of	0.0%	\$0	602,000	0.0%	
Mankato City of	0.0%	\$0	557,000	0.0%	
Jetmore City of	0.0%	\$0	556,000	0.0%	
Altamont City of	0.0%	\$0	533,000	0.0%	
Alma City of	0.0%	\$0	530,000	0.0%	
Troy City of	0.0%	\$0	512,000	0.0%	
Mount Hope City of	0.0%	\$0	491,000	0.0%	
Pomona City of	0.0%	\$0	413,000	0.0%	
Waterville City of	0.0%	\$0	408,000	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 Kansas - Continued.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Udall City of	0.0%	\$0	407,000	0.0%	
Attica City of	0.0%	\$0	405,000	0.0%	
Cawker City City of	0.0%	\$0	379,000	0.0%	
Elwood City of	0.0%	\$0	375,000	0.0%	
Gasco City of	0.0%	\$0	354,000	0.0%	
Enterprise City of	0.0%	\$0	348,000	0.0%	
Scranton City of	0.0%	\$0	336,000	0.0%	
Centralia City of	0.0%	\$0	323,000	0.0%	
Galva City of	0.0%	\$0	310,000	0.0%	
Moran City of	0.0%	\$0	305,000	0.0%	
Mulberry City of	0.0%	\$0	290,000	0.0%	
Lucas City of	0.0%	\$0	288,000	0.0%	
La Harpe City of	0.0%	\$0	242,000	0.0%	
Glen Elder City of	0.0%	\$0	236,000	0.0%	
Holyrood City of	0.0%	\$0	211,000	0.0%	
Bronson City of	0.0%	\$0	181,000	0.0%	
Axtell City of	0.0%	\$0	169,000	0.0%	
Arcadia City of	0.0%	\$0	160,000	0.0%	
Prescott City of	0.0%	\$0	148,000	0.0%	
Toronto City of	0.0%	\$0	141,000	0.0%	
Luray City of	0.0%	\$0	126,000	0.0%	
Herndon City of	0.0%	\$0	123,000	0.0%	
Radium City of	0.0%	\$0	120,000	0.0%	
Blue Mound City of	0.0%	\$0	114,000	0.0%	
Iuka City of	0.0%	\$0	114,000	0.0%	
Robinson City of	0.0%	\$0	108,000	0.0%	
Summerfield Town of	0.0%	\$0	97,000	0.0%	
Isabel City of	0.0%	\$0	94,000	0.0%	
Morrill City of	0.0%	\$0	92,000	0.0%	
Muscotah City of	0.0%	\$0	66,000	0.0%	
Vermillion City of	0.0%	\$0	56,000	0.0%	
Seward City of	0.0%	\$0	49,000	0.0%	
Savonburg City of	0.0%	\$0	45,000	0.0%	
Elsmore City of	0.0%	\$0	36,000	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 Kentucky.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Louisville Gas & Electric Co	0.4%	\$2,262,000	614,532,000	0.0%	60
East Kentucky Power Coop Inc	0.3%	\$1,000,000	385,495,000	0.0%	68
Tennessee Valley Authority	0.2%	\$12,600,000	5,753,883,000	130.1%	76
Union Light Heat & Power Co	0.2%	\$407,000	192,774,000	0.0%	77
Harrison County Rural E C C	0.1%	\$13,000	11,567,000	0.0%	
Kentucky Utilities Co	0.0%	\$159,000	716,437,000	-74.0%	117
Owen County Rural El Coop Corp	0.0%	\$7,000	56,701,000	-75.9%	
Kentucky Power Co	0.0%	\$0	359,543,000	-100%	N/A
Electric Energy Inc	0.0%	\$0	232,029,000	0.0%	N/A
Green River Electric Corp	0.0%	\$0	143,852,000	0.0%	N/A
Henderson-Union Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	84,379,000	0.0%	
Warren Rural Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	75,098,000	0.0%	
Owensboro City of	0.0%	\$0	71,043,000	0.0%	
Pennyriple Rural Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	58,378,000	0.0%	
Tri-County Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	58,293,000	0.0%	
West Kentucky Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	48,527,000	0.0%	
South Kentucky Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	45,049,000	0.0%	
Bowling Green City of	0.0%	\$0	42,726,000	0.0%	
Jackson County Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	42,120,000	0.0%	
Henderson City Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	36,181,000	0.0%	
Paducah City of	0.0%	\$0	34,492,000	0.0%	
Jackson Purchase El Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	33,407,000	0.0%	
Salt River Rural El Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	32,249,000	0.0%	
Nolin Rural Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	27,630,000	0.0%	
Frankfort City of	0.0%	\$0	26,340,000	0.0%	
Fleming-Mason Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	24,223,000	0.0%	
Blue Grass Rural El Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	23,777,000	0.0%	
Hopkinsville City of	0.0%	\$0	21,644,000	0.0%	
Cumberland Valley Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	21,096,000	0.0%	
Meade County Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	20,718,000	0.0%	
Clark Rural Electric Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	19,444,000	0.0%	
Inter County Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	18,253,000	0.0%	
Farmers Rural Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	18,229,000	0.0%	
Glasgow City of	0.0%	\$0	17,642,000	0.0%	
Taylor County Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	17,434,000	0.0%	
Shelby Rural Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	16,707,000	0.0%	
Murray City of	0.0%	\$0	13,899,000	0.0%	
Madisonville City of	0.0%	\$0	13,211,000	0.0%	
Licking Valley Rural E C C	0.0%	\$0	12,752,000	0.0%	
Big Sandy Rural Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	12,338,000	0.0%	
Grayson Rural Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	12,029,000	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 Kentucky - Continued.

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	0.0%	\$0	10,344,000	0.0%	
Mayfield City of	0.0%	\$0	9,651,000	0.0%	
Fox Creek Rural Elec Coop Corp	0.0%	\$0	8,799,000	0.0%	
Russellville City of	0.0%	\$0	8,045,000	0.0%	
Bardstown City of	0.0%	\$0	7,571,000	0.0%	
Hickman-Fulton Counties RECC	0.0%	\$0	7,474,000	0.0%	
Princeton City of	0.0%	\$0	6,330,000	0.0%	
Nicholasville City of	0.0%	\$0	5,943,000	0.0%	
Monticello City of	0.0%	\$0	5,531,000	0.0%	
Jellico City of	0.0%	\$0	5,408,000	0.0%	
Berea College	0.0%	\$0	5,238,000	0.0%	
Barbourville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,374,000	0.0%	
Fulton City of	0.0%	\$0	3,915,000	0.0%	
Benton City of	0.0%	\$0	3,824,000	0.0%	
Williamstown Utility Comm	0.0%	\$0	3,334,000	0.0%	
Corbin Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	3,243,000	0.0%	
Vanceburg City of	0.0%	\$0	2,349,000	0.0%	
Providence City of	0.0%	\$0	1,794,000	0.0%	
Hickman City of	0.0%	\$0	1,782,000	0.0%	
Paris City of	0.0%	\$0	1,581,000	0.0%	
Olive Hill City of	0.0%	\$0	1,229,000	0.0%	
Falmouth City of	0.0%	\$0	1,157,000	0.0%	
Bardwell City of	0.0%	\$0	429,000	0.0%	
Benham City of	0.0%	\$0	309,000	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 Louisiana.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Entergy Gulf States, Inc	0.0%	\$0	2,067,485,000	-100%	N/A
Entergy Louisiana, Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,803,272,000	0.0%	N/A
Central Louisiana Elec Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	456,245,000	0.0%	N/A
Entergy New Orleans, Inc	0.0%	\$0	410,269,000	0.0%	N/A
Lafayette City of	0.0%	\$0	109,539,000	0.0%	N/A
Southwest Louisiana E M C	0.0%	\$0	95,098,000	0.0%	
Dixie Electric Membership Corp	0.0%	\$0	91,089,000	0.0%	
Louisiana Energy & Power Auth	0.0%	\$0	55,004,000	0.0%	
Washington-St Tammany E C Inc	0.0%	\$0	47,032,000	0.0%	
Alexandria City of	0.0%	\$0	43,164,000	0.0%	
Beauregard Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	41,616,000	0.0%	
Valley Electric Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	35,929,000	0.0%	
South Louisiana Elec Coop Assn	0.0%	\$0	28,001,000	0.0%	
Claiborne Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	27,131,000	0.0%	
Terrebonne Parish Consol Gov't	0.0%	\$0	19,025,000	0.0%	
Northeast Louisiana Power Coop	0.0%	\$0	15,547,000	0.0%	
Natchitoches City of	0.0%	\$0	13,760,000	0.0%	
Jefferson Davis Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,653,000	0.0%	
Ruston City of	0.0%	\$0	13,561,000	0.0%	
Panola-Harrison Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	13,554,000	0.0%	
Pointe Coupee Elec Member Corp	0.0%	\$0	13,412,000	0.0%	
Concordia Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	12,842,000	0.0%	
Morgan City City of	0.0%	\$0	10,957,000	0.0%	
Abbeville City of	0.0%	\$0	9,705,000	0.0%	
Minden City of	0.0%	\$0	9,018,000	0.0%	
Plaquemine City of	0.0%	\$0	5,661,000	0.0%	
Ashley Chicot Elec Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	5,431,000	0.0%	
Rayne City of	0.0%	\$0	5,065,000	0.0%	
Winnfield City of	0.0%	\$0	4,634,000	0.0%	
Vidalia Town of	0.0%	\$0	4,595,000	0.0%	
St Martinville City of	0.0%	\$0	4,137,000	0.0%	
Kaplan City of	0.0%	\$0	3,655,000	0.0%	
New Roads City of	0.0%	\$0	2,997,000	0.0%	
Vinton City of	0.0%	\$0	2,593,000	0.0%	
Jonesville City of	0.0%	\$0	2,245,000	0.0%	
Welsh Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,638,000	0.0%	
Erath Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,300,000	0.0%	
Gueydan Town of	0.0%	\$0	1,263,000	0.0%	
Boyce Town of	0.0%	\$0	514,000	0.0%	
Town of Elizabeth	0.0%	\$0	274,000	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 Maine.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Central Maine Power Co	1.3%	\$12,494,000	944,390,000	-1.6%	19
Bangor Hydro-Electric Co	0.4%	\$699,000	186,432,000	-30.2%	62
Maine Public Service Co	0.1%	\$47,000	55,019,000	-39.0%	
Maine Yankee Atomic Power Co	0.0%	\$0	238,586,000	0.0%	N/A
Maine Electric Power Co Inc	0.0%	\$0	24,473,000	0.0%	
Eastern Maine Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	13,157,000	0.0%	
Madison Town of	0.0%	\$0	10,774,000	0.0%	
Houlton Water Co	0.0%	\$0	7,247,000	0.0%	
Kennebunk Light & Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	5,323,000	0.0%	
Fox Islands Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	1,205,000	0.0%	
Van Buren Light & Power Dist	0.0%	\$0	1,027,000	0.0%	
Swans Island Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	442,000	0.0%	
Matinicus Plantation Elec Co	0.0%	\$0	66,000	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 Maryland.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Potomac Electric Power Co	1.6%	\$29,562,000	1,863,510,000	-43.9%	11
Southern Maryland El Coop Inc	1.6%	\$3,109,000	197,026,000	91.3%	12
Baltimore Gas & Electric Co	1.3%	\$27,791,000	2,192,016,000	-1.7%	20
Delmarva Power & Light Co	0.2%	\$2,349,000	1,093,883,000	35.9%	78
Potomac Edison Co	0.1%	\$773,000	760,973,000	-31.8%	93
Hagerstown City of	0.0%	\$5,000	20,144,000	0.0%	
Choptank Electric Coop Inc	0.0%	\$0	53,855,000	0.0%	
Easton Utilities Comm	0.0%	\$0	14,551,000	-100%	
A & N Electric Coop	0.0%	\$0	13,126,000	0.0%	
Berlin City of	0.0%	\$0	3,786,000	0.0%	
Thurmont Municipal Light Co	0.0%	\$0	3,592,000	0.0%	
Williamsport Town of	0.0%	\$0	995,000	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 Massachusetts.

Utility	Efficiency Investment as Percent of Revenue	Efficiency Investment 1997	Revenue 1997	Efficiency Investment Trend 93-97	National Rank for Efficiency Investment*
Massachusetts Electric Co	2.8%	\$45,620,000	1,624,085,000	18.4%	4
Western Massachusetts Elec Co	2.1%	\$8,941,000	426,447,000	-40.1%	8
Eastern Edison Co	1.4%	\$4,000,000	277,323,000	-31.8%	16
Fitchburg Gas & Elec Light Co	0.9%	\$457,000	49,436,000	-30.8%	
Boston Edison Co	0.8%	\$13,542,000	1,768,712,000	-69.3%	36
Norwood City of	0.5%	\$132,000	27,591,000	-30.5%	
Taunton City of	0.5%	\$216,000	46,963,000	-42.9%	
Commonwealth Electric Co	0.4%	\$1,748,000	466,961,000	-50.0%	61
Cambridge Electric Light Co	0.2%	\$311,000	131,326,000	-87.0%	73
Holyoke City of	0.2%	\$51,000	27,403,000	104.0%	
Concord Town of	0.1%	\$17,000	12,948,000	0.0%	
Braintree Town of	0.1%	\$40,000	35,948,000	-38.5%	
Chicopee City of	0.1%	\$18,000	32,576,000	-83.6%	
Littleton Town of	0.0%	\$5,000	14,955,000	25.0%	
Reading Town of	0.0%	\$10,000	58,672,000	0.0%	
Shrewsbury Town of	0.0%	\$5,000	23,530,000	-85.7%	
New England Power Co	0.0%	\$0	1,677,903,000	0.0%	N/A
Montaup Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	347,709,000	-100%	N/A
Massachusetts Mun Whls Elec Co	0.0%	\$0	257,054,000	0.0%	N/A
Holyoke Water Power Co	0.0%	\$0	71,826,000	0.0%	
Peabody City of	0.0%	\$0	40,597,000	0.0%	
Westfield City of	0.0%	\$0	35,079,000	0.0%	
Holyoke Power & Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	32,024,000	-0.0%	
Danvers Town of	0.0%	\$0	31,179,000	0.0%	
Hudson Town of	0.0%	\$0	27,751,000	0.0%	
North Attleborough Town of	0.0%	\$0	19,047,000	0.0%	
Wakefield Town of	0.0%	\$0	18,375,000	0.0%	
Wellesley Town of	0.0%	\$0	17,843,000	0.0%	
Mansfield Town of	0.0%	\$0	17,202,000	0.0%	
Middleborough Town of	0.0%	\$0	16,944,000	0.0%	
Hingham City of	0.0%	\$0	14,730,000	-100%	
Nantucket Electric Co	0.0%	\$0	14,553,000	0.0%	
South Hadley Town of	0.0%	\$0	13,281,000	0.0%	
Belmont Town of	0.0%	\$0	10,830,000	0.0%	
Marblehead City of	0.0%	\$0	9,470,000	0.0%	
Holden City of	0.0%	\$0	9,010,000	0.0%	
Middleton City of	0.0%	\$0	8,217,000	0.0%	
Ipswich Town of	0.0%	\$0	7,553,000	0.0%	
Templeton Town of	0.0%	\$0	6,440,000	0.0%	
West Boylston Town of	0.0%	\$0	5,946,000	0.0%	
Groton City of	0.0%	\$0	5,483,000	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 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.



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 Elecificatn 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.